




V. 6

9282 C36

Kansas City  
Public Library



This Volume is for  
REFERENCE USE ONLY

3-39-6m-P









# The Catholic Encyclopedia

---

VOLUME SIX

Fathers—Gregory



# THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

AN INTERNATIONAL WORK OF REFERENCE  
ON THE CONSTITUTION, DOCTRINE,  
DISCIPLINE, AND HISTORY OF THE  
CATHOLIC CHURCH

EDITED BY


CHARLES G. HERBERMANN, PH.D., LL.D.

EDWARD A. PACE, PH.D., D.D.      CONDÉ B. PALLAN, PH.D., LL.D.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D.      JOHN J. WYNNE, S.J.

ASSISTED BY NUMEROUS COLLABORATORS

IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES  
VOLUME VI



New York  
ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY



*Nihil Obstat, September 1, 1909*

REMY LAFORT

CENSOR

*Imprimatur*

✠ JOHN M. FARLEY

ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

*Copyright, 1909*

BY ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

The articles in this work have been written specially for The Catholic Encyclopedia and are protected by copyright. All rights, including the right of translation and reproduction, are reserved.

## Contributors to the Sixth Volume

- AHERNE, CORNELIUS, PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, RECTOR, ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE, MILL HILL, LONDON: Galatians, Epistle to the.
- ALBERS, P., S.J., MAASTRICHT, HOLLAND: Gorkum, The Martyrs of.
- ÁLDÁSY, ANTAL, PH.D., ARCHIVIST OF THE LIBRARY OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM, BUDAPEST: Gran, Archdiocese of.
- ALSTON, G. CYPRIAN, O.S.B., DOWNSIDE ABBEY, BATH, ENGLAND: Fontenelle, Abbey of; Fontfroide, Abbey of; Gall, Abbey of Saint; Garland; Gaudete Sunday; General Chapter; Glebe; Goscelin.
- ARENDZEN, J. P., S.T.D., M.A. (CANTAB.), PROFESSOR OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE, WARE, ENGLAND: Gabriel Sionita; Gnosticism.
- ASTRAÍN, ANTONIO, S.J., MADRID: Francis Xavier, Saint.
- AVELING, FRANCIS, S.T.D., LONDON: Form; Free-Thinkers.
- BARBIERI, REMIGIO GUIDO, TITULAR BISHOP OF THEODOSIOPOLIS, VICAR APOSTOLIC OF GIBALTAR: Gibraltar, Vicariate Apostolic of.
- BARNES, ARTHUR STAPYLTON, M.A. (OXON. AND CANTAB.), CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND: Glabrio, Manius Acilius.
- BARRETT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., BUCKIE, SCOTLAND: Fort Augustus Abbey; Graham, Patrick.
- † BARRY, ALBERT, C.S.S.R., LIMERICK, IRELAND: Furniss, John.
- BENIGNI, UMBERTO, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, PONT. COLLEGIO URBANO DI PROPAGANDA, ROME: Ferentino, Diocese of; Fermo, Archdiocese of; Ferrara, Archdiocese of; Fiesole, Diocese of; Florence, Archdiocese of; Foggia, Diocese of; Foligno, Diocese of; Forlì, Diocese of; Fossano, Diocese of; Fossombrone, Diocese of; Frascati, Diocese of; Gaeta, Archdiocese of; Gallipoli, Diocese of; Galluppi, Pasquale; Galtelli-Nuoro, Diocese of; Genoa, Archdiocese of; Gerace, Diocese of; Giberti, Gian Matteo; Gioberti, Vincenzo; Girgenti, Diocese of; Gonzaga, Ercole; Gonzaga, Scipione; Grassis, Paris de; Gravina and Montepeloso, Diocese of.
- BERGH, FREDERICK THOMAS, O.S.B., ABBOT OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CARSHALTON, SURREY, ENGLAND: Genuflexion.
- † Deceased
- BEWERUNGE, H., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH MUSIC, ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, DUBLIN: Gregorian Chant.
- BIHL, MICHAEL, O.F.M., LECTOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, COLLEGIO SAN BONAVENTURA, QUARACCHI, FLORENCE: Fraticelli; Friars Minor, Order of; Gerardus Odonis.
- BOOTHMAN, C. T., KINGSTOWN, IRELAND: Fitzherbert, Maria Anne; Glanville, Ranulf de.
- BOUDINHON, AUGUSTE-MARIE, S.T.D., D.C.L., DIRECTOR, "CANONISTE CONTEMPORAIN", PROFESSOR OF CANON LAW, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, PARIS: Forgery, Forger; Formularies; Gibert, Jean-Pierre; Glaire, Jean-Baptiste; Glosses, Glossaries, Glossarists.
- BRANN, HENRY A., D.D., NEW YORK: Grace, William Russell.
- BRAUN, JOSEPH, S.J., BELLEVUE, LUXEMBURG: Gloves, Episcopal.
- BRÉHIER, LOUIS-RENÉ, PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF CLERMONT-FERRAND, PUY-DE-DÔME, FRANCE: Foulque de Neuilly; Fregoso, Federico; Froissart, Jean; Gesta Dei per Francos; Godfrey of Bouillon.
- BRIAULT, MAURICE, C.S.Sp., PARIS: Gaboon, Vicariate Apostolic of.
- BROCK, HENRY M., S.J., PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS, HOLY CROSS COLLEGE, WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS: Ferdinand, Blessed; Feuillet, Louis; Fixmillner, Placidus; Fontana, Felice; Förster, Arnold; Förster, Thomas Ignatius Maria; Fresnel, Augustin-Jean; Gerbillon, Jean-François.
- BROWN, CHARLES FRANCIS WEMYSS, LOCHTON CASTLE, PERTSHIRE, SCOTLAND: Gandolphy, Peter; Gervase, George; Goldwell, Thomas; Gother, John; Gradwell, Robert.
- BURKE, EDMUND, B.A., INSTRUCTOR IN LATIN, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Filelfo, Francesco; Forcellini, Egidio; Fust, John.
- BURTON, EDWIN, S.T.D., F.S. HIST. SOC., VICE-PRESIDENT, ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE, WARE, ENGLAND: Fenn, John; Finch, John, Venerable; Fitzalan, Henry; Fitzherbert, Sir Anthony; Fleming, Richard; Fletcher, John; Floyd, John; Formby, Henry; Fowler, John; Gardiner, Stephen; Geoffrey of Dunstable; Geoffrey of Monmouth; Gerard, Archbishop of York; Gervase of Canterbury; Gesta Romanorum; Goffe, Stephen; Goss, Alexander; Grant, Thomas; Green, Thomas Louis.

# CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SIXTH VOLUME

- BUTLER, RICHARD URBAN, O.S.B., DOWNSIDE ABBEY, BATH, ENGLAND: Gilbertines, Order of; Gilbert of Sempringham, Saint.
- CAMM, BEDE, O.S.B., B.A. (OXON.), ERDINGTON ABBEY, BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND: Feckenham, John de.
- CARTER, MARY GILMORE, NEW YORK: Gilmore, Patrick Sarsfield.
- CASANOVA, GERTRUDE, O.S.B., STANBROOK ABBEY, WORCESTER, ENGLAND: Gertrude the Great, Saint; Gertrude van der Oosten, Venerable.
- CASARTELLI, L. C., S.T.D., BISHOP OF SALFORD, ENGLAND: Gentili, Aloysius.
- CHAPMAN, JOHN, O.S.B., B.A. (OXON.), PRIOR OF ST. THOMAS'S ABBEY, ERDINGTON, BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND: Fathers of the Church; Fessler, Joseph; Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea; Fulgentius, Fabius Claudius Gordianus, Saint; Gauden- tius, Saint; Gennadius I, Saint.
- CLEARY, GREGORY, O.F.M., S.T.L., J.U.L., PRO- FESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW, ST. ISIDORE'S COLLEGE, ROME: Friar.
- CLEARY, HENRY W., EDITOR, "NEW ZEALAND TABLET", DUNEDIN, NEW ZEALAND: Goulburn, Diocese of.
- CLUGNET, JOSEPH-LÉON-TIBURCE, LITT.L., PARIS: Gatianus, Saint; Gerard, Saint, Abbot of Brogne; Gerard, Saint, Bishop of Toul; Goar, Saint.
- COFFEY, PETER, S.T.L., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, DUBLIN: Gilbert de la Porrée; Godfrey of Fon- taines.
- COLEMAN, AMBROSE, O.P., M.R.I.A., ST. SAV- IOUR'S PRIORY, DUBLIN: Felix III, Saint, Pope; Felix of Nola, Saint.
- CONNOLLY, ARTHUR THEODORE, B.D., Bos- ton: Fitton, James.
- COOREMAN, JOSEPH, S.J., V.G., GENERAL MANA- GER OF THE SCHOOLS OF THE DIOCESE OF GALLE, CEYLON: Galle, Diocese of.
- CORBETT, JOHN, S.J., NEW YORK: Gradual Psalms.
- CORDIER, HENRI, PROFESSOR AT THE SCHOOL FOR ORIENTAL LIVING LANGUAGES, PARIS: Gaubil, Antoine.
- CRAM, RALPH ADAMS, F.R.G.S., F. AM. INST. ARCHITECTS, PRESIDENT, BOSTON SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS, BOSTON: Gothic Architecture.
- CREUTZBERG, HEINRICH AUGUST, PH.D., KREFELD, GERMANY: George the Bearded.
- CRIVELLI, CAMILLUS, S.J., PROFESSOR OF GEN- ERAL HISTORY, INSTITUTO CIENTÍFICO, CITY OF MEXICO: Figueroa, Francisco García de la Rosa; Gómara, Francisco López de.
- CUTHBERT, FATHER, O.S.F.C., CRAWLEY, SUS- SEX, ENGLAND: Felix of Cantalice, Saint; Fidelis of Sigmaringen, Saint; Francis of Paula, Saint; Fyfe, William Benedict; Gennings, Edmund and John.
- D'ALTON, E. A., M.R.I.A., ATHENRY, IRELAND: Fitzpatrick, William John; Fleming, Patrick; Galway and Kilmacduagh, Diocese of.
- DEBUCHY, PAUL, S.J., LITT.L., ENGHEN, BEL- GIUM. Gagliardi, Achille; Gaudier, Antoine le; Gisbert, Blaise.
- DEGERT, ANTOINE, LL.D., EDITOR, "LA REVUE DE LA GASCOGNE", PROFESSOR OF LATIN LITERA- TURE, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, TOULOUSE: Féné- lon, François de Salignac de la Mothe; Gallican- ism.
- DELAMARRE, LOUIS N., PH.D., INSTRUCTOR IN FRENCH, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK. Fauriel, Charles-Claude; Florian, Jean-Pierre- Claris; Gebhart, Emile; Gilbert, Nicolas-Joseph- Laurent; Giraud de Borneil.
- DELANY, JOSEPH, S.T.D., NEW YORK: Fear (from moral standpoint); Gluttony; Good Faith.
- DE SMEDT, CIL, S.J., BRUSSELS: Gamans, Jean.
- DEVINE, ARTHUR, C.P., PROFESSOR OF THEOL- OGY, ST. SAVIOUR'S RETREAT, BROADWAY, WORCESTERSHIRE, ENGLAND: Gabriel Possenti, Blessed.
- DEVITT, E. J., S.J., PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON: George- town University.
- DINNEEN, MICHAEL FRANCIS, S.T.D., PRO- FESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY, ST. MARY'S UNI- VERSITY, BALTIMORE: Good, The Highest.
- DIONNE, N. E., M.D., LL.D., LIBRARIAN TO THE LEGISLATURE OF QUEBEC: Fréchette, Louis- Honoré.
- DONOVAN, STEPHEN M., O.F.M., WASHINGTON: Ferber, Nicolaus; Fonseca, José Ribeiro da; Fonseca Soares, Antonio da; Francis Solanus, Saint; Frassen, Claude; Gaudentius of Brescia.
- DOUMIC, RENÉ, MEMBER OF THE FRENCH ACADEMY, LITERARY AND DRAMATIC CRITIC, "REVUE DES DEUX MONDES", PARIS: French Literature.
- DRISCOLL, JAMES F., S.T.D., NEW YORK: Firmam- ent; Gog and Magog; Golden Calf.
- DRISCOLL, JOHN THOMAS, M.A., S.T.L., FONDA, NEW YORK: Fetishism.
- D'SA, MANOEL F. X., PRINCIPAL, ANTONIO DE SOUZA SCHOOL, MAZAGON, BOMBAY, INDIA: Gar- cia, Gonsalo, Saint.
- DUBRAY, CHARLES A., S.M., S.T.B., PH. D., PRO- FESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, MARIST COLLEGE, WASH- INGTON: Franchi, Ausonio; Gaultier, Aloisius- Edouard-Camille; Gédoyne, Nicolas; Gérando, Joseph-Marie de; Ginouliac, Jacques-Marie- Achille; Girard, Jean-Baptiste.
- DUNFORD, DAVID, DIOCESAN INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS, HODDESDON, HERTFORDSHIRE, ENG- LAND: Fear (in Canon Law); Foundation; Gar- dellini, Aloisio; Funeral Dues; Gavantus, Barto- lommeo.
- DUNN, ARCHIBALD JOSEPH, F.S.S., F.R. HIST. Soc., LONDON: Feilding, Rudolph William Basil.

# CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SIXTH VOLUME

- HEALY, PATRICK J., S.T.D., ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Faustus of Riez; Felicissimus; Firmicus Maternus; Flavia Domitilla; Fulgentius Ferrandus.
- HECKMANN, FERDINAND, O.F.M., TEACHER OF LATIN AND GREEK, FRANCISCAN MONASTERY, WASHINGTON; Ferdinand III, Saint.
- HERBERMANN, CHARLES G., PH.D., LL.D., LITT.D., K.S.G., PROFESSOR OF LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Frank, Michael Sigismund.
- HIND, GEORGE ELPHEGE, O.S.B., GLAMORGANSHIRE, WALES: Faversham Abbey; Folkestone Abbey; Fountains Abbey; Furness Abbey.
- HOEBER, KARL, PH.D., EDITOR, "VOLKSZEITUNG" AND "AKADEMISCHE MONATSBLÄTTER", COLOGNE: Galerius, Valerius Maximianus; Gallienus, Publius Licinius Egnatius; Graz, University of.
- HOFFMANN, ALEXIUS, O.S.B., ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA: Feder, Johann Michael; Feilmoser, Andreas Benedict; Feneberg, John Michael Nathanael.
- HOLWECK, FREDERICK G., ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI: Feasts, Ecclesiastical.
- HUDLESTON, GILBERT ROGER, O.S.B., DOWNSIDE ABBEY, BATH, ENGLAND: Glastonbury Abbey; Gregory I, Saint, Pope.
- HULL, ERNEST R., S.J., EDITOR, "THE EXAMINER", BOMBAY, INDIA: Goa, Archdiocese of.
- HUNT, LEIGH, PROFESSOR OF ART, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Gaillard, Claude-Ferdinand; Giocondo, Fra Giovanni; Giorgione; Goya y Lucientes, Francisco José de.
- HUNT, THOMAS JOHN, DUBLIN: Goyaz, Diocese of.
- HUNTER-BLAIR, SIR D. O., BART., O.S.B., M.A., OXFORD: Foreman, Andrew; Free Church of Scotland; Gillis, James.
- HUONDER, ANTHONY, S.J., EDITOR, "KATHOLISCHE MISSIONEN", BELLEVUE, LUXEMBURG: Fridelli, Xaver Ehrenbert; Fritz, Samuel.
- HYDE, DOUGLAS, LL.D., LITT.D., M.R.I.A., FRENCHPARK, CO. ROSCOMMON, IRELAND: Four Masters, Annals of the.
- ISENBERG, ANTHONY FRANCIS, EDITOR, "MORNING STAR", NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA: Gayarré, Charles Etienne Arthur.
- JAROSSEAU, ANDRÉ, O.M. CAP., TITULAR BISHOP OF SOATRA, VICAR APOSTOLIC OF GALLA, HARAR, ABYSSINIA: Galla, Vicariate Apostolic of.
- JARRETT, BEDE, O.P., B.A. (OXON.), S.T.L., ST. DOMINIC'S PRIORY, LONDON: Feudalism.
- JENNER, HENRY, F.S.A., LATE OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON: Gallican Rite, The.
- JEROME, MOTHER MARY, DOYLE, NEW YORK: Felician Sisters.
- JOYCE, GEORGE HAYWARD, S.J., M.A. (OXON.), PROFESSOR OF LOGIC, STONYHURST COLLEGE, BLACKBURN, ENGLAND: Fundamental Articles.
- KAMPERS, FRANZ, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN CHURCH HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF BRESLAU: Frederick I; Frederick II; Germany, from the beginning to 1556; Godfrey of Viterbo.
- KEILEY, JARVIS, M.A., GRANTWOOD, NEW JERSEY: Georgia.
- KELLY, BLANCHE M., NEW YORK: Ferrer, Rafael, Gerona, Diocese of; Granada, University of; Grassel, Lorenz.
- KELLY, LEO A., PH.B., ROCHESTER, NEW YORK: Frankfort, Council of.
- KIRSCH, JOHANN PETER, S.T.D., DOMESTIC PRELATE, PROFESSOR OF PATROLOGY AND CHRISTIAN ARCHEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG, SWITZERLAND: Felicitas, Saint; Felicitas and Perpetua, Saints; Felix I, Saint, Pope; Felix II, Pope; Felix IV, Pope; Felix V, Antipope; Flaccilla, Elia; Fleury, Claude; Florentina, Saint; Florus; Formosus, Pope; Forty Martyrs; Four Crowned Martyrs; Fribourg, University of; Fridolin, Saint; Fulcran, Saint; Fulgentius, Saint; Funfkirchen, Diocese of; Funk, Franz Xaver von; Galletti, Pietro Luigi; Gaudiosus, Bishop of Tarazona; Germanus I, Saint; Gobelius, Person; Görres, Guido; Görres, Johann Joseph; Gregory X, Blessed, Pope.
- KITTELL, FERDINAND, LORETTO, PENNSYLVANIA: Gallitzin, Demetrius Augustine.
- KLAAR, KARL, GOVERNMENT ARCHIVIST, INNEBRUCK: Ferdinand II.
- KURTH, GODEFROID, DIRECTOR, BELGIAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE, ROME: Frankenberg, Johann Heinrich; Franks, The; Fredegarius; Granvelle, Antoine Perrenot de.
- LADEUZE, PAULIN, S.T.D., RECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: Goossens, Pierre-Lambert.
- LAFLAMME, J. K. L., EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, "L'ACTION SOCIALE", QUEBEC: French Catholics in the United States.
- LALANDE, LOUIS, S.J., MONTREAL, CANADA: Félix, Célestin-Joseph; Fléchier, Esprit; Frayssinous, Denis de; Freppel, Charles-Ernie.
- LAUCHERT, FRIEDRICH, PH.D., AACHEN: Felonianism; Geissel, Johannes von; Gerhoh of Reichersberg; Granderath, Theodor.
- LAURENTIUS, JOSEPH, S.J., PROFESSOR OF CANON LAW, ST. IGNATIUS COLLEGE, VALKENBURG, HOLLAND: Fiscal Procurator; Fiscal of the Holy Office.
- LAVIGNE, DAVID E., EDITOR, "LA TRIBUNE", WOONSOCKET, RHODE ISLAND: French Catholics in the United States.
- LEBRUN, CHARLES, C.J.M., S.T.D., SUPERIOR, HOLY HEART SEMINARY, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA: Good Shepherd, Our Lady of Charity of the.
- LECLERCQ, HENRI, O.S.B., LONDON: Ferrières, Abbey of; Fire, Liturgical Use of; Flavigny, Abbey of; Gams, Pius Bonifacius; Gerbert, Martin; Goar, Jacques; Grace at Meals; Grancolas, Jean.

# CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SIXTH VOLUME

- LEJAY, PAUL, FELLOW OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FRANCE, PROFESSOR, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF PARIS. Fortunatus, Venantius Honorius Clementianus; Garet, Jean; Garland, John; Gaul, Christian.
- LENHART, JOHN M., O.M.CAP., LECTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, ST. FIDELIS MONASTERY, VICTORIA, KANSAS: Forbes, John.
- LENNOX, PATRICK JOSEPH, B.A., PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Gower, John.
- LINDSAY, LIONEL ST. GEORGE, B.Sc., PH.D., EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, "LA NOUVELLE FRANCE", QUEBEC: Frontenac, Louis de Buade; Garneau, François-Xavier; Garnier, Charles; Gaspé, Philippe Aubert de; Goupil, René; Gravier, Jacques.
- LINS, JOSEPH, FREIBURG IM BREISGAU, GERMANY: Frankfurt-on-the-Main; Freiburg (City, Archdiocese, University); Fulda, Diocese of; Germany, Vicariate Apostolic of Northern; Gesellenvereine; Gnesen-Posen, Archdiocese of.
- LOUGHILIN, JAMES F., S.T.D., PHILADELPHIA: Friends, Society of; Gelasius II, Pope; Gregory VIII, Pope; Gregory VIII, Antipope.
- MAAS, A. J., S.J., RECTOR, WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: Filioque; Forer, Laurenz; Genealogy (in the Bible); Genealogy of Christ; Gibbons, John; Gibbons, Richard.
- MACAULEY, PATRICK J., BELFAST, IRELAND: Gagarin, Ivan Sergejewitch; Gifford, William; Gonnelleu, Jérôme de.
- MACCAFFREY, JAMES, S.T.L., PH.D., ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, DUBLIN: Fleming, Thomas; French, Nicholas; Giraldus Cambrensis.
- MACERLEAN, ANDREW A., NEW YORK: Finbarr, Saint; Garzon, Diocese of; Genevieve, Saint; George Pisides; Germain, Saint, Bishop of Auxerre; Germain, Saint, Bishop of Paris; Giffard, Bonaventure; Gilbert, Sir John Thomas; Glaber, Raoul; Goajira, Vicariate Apostolic of; Goodman, Godfrey.
- McMAHON, ARTHUR L., O.P., ST. DOMINIC'S PRIORY, SAN FRANCISCO: Ferre, Vincent; Galilee; Gravina, Dominic.
- MACPHERSON, EWAN, NEW YORK: García Moreno, Gabriel.
- MAERE, R., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY, University of Louvain: Garrucci, Raffaele.
- MAES, CAMILLUS P., S.T.D., BISHOP OF COVINGTON, KENTUCKY: Flaget, Benedict Joseph; Forbin-Janson, Charles - Auguste - Marie - Joseph, Comte de.
- MAGNIER, JOHN, C.S.S.R., ROME; Gerard Majella, Saint.
- MAHER, MICHAEL, S.J., LITT.D., M.A. (LONDON), DIRECTOR OF STUDIES AND PROFESSOR OF PEDAGOGICS, STONYHURST COLLEGE, BLACKBURN, ENGLAND: Free Will.
- MANN, HORACE K., HEADMASTER, ST. CUTHBERT'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, ENGLAND: Gregory II, Saint, Pope; Gregory III, Saint, Pope; Gregory IV, Pope; Gregory V, Pope; Gregory VI, Pope; Gregory VI, Antipope.
- MARIQUE, PIERRE JOSEPH, INSTRUCTOR IN FRENCH, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK. Féval, Paul-Henri-Corentin; Flanders; Fleuriot, Zénaide-Marie-Anne.
- MEDIN, JOSEPH, GREAT FALLS, MONTANA: Great Falls, Diocese of.
- MEEHAN, THOMAS F., NEW YORK: Fitz-Simons, Thomas; Foresters, Catholic Orders of; Foster, John Gray; Galveston, Diocese of; Garesché, Julius Peter; Gaston, William; Geraldton, Diocese of; Grand Rapids, Diocese of; Green Bay, Diocese of.
- MEIER, GABRIEL, O.S.B., EINSIEDELN, SWITZERLAND: Fructuosus of Braga, Saint; Fructuosus of Tarragona, Saint.
- MEISTERMANN, BARNABAS, O.F.M., LECTOR, CONVENT OF S. SALVATOR, JERUSALEM: Gethsemani.
- MERSHMAN, FRANCIS, O.S.B., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY, CANON LAW, AND LITURGY, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY, COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA: Felix and Adauctus, Saints; Feria; Flabellum; Funeral Pall; Galla, Saint; Gallicanus, Saints; Garnier, Jean; Genesius (1. Genesius, a comedian at Rome; 2. Genesius of Arles; 3. Genesius, Bishop of Clermont; 4. Genesius, Count of Clermont; 5. Genesius, Archbishop of Lyons); Gervasius and Protasius, Saints; Gottschalk, Saint.
- MOONEY, JAMES, UNITED STATES ETHNOLOGIST, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, WASHINGTON: Flathead Indians; Ghost Dance.
- MORICE, A.G., O.M.I., ST. BONIFACE, MANITOBA, CANADA: Garin, André.
- MUELLER, ULRICH F., C.P.P.S., PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, ST. CHARLES BORROMEO SEMINARY, CARTHAGENA, OHIO: Gaspere del Bufalo, Blessed.
- MULCAHY, CORNELIUS, PROFESSOR OF RHETORIC, ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, DUBLIN: Fergus, Saint; Fiace, Saint; Fiacre, Saint; Furse, Saint; Germaine Cousin, Saint.
- MURPHY, JOHN F. X., S.J., WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: Faustinus and Jovita, Saints; Fillucci, Vincenzo; Fonseca, Pedro da; Franzelin, Johann Baptist; Frowin, Blessed; Gelasius I, Saint, Pope; Giles, Saint; Gordianus and Epimachus, Saints; Gorgonius, Saint.
- MYERS, EDWARD, M.A. (CANTAB.), PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY AND PATROLOGY, ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE, WARE, ENGLAND: Gelasius of Cyzicus; George of Trebizond; Giffard, Godfrey; Giffard, William.
- OBRECHT, EDMOND, O.C.R., GETHSEMANI ABBEY, KENTUCKY: Feuillants; Florians, The; Géramb, Ferdinand de; Gervaise, François-Armand; Gethsemani, Abbey of Our Lady of.
- O'BRIEN, JOHN JOSEPH, PH.D., COLLEGE OF ST. THOMAS, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA: Gibault, Pierre.

# CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SIXTH VOLUME

- OESTREICH, THOMAS, O.S.B., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY AND SACRED SCRIPTURE, MARY-HELP ABBEY, BELMONT, NORTH CAROLINA: Monlogia, Gregory VII, Saint, Pope.
- O'KANE, MICHAEL M., O.P., PH.D., S.T.L., LIMERICK, IRELAND: Felix of Valois, Saint.
- OLIGER, LIVARIUS, O.F.M., LECTOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, COLLEGIO S. ANTONIO, ROME: Fear-dent, François; Francis, Rule of Saint.
- OTT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY, COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA: Forster, Frobenius; Fulbert of Chartres; Furstenberg, Franz Friedrich Wilhelm von; Gebhard of Constance; Gemblours; Génebrard, Gilbert; Gerberon, Gabriel; Gertrude of Aldenberg, Blessed; Gertrude of Hackeborn; Gertrude of Nivelles, Saint; Gil de Albornoz, Alvarez Carillo; Gil of Santarem, Blessed; Gottschalk of Orbais; Göttweig, Abbey of; Gregory IX, Pope; Gregory XI, Pope.
- OTTEN, JOSEPH, PITTSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA: Gounod, Charles-François.
- PAOLI, FRANCESCO, S.J., ROME: Francis of Rome, Saint; Francis Caracciolo, Saint; Giuseppe Maria Tommasi, Blessed.
- PARKINSON, HENRY, S.T.D., PH.D., RECTOR, OSCOTT COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND: Pitter, Daniel.
- PERNIN, RAPHAEL, O.S.F.S., ALBANO-LAZIALE, ITALY: Francis de Sales, Saint.
- PHILLIMORE, JOHN SWINNERTON, M.A. (OXON.), PROFESSOR OF HUMANITIES, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW: Glasgow, University of.
- PLASSMAN, THOMAS, O.F.M., PH.D., S.T.D., ROME: Francis of Fabriano, Blessed; Galatino, Pietro Colonna.
- POHLE, JOSEPH, S.T.D., PH.D., J.C.L., PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF BRESLAU: Grace; Grace, Controversies on.
- POLLEN, JOHN HUNGERFORD, S.J., LONDON: Fitzherbert, Thomas; Fitzsimon, Henry; Fortescue, Adrian, Blessed; Freeman, William, Venerable; Frideswide, Saint; Garlick, Nicholas, Venerable; Garnet, Henry; Garnet, Thomas, Venerable; Gerard, John; Gerard, Myles; Gerard, Richard; German Gardiner, Blessed; Goodman, John, Venerable; Gordon Riots; Green, Hugh, Venerable.
- PONCELET, ALBERT, S.J., BRUSSELS: Gall, Saint.
- POOLE, THOMAS H., NEW YORK: Fontana, Carlo; Galilei, Alessandro; Gau, Franz Christian; Gaulli, Giovanni Battista.
- POPE, HUGH, O.P., HAWKESYARD PRIORY, RUGLEY, ENGLAND: Gabriel, Archangel.
- POTAMIAN, BROTHER, F.S.C., D.Sc. (LONDON), PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS, MANHATTAN COLLEGE, NEW YORK: Gordon, Andrew.
- QUINN, STANLEY J., NEW YORK: Fremin, James; Garnier, Julien; Gilbert Islands, Vicariate Apostolic of.
- RANDOLPH, BARTHOLOMEW, C.M., M.A., TEACHER OF PHILOSOPHY AND CHURCH HISTORY, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK: Francis Regis (Clet, Blessed).
- REINHOLD, GREGOR, FREIBURG IM BREISGAU, GERMANY: Gorz, Archdiocese of.
- REMY, ARTHUR F. J., M.A., PH.D., ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK: Feuchter-leben, Ernst von; Flodoard; Friedrich von Hausen; German Literature; Gottfried von Strasburg; Grail, The Holy.
- RICKABY, JOHN, S.J., PROFESSOR OF ETHICS, STONYHURST COLLEGE, BLACKBURN, ENGLAND: Fortitude.
- RITCHIE, JOHN (CANON, DIOCESAN SECRETARY, GLASGOW: Glasgow, Archdiocese of.
- ROBINSON, PASCHAL, O.F.M., WASHINGTON: Fioretti di S. Francesco d'Assisi; Franciscan Order; Francis of Assisi, Saint.
- ROCK, P. M. J., LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY: Golden Rose.
- ROY, J. EDMOND, LITT.D., F.R.S.C., OFFICER OF THE FRENCH ACADEMY, OTTAWA, CANADA: Ferland, Jean-Baptiste-Antoine.
- RUDGE, FLORENCE MARIE, M.A., YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO: Faunt, Lawrence Arthur; Fernández, Antonio; Fernández, Juan; Finglow, John, Venerable; Flavian, Saint; Fontbonne, Jeanne; Good Samaritan, Sisters of the.
- RYAN, JOHN A., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY, ST. PAUL SEMINARY, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA: Foundling Asylums.
- SALEMBIER, LOUIS, S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF LILLE: Gerson, Jean le Charlier de.
- SALSMANS, JOSEPH, S.J., PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW, JESUIT COLLEGE, LOUVAIN: Génicot, Edward; Gobat, George; Gonzalez de Santalla, Thyrsus.
- SAUER, JOSEPH, S.T.D., EDITOR, "RUNDSCHAU", PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG, GERMANY: Ferstel, Heinrich Freiherr von; Fontana, Domenico.
- SAUVAGE, G. M., C.S.C., S.T.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, HOLY CROSS COLLEGE, WASHINGTON: Fideism; Gerbil, Hyacinthe-Sigismond; Gratry, Auguste-Joseph-Alphonse.
- SCANNELL, THOMAS B. (CANON, S.T.D., EDITOR, "CATHOLIC DICTIONARY", WEYBRIDGE, ENGLAND: Frequent Communion; Gift, Supernatural; Gordian, Roman Emperors; Gratian, Roman Emperor.
- SCHAEFER, FRANCIS J., S.T.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, ST. PAUL SEMINARY, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA: Gassner, Johann Joseph; Geoffrey of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Vendôme.
- SCHEID, N., S.J., STELLA MATUTINA COLLEGE, FELD-KIRCH, AUSTRIA: Geiler von Kaysersberg, Johann.

# CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SIXTH VOLUME

- SCHIRP, FRANCIS M., PH.D., INSTRUCTOR, LOYOLA SCHOOL, NEW YORK. Germans in the United States.
- SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICIUS, HARREVELD, LICHTENVOORDE, HOLLAND: Feller, François-Xavier de; Ficker, Julius; Galland, Andrea; Gallitzin, Adèle Amalie; Gervase of Tilbury; Grorer, August Friedrich; Giannone, Pietro; Grandidier, Philippe-André; Gratius, Ortwin.
- SCHROEDER, JOSEPH, O.P., IMMACULATE CONCEPTION COLLEGE, WASHINGTON: Francis of Vittoria; Franck, Kaspar; Galura, Bernhard; Gazzaniga, Pietro Maria; Gonet, Jean Baptiste; Gratz, Peter Aloys.
- SCHUMACHER, MATTHEW, C.S.C., PH.D., S.T.B., DIRECTOR OF STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, INDIANA: Ficino, Marsilio.
- SCULLY, VINCENT JOSEPH, C.R.L., St. IVES, CORNWALL, ENGLAND: Gerhard of Zutphen.
- SHIPMAN, ANDREW J., M.A., LL.M., NEW YORK: Glogolitic; Greek Catholics in the United States; Greek Orthodox Church in America.
- SLATER, T., S.J., St. BEUNO'S COLLEGE, St. ASAPH, WALES: Fraud; Gambling.
- SLOANE, THOMAS O'CONOR, M.A., E.M., PH.D., NEW YORK: Fuchs, Johann Nepomuk von.
- SMITH, HENRY IGNATIUS, O.P., WASHINGTON: Fumo, Bartolommeo.
- SMITH, JOSEPH H., S.J., BROOKLYN COLLEGE, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK: Gallifet, Joseph de.
- SMITH, SYDNEY F., S.J., LONDON: Gallwey, Peter.
- SOLLIER, JOSEPH FRANCIS, S.M., S.T.D., SAN FRANCISCO: Gerbet, Olympe-Philippe; Godet des Marais.
- SORTAIS, GASTON, S.J., ASSISTANT EDITOR, "ÉTUDES", PARIS: Gozzoli.
- SOUVAY, CHARLES L., C.M., LL.B., S.T.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AND HEBREW, KENRICK SEMINARY, St. LOUIS: First-Born; First-Fruits; Fringes; Geography, Biblical.
- SPAIN, MARTIN, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF STRASBURG: Germany (1556 to 1871; The New German Empire).
- SPELLANE, EDWARD P., S.J., ASSOCIATE EDITOR, "AMERICA", NEW YORK: Finotti, Joseph; Fisher, Philip.
- STEELE, FRANCESCA M., STROUD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE, ENGLAND: Flete, William; Gabriel, Brothers of Saint.
- STUART, JANET, R.S.H., SUPERIOR VICAR, CONVENT OF THE SACRED HEART, ROELIAMPTON, LONDON: Gallitzin, Elizabeth; Goetz, Marie Josephine; Gramont, Eugénie de.
- STUDART, GUILHERME, BARÃO DE, CEARÁ, BRAZIL: Fortaleza, Diocese of.
- SUAU, PIERRE, S.J., TOURNAI, BELGIUM: Francis Borgia, Saint.
- THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., LONDON: Fools, Feast of; Forty Hours' Devotion; Fractio Panis; George, Saint.
- TIERNEY, JOHN J., M.A., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF SCRIPTURE AND SEMITIC STUDIES, Mt. ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, EMMITSBURG, MARYLAND: Flagellation.
- TOKE, LESLIE ALEXANDER ST. LAURENCE, B.A., STRATTON-ON-THE-FOSSE, NEAR BATH, ENGLAND: Flagellants Fonte-Avellana; Godric I; Godric II.
- TONER, PATRICK J., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, St. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, DUBLIN: Gahan, William; God.
- TURNER, WILLIAM, S.T.D., BISHOP OF GALLOWAY, SCOTLAND: Galloway, Diocese of.
- TURNER, WILLIAM, B.A., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF LOGIC AND THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Fredegis of Tours; Gerard of Cremona.
- URQUHART, FRANCIS FORTESCUE, M.A., LECTURER IN MODERN HISTORY, BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD: Florence of Worcester; Gilbert Foliot.
- VAILHÉ, SIMÉON, A.A., MEMBER OF THE RUSSIAN ARCHEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF CONSTANTINOPLE, PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY AT THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT KADI-KEUI, CONSTANTINOPLE: Flavius; Flaviopolis; Fogaras, Archdiocese of; Furni; Fussola; Gabala; Gadara; Gangra; Gargara; Gaza; Gerasa; Germanicia; Germanicopolis; Germia; Gertha; Gezireh; Gilhal and Batrun; Gindarus; Girba; Gordos; Gortyna; Gratianopolis; Greek Church.
- VAN CLEEF, AUGUSTUS, NEW YORK: Gegenbauer, Josef Anton von.
- VAN DEN GHEYN, GABRIEL, PRESIDENT OF THE HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF GHENT, SECRETARY OF THE PROVINCIAL COMMISSION OF MONUMENTS, INSPECTOR OF CONVENTS, GHENT: Ghent, Diocese of.
- VAN DER ESSEN, LÉON, Litt.D., PH.D., COLLÈGE DU PAPE, LOUVAIN, BELGIUM: Florence, Council of; Foillan, Saint; Géry, Saint; Ghislain, Saint; Gondulphus of Metz; Gondulphus of Tongres; Gondulphus, Saint.
- VAN HOVE, A., J.C.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY AND CANON LAW, UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: Ferraris, Lucius; Giraldi, Ubaldo; Gratian, Johannes; Gravina, Giovanni Vincenzo.
- VAN ORTROY, FRANCIS, S.J., BRUSSELS: Francis de Geronimo, Saint.
- VEALE, JAMES, S.T.D., MANDARIN, FLORIDA: Florida.
- VELLA, ANTONIO, Gozo, MALTA: Gozo, Diocese of.
- VONIER, ANSCAR, O.S.B., PH.D., ABBOT OF BUCKFAST, BUCKFASTLEIGH, ENGLAND: Fleury, Abbey of.
- WALSH, REGINALD, O.P., S.T.D., ROME: Friends of God.
- WARD, MGR. BERNARD, PRESIDENT, St. EDMUND'S COLLEGE, WARE, ENGLAND: Flanagan, Thomas.

# CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SIXTH VOLUME

- WARREN, KATE MARY, LECTURER IN ENGLISH LITERATURE UNDER UNIVERSITY OF LONDON AT WESTFIELD COLLEGE, HAMPSTEAD, LONDON: Forrest, William; Fullerton, Lady Georgiana Charlotte.
- WEBER, N. A., S.M., S.T.L., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, MARIST COLLEGE, WASHINGTON: Felbiger, Johann Ignaz von.
- WEBSTER, RAYMUND, O.S.B., M.A. (OXON.), DOWNSIDE ABBEY, BATH, ENGLAND: Fontevault, Order and Abbey of; Grandmont, Abbey and Order of.
- WELCH, SIDNEY READ, S.T.D., PH.D., J.P., EDITOR, "CATHOLIC MAGAZINE FOR SOUTH AFRICA", CAPE TOWN: Good Hope, Eastern Vicariate of the Cape of; Good Hope, Western Vicariate of the Cape of.
- WILHELM, BALTHASAR, S.J., STELLA MATUTINA COLLEGE, FELDKIRCH, AUSTRIA: Galen, Joseph.
- WILLIAMSON, GEORGE CHARLES, LIT.D., LONDON: Flemael, Bertholet; Foppa, Ambrogio. Franceschini, Marc'Antonio; Franco, Giovanni Battista; Gaddi, Antonio, Giovanni and Taddeo; Gallait, Louis; Genga, Girolamo; Gentile da Fabriano; Giordano, Luca.
- WINTERSGILL, H. G., NEW YORK: Flathers, Matthew, Venerable; Fredoli, Berenger.
- WITTMANN, PIUS, PH.D., REICHSARCHIVRAT, MUNICH: Finland, Grand Duchy of; Greenland.
- ZIMMERMAN, BENEDICT, O.D.C., ST. LUKE'S PRIORY, WINCANTON, SOMERSET, ENGLAND: Frances d'Amboise, Blessed; Garcla, Anne; Gratian, Jerome.



## Tables of Abbreviations

The following tables and notes are intended to guide readers of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA in interpreting those abbreviations, signs, or technical phrases which, for economy of space, will be most frequently used in the work. For more general information see the article ABBREVIATIONS, ECCLESIASTICAL.

### I.—GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS.

a. . . . .	article.	inf. . . . .	below (Lat. <i>infra</i> ).
ad an. . . . .	at the year (Lat. <i>ad annum</i> ).	It. . . . .	Italian.
an., ann. . . . .	the year, the years (Lat. <i>annus, anni</i> ).	l. c., loc. cit. . . . .	at the place quoted (Lat. <i>loco citato</i> ).
ap. . . . .	in (Lat. <i>apud</i> ).	Lat. . . . .	Latin.
art. . . . .	article.	lat. . . . .	latitude.
Assyr. . . . .	Assyrian.	lib. . . . .	book (Lat. <i>liber</i> ).
A. S. . . . .	Anglo-Saxon.	long. . . . .	longitude.
A. V. . . . .	Authorized Version (i.e. tr. of the Bible authorized for use in the Anglican Church—the so-called "King James", or "Protestant Bible").	Mon. . . . .	Lat. <i>Monumenta</i> .
b. . . . .	born	MS., MSS. . . . .	manuscript, manuscripts.
Bk. . . . .	Book.	n., no. . . . .	number.
Bl. . . . .	Blessed.	N. T. . . . .	New Testament.
C., c. . . . .	about (Lat. <i>circa</i> ); canon; chapter; <i>compagnie</i> .	Nat. . . . .	National.
can. . . . .	canon.	Old Fr., O. Fr. . . . .	Old French.
cap. . . . .	chapter (Lat. <i>caput</i> —used only in Latin context).	op. cit. . . . .	in the work quoted (Lat. <i>opere citato</i> ).
cf. . . . .	compare (Lat. <i>confer</i> ).	Ord. . . . .	Order.
cod. . . . .	codex.	O. T. . . . .	Old Testament.
col. . . . .	column.	p., pp. . . . .	page, pages, or (in Latin references) <i>pars</i> (part).
concl. . . . .	conclusion.	par. . . . .	paragraph.
const., constit. . . . .	Lat. <i>constitutio</i> .	<i>passim</i> . . . . .	in various places.
curâ. . . . .	by the industry of.	pt. . . . .	part.
d. . . . .	died.	Q. . . . .	Quarterly (a periodical), e.g. "Church Quarterly".
diet. . . . .	dictionary (Fr. <i>dictionnaire</i> ).	Q., QQ., quæst. . . . .	question, questions (Lat. <i>quæstio</i> ).
disp. . . . .	Lat. <i>disputatio</i> .	q. v. . . . .	which [title] see (Lat. <i>quod vide</i> ).
diss. . . . .	Lat. <i>dissertatio</i> .	Rev. . . . .	Review (a periodical).
dist. . . . .	Lat. <i>distinctio</i> .	R. S. . . . .	Rolls Series.
D. V. . . . .	Douay Version.	R. V. . . . .	Revised Version.
ed., edit. . . . .	edited, edition, editor.	S., SS. . . . .	Lat. <i>Sanctus, Sancti</i> , "Saint", "Saints"—used in this Encyclopedia only in Latin context.
Ep., Epp. . . . .	letter, letters (Lat. <i>epistola</i> ).	Sept. . . . .	Septuagint.
Fr. . . . .	French.	Sess. . . . .	Session.
gen. . . . .	genus.	Skt. . . . .	Sanskrit.
Gr. . . . .	Greek.	Sp. . . . .	Spanish.
H. E., Hist. Eccl. . . . .	Ecclesiastical History.	sq., sqq. . . . .	following page, or pages (Lat. <i>sequens</i> ).
Heb., Hebr. . . . .	Hebrew.	St., Sts. . . . .	Saint, Saints.
ib., ibid. . . . .	in the same place (Lat. <i>ibidem</i> ).	sup. . . . .	Above (Lat. <i>supra</i> ).
Id. . . . .	the same person, or author (Lat. <i>idem</i> ).	s. v. . . . .	Under the corresponding title (Lat. <i>sub voce</i> ).
		tom. . . . .	volume (Lat. <i>tomus</i> ).

## TABLES OF ABBREVIATIONS.

tr. . . . . translation or translated. By itself it means "English translation", or "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.  
 tr., tract. . . . . tractate  
 v. . . . . see (Lat. *vide*).  
 Ven. . . . . Venerable.  
 Vol. . . . . Volume.

### II.—ABBREVIATIONS OF TITLES.

Acta SS. . . . . *Acta Sanctorum* (Bollandists).  
 Ann. pont. cath. . . . Battandier, *Annuaire pontifical catholique*.  
 Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath. Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics*.  
 Dict. Christ. Antiq. . . Smith and Cheetham (ed.), *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

Dict. Christ. Biog. . . Smith and Wace (ed.), *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.  
 Dict. d'arch. chrét. . . Cabrol (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*.  
 Dict. de théol. cath. . . Vacant and Mangenot (ed.), *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*.  
 Dict. Nat. Biog. . . . Stephen (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*.  
 Hast., Dict. of the Bible . . . . . Hastings (ed.), *A Dictionary of the Bible*.  
 Kirchenlex. . . . . Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexicon*.  
 P. G. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Greci*.  
 P. L. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Latini*.  
 Vig., Dict. de la Bible. Vigouroux (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la Bible*.

NOTE I.—Large Roman numerals standing alone indicate volumes. Small Roman numerals standing alone indicate chapters. Arabic numerals standing alone indicate pages. In other cases the divisions are explicitly stated. Thus "Ita habet, Universities of Europe, I, ix" refers the reader to the ninth chapter of the first volume of that work; "I, p. ix" would indicate the ninth page of the preface of the same volume.

NOTE II.—Where St. Thomas (Aquinas) is cited without the name of any particular work the reference is always to "Summa Theologica" (not to "Summa Philosophiae"). The divisions of the "Summa Theol." are indicated by a system which may best be understood by the following example: "I-II, Q. vi, a. 7, ad 2<sup>um</sup>" refers the reader to the seventh article of the sixth question in the first part of the second part, in the response to the second objection.

NOTE III.—The abbreviations employed for the various books of the Bible are obvious. Ecclesiastical are indicated by *Ecclus.*, to distinguish it from Ecclesiastes (*Eccles.*). It should also be noted that I and II Kings in D. V. correspond to I and II Samuel in A. V.; and I and II Par. to I and II Chronicles. Where, in the spelling of a proper name, there is a marked difference between the D. V. and the A. V., the form found in the latter is added, in parentheses.

## Full Page Illustrations in Volume VI

	PAGE
Fénelon—Portrait by Joseph Vivien .....	36
Cathedral, Ferrara .....	46
Votivkirche, Vienna .....	50
Cathedral, Fiesole.....	70
Pope Leo XII Carried in Procession in St. Peter's—Vernet .....	88
Florence .....	104
The Cathedral of Florence... ..	112
Church of San Mercuriale, Forlì .....	136
Fountains Abbey, Ripon, England .....	160
France .....	178
The Virgin with Sts. Francis Borgia and Stanislaus Kostka—Deferrari.....	216
St. Francis of Assisi .....	220
Assisi .....	228
Mary's Journey through the Hill Country—Führich.....	312
Ponte Vecchio, Florence .....	332
Façade, St. John Lateran, Rome .....	342
Germany .....	492
The Castelfranco Altar-Piece—Giorgione.....	564
Giotto—Frescoes in Santa Croce, Florence .....	568
English Gothic Interiors .....	672
English Gothic Exteriors .....	680
Michael Palaeologus as One of the Magi—Gozzoli.....	688
The Acropolis, Athens .....	740

## Coloured Plates

The Reliquary of St. Genevieve.....	170
St. George and the Dragon—Francia.....	206
The Nativity of the Virgin—Ghirlandajo.....	546

## Maps

France .....	188
Palestine in the Old-Testament Period .....	428
Palestine in the Time of Christ .....	432
Fra Mauro's Map of the World (1459) .....	450
Germany .....	514



# THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

## F

**Fathers of the Church.**—The word Father is used in the New Testament to mean a teacher of spiritual things, by whose means the soul of man is born again into the likeness of Christ: "For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus, by the gospel, I have begotten you. Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ" (1 Cor., iv, 15, 16; cf. Gal., iv, 19). The first teachers of Christianity seem to be collectively spoken of as "the Fathers" (II Peter, iii, 4). Thus St. Irenæus defines that a teacher is a father, and a disciple is a son (iv, 41, 2), and so says Clement of Alexandria (Strom., i, 1, 1). A bishop is emphatically a "father in Christ", both because it was he, in early times, who baptized all his flock, and because he is the chief teacher of his church. But he is also regarded by the early Fathers, such as Hegesippus, Irenæus, and Tertullian, as the recipient of the tradition of his predecessors in the see, and consequently as the witness and representative of the faith of his Church before Catholicity and the world. Hence the expression "the Fathers" comes naturally to be applied to the holy bishops of a preceding age, whether of the last generation or further back, since they are the parents at whose knee the Church of to-day was taught her belief. It is also applicable in an eminent way to bishops sitting in council, "the Fathers of Nicaea", "the Fathers of Trent". Thus Fathers have learnt from Fathers, and in the last resort from the Apostles, who are sometimes called Fathers in this sense: "They are your Fathers", says St. Leo, of the Princes of the Apostles, speaking to the Romans; St. Hilary of Arles calls them *sanchi patres*; Clement of Alexandria says that his teachers, from Greece, Ionia, Coele-Syria, Egypt, the Orient, Assyria, Palestine, respectively, had handed on to him the tradition of blessed teaching from Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, receiving it "as son from father".

It follows that, as our own Fathers are the predecessors who have taught us, so the Fathers of the whole Church are especially the earlier teachers, who instructed her in the teaching of the Apostles, during her infancy and first growth. It is difficult to define the first age of the Church, or the age of the Fathers. It is a common habit to stop the study of the early Church at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. "The Fathers" must undoubtedly include, in the West, St. Gregory the Great (d. 604), and in the East, St. John Damascene (d. about 754). It is frequently said that St. Bernard (d. 1153) was the last of the Fathers, and Migne's "Patrologia Latina" extends to Innocent III, halting only on the verge of the thirteenth century, while his "Patrologia Græca" goes as far as the Council of Florence (1438-9). These limits are evidently too wide. It will be best to consider that the great merit of St. Bernard as a writer lies in his resemblance in style and matter to the greatest among the Fathers, in spite of the difference of period. St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636) and the Venerable Bede (d. 735) are

to be classed among the Fathers, but they may be said to have been born out of due time, as St. Theodore the Studite was in the East.

**THE APPEAL TO THE FATHERS.**—Thus the use of the term Fathers has been continuous, yet it could not at first be employed in precisely the modern sense of Fathers of the Church. In early days the expression referred to writers who were then quite recent. It is still applied to those writers who are to us the ancients, but no longer in the same way to writers who are now recent. Appeals to the Fathers are a sub-division of appeals to tradition. In the first half of the second century begin the appeals to the sub-Apostolic age: Papias appeals to the presbyters, and through them to the Apostles. Half a century later St. Irenæus supplements this method by an appeal to the tradition handed down in every Church by the succession of its bishops (Adv. Hær., III, i-iii), and Tertullian clinches this argument by the observation that as all the Churches agree, their tradition is secure, for they could not all have strayed by chance into the same error (Præser., xxviii). The appeal is thus to Churches and their bishops, none but bishops being the authoritative exponents of the doctrine of their Churches. As late as 341 the bishops of the Dedication Council at Antioch declared: "We are not followers of Arius; for how could we, who are bishops, be disciples of a priest?"

Yet slowly, as the appeals to the presbyters died out, there was arising by the side of appeals to the Churches a third method: the custom of appealing to Christian teachers who were not necessarily bishops. While, without the Church, Gnostic schools were substituted for churches, within the Church, Catholic schools were growing up. Philosophers like Justin and most of the numerous second-century apologists were reasoning about religion, and the great catechetical school of Alexandria was gathering renown. Great bishops and saints like Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus of Pontus, Firmilian of Cappadocia, and Alexander of Jerusalem were proud to be disciples of the priest Origen. The Bishop Cyprian called daily for the works of the priest Tertullian with the words "Give me the master". The Patriarch Athanasius refers for the ancient use of the word *διδασκαλος*, not merely to the two Dionysii, but to the priest Theognostus. Yet these priest-teachers are not yet called Fathers, and the greatest among them, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, Hippolytus, Novatian, Lucian, happen to be tinged with heresy; two became antipopes; one is the father of Arianism; another was condemned by a general council. In each case we might apply the words used by St. Hilary of Tertullian: "Sequenti errore detraxit scriptis probabilibus auctoritatem" (Comm. in Matt., v, 1, cited by Vincent of Lérins, 24).

A fourth form of appeal was better founded and of enduring value. Eventually it appeared that bishops as well as priests were fallible. In the second century

the bishops were orthodox. In the third they were often found wanting. In the fourth they were the leaders of schisms, and heresies, in the Meletian and Donatist troubles and in the long Arian struggle, in which few were found to stand firm against the insidious persecution of Constantius. It came to be seen that the true Fathers of the Church are those Catholic teachers who have persevered in her communion, and whose teaching has been recognized as orthodox. So it came to pass that out of the four "Latin Doctors" one is not a bishop. Two other Fathers who were not bishops have been declared to be Doctors of the Church, Bede and John Damascene, while among the Doctors outside the patristic period we find two more priests, the incomparable St. Bernard and the greatest of all theologians, St. Thomas Aquinas. Nay, few writers had such great authority in the Schools of the middle ages as the layman Boethius, many of whose definitions are still commonplaces of theology.

Similarly we may notice in passing the name "Father", which originally belonged to bishops, has been as it were delegated to priests, especially as ministers of the Sacrament of Penance. It is now a form of address to all priests in Spain, in Ireland, and, of recent years, in England and the United States.

*Pater* or *Pateras*, Pope, was a term of respect for eminent bishops (e.g. in letters to St. Cyprian and to St. Augustine, —neither of these writers seems to use it in addressing other bishops, except when St. Augustine writes to Rome). Eventually the term was reserved to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria; yet in the East to-day every priest is a "pope". The Aramaic *abba* was used from early times for the superiors of religious houses. But through the abuse of granting abbeys in *commendam* to seculars, it has become a polite title for all secular clerics, even seminarists, in Italy, and especially in France, whereas all religious who are priests are addressed as "Father".

We receive only, says St. Basil, what we have been taught by the Holy Fathers; and he adds that in his Church of Caesarea the faith of the holy Fathers of Nicaea has long been implanted (Ep. xli, 2). St. Gregory Nazianzen declares that he holds fast the teaching which he heard from the holy Oracles, and was taught by the holy Fathers. These Cappadocian saints seem to be the first to appeal to a real catena of Fathers. The appeal to one or two was already common enough; but not even the learned Eusebius had thought of a long string of authorities. St. Basil, for example (De Spir. S., ii, 29), cites for the formula "with the Holy Ghost" in the doxology, the example of Irenaeus, Clement and Dionysius of Alexandria, Dionysius of Rome, Eusebius of Caesarea, Origen, Africanus, the *preces lucernariae* said at the lighting of lamps, Athenagoras, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Firmilian, Meletius. In the fifth century this method became a stereotyped custom. St. Jerome is perhaps the first writer to try to establish his interpretation of a text by a string of exegetes (Ep. cxii, ad Aug.). Paulinus, the deacon and biographer of St. Ambrose, in the libellus he presented against the Pelagians to Pope Zosimus in 417, quotes Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, and the decrees of the late Pope Innocent. In 420 St. Augustine quotes Cyprian and Ambrose against the same heretics (C. duas Epp. Pel., iv). Julian of Eclanum quoted Chrysostom and Basil; St. Augustine replies to him in 421 (Contra Julianum, i) with Irenaeus, Cyprian, Reticus, Olympius, Hilary, Ambrose, the decrees of African councils, and above all Popes Innocent and Zosimus. In a celebrated passage he argues that these Western writers are more than sufficient, but as Julian had appealed to the East, to the East he shall go, and the saint adds Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Synod of Diospolis, Chrysostom. To these he adds Jerome (c. xxxiv): "Nor should you think Jerome, because he was a priest, is to be despised", and adds a eulogy. This is amusing, when

we remember that Jerome in a fit of irritation, fifteen years before, had written to Augustine (Ep. cxlii): "Do not excite against me the silly crowd of the ignorant, who venerate you as a bishop, and receive you with the honour due to a prelate when you declaim in the Church, whereas they think little of me, an old man, nearly decrepit, in my monastery in the solitude of the country."

In the second book "Contra Julianum", St. Augustine again cites Ambrose frequently, and Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, Chrysostom; in ii, 37, he recapitulates the nine names (omitting councils and popes), adding (iii, 32) Innocent and Jerome. A few years later the Semipelagians of Southern Gaul, who were led by St. Hilary of Arles, St. Vincent of Lérins, and Bl. Cassian, refuse to accept St. Augustine's severe view of predestination because "*contrarium putant patrum opinioni et ecclesiastico sensui*". Their opponent St. Prosper, who was trying to convert them to Augustinianism, complains: "*Obstationem suam vetustate defendunt*" (Ep. inter Aug. cccxxv, 2), and they said that no ecclesiastical writer had ever before interpreted Romans quite as St. Augustine did—which was probably true enough. The interest of this attitude lies in the fact that it was, if not new, at least more definite than any earlier appeal to antiquity. Through most of the fourth century, the controversy with the Arians had turned upon Scripture, and appeals to past authority were few. But the appeal to the Fathers was never the most imposing *locus theologicus*, for they could not easily be assembled so as to form an absolutely conclusive test. On the other hand up to the end of the fourth century, there were practically no infallible definitions available, except condemnations of heresies, chiefly by popes. By the time that the Arian reaction under Valens caused the Eastern conservatives to draw towards the orthodox, and prepared the restoration of orthodoxy to power by Theodosius, the Nicene decisions were beginning to be looked upon as sacrosanct, and that council to be preferred to a unique position above all others. By 430, the date we have reached, the Creed we now say at Mass was revered in the East, whether rightly or wrongly, as the work of the 150 Fathers of Constantinople in 381, and there were also new papal decisions, especially the *tractoria* of Pope Zosimus, which in 418 had been sent to all the bishops of the world to be signed.

It is to living authority, the idea of which had thus come to the fore, that St. Prosper was appealing in his controversy with the Lerinese school. When he went to Gaul, in 431, as papal envoy, just after St. Augustine's death, he replied to their difficulties, not by reiterating that saint's hardest arguments, but by taking with him a letter from Pope St. Celestine, in which St. Augustine is extolled as having been held by the pope's predecessors to be "*inter magistros optimos*". No one is to be allowed to depreciate him, but it is not said that every word of his is to be followed. The disturbers had appealed to the Holy See, and the reply is "*Desinat incessere novitas vetustatem*" (Let novelty cease to attack antiquity!). An appendix is added, not of the opinions of ancient Fathers, but of recent popes, since the very same monks who thought St. Augustine went too far, professed (says the appendix) "that they followed and approved only what the most holy See of the Blessed Apostle Peter sanctioned and taught by the ministry of its prelates". A list therefore follows of "the judgments of the rulers of the Roman Church", to which are added some sentences of African councils, "which indeed the Apostolic bishops made their own when they approved them". To these *inviolabiles sanctiones* (we might roughly render "infallible utterances") prayers used in the sacraments are appended "*ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*"—a frequently misquoted phrase—and in conclusion, it is declared that these testimonies of the Apostolic See

are sufficient, "so that we consider not to be Catholic at all whatever shall appear to be contrary to the decisions we have cited". Thus the decisions of the Apostolic See are put on a very different level from the views of St. Augustine, just as that saint always drew a sharp distinction between the resolutions of African councils or the extracts from the Fathers, on the one hand, and the decrees of Popes Innocent and Zosimus on the other.

Three years later a famous document on tradition and its use emanated from the Lerinese school, the "Commonitorium" of St. Vincent. He wholeheartedly accepted the letter of Pope Celestine, and he quoted it as an authoritative and irresistible witness to his own doctrine that where *quod ubique, or universitas*, is uncertain, we must turn to *quod semper, or antiquitas*. Nothing could be more to his purpose than the pope's: "Desinat incescere novitas vetustatem". The oecumenical Council of Ephesus had been held in the same year that Celestine wrote. Its Acts were before St. Vincent, and it is clear that he looked upon both pope and council as decisive authorities. It was necessary to establish this, before turning to his famous canon, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*—otherwise *universitas, antiquitas, consensus*. It was not a new criterion, else it would have committed suicide by its very expression. But never had the doctrine been so admirably phrased, so limpidly explained, so adequately exemplified. Even the law of the evolution of dogma is defined by Vincent in language which can hardly be surpassed for exactness and vigour. St. Vincent's triple test is wholly misunderstood if it is taken to be the ordinary rule of faith. Like all Catholics he took the ordinary rule to be the living magisterium of the Church, and he assumes that the formal decision in cases of doubt lies with the Apostolic See, or with a general council. But cases of doubt arise when no such decision is forthcoming. Then it is that the three tests are to be applied, not simultaneously, but, if necessary, in succession.

When an error is found in one corner of the Church, then the first test, *universitas, quod ubique*, is an answerable refutation, nor is there any need to examine further (iii, 7, 8). But if an error attacks the whole Church, then *antiquitas, quod semper* is to be appealed to, that is, a consensus existing before the novelty arose. Still, in the previous period one or two teachers, even men of great fame, may have erred. Then we betake ourselves to *quod ab omnibus, consensus*, to the many against the few (if possible to a general council; if not, to an examination of writings). Those few are a trial of faith "ut tentet vos Dominus Deus vester" (Deut., xiii, 1 sqq.). So Tertullian was a *magna tentatio*; so was Origen—indeed the greatest temptation of all. We must know that whenever what is new or unheard before is introduced by one man beyond or against all the saints, it pertains not to religion but to temptation (xx, 49). Who are the "Saints" to whom we appeal? The reply is a definition of "Fathers of the Church" given with all St. Vincent's inimitable accuracy: "Inter se majorem consulat interrogetque sententias, eorum dumtaxat qui, diversis licet temporibus et locis, in unius tamen ecclesie Catholicae communione et fide permanentes, magistri probabiles extiterunt; et quicquid non unus aut duo tantum, sed omnes pariter uno eodemque consensu aperte, frequenter, perseveranter tenuisse, scripsisse, docuisse cognoverit, id sibi quoque intelligat absque ulla dubitatione credendum" (iii, 8). This unambiguous sentence defines for us what is the right way of appealing to the Fathers, and the italicized words perfectly explain what is a "Father": "Those alone who, though in diverse times and places, yet persevering in the communion and faith of the one Catholic Church, have been approved teachers."

The same result is obtained by modern theologians, in their definitions; e. g. Fessler thus defines what constitutes a "Father": (1) orthodox doctrine and learning; (2) holiness of life; (3) (at the present day) a certain antiquity. The criteria by which we judge whether a writer is a "Father" or not are: (1) citation by a general council, or (2) in public Acts of popes addressed to the Church or concerning Faith; (3) encomium in the Roman Martyrology as "sanctitate et doctrina insignis"; (4) public reading in Churches in early centuries; (5) citation, with praise, as an authority as to the Faith by one of the more celebrated Fathers. Early authors, though belonging to the Church, who fail to reach this standard are simply ecclesiastical writers ("Patrologia", ed. Jungmann, ch. i, §11). On the other hand, where the appeal is not to the authority of the writer, but his testimony is merely required to the belief of his time, one writer is as good as another, and if a Father is cited for this purpose, it is not as a Father that he is cited, but merely as a witness to facts well known to him. For the history of dogma, therefore, the works of ecclesiastical writers who are not only not approved, but even heretical, are often just as valuable as those of the Fathers. On the other hand, the witness of one Father is occasionally of great weight for doctrine when taken singly, if he is teaching a subject on which he is recognized by the Church as an especial authority, e. g., St. Athanasius on the Divinity of the Son, St. Augustine on the Holy Trinity, etc. There are a few cases in which a general council has given approbation to the work of a Father, the most important being the two letters of St. Cyril of Alexandria which were read at the Council of Ephesus. But "the authority of single Fathers considered in itself", says Franzelin (De Traditione, thesis xv), "is not infallible or peremptory; though piety and sound reason agree that the theological opinions of such individuals should not be treated lightly, and should not without great caution be interpreted in a sense which clashes with the common doctrine of other Fathers." The reason is plain enough; they were holy men, who are not to be presumed to have intended to swerve from the doctrine of the Church, and their doubtful utterances are therefore to be taken in the best sense of which they are capable. If they cannot be explained in an orthodox sense, we have to admit that not the greatest is immune from ignorance or accidental error or obscurity. But on the use of the Fathers in theological questions, the article TRADITION and the ordinary dogmatic treatises on that subject must be consulted, as it is proper here only to deal with the historical development of their use. The subject was never treated as a part of dogmatic theology until the rise of what is now commonly called "Theologia fundamentalis", in the sixteenth century, the founders of which are Melchior Canus and Bellarmine. The former has a discussion of the use of the Fathers in deciding questions of faith (De locis theologicis, vii). The Protestant Reformers attacked the authority of the Fathers. The most famous of these opponents is Dailleus (Jean Dailé, 1594-1670, "Traité de l'emploi des saints Pères", 1632; in Latin "De usu Patrum", 1656). But their objections are long since forgotten.

Having traced the development of the use of the Fathers up to the period of its frequent employment, and of its formal statement by St. Vincent of Lérins, it will be well to give a glance at the continuation of the practice. We saw that, in 434, it was possible for St. Vincent (in a book which has been most unreasonably taken to be a mere polemic against St. Augustine—a notion which is amply refuted by the use made in it of St. Celestine's letter) to define the meaning and method of patristic appeals. From that time onward they are very common. In the Council of Ephesus, 431, as St. Vincent points out, St. Cyril presented a series of quotations from the Fathers, τὰν ἀγιοτάτων καὶ

ὁσιωτάτων πατέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ διαφόρων μαρτύρων, which were read on the motion of Flavian, Bishop of Philippi. They were from Peter I of Alexandria, Martyr, Athanasius, Popes Julius and Felix (forgeries), Theophilus, Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus, Amphilocheius. On the other hand Eutyches, when tried at Constantinople by St. Flavian, in 449, refused to accept either Fathers or councils as authorities, confining himself to Holy Scripture, a position which horrified his judges (see EUTYCHES). In the following year St. Leo sent his legates, Abundius and Asterius, to Constantinople with a list of testimonies from Hilary, Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria. They were signed in that city, but were not produced at the Council of Chalcedon in the following year. Thenceforward the custom is fixed, and it is unnecessary to give examples. However, that of the sixth council in 680 is important: Pope St. Agatho sent a long series of extracts from Rome, and the leader of the Monothelites, Macarius of Antioch, presented another. Both sets were carefully verified from the library of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and sealed. It should be noted that it was never in such cases thought necessary to trace a doctrine back to the earliest times; St. Vincent demanded the proof of the Church's belief before a doubt arose—this is his notion of *antiquitas*; and in conformity with this view, the Fathers quoted by councils and popes and Fathers are for the most part recent (Petavius, *De Incarn.*, XIV, 15, 2-5).

In the last years of the fifth century a famous document, attributed to Popes Gelasius and Hormisdas, adds to decrees of St. Damasus of 382 a list of books which are approved, and another of those disapproved. In its present form the list of approved Fathers comprises Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria (wanting in one MS.), Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Prosper, Leo ("every iota" of the tome to Flavian is to be accepted under anathema), and "also the treatises of all orthodox Fathers, who deviated in nothing from the fellowship of the holy Roman Church, and were not separated from her faith and preaching, but were participators through the grace of God until the end of their life in her communion; also the decretal letters, which most blessed popes have given at various times when consulted by various Fathers, are to be received with veneration". Orosius, Sedulius, and Juvenius are praised. Rufinus and Origen are rejected. Eusebius's "History" and "Chronicle" are not to be condemned altogether, though in another part of the list they appear as "apocrypha" with Tertullian, Lactantius, Africanus, Commodian, Clement of Alexandria, Arnobius, Cassian, Victorinus of Pettau, Faustus, and the works of heretics, and forged Scriptural documents. The later Fathers constantly used the writings of the earlier. For instance, St. Cæsarius of Arles drew freely on St. Augustine's sermons, and embodied them in collections of his own; St. Gregory the Great has largely founded himself on St. Augustine; St. Isidore rests upon all his predecessors; St. John Damascene's great work is a synthesis of patristic theology. St. Bede's sermons are a cento from the greater Fathers. Eugippius made a selection from St. Augustine's writings, which had an immense vogue. Cassiodorus made a collection of select commentaries by various writers on all the books of Holy Scripture. St. Benedict especially recommended patristic study, and his sons have observed his advice: "Ad perfectionem conversationis qui festinat, sunt doctrinæ sanctorum Patrum, quarum observatio perducit hominem ad celsitudinem perfectionis . . . quis liber sanctorum catholicorum Patrum hoc non resonat, ut recto cursu perveniamus ad creatorem nostrum?" (*Sancti Regula*,

lxxiii). Florilegia and catenæ became common fifth century onwards. They are mostly and but those in the East which go under the Ecumenicus are well known. Most famous throughout the Middle Ages was the "Glossaria" attributed to Walafrid Strabo. The "aurea" of St. Thomas Aquinas is still in use CATENÆ, and the valuable matter collected by in Hastings, *Diet. of the Bible*, V, 521.)

St. Augustine was early recognized as the Western Fathers, with St. Ambrose, Jerome by his side. St. Gregory the Great was and these four became "the Latin Doctors". In some ways the greatest of theologians, was both on account of the paucity of his writings the fact that his letters had a far higher utterances. In the East St. John Chrysostom has always been the most popular, as he is voluminous, of the Fathers. With the great the father of monachism, and St. Gregory Nazianzen famous for the purity of his faith, he made triumvirate called "the three hierarchs", famous to the present day in Eastern art. St. Augustine was added to these by the Westerns, so that might answer to four. (See DOCTORS OF THE CHURCH.) It will be observed that many of the writers in the Gelasian list lived and died in Catholic communion, but incorrectness in some parts of their writings, e. g. the Semipelagian error attributed to Cassian and Faustus, the chiliasm of the con Victorinus's commentary on the Apocalypse. Jerome issued an expurgated edition, the first in print as yet, the unsoundness of the lost "typos" of Clement, and so forth, prevailed over writers from being spoken of, as Hilary was by "inoffenso pede percurritur". As all the important doctrines of the Church (except the Canon and the Inspiration of Scripture) may be found or at least illustrated, from Scripture, the office of tradition is the interpretation of it, and the authority of the Fathers is here of no importance. Nevertheless it is only then necessary to be followed when all are of one mind: "Nemo contra unanimum consensum Patrum ipsam sacram interpretari audeat", says the Council of Trent; and the Creed of Pius IV has similarly "eam unquam nisi juxta unanimum consensum accipiam et interpretabor". The Vatican echoes Trent: "nemini licere . . . contra unanimum consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari."

A consensus of the Fathers is not, of course, to be expected in very small matters: "Quia antiqua sanctorum patrum consensio non in divina legis questionibus, sed solum certe in fidei regula magno nobis studio et investito et sequenda" (Vincent, xxviii, 72). This method, adds St. Vincent, against wide-spread inveterate heresies, but rather against novelties to be applied directly they appear. A better method could hardly be given than the way in which the Council of Trent met the way in which the Council of Frankfurt nor could the principle be better expressed than the Fathers of the Council: "Tenete vos in consensu Patrum, et nolite novas versare quæ ad nihilum enim valent nisi ad subversionem tantum. Sufficit enim vobis sanctorum Patrum sequi, et illorum dicta firma tenere fide." Domini nostri exstiterunt doctores in fide, in vita, in bonis, in sapientia et in plenitudine libris legitur inscripta, et vita miraculis clara et sanctissima; quorum a Deum Dei Filium, D. N. J. C. pro magno labore regnant in cælis. Hos ergo tota animo caritatis affectu sequimini, beatissimorum horum inconcussa firmitate doctrinis et consortium æternæ beatitudinis . . . cu



bere mereamini in cælis" ("Synodica ad Episc." in Mansi, XIII, 897-8). And an excellent act of faith in the tradition of the Church is that of Charlemagne (ibid., 902) made on the same occasion: "Apostolice sedi et antiquis ab initio nascentis ecclesie et catholicis traditionibus tota mentis intentione, tota cordis alacritate, me conjungo. Quicquid in illorum legitur libris, qui divino Spiritu afflati, toti orbi a Deo Christo dati sunt doctores, indubitanter teneo; hoc ad salutem animæ meæ sufficere credens, quod sacratissimæ evangelicæ veritatis pandit historia, quod apostolica in suis epistolis confirmat auctoritas, quod eximii Sacre Scripture tractatores et præcipui Christianæ fidei doctores ad perpetuam posteris scriptum reliquerunt memoriam."

CLASSIFICATION OF PATRISTIC WRITINGS.—In order to get a good view of the patristic period, the Fathers may be divided in various ways. One favourite method is by periods: the Ante-Nicene Fathers till 325; the Great Fathers of the fourth century and half the fifth (325-451); and the later Fathers. A more obvious division is into Easterns and Westerns, and the Easterns will comprise writers in Greek, Syriac, Armenian, and Coptic. A convenient division into smaller groups will be by periods, nationalities and character of writings; for in the East and West there were many races, and some of the ecclesiastical writers are apologists, some preachers, some historians, some commentators, and so forth.

A. After (1) the Apostolic Fathers come in the second century (2) the Greek apologists, followed by (3) the Western apologists somewhat later, (4) the Gnostic and Marcionite heretics with their apocryphal Scriptures, and (5) the Catholic replies to them.

B. The third century gives us (1) the Alexandrian writers of the catechetical school, (2) the writers of Asia Minor and (3) Palestine, and the first Western writers, (4) at Rome, Hippolytus (in Greek), and Novatian, (5) the great African writers, and a few others.

C. The fourth century opens with (1) the apologetic and the historical works of Eusebius of Cæsarea, with whom we may class St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Epiphanius, (2) the Alexandrian writers Athanasius, Didymus, and others, (3) the Cappadocians, (4) the Antiochenes, (5) the Syriac writers. In the West we have (6) the opponents of Arianism, (7) the Italians, including Jerome, (8) the Africans, and (9) the Spanish and Gallic writers.

D. The fifth century gives us (1) the Nestorian controversy, (2) the Eutychian controversy, including the Western St. Leo; (3) the historians. In the West (4) the school of Lérins, (5) the letters of the popes.

E. The sixth century and the seventh give us less important names and they must be grouped in a more mechanical way.

A. (1) If we now take these groups in detail we find the letters of the chief Apostolic Fathers, St. Clement, St. Ignatius, and St. Polycarp, venerable not merely for their antiquity, but for a certain simplicity and nobility of thought and style which is very moving to the reader. Their quotations from the New Testament are quite free. They offer most important information to the historian, though in somewhat homœopathic quantities. To these we add the *Didache* (q. v.), probably the earliest of all; the curious allegorizing anti-Jewish epistle which goes under the name of Barnabas; the Shepherd of Hermas, a rather dull series of visions chiefly connected with penance and pardon, composed by the brother of Pope Pius I, and long appended to the New Testament as of almost canonical importance. The works of Papias, the disciple of St. John and Aristion, are lost, all but a few precious fragments.

(2) The apologists are most of them philosophic in their treatment of Christianity. Some of their works were presented to emperors in order to disarm

persecutions. We must not always accept the view given to outsiders by the apologists, as representing the whole of the Christianity they knew and practised. The apologies of Quadratus to Hadrian, of Aristo of Pella to the Jews, of Miltiades, of Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and of Melito of Sardis are lost to us. But we still possess several of greater importance. That of Aristides of Athens was presented to Antoninus Pius, and deals principally with the knowledge of the true God. The fine apology of St. Justin with its appendix is above all interesting for its description of the Liturgy at Rome c. 150. His arguments against the Jews are found in the well-composed "Dialogue with Trypho", where he speaks of the Apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse in a manner which is of first-rate importance in the mouth of a man who was converted at Ephesus some time before the year 132. The "Apology" of Justin's Syrian disciple Tatian is a less conciliatory work, and its author fell into heresy. Athenagoras, an Athenian (c. 177), addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus an eloquent refutation of the absurd calumnies against Christians. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, about the same date, wrote three books of apology addressed to a certain Autolyceus.

(3) All these works are of considerable literary ability. This is not the case with the great Latin apology which closely follows them in date, the "Apologeticus" of Tertullian, which is in the uncouth and untranslatable language affected by its author. Nevertheless it is a work of extraordinary genius, in interest and value far above all the rest, and for energy and boldness it is incomparable. His fierce "Ad Scapulam" is a warning addressed to a persecuting proconsul. "Adversus Judæos" is a title which explains itself. The other Latin apologists are later. The "Octavius" of Minucius Felix is as polished and gentle as Tertullian is rough. Its date is uncertain. If the "Apologeticus" was well calculated to infuse courage into the persecuted Christian, the "Octavius" was more likely to impress the inquiring pagan, if so be that more flies are caught with honey than with vinegar. With these works we may mention the much later Lactantius, the most perfect of all in literary form ("Divine Institutiones", c. 305-10, and "De Mortibus persecutorum", c. 314). Greek apologies probably later than the second century are the "Irrisiones" of Hermias, and the very beautiful "Epistle" to Diognetus. (4) The heretical writings of the second century are mostly lost. The Gnostics had schools and philosophized; their writers were numerous. Some curious works have come down to us in Coptic. The letter of Ptolemæus to Flora in Epiphanius is almost the only Greek fragment of real importance. Marcion founded not a school but a Church, and his New Testament, consisting of St. Luke and St. Paul, is preserved to some extent in the works written against him by Tertullian and Epiphanius. Of the writings of Greek Montanists and of other early heretics, almost nothing remains. The Gnostics composed a quantity of apocryphal Gospels and Acts of individual Apostles, large portions of which are preserved, mostly in fragments, in Latin revisions, or in Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, or Slavonic versions. To these are to be added such well-known forgeries as the letters of Paul to Seneca, and the Apocalypse of Peter, of which a fragment was recently found in the Fayûm.

(5) Replies to the attacks of heretics form, next to the apologetic against heathen persecutors on the one hand and Jews on the other, the characteristic Catholic literature of the second century. The "Syntagma" of St. Justin against all heresies is lost. Earlier yet, St. Papias (already mentioned) had directed his efforts to the refutation of the rising errors, and the same preoccupation is seen in St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp. Hegesippus, a converted Jew of Palestine, journeyed to Corinth and Rome, where he stayed from the epis-

copate of Anicetus till that of Eleutherius (c. 160-180), with the intention of refuting the novelties of the Gnostics and Marcionites by an appeal to tradition. His work is lost. But the great work of St. Irenæus (c. 180) against heresies is founded on Papias, Hegesippus, and Justin, and gives from careful investigation an account of many Gnostic systems, together with their refutation. His appeal is less to Scripture than to the tradition which the whole Catholic Church has received and handed down from the Apostles, through the ministry of successive bishops, and particularly to the tradition of the Roman Church founded by Peter and Paul.

By the side of Irenæus must be put the Latin Tertullian, whose book "Of the Prescriptions Against Heretics" is not only a masterpiece of argument, but is almost as effective against modern heresies as against those of the early Church. It is a witness of extraordinary importance to the principles of unvarying tradition which the Catholic Church has always professed, and to the primitive belief that Holy Scripture must be interpreted by the Church and not by private industry. He uses Irenæus in this work, and his polemical books against the Valentinians and the Marcionites borrow freely from that saint. He is the less persuasive of the two, because he is too abrupt, too clever, too anxious for the slightest controversial advantage, without thought of the easy replies that might be made. He sometimes prefers wit or hard hitting to solid argument. At this period controversies were beginning within the Church, the most important being the question whether Easter could be celebrated on a weekday. Another burning question at Rome, at the turn of the century, was the doubt whether the prophesying of the Montanists could be approved, and yet another, in the first years of the third century, was the controversy with a group of opponents of Montanism (so it seems), who denied the authenticity of the writings of St. John, an error then quite new.

B. (1) The Church of Alexandria already in the second century showed the note of learning, together with a habit borrowed from the Alexandrian Jews, especially Philo, of an allegorizing interpretation of Scripture. The latter characteristic is already found in the "Epistle of Barnabas", which may be of Alexandrian origin. Pantænus was the first to make the Catechetical school of the city famous. No writings of his are extant, but his pupil Clement, who taught in the school with Pantænus, c. 180, and as its head, c. 180-202 (died c. 214), has left a considerable amount of rather lengthy disquisitions dealing with mythology, mystical theology, education, social observances, and all other things in heaven and on earth. He was followed by the great Origen, whose fame spread far and wide even among the heathen. The remains of his works, though they fill several volumes, are to a great extent only in free Latin translations, and bear but a small ratio to the vast amount that has perished. The Alexandrians held as firmly as any Catholics to tradition as the rule of faith, at least in theory, but beyond tradition they allowed themselves to speculate, so that the "Hypotyposes" of Clement have been almost entirely lost on account of the errors which found a place in them, and Origen's works fell under the ban of the Church, though their author lived the life of a saint, and died, shortly after the Decian persecution, of the sufferings he had undergone in it.

The disciples of Origen were many and eminent. The library founded by one of them, St. Alexander of Jerusalem, was precious later on to Eusebius. The most celebrated of the school were St. Dionysius "the Great" of Alexandria and St. Gregory of Neocæsarea in Pontus, known as the Wonder-Worker, who, like St. Nonnosus in the West, was said to have moved a mountain for a short distance by his prayers. Of the writings of these two saints not very much is extant.

(2) Montanism and the paschal question brought Asia Minor down from the leading position it held in the second century into a very inferior rank in the third. Besides St. Gregory, St. Methodius at the end of that century was a polished writer and an opponent of Origenism—his name is consequently passed over without mention by the Origenist historian Eusebius. We have his "Banquet" in Greek, and some smaller works in Old Slavonic.

(3) Antioch was the head see over the "Orient", including Syria and Mesopotamia as well as Palestine and Phœnicia, but at no time did this form a compact patriarchate like that of Alexandria. We must group here writers who have no connexion with one another in matter or style. Julius Africanus lived at Emmaus and composed a chronography, out of which the episcopal lists of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, and a great deal of other matter, have been preserved for us in St. Jerome's version of the Chronicle of Eusebius and in Byzantine chronographers. Two letters of his are of interest, but the fragments of his "Kestoi" or "Girdles" are of no ecclesiastical value; they contain much curious matter and much that is objectionable. In the second half of the third century, perhaps towards the end of it, a great school was established at Antioch by Lucian, who was martyred at Nicomedia in 312. He is said to have been excommunicated under three bishops, but if this is true he had been long restored at the time of his martyrdom. It is quite uncertain whether he shared the errors of Paul of Samosata (Bishop of Antioch, deposed for heresy in 268-9). At all events he was—however unintentionally—the father of Arianism, and his pupils were the leaders of that heresy: Eusebius of Nicomedia, Arius himself with Menophantus of Ephesus, Athanasius of Anazarbus, and the only two bishops who refused to sign the new creed at the Council of Nicæa, Theognis of Nicæa and Maris of Chalcædon, besides the scandalous bishop Leontius of Antioch and the Sophist Asterius. A Cæsarea, an Origenist centre, flourished under another martyr, St. Pamphilus, who with his friend Eusebius a certain Ammonius, and others, collected the works of Origen in a long-famous library, corrected Origen's "Hexapla", and did much editing of the text both of the Old and the New Testaments.

(4) We hear of no writings at Rome except in Greek until the mention of some small works in Latin, by Pope St. Victor, which still existed in Jerome's day. Hippolytus, a Roman priest, wrote from c. 200 to 23 and always in Greek, though at Carthage Tertullian had been writing before this in Latin. If Hippolytus is the author of the "Philosophumena" he was a antipope, and full of unreasoning enmity to his rival St. Callistus; his theology makes the Word proceed from God by His Will, distinct from Him in substance and becoming Son by becoming man. There is nothing Roman in the theology of this work; it rather connects itself with the Greek apologists. A great part of a large commentary on Daniel and a work against Noetus are the only other important remains of this writer, who was soon forgotten in the West, though fragments of his works turn up in all the Eastern languages. Parts of his chronography, perhaps his last work, have survived. Another Roman antipope, Novatian, wrote in ponderous and studied prose with metrical endings. Some of his works have come down to us under the name of St. Cyprian. Like Hippolytus, he made his rigorist views the pretext for schism. Unlike Hippolytus, he is quite orthodox in his principal work, "De Trinitate".

(5) The apologetic works of Tertullian have been mentioned. The earlier were written by him when priest of the Church of Carthage, but about the year 200 he was led to believe in the Montanist prophets Phrygia, and he headed a Montanist schism at Carthage. Many of his treatises are written to defend position and his rigorist doctrines, and he does

with considerable violence and with the clever and hasty argumentation which is natural to him. The placid flow of St. Cyprian's eloquence (Bishop of Carthage, 249-58) is a great contrast to that of his "master". The short treatises and large correspondence of this saint are all concerned with local questions and needs, and he eschews all speculative theology. From this we gain the more light on the state of the Church, on its government, and on a number of interesting ecclesiastical and social matters. In all the patristic period there is nothing, with the exception of Eusebius's history, which tells us so much about the early Church as the small volume which contains St. Cyprian's works. At the end of the century Arnobius, like Cyprian a convert in middle age, and like other Africans, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, and Augustine, a former rhetorician, composed a dull apology. Lactantius carries us into the fourth century. He was an elegant and eloquent writer, but like Arnobius was not a well-instructed Christian.

(1) The fourth century is the great age of the Fathers. It was twelve years old when Constantine published his edict of toleration, and a new era for the Christian religion began. It is ushered in by Eusebius of Caesarea, with his great apologetic works "*Præparatio Evangelica*" and "*Demonstratio Evangelica*", which show the transcendent merit of Christianity, and his still greater historical works, the "*Chronicle*" (the Greek original is lost) and the "*History*", which has gathered up the fragments of the age of persecutions, and has preserved to us more than half of all we know about the heroic ages of the Faith. In theology Eusebius was a follower of Origen, but he rejected the eternity of Creation and of the Logos, so that he was able to regard the Arians with considerable cordiality. The original form of the pseudo-Clementine romance, with its long and tiresome dialogues, seems to be a work of the very beginning of the century against the new developments of heathenism, and it was written either on the Phœnician coast or not far inland in the Syrian neighbourhood. Replies to the greatest of the pagan attacks, that of Porphyry, become more frequent after the pagan revival under Julian (361-3), and they occupied the labours of many celebrated writers. St. Cyril of Jerusalem has left us a complete series of instructions to catechumens and the baptized, thus supplying us with an exact knowledge of the religious teaching imparted to the people in an important Church of the East in the middle of the fourth century. A Palestinian of the second half of the century, St. Epiphanius, became Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, and wrote a learned history of all the heresies. He is unfortunately inaccurate, and has further made great difficulties for us by not naming his authorities. He was a friend of St. Jerome, and an uncompromising opponent of Origenism.

(2) The Alexandrian priest Arius was not a product of the catechetical school of that city, but of the Lucianic school of Antioch. The Alexandrian tendency was quite opposite to the Antiochene, and the Alexandrian bishop, Alexander, condemned Arius in letters still extant, in which we gather the tradition of the Alexandrian Church. There is no trace in them of Origenism, the head-quarters of which had long been at Caesarea in Palestine, in the succession Theoclitus, Pamphilus, Eusebius. The tradition of Alexandria was rather that which Dionysius the Great had received from Pope Dionysius. Three years after the Nicene Council (325), St. Athanasius began his long episcopate of forty-five years. His writings are not very voluminous, being either controversial theology or apologetic memoirs of his own troubles, but their theological and historical value is enormous, on account of the leading part taken by this truly great man in the fifty years of fight with Arianism. The head of the catechetical school during this half-century was Didymus the Blind, an Athanasian in his doctrine of

the Son, and rather clearer even than his patriarch in his doctrine of the Trinity, but in many other points carrying on the Origenistic tradition. Here may be also mentioned by the way a rather later writer, Serapion of Cyrene, a man of philosophical and literary habits, who showed energy and sincere piety as a bishop, in spite of the rather pagan character of his culture. His letters are of great interest.

(3) The second half of the century is illustrated by an illustrious triad in Cappadocia, St. Basil, his friend St. Gregory Nazianzen, and his brother St. Gregory of Nyssa. They were the main workers in the return of the East to orthodoxy. Their doctrine of the Trinity is an advance even upon that of Didymus, and is very near indeed to the Roman doctrine which was later embodied in the Athanasian creed. But it had taken a long while for the East to assimilate the entire meaning of the orthodox view. St. Basil showed great patience with those who had advanced less far on the right road than himself, and he even tempered his language so as to conciliate them. For fame of sanctity scarcely any of the Fathers, save St. Gregory the Wonder-Worker, or St. Augustine, has ever equalled him. He practised extraordinary asceticism, and his family were all saints. He composed a rule for monks which has remained practically the only one in the East. St. Gregory had far less character, but equal abilities and learning, with greater eloquence. The love of Origen which persuaded the friends in their youth to publish a book of extracts from his writings had little influence on their later theology; that of St. Gregory in particular is renowned for its accuracy or even inerrancy. St. Gregory of Nyssa is, on the other hand, full of Origenism. The classical culture and literary form of the Cappadocians, united to sanctity and orthodoxy, makes them a unique group in the history of the Church.

(4) The Antiochene school of the fourth century seemed given over to Arianism, until the time when the great Alexandrians, Athanasius and Didymus, were dying, when it was just reviving not merely into orthodoxy, but into an efflorescence by which the recent glory of Alexandria and even of Cappadocia was to be surpassed. Diodorus, a monk at Antioch and then Bishop of Tarsus, was a noble supporter of Nicene doctrine and a great writer, though the larger part of his works has perished. His friend Theodore of Mopsuestia was a learned and judicious commentator in the literal Antiochene style, but unfortunately his opposition to the heresy of Apollinarius of Laodicea carried him into the opposite extreme of Nestorianism—indeed the pupil Nestorius scarcely went so far as the master Theodore. But then Nestorius resisted the judgment of the Church, whereas Theodore died in Catholic communion, and was the friend of saints, including that crowning glory of the Antiochene school, St. John Chrysostom, whose greatest sermons were preached at Antioch, before he became Bishop of Constantinople. Chrysostom is of course the chief of the Greek Fathers, the first of all commentators, and the first of all orators whether in East or West. He was for a time a hermit, and remained ascetic in his life; he was also a fervent social reformer. His grandeur of character makes him worthy of a place beside St. Basil and St. Athanasius.

As Basil and Gregory were formed to oratory by the Christian Prohæresius, so was Chrysostom by the heathen orator Libanius. In the classical Gregory we may sometimes find the rhetorician; in Chrysostom never; his amazing natural talent prevents his needing the assistance of art, and though training had preceded, it has been lost in the flow of energetic thought and the torrent of words. He is not afraid of repeating himself and of neglecting the rules, for he never wishes to be admired, but only to instruct or to persuade. But even so great a man has his limitations. He has no speculative interest in philosophy

saved Rome from Attila, and the Romans from Genseric. He could be unbending in the enunciation of principle; he was condescending in the condoning of breaches of discipline for the sake of peace, and he was a skilful diplomatist. His sermons and the dogmatic letters in his large correspondence show him to us as the most lucid of all theologians. He is clear in his expression, not because he is superficial, but because he has thought clearly and deeply. He steers between Nestorianism and Eutychianism, not by using subtle distinctions or elaborate arguments, but by stating plain definitions in accurate words. He condemned Monothelism by anticipation. His style is careful, with metrical sentences. Its majestic rhythms and its sonorous closes have invested the Latin language with a new splendour and dignity.

E. (1) In the sixth century the large correspondence of Pope Hormisdas is of the highest interest. That century closes with St. Gregory the Great, whose celebrated "Registrum" exceeds in volume many times over the collections of the letters of other early popes. The Epistles are of great variety and throw light on the varied interests of the great pope's life and the varied events in the East and West of his time. His "Morals on the Book of Job" is not a literal commentary, but pretends only to illustrate the moral sense underlying the text. With all the strangeness it presents to modern notions, it is a work full of wisdom and instruction. The remarks of St. Gregory on the spiritual life and on contemplation are of special interest. As a theologian he is original only in that he combines all the traditional theology of the West without adding to it. He commonly follows Augustine as a theologian, a commentator and a preacher. His sermons are admirably practical; they are models of what a good sermon should be. After St. Gregory there are some great popes whose letters are worthy of study, such as Nicholas I and John VIII; but these and the many other late writers of the West belong properly to the medieval period. St. Gregory of Tours is certainly medieval, but the learned Bede is quite patristic. His great history is the most faithful and perfect history to be found in the early centuries. (2) In the East, the latter half of the fifth century is very barren. The sixth century is not much better. The importance of Leontius of Byzantium (died c. 543) for the history of dogma has only lately been realized. Poets and hagiographers, chroniclers, canonists, and ascetical writers succeed each other. Catena by way of commentaries are the order of the day. St. Maximus Confessor, Anastasius of Mount Sinai, and Andrew of Caesarea must be named. The first of these commented on the works of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, which had probably first seen the light towards the end of the fifth century. St. John of Damascus (c. 750) closes the patristic period with his polemics against heresies, his exegetical and ascetical writings, his beautiful hymns, and above all his "Fountain of Wisdom", which is a compendium of patristic theology and a kind of anticipation of scholasticism. Indeed, the "Summa Theologica" of the Middle Ages were founded on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard, who had taken the skeleton of his work from this last of the Greek Fathers.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PATRISTIC WRITINGS.—(a) *Commentaries*.—It has been seen that the literal school of exegesis had its home at Antioch, while the allegorical school was Alexandrian, and the entire West, on the whole, followed the allegorical method, mingling literalism with it in various degrees. The suspicion of Arianism has lost to us the fourth-century writers of the Antiochene school, such as Theodore of Heraclea and Eusebius of Emesa, and the charge of Nestorianism has caused the commentaries of Diodorus and Theodore of Mopsuestia (for the most part) to disappear. The Alexandrian school has lost yet more heavily, for little of the great Origen remains except in fragments

and in unreliable versions. The great Antiochenes, Chrysostom and Theodoret, have a real grasp of the sense of the sacred text. They treat it with reverence and love, and their explanations are of deep value, because the language of the New Testament was their own tongue, so that we moderns cannot afford to neglect their comments. On the contrary, Origen, the moulder of the allegorizing type of commentary, who had inherited the Philonic tradition of the Alexandrian Jews, was essentially irreverent to the inspired authors. The Old Testament was to him full of errors, lies, and blasphemies, so far as the letter was concerned, and his defence of it against the pagans, the Gnostics, and especially the Marcionites, was to point only to the spiritual meaning. Theoretically he distinguished a triple sense, the somatic, the psychic, and the pneumatic, following St. Paul's trichotomy; but in practice he mainly gives the spiritual, as opposed to the corporal or literal.

St. Augustine sometimes defends the Old Testament against the Manichæans in the same style, and occasionally in a most unconvincing manner, but with great moderation and restraint. In his "De Genesi ad litteram" he has evolved a far more effective method, with his usual brilliant originality, and he shows that the objections brought against the truth of the first chapters of the book invariably rest upon the baseless assumption that the objector has found the true meaning of the text. But Origen applied his method, though partially, even to the New Testament, and regarded the Evangelists as sometimes false in the letter, but as saving the truth in the hidden spiritual meaning. In this point the good feeling of Christians prevented his being followed. But the brilliant example he gave, of running riot in the fantastic exegesis which his method encouraged, had an unfortunate influence. He is fond of giving a variety of applications to a single text, and his promise to hold nothing but what can be proved from Scripture becomes illusory when he shows by example that any part of Scripture may mean anything he pleases. The reverent temper of later writers, and especially of the Westerns, preferred to represent as the true meaning of the sacred writer the allegory which appeared to them to be the most obvious. St. Ambrose and St. Augustine in their beautiful works on the Psalms rather spiritualize, or moralize, than allegorize, and their imaginative interpretations are chiefly of events, actions, numbers, etc. But almost all allegorical interpretation is so arbitrary and depends so much on the caprice of the exegete that it is difficult to conciliate it with reverence, however one may be dazzled by the beauty of much of it. An alternative way of defending the Old Testament was excogitated by the ingenious author of the pseudo-Clementines; he asserts that it has been depraved and interpolated. St. Jerome's learning has made his exegesis unique; he frequently gives alternative explanations and refers to the authors who have adopted them. From the middle of the fifth century onwards, second-hand commentaries are universal in East and West, and originality almost entirely disappears. Andrew of Caesarea is perhaps an exception, for he commented on a book which was scarcely at all read in the East, the Apocalypse.

Discussions of method are not wanting. Clement of Alexandria gives "traditional methods", the literal, typical, moral, and prophetic. The tradition is obviously from Rabbinism. We must admit that it has in its favour the practice of St. Matthew and St. Paul. Even more than Origen, St. Augustine theorized on this subject. In his "De Doctrina Christiana" he gives elaborate rules of exegesis. Elsewhere he distinguishes four senses of Scripture: historical, ætiological (economic), analogical (where N. T. explains O. T.), and allegorical ("De Util. Cred.", 3; cf. "De Vera Rel.", 50). The book of rules composed by the Donatist Tichonius has an analogy in the



smaller "canons" of St. Paul's Epistles by Priscillian. Hadrian of Antioch was mentioned above. St. Gregory the Great compares Scripture to a river so shallow that a lamb can walk in it, so deep that an elephant can float. (Pref. to "Morals on Job"). He distinguishes the historical or literal sense, the moral, and the allegorical or typical. If the Western Fathers are fanciful, yet this is better than the extreme literalism of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who refused to allegorize even the Canticle of Canticles.

(b) *Preachers*.—We have sermons from the Greek Church much earlier than from the Latin. Indeed, Sozomen tells us that, up to his time (c. 450), there were no public sermons in the churches at Rome. This seems almost incredible. St. Leo's sermons are, however, the first sermons certainly preached at Rome which have reached us, for those of Hippolytus were all in Greek; unless the homily "Adversus Alectores" be a sermon by a Novatian antipope. The series of Latin preachers begins in the middle of the fourth century. The so-called "Second Epistle of St. Clement" is a homily belonging possibly to the second century. Many of the commentaries of Origen are a series of sermons, as is the case later with all Chrysostom's commentaries and most of Augustine's. In many cases treatises are composed of a course of sermons, as, for instance, is the case for some of those of Ambrose, who seems to have rewritten his sermons after delivery. The "De Sacramentis" may possibly be the version by a shorthand-writer of the course which the saint himself edited under the title "De Mysteriis". In any case the "De Sacramentis" (whether by Ambrose or not) has a freshness and *naïveté* which is wanting in the certainly authentic "De Mysteriis". Similarly the great courses of sermons preached by St. Chrysostom at Antioch were evidently written or corrected by his own hand, but those he delivered at Constantinople were either hurriedly corrected, or not at all. His sermons on Acts, which have come down to us in two quite distinct texts in the MSS., are probably known to us only in the forms in which they were taken down by two different tachygraphers. St. Gregory Nazianzen complains of the importunity of these shorthand-writers (Orat. xxxii), as St. Jerome does of their incapacity (Ep. lxxi, 5). Their art was evidently highly perfected, and specimens of it have come down to us. They were officially employed at councils (e. g. at the great conference with the Donatists at Carthage, in 411, we hear of them). It appears that many or most of the bishops at the Council of Ephesus, in 449, had their own shorthand-writers with them. The method of taking notes and of amplifying receives illustration from the Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 27 April, 449, at which the minutes were examined which had been taken down by tachygraphers at the council held a few weeks earlier.

Many of St. Augustine's sermons are certainly from shorthand notes. As to others we are uncertain, for the style of the written ones is often so colloquial that it is difficult to get a criterion. The sermons of St. Jerome at Bethlehem, published by Dom Morin, are from shorthand reports, and the discourses themselves were unprepared conferences on those portions of the Psalms or of the Gospels which had been sung in the liturgy. The speaker has clearly often been preceded by another priest, and on the Western Christmas Day, which his community alone is keeping, the bishop is present and will speak last. In fact the pilgrim Ætheria tells us that at Jerusalem, in the fourth century, all the priests present spoke in turn, if they chose, and the bishop last of all. Such improvised comments are far indeed from the oratorical discourses of St. Gregory Nazianzen, from the lofty flights of Chrysostom, from the torrent of iteration that characterizes the short sermons of Peter Chrysologus, from the neat phrases of Maximus of Turin, and the ponderous

rhythms of Leo the Great. The eloquence of these Fathers need not be here described. In the West we may add in the fourth century Gaudentius of Brescia; several small collections of interesting sermons appear in the fifth century; the sixth opens with the numerous collections made by St. Caesarius for the use of preachers. There is practically no edition of the works of this eminent and practical bishop. St. Gregory (apart from some fanciful exegesis) is the most practical preacher of the West. Nothing could be more admirable for imitation than St. Chrysostom. The more ornate writers are less safe to copy. St. Augustine's style is too personal to be an example, and few are so learned, so great, and so ready, that they can venture to speak as simply as he often does.

(c) *Writers*.—The Fathers do not belong to the strictly classical period of either the Greek or the Latin language; but this does not imply that they wrote bad Latin or Greek. The conversational form of the *κοινή* or common dialect of Greek, which is found in the New Testament and in many papyri, is not the language of the Fathers, except of the very earliest. For the Greek Fathers write in a more classicizing style than most of the New Testament writers; none of them uses quite a vulgar or ungrammatical Greek, while some Atticize, e. g. the Cappadocians and Synesius. The Latin Fathers are often less classical. Tertullian is a Latin Carlyle; he knew Greek, and wrote books in that language, and tried to introduce ecclesiastical terms into Latin. St. Cyprian's "Ad Donatum", probably his first Christian writing, shows an Apuleian preciosity which he eschewed in all his other works, but which his biographer Pontius has imitated and exaggerated. Men like Jerome and Augustine, who had a thorough knowledge of classical literature, would not employ tricks of style, and cultivated a manner which should be correct, but simple and straightforward; yet their style could not have been what it was but for their previous study. For the spoken Latin of all the patristic centuries was very different from the written. We get examples of the vulgar tongue here and there in the letters of Pope Cornelius as edited by Mercati, for the third century, or in the Rule of St. Benedict in Wölfflin's or Dom Morin's editions, for the sixth. In the latter we get such modernisms as *cor murmurantem, post quibus, cum responsoria sua*, which show how the confusing genders and cases of the classics were disappearing into the more reasonable simplicity of Italian. Some of the Fathers use the rhythmical endings of the "cur-sus" in their prose; some have the later accented endings which were corruptions of the correct prosodial ones. Familiar examples of the former are in the older Collects of the Mass; of the latter the Te Deum is an obvious instance.

(d) *East and West*.—Before speaking of the theological characteristics of the Fathers, we have to take into account the great division of the Roman Empire into two languages. Language is the great separator. When two emperors divided the Empire, it was not quite according to language; nor were the ecclesiastical divisions more exact, since the great province of Illyricum, including Macedonia and all Greece, was attached to the West through at least a large part of the patristic period, and was governed by the archbishop of Thessalonica, not as its exarch or patriarch, but as papal legate. But in considering the literary productions of the age, we must class them as Latin or Greek, and this is what will be meant here by Western and Eastern. The understanding of the relations between Greeks and Latins is often obscured by certain prepossessions. We talk of the "unchanging East", of the philosophical Greeks as opposed to the practical Romans, of the reposeful thought of the Oriental mind over against the rapidity and orderly classification which characterizes Western intelligence. All this is very misleading, and it is important to go

back to the facts. In the first place, the East was converted far more rapidly than the West. When Constantine made Christianity the established religion of both empires from 323 onwards, there was a striking contrast between the two. In the West paganism had everywhere a very large majority, except possibly in Africa. But in the Greek world Christianity was quite the equal of the old religions in influence and numbers; in the great cities it might even be predominant, and some towns were practically Christian. The story told of St. Gregory the Wonder-Worker, that he found but seventeen Christians in Neocesarea when he became bishop, and that he left but seventeen pagans in the same city when he died (c. 270-5), must be substantially true. Such a story in the West would be absurd. The villages of the Latin countries held out for long, and the *pagani* retained the worship of the old gods even after they were all nominally Christianized. In Phrygia, on the contrary, entire villages were Christian long before Constantine, though it is true that elsewhere some towns were still heathen in Julian's day—Gaza in Palestine is an example; but then Mafouma, the port of Gaza, was Christian.

Two consequences, amongst others, of this swift evangelization of the East must be noticed. In the first place, while the slow progress of the West was favourable to the preservation of the unchanged tradition, the quick conversion of the East was accompanied by a rapid development which, in the sphere of dogma, was hasty, unequal, and fruitful of error. Secondly, the Eastern religion partook, even during the heroic age of persecution, of the evil which the West felt so deeply after Constantine, that is to say, of the crowding into the Church of multitudes who were only half Christianized, because it was the fashionable thing to do, or because a part of the beauties of the new religion and of the absurdities of the old were seen. We have actually Christian writers, in East and West, such as Arnobius, and to some extent Lactantius and Julius Africanus, who show that they are only half instructed in the Faith. This must have been largely the case among the people in the East. Tradition in the East was less regarded, and faith was less deep than in the smaller Western communities. Again, the Latin writers begin in Africa with Tertullian, just before the third century, at Rome with Novatian, just in the middle of the third century, and in Spain and Gaul not till the fourth. But the East had writers in the first century, and numbers in the second: there were Gnostic and Christian schools in the second and third. There had been, indeed, Greek writers at Rome in the first and second centuries and part of the third. But when the Roman Church became Latin they were forgotten; the Latin writers did not cite Clement and Hermas; they totally forgot Hippolytus, except his chronicle, and his name became merely a theme for legend.

Though Rome was powerful and venerated in the second century, and though her tradition remained unbroken, the break in her literature is complete. Latin literature is thus a century and a half younger than the Greek; indeed it is practically two centuries and a half younger. Tertullian stands alone, and he became a heretic. Until the middle of the fourth century there had appeared but one Latin Father for the spiritual reading of the educated Latin Christian, and it is natural that the stichometry, edited (perhaps semi-officially) under Pope Liberius for the control of booksellers' prices, gives the works of St. Cyprian as well as the books of the Latin Bible. This unique position of St. Cyprian was still recognized at the beginning of the fifth century. From Cyprian (d. 258) to Hilary there was scarcely a Latin book that could be recommended for popular reading except Lactantius's "*De moribus persecutorum*", and there was no theology at all. Even a little later, the commentaries

of Victorinus the Rhetorician were valueless, and those of Isaac the Jew (?) were odd. The one vigorous period of Latin literature is the bare century which ends with Leo (d. 461). During that century Rome had been repeatedly captured or threatened by barbarians; Arian Vandals, besides devastating Italy and Gaul, had almost destroyed the Catholicism of Spain and Africa; the Christian British had been murdered in the English invasion. Yet the West had been able to rival the East in output and in eloquence, and even to surpass it in learning, depth, and variety. The elder sister knew little of these productions, but the West was supplied with a considerable body of translations from the Greek, even in the fourth century. In the sixth, Cassiodorus took care that the amount should be increased. This gave the Latins a larger outlook, and even the decay of learning which Cassiodorus and Agapetus could not remedy, and which Pope Agatho deplored so humbly in his letter to the Greek council of 680, was resisted with a certain persistent vigour.

At Constantinople the means of learning were abundant, and there were many authors; yet there is a gradual decline till the fifteenth century. The more notable writers are like flickers amid dying embers. There were chroniclers and chronographers, but with little originality. Even the monastery of Studium is hardly a literary revival. There is in the East no enthusiasm like that of Cassiodorus, of Isidore, of Alcuin, amid a barbarian world. Photius had wonderful libraries at his disposal, yet Bede had wider learning, and probably knew more of the East than Photius did of the West. The industrious Irish schools which propagated learning in every part of Europe had no parallel in the Oriental world. It was after the fifth century that the East began to be "unchanging". And as the bond with the West grew less and less continuous, her theology and literature became more and more mummified; whereas the Latin world blossomed anew with an Anselm, subtle as Augustine, a Bernard, rival to Chrysostom, an Aquinas, prince of theologians. Hence we observe in the early centuries a twofold movement, which must be spoken of separately: an Eastward movement of theology, by which the West imposed her dogmas on the reluctant East, and a Westward movement in most practical things—organization, liturgy, ascetics, devotion—by which the West assimilated the swifter evolution of the Greeks. We take first the theological movement.

(c) *Theology*.—Throughout the second century the Greek portion of Christendom bred heresies. The multitude of Gnostic schools tried to introduce all kinds of foreign elements into Christianity. Those who taught and believed them did not start from a belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation such as we are accustomed to. Marcion formed, not a school, but a Church; his Christology was very far removed from tradition. The Montanists made a schism which retained the traditional beliefs and practices, but asserted a new revelation. The leaders of all the new views came to Rome, and tried to gain a footing there; all were condemned and excommunicated. At the end of the century, Rome got all the East to agree with her traditional rule that Easter should be kept on Sunday. The Churches of Asia Minor had a different custom. One of their bishops protested. But they seem to have submitted almost at once. In the first decades of the third century, Rome impartially repelled opposing heresies, those which identified the three Persons of the Holy Trinity with only a modal distinction (Monarchians, Sabellians, "Patripassians"), and those who, on the contrary, made Christ a mere man, or seemed to ascribe to the Word of God a distinct being from that of the Father. This last conception, to our amazement, is assumed, it would appear, by the early Greek apologists, though in varying language;

Athenagoras (who as an Athenian may have been in relation with the West) is the only one who asserts the Unity of the Trinity. Hippolytus (somewhat diversely in the "Contra Noetum" and in the "Philosophumena," if they are both his) taught the same division of the Son from the Father as traditional, and he records that Pope Callistus condemned him as a Ditheist.

Origen, like many of the others, makes the procession of the Word depend upon His office of Creator; and if he is orthodox enough to make the procession an eternal and necessary one, this is only because he regards Creation itself as necessary and eternal. His pupil, Dionysius of Alexandria, in combating the Sabellians, who admitted no real distinctions in the Godhead, manifested the characteristic weakness of the Greek theology, but some of his own Egyptians were more correct than their patriarch, and appealed to Rome. The Alexandrian listened to the Roman Dionysius, for all respected the unchanging tradition and unblemished orthodoxy of the See of Peter; his apology accepts the word "consubstantial", and he explains, no doubt sincerely, that he had never meant anything else; but he had learnt to see more clearly, without recognizing how unfortunately worded were his earlier arguments. He was not present when a council, mainly of Origenists, justly condemned Paul of Samosata (268); and these bishops, holding the traditional Eastern view, refused to use the word "consubstantial" as being too like Sabellianism. The Arians, disciples of Lucian, rejected (as did the more moderate Eusebius of Cæsarea) the eternity of Creation, and they were logical enough to argue that consequently "there was (before time was) when the Word was not", and that He was a creature. All Christendom was horrified; but the East was soon appeased by vague explanations, and after Nicæa, real, undisguised Arianism hardly showed its head for nearly forty years. The highest point of orthodoxy that the East could reach is shown in the admirable lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. There is one God, he teaches, that is the Father, and His Son is equal to Him in all things, and the Holy Ghost is adored with Them; we cannot separate Them in our worship. But he does not ask himself how there are not three Gods; he will not use the Nicene word "consubstantial", and he never suggests that there is one Godhead common to the three Persons.

If we turn to the Latins all is different. The essential Monotheism of Christianity is not saved in the West by saying there is "one God the Father", as in all the Eastern creeds, but the theologians teach the unity of the Divine essence, in which subsist three Persons. If Tertullian and Novatian use subordinationist language of the Son (perhaps borrowed from the East), it is of little consequence in comparison with their main doctrine, that there is one substance of the Father and of the Son. Callistus excommunicates equally those who deny the distinction of Persons, and those who refuse to assert the unity of substance. Pope Dionysius is shocked that his namesake did not use the word "consubstantial"—this is more than sixty years before Nicæa. At that great council a Western bishop has the first place, with two Roman priests, and the result of the discussion is that the Roman word "consubstantial" is imposed upon all. In the East the council is succeeded by a conspiracy of silence; the Orientals will not use the word. Even Alexandria, which had kept to the doctrine of Dionysius of Rome, is not convinced that the policy was good, and Athanasius spends his life in fighting for Nicæa, yet rarely uses the crucial word. It takes half a century for the Easterns to digest it; and when they do so, they do not make the most of its meaning. It is curious how little interest even Athanasius shows in the Unity of the Trinity, which he scarcely mentions except when quoting the Dio-

nysii; it is Didymus and the Cappadocians who word Trinitarian doctrine in the manner since consecrated by the centuries—three hypostases, one *ousia*; but this is merely the conventional translation of the ancient Latin formula, though it was new to the East.

If we look back at the three centuries, second, third, and fourth, of which we have been speaking, we shall see that the Greek-speaking Church taught the Divinity of the Son, and Three inseparable Persons, and one God the Father, without being able philosophically to harmonize these conceptions. The attempts which were made were sometimes condemned as heresy in the one direction or the other, or at best arrived at unsatisfactory and erroneous explanations, such as the distinction of the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and the *λόγος προφορικός* or the assertion of the eternity of Creation. The Latin Church preserved always the simple tradition of three distinct Persons and one divine Essence. We must judge the Easterns to have started from a less perfect tradition, for it would be too harsh to accuse them of wilfully perverting it. But they show their love of subtle distinctions at the same time that they lay bare their want of philosophical grasp. The common people talked theology in the streets; but the professional theologians did not see that the root of religion is the unity of God, and that, so far, it is better to be a Sabellian than a Semi-Arian. There is something mythological about their conceptions, even in the case of Origen, however important a thinker he may be in comparison with other ancients. His conceptions of Christianity dominated the East for some time, but an Origenist Christianity would never have influenced the modern world.

The Latin conception of theological doctrine, on the other hand, was by no means a mere adherence to an uncomprehended tradition. The Latins in each controversy of these early centuries seized the main point, and preserved it at all hazards. Never for an instant did they allow the unity of God to be obscured. The equality of the Son and his consubstantiality were seen to be necessary to that unity. The Platonist idea of the need of a mediator between the transcendent God and Creation does not entangle them, for they were too clear-headed to suppose that there could be anything half-way between the finite and the infinite. In a word, the Latins are philosophers, and the Easterns are not. The East can speculate and wrangle about theology, but it cannot grasp a large view. It is in accordance with this that it was in the West, after all the struggle was over, that the Trinitarian doctrine was completely systematized by Augustine; in the West, that the Athanasian creed was formulated. The same story repeats itself in the fifth century. The philosophical heresy of Pelagius arose in the West, and in the West only could it have been exorcized. The schools of Antioch and Alexandria each insisted on one side of the question as to the union of the two Natures in the Incarnation; the one School fell into Nestorianism, the other into Eutychianism, though the leaders were orthodox. But neither Cyril nor the great Theodoret was able to rise above the controversy, and express the two complementary truths in one consistent doctrine. They held what St. Leo held; but, omitting their interminable arguments and proofs, the Latin writer words the true doctrine once for all, because he sees it philosophically. No wonder that the most popular of the Eastern Fathers has always been untheological Chrysostom, whereas the most popular of the Western Fathers is the philosopher Augustine. Whenever the East was severed from the West, it contributed nothing to the elucidation and development of dogma, and when united, its contribution was mostly to make difficulties for the West to unravel.

But the West has continued without ceasing its work of exposition and evolution. After the fifth century there is not much development or definition

in the patristic period; the dogmas defined needed only a reference to antiquity. But again and again Rome had to impose her dogmas on Byzantium—519, 680, and 786 are famous dates, when the whole Eastern Church had to accept a papal document for the sake of reunion, and the intervals between these dates supply lesser instances. The Eastern Church had always possessed a traditional belief in Roman tradition and in the duty of recourse to the See of Peter; the Arians expressed it when they wrote to Pope Julius to deprecate interference—Rome, they said, was “the metropolis of the faith from the beginning”. In the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries the lesson had been learnt thoroughly, and the East proclaimed the papal prerogatives, and appealed to them with a fervour which experience had taught to be in place. In such a sketch as this, all elements cannot be taken into consideration. It is obvious that Eastern theology had a great and varied influence on Latin Christendom. But the essential truth remains that the West thought more clearly than the East, while preserving with greater faithfulness a more explicit tradition as to cardinal dogmas, and that the West imposed her doctrines and her definitions on the East, and repeatedly, if necessary, reasserted and reimposed them.

(f) *Discipline, Liturgy, Ascetics.*—According to tradition, the multiplication of bishoprics, so that each city had its own bishop, began in the province of Asia, under the direction of St. John. The development was uneven. There may have been but one see in Egypt at the end of the second century, though there were large numbers in all the provinces of Asia Minor, and a great many in Phœnicia and Palestine. Groupings under metropolitan sees began in that century in the East, and in the third century this organization was recognized as a matter of course. Over metropolitans are the patriarchs. This method of grouping spread to the West. At first Africa had the most numerous sees; in the middle of the third century there were about a hundred, and they quickly increased to more than four times that number. But each province of Africa had not a metropolitan see; only a presidency was accorded to the senior bishop, except in Proconsularis, where Carthage was the metropolis of the province and her bishop was the first of all Africa. His rights were undefined, though his influence was great. But Rome was near, and the pope had certainly far more actual power, as well as more recognized right, than the primate; we see this in Tertullian's time, and it remains true in spite of the resistance of Cyprian. The other countries, Italy, Spain, Gaul, were gradually organized according to the Greek model, and the Greek names, *metropolis*, *patriarch*, were adopted. Councils were held early in the West. But disciplinary canons were first enacted in the East. St. Cyprian's large councils passed no canons, and that saint considered that each bishop is answerable to God alone for the government of his diocese; in other words, he knows no canon law. The foundation of Latin canon law is in the canons of Eastern councils, which open the Western collections. In spite of this, we need not suppose the East was more regular, or better governed, than the West, where the popes guarded order and justice. But the East had larger communities, and they had developed more fully, and therefore the need arose earlier there to commit definite rules to writing.

The florid taste of the East soon decorated the liturgy with beautiful excrescences. Many such excellent practices moved Westward; the Latin rites borrowed prayers and songs, antiphons, antiphonal singing, the use of the alleluia, of the doxology, etc. If the East adopted the Latin Christmas Day, the West imported not merely the Greek Epiphany, but feast after feast, in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. The West joined in devotion to Eastern

martyrs. The special honour and love of Our Lady is at first characteristic of the East (except Antioch), and then conquers the West. The parcelling of the bodies of the saints as relics for devotional purposes, spread all over the West from the East; only Rome held out, until the time of St. Gregory the Great, against what might be thought an irreverence rather than an honour to the saints. If the first three centuries are full of pilgrimages to Rome from the East, yet from the fourth century onward West joins with East in making Jerusalem the principal goal of such pious journeys; and these voyagers brought back much knowledge of the East to the most distant parts of the West. Monasticism began in Egypt with Paul and Anthony, and spread from Egypt to Syria; St. Athanasius brought the knowledge of it to the West, and the Western monasticism of Jerome and Augustine, of Honoratus and Martin, of Benedict and Columba, always looked to the East, to Anthony and Pachomius and Hilarion, and above all to Basil, for its most perfect models. Edifying literature in the form of the lives of the saints began with Athanasius, and was imitated by Jerome. But the Latin writers, Rufinus and Cassian, gave accounts of Eastern monachism, and Palladius and the later Greek writers were early translated into Latin. Soon indeed there were lives of Latin saints, of which that of St. Martin was the most famous, but the year 600 had almost come when St. Gregory the Great felt it still necessary to protest that as good might be found in Italy as in Egypt and Syria, and published his dialogues to prove his point, by supplying edifying stories of his own country to put beside the older histories of the monks. It would be out of place here to go more into detail in these subjects. Enough has been said to show that the West borrowed, with open-minded simplicity and humility, from the elder East all kinds of practical and useful ways in ecclesiastical affairs and in the Christian life. The converse influence in practical matters of West on East was naturally very small.

(g) *Historical Materials.*—The principal ancient historians of the patristic period were mentioned above. They cannot always be completely trusted. The continuators of Eusebius, that is, Rufinus, Sozomen, Theodoret, are not to be compared to Eusebius himself, for that industrious prelate has fortunately bequeathed to us rather a collection of invaluable materials than a history. His “Life” or rather “Panegyric of Constantine” is less remarkable for its contents than for its politic omissions. Eusebius found his materials in the library of Pamphilus at Casarea, and still more in that left by Bishop Alexander at Jerusalem. He cites earlier collections of documents, the letters of Dionysius of Corinth, Dionysius of Alexandria, Serapion of Antioch, some of the epistles sent to Pope Victor by councils throughout the Church, besides employing earlier writers of history or memoirs such as Papias, Hegesippus, Apollonius, an anonymous opponent of the Montanists, the “Little Labyrinth” of Hippolytus (?), etc. The principal additions we can still make to these precious remnants are, first, St. Irenæus on the heresies; then the works of Tertullian, full of valuable information about the controversies of his own time and place and the customs of the Western Church, and containing also some less valuable information about earlier matters—less valuable, because Tertullian is singularly careless and deficient in historical sense. Next, we possess the correspondence of St. Cyprian, comprising letters of African councils, of St. Cornelius and others, besides those of the saint himself. To all this fragmentary information we can add much from St. Epiphanius, something from St. Jerome and also from Photius and Byzantine chronographers. The whole Ante-Nicene evidence has been catalogued with wonderful industry by Harnack, with the help of Preuschen and others, in a book of 1021 pages, the first



volume of his invaluable "History of Early Christian Literature". In the middle of the fourth century, St. Epiphanius's book on heresies is learned but confused; it is most annoying to think how useful it would have been had its pious author quoted his authorities by name, as Eusebius did. As it is, we can with difficulty, if at all, discover whether his sources are to be depended on or not. St. Jerome's lives of illustrious men are carelessly put together, mainly from Eusebius, but with additional information of great value, where we can trust its accuracy. Gennadius of Marseilles continued this work with great profit to us. The Western catalogues of heresies, such as Philastrius, Prædestinatus, and St. Augustine, are less useful.

Collections of documents are the most important matter of all. In the Arian controversy the collections published by St. Athanasius in his apologetic works are first-rate authorities. Of those put together by St. Hilary only fragments survive. Another *dossier* by the Homoiousian Sabinus, Bishop of Heraclea, was known to Socrates, and we can trace its use by him. A collection of documents connected with the origins of Donatism was made towards the beginning of the fourth century, and was appended by St. Optatus to his great work. Unfortunately only a part is preserved; but much of the lost matter is quoted by Optatus and Augustine. A pupil of St. Augustine, Marius Mercator, happened to be at Constantinople during the Nestorian controversy, and he formed an interesting collection of *pièces justificatives*. He put together a corresponding set of papers bearing on the Pelagian controversy. Irenæus, Bishop of Tyre, amassed documents bearing on Nestorianism, as a brief in his own defence. These have been preserved to us in the reply of an opponent, who has added a great number. Another kind of collection is that of letters. St. Isidore's and St. Augustine's are immensely numerous, but bear little upon history. There is far more historical matter in those (for instance) of Ambrose and Jerome, Basil and Chrysostom. Those of the popes are numerous, and of first-rate value; and the large collections of them also contain letters addressed to the popes. The correspondence of Leo and of Hormisdas is very complete. Besides these collections of papal letters and the decretals, we have separate collections, of which two are important, the *Collectio Avellana*, and that of Stephen of Larissa.

Councils supply another great historical source. Those of Nicæa, Sardica, Constantinople, have left us no Acts, only some letters and canons. Of the later œcumenical councils we have not only the detailed Acts, but also numbers of letters connected with them. Many smaller councils have also been preserved in the later collections; those made by Ferrandus of Carthage and Dionysius the Little deserve special mention. In many cases the Acts of one council are preserved by another at which they were read. For example, in 418, a Council of Carthage recited all the canons of former African plenary councils in the presence of a papal legate; the Council of Chalcedon embodies all the Acts of the first session of the Robber Council of Ephesus, and the Acts of that session contained the Acts of two synods of Constantinople. The later sessions of the Robber Council (preserved only in Syriac) contain a number of documents concerning inquiries and trials of prelates. Much information of various kinds has been derived of late years from Syriac and Coptic sources, and even from the Arabic, Armenian, Persian, Ethiopic and Slavonic. It is not necessary to speak here of the patristic writings as sources for our knowledge of Church organization, ecclesiastical geography, liturgies, canon law and procedure, archæology, etc. The sources are, however, much the same for all these branches as for history proper.

PATRISTIC STUDY.—(1) *Editors of the Fathers*.—The earliest histories of patristic literature are those contained in Eusebius and in Jerome's "De viris

illustribus". They were followed by Gennadius, who continued Eusebius, by St. Isidore of Seville, and by St. Ildephonsus of Toledo. In the Middle Ages the best known are Sigebert of the monastery of Gembloux (d. 1112), and Trithemius, Abbot of Sponheim and of Wurzburg (d. 1516). Between these come an anonymous monk of Melk (Melliensis, c. 1135) and Honorius of Autun (1122-5). Ancient editors are not wanting; for instance, many anonymous works, like the Pseudo-Clementines and Apostolic Constitutions, have been remodelled more than once; the translators of Origen (Jerome, Rufinus, and unknown persons) cut out, altered, added; St. Jerome published an expurgated edition of Victorinus "On the Apocalypse". Pamphilus made a list of Origen's writings, and Possidius did the same for those of Augustine.

The great editions of the Fathers began when printing had become common. One of the earliest editors was Faber Stapulensis (Lefèvre d'Estaples), whose edition of Dionysius the Areopagite was published in 1498. The Belgian Pamelé (1536-87) published much. The controversialist Feuillard, a Franciscan (1539-1610) did some good editing. The sixteenth century produced gigantic works of history. The Protestant "Centuriators" of Magdeburg described thirteen centuries in as many volumes (1559-74). Cardinal Baronius (1538-1607) replied with his famous "Annales Ecclesiastici", reaching to the year 1198 (12 vols., 1588-1607). Marguerin de la Bigne, a doctor of the Sorbonne (1546-89), published his "Bibliotheca veterum Patrum" (9 vols., 1577-9) to assist in refuting the Centuriators.

The great Jesuit editors were almost in the seventeenth century; Gretserus (1562-1625), Fronto Ducæus (Fronton du Duc, 1558-1624), Andreas Schott (1552-1629), were diligent editors of the Greek Fathers. The celebrated Sirmond (1559-1651) continued to publish Greek Fathers and councils and much else, from the age of 51 to 92. Denis Petau (Petavius, 1583-1652) edited Greek Fathers, wrote on chronology, and produced an incomparable book of historical theology, "De theologicis dogmatibus" (1644). To these may be added the ascetic Halloix (1572-1636), the uncritical Chifflet (1592-1682), and Jean Garnier, the historian of the Pelagians (d. 1681). The greatest work of the Society of Jesus is the publication of the "Acta Sanctorum", which has now reached the beginning of November, in 64 volumes. It was planned by Rosweyde (1570-1629) as a large collection of lives of saints; but the founder of the work as we have it is the famous John van Bolland (1596-1665). He was joined in 1643 by Henschenius and Papebrochius (1628-1714), and thus the Society of Bollandists began, and continued, in spite of the suppression of the Jesuits, until the French Revolution, 1794. It was happily revived in 1836 (see BOLLANDISTS). Other Catholic editors were Gerhard Voss (d. 1609), Albaspinæus (De l'Aubespine, Bishop of Orléans, 1579-1630), Rigault (1577-1654), and the Sorbonne doctor Cotelier (1629-86). The Dominican Combéfiis (1605-79) edited Greek Fathers, added two volumes to de la Bigne's collection, and made collections of patristic sermons. The layman Valesius (de Valois, 1603-70) was of great eminence.

Among Protestants may be mentioned the controversialist Clericus (Le Clerc, 1657-1736); Bishop Fell of Oxford (1625-86), the editor of Cyprian, with whom must be classed Bishop Pearson and Dodwell; Grabe (1666-1711), a Prussian who settled in England; the Calvinist Basnage (1653-1723). The famous Gallican Etienne Baluze (1630-1718), was an editor of great industry. The Provençal Franciscan, Pagi, published an invaluable commentary on Baronius in 1689-1705. But the greatest historical achievement was that of a secular priest, Louis Le Nain de Tillemont, whose "Histoire des Empereurs" (6 vols., 1690) and "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique

des six premiers siècles" (16 vols., 1693) have never been superseded or equalled. Other historians are Cardinal H. Noris (1631-1704); Natalis Alexander (1639-1725), a Dominican; Fleury (in French, 1690-1719). To these must be added the Protestant Archbishop Usher of Dublin (1580-1656), and many canonists, such as Van Espen, Du Pin, La Marca, and Christianus Lupus. The Oratorian Thomassin wrote on Christian antiquities (1619-95); the English Bingham composed a great work on the same subject (1708-22). Holstein (1596-1661), a convert from Protestantism, was librarian at the Vatican, and published collections of documents. The Oratorian J. Morin (1597-1659) published a famous work on the history of Holy orders, and a confused one on that of penance. The chief patristic theologian among English Protestants is Bishop Bull, who wrote a reply to Petavius's views on the development of dogma, entitled "Defensio fidei Nicenæ" (1655). The Greek Leo Allatius (1586-1669), custos of the Vatican Library, was almost a second Bessarion. He wrote on dogma and on the ecclesiastical books of the Greeks. A century later the Maronite J. S. Assemani (1687-1768) published amongst other works a "Bibliotheca Orientalis" and an edition of Ephrem Syrus. His nephew edited an immense collection of liturgies. The chief liturgiologist of the seventeenth century is the Blessed Cardinal Tommasi, a Theatine (1649-1713, beatified 1803), the type of a saintly savant.

The great Benedictines form a group by themselves, for (apart from Dom Calmet, a Biblical scholar, and Dom Cœlilier, who belonged to the Congregation of St-Vannes) all were of the Congregation of St-Maur, the learned men of which were drafted into the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés at Paris. Dom Luc d'Achéry (1605-85) is the founder ("Spicilegium", 13 vols.); Dom Mabillon (1632-1707) is the greatest name, but he was mainly occupied with the early Middle Ages. Bernard de Montfaucon (1655-1741) has almost equal fame (Athanasis, Hexapla of Origen, Chrysostom, Antiquities, Palaeography). Dom Coustant (1654-1721) was the principal collaborator, it seems, in the great edition of St. Augustine (1679-1700; also letters of the Popes, Hilary). Dom Garet (Cassiodorus, 1679). Du Friche (St. Ambrose, 1686-90), Martigny (St. Jerome, 1693-1706, less successful), Delarue (Origen, 1733-59), Maran (with Toutée, Cyril of Jerusalem, 1720; alone, the Apologists, 1742; Gregory Nazianzen, unfinished), Massuet (Irenæus, 1710), Ste-Marthe (Gregory the Great, 1705), Julien Garnier (St. Basil, 1721-2), Ruinart (Acta Martyrum sincera, 1689, Victor Vitensis, 1694, and Gregory of Tours and Fredegar, 1699), are all well-known names. The works of Martène (1654-1739) on ecclesiastical and monastic rites (1690 and 1700-2) and his collections of anecdotes (1700, 1717, and 1724-33) are most voluminous; he was assisted by Durand. The great historical works of the Benedictines of St-Maur need not be mentioned here, but Dom Sabatier's edition of the Old Latin Bible, and the new editions of Du Cange's glossaries must be noted. For the great editors of collections of councils see under the names mentioned in the bibliography of the article on COUNCILS.

In the eighteenth century may be noted Archbishop Potter (1674-1747, Clement of Alexandria). At Rome Arevalo (Isidore of Seville, 1797-1803); Gallandi, a Venetian Oratorian (Bibliotheca veterum Patrum, 1765-81). The Veronese scholars form a remarkable group. The historian Maffei (for our purpose his "anecdota of Cassiodorus" are to be noted, 1702), Vallarsi (St. Jerome, 1734-42, a great work, and Rufinus, 1745), the brothers Ballerini (St. Zeno, 1739; St. Leo, 1753-7, a most remarkable production), not to speak of Bianchini, who published codices of the Old Latin Gospels, and the Dominican Mansi, Archbishop of Lucca, who re-edited Baronius, Fabricius, Thomassinus, Baluze,

etc., as well as the "Collectio Amplissima" of councils. A general conspectus shows us the Jesuits taking the lead c. 1590-1630, and the Benedictines working about 1680-1750. The French are always in the first place. There are some sparse names of eminence in Protestant England; a few in Germany; Italy takes the lead in the second half of the eighteenth century. The great literary histories of Bellarmine, Fabricius, Du Pin, Cave, Oudin, Schram, Lumper, Ziegelbauer, and Schœnemann will be found below in the bibliography. The first half of the nineteenth century was singularly barren of patristic study; nevertheless there were marks of the commencement of the new era in which Germany takes the lead. The second half of the nineteenth was exceptionally and increasingly prolific. It is impossible to enumerate the chief editors and critics. New matter was poured forth by Cardinal Mai (1782-1854) and Cardinal Pitra (1812-89), both prefects of the Vatican Library. Inedita in such quantities seem to be found no more, but isolated discoveries have come frequently and still come; Eastern libraries, such as those of Mount Athos and Patmos, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, and Mount Sinai, have yielded unknown treasures, while the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, etc., have supplied many losses supposed to be irrecoverable. The sands of Egypt have given something, but not much, to patrology.

The greatest boon in the way of editing has been the two great patrologies of the Abbé Migne (1800-75). This energetic man put the works of all the Greek and Latin Fathers within easy reach by the "Patrologia Latina" (222 vols., including 4 vols. of indexes) and the "Patrologia Græca" (161 vols). The Ateliers Catholiques which he founded produced wood-carving, pictures, organs, etc., but printing was the special work. The workshops were destroyed by a disastrous fire in 1868, and the recommencement of the work was made impossible by the Franco-German war. The "Monumenta Germaniae", begun by the Berlin librarian Pertz, was continued with vigour under the most celebrated scholar of the century, Theodor Mommsen. Small collections of patristic works are catalogued below. A new edition of the Latin Fathers was undertaken in the sixties by the Academy of Vienna. The volumes published up till now have been uniformly creditable works which call up no particular enthusiasm. At the present rate of progress some centuries will be needed for the great work. The Berlin Academy has commenced a more modest task, the re-editing of the Greek Ante-Nicene writers, and the energy of Adolf Harnack is ensuring rapid publication and real success. The same indefatigable student, with von Gebhardt, edits a series of "Texte und Untersuchungen", which have for a part of their object to be the organ of the Berlin editors of the Fathers. The series contains many valuable studies, with much that would hardly have been published in other countries.

The Cambridge series of "Texts and Studies" is younger and proceeds more slowly, but keeps at a rather higher level. There should be mentioned also the Italian "Studii e Testi", in which Mercati and Pio Franchi de' Cavalieri collaborate. In England, in spite of the slight revival of interest in patristic studies caused by the Oxford Movement, the amount of work has not been great. For learning perhaps Newman is really first in the theological questions. As critics the Cambridge School, Westcott, Hort, and above all Lightfoot, are second to none. But the amount edited has been very small, and the excellent "Dictionary of Christian Biography" is the only great work published. Until 1898 there was absolutely no organ for patristic studies, and the "Journal of Theological Studies" founded in that year would have found it difficult to survive financially without the help of the Oxford University Press. But

there has been an increase of interest in these subjects of late years, both among Protestants and Catholics, in England and in the United States. Catholic France has lately been coming once more to the fore, and is very nearly level with Germany even in output. In the last fifty years, archaeology has added much to patristic studies; in this sphere the greatest name is that of De Rossi.

(2) *The Study of the Fathers.*—The helps to study, such as Patrologies, lexical information, literary histories, are mentioned below.

**COLLECTIONS.**—The chief collections of the Fathers are the following: DE LA BIGNÉ, *Bibliotheca SS. PP.* (8 vols. fol., Paris, 1755, and App., 1759; 4th ed., 10 vols., 1824, with *Auctarium*, 2 vols., 1824, and *Suppl.*, 1839, 5th and 6th ed., 17 vols. fol., 1844 and 1874; this great work is a supplement of over 200 writings to the editions till then published of the Fathers; enlarged by UNIV. OF COLOGNE (Cologne, 1618, 14 vols., and App., 1622; the Cologne ed. enlarged by 100 writings, in 27 folio vols., Lyons, 1677); COMBES, *Græco-Latina Patrum Bibliotheca novum Auctarium* (2 vols., Paris, 1648, and *Auctarium novissimum*, 2 vols., Paris, 1672; D'ACHERY, *Veterum aliquot scriptum Specilegium* (13 vols. 4to, Paris, 1655-77, and 3 vols. fol., 1723), mostly of writings later than patristic period, as is also the case with BALZEE, *Macellanea* (7 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1678-1715; re-ed. by MANSI (4 vols. fol., Lucra, 1761-4; SCHOEN, *Opera varia nunc primum collecta* (5 vols. fol., Paris, 1696, and Venice, 1728); MURATORI, *Anecdota* from the Ambrosian Libr. at Milan (4 vols. 4to, Milan, 1697-8; Padua, 1713); IDEM, *Anecdota græca* (Padua, 1709; GRABE, *Specilegium* of Fathers of the first and second centuries (Oxford, 1698-9, 1700, and enlarged, 1714; GALLANDI, *Bibl. vet. PP.*, an enlarged edition of the Lyons ed. of de la Bigne (14 vols. fol., Venice, 1765-88, and index publ. at Bologna, 1863—nearly all the contents are reprinted in Migne; OEBERHAY, *SS. Patrum opera polemica de veritate religionis christ. c. Gent. et Jud.* (21 vols. 8vo, Würzburg, 1777-94); IDEM, *Opera omnia SS. Patrum Latinorum* (13 vols., Würzburg, 1789-91); ROCHT, *Reliquæ sacrae, secundæ et tertiæ centuriæ (4 vols., Oxford, 1814-18; in 5 vols., 1846-8; IDEM, *Scriptorum eccl. opuscula præcipua* (2 vols., Oxford, 1832, 3rd vol., 1838); MAL, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio* (unpubl. matter from Vatican MSS., 10 vols. 4to, 1825-38; IDEM, *Specilegium Romanum* (10 vols. 8vo, Rome, 1839-44); IDEM, *Novum Patrum Bibliotheca* (7 vols. 4to, Rome, 1844-54, vol. 8 completed by Cozza-Luzzi, 1871, vol. 9 by Cozza-Luzzi, 1888, App. ad opera ed. ab A. Maio, Rome, 1871, App. altera, 1871); a few eccl. writings in MAL's *Classici auctores* (10 vols., Rome, 1838-38); CAILLAT, *Collectio selecta SS. Ecclesie Patrum* (13 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1829-42); GERSDORF, *Bibl. Patrum eccl. lat. selecta* (13 vols., Leipzig, 1838-47); the Oxford *Bibliotheca Patrum* reached 10 vols. (Oxford, 1838-55); PITRA, *Specilegium Solesmense* (4 vols. 4to, Paris, 1852-8). The number of these various collections, in addition to the works of the great Fathers, made it difficult to obtain a complete set of patristic writings. Migne supplied the want by collecting almost all the foregoing (except the end of the last mentioned work, and MAL's later volumes) into his complete editions: *Patrologia cursus completus, Series latina* (to Innocent III, A. D. 1300, 221 vols. 4to, including four vols. of indexes, 1844-55), *Series græco-latina* (to the Council of Florence, A. D. 1438-9, 161 vols. 4to, 1857-66, and another rare vol. of additions, 1866); the *Series græca* was also published, in Latin only, in 81 vols.; there is no index in the *Series græca*; an alphabetical list of contents by SCHOLARIUS (Athens, 1879, useful); other publications, not included in Migne, by PITRA, are *Juris ecclesiastici Græcorum hist. et monum.* (2 vols., Rome, 1864-8); *Analecta sacra* (6 vols., numbered I, II, III, IV, VI, VIII, Paris, 1876-84); *Analecta sacra et classica* (Paris, 1888); *Analecta novissima*, medieval (2 vols., 1885-8); the new edition of Latin Fathers is called *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, editum consilio et impensis Academiae litterarum Casarea Vindobonensis* (Vienna, 1866, 8vo, in progress); and of the Greek Fathers: *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, herausgegeben von der Kirchenhistorischen-Kommission der Königl. preussischen Akad. der Wiss. (Berlin, 1897, large 8vo, in progress). Of the *Monumenta Germanica historica*, one portion, the *Auctores antiquissimi* (Berlin, 1877-98), contains works of the sixth century which connect themselves with patrology. Small modern collections are HURTER, *SS. Patrum opuscula selecta*, with a few good notes (Innsbruck, 1st series, 48 vols., 1868-85, 2nd series, 6 vols., 1884-92)—these little books have been deservedly popular; KRÜGER, *Sammlung ausgewählter Kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften* (Freiburg, 1891-); RAUSCHEN, *Florilegium patristicum*, of first and second centuries (3 fasc., Bonn, 1904-5); Cambridge patristic texts (I, *The Five Theol. Orig. of Greg. Naz., ed. MASON, 1899; II, The Catech. Orig. of Greg. Nyssen., ed. SRAWLEY, 1903; Dionysius Alex., ed. FEUTRE, 1904, in progress); VIZZINI, *Bibl. SS. PP. Theologia trinitatis et universo clero accommodata* (Rome, 1901—in progress); LIETZMANN, *Kleine Texte, für theol. Vorlesungen und Übungen* (twenty-five numbers have appeared of about 16 pp. each, Bonn, 1902—in progress); an English ed. of the same (Cambridge, 1903-); *Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du christianisme*, ed. HEMMER and LEJAY (texts, French tr., and notes, Paris, in progress—an admirable series).**

**INITIA.**—For Greek and Latin writers up to Eusebius, the index to HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, I; for the Latin writers of first six centuries, AUMERS, *Initia librorum PP. lat.*

(Vienna, 1865; and up to 1200, VATAZ, *Index PP. altiorum scriptum eccl. lat.* (2 vols., Vatican press, 1906-8).

**LITERARY HISTORIES.**—The first is BELLARMINE, *De Scripturis ecclesiasticis* (Rome, 1613, often reprinted; with additions by LABBE, Paris, 1660, and by OUDIN, Paris, 1688; Du PIN, *Bibliothèque universelle des auteurs eccl.* (161 vols. 8vo, or 19 vols. 4to, Paris, 1686, etc.; this was severely criticized by the Benedictine PETITDRIER and by the Oratorian SIMON (*Œuvre de la Bibl. des auteurs eccl. publ. par M. E. Dupin*, Paris, 1730), and Du Pin's work was put on the Index in 1757; FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Græca, sive notitia scriptum veterum Græcorum* (Hamburg, 1705-28, 14 vols.; new ed. by HARLES, Hamburg, 1790-1809, 12 vols., embraces not quite 11 vols. of the original ed.; index to this ed., Leipzig, 1838)—this great work is really a vast collection of materials; Fabricius was a Protestant ed. 1736; he made a smaller collection of the Latin lit. hist., *Bibl. Latina, sive not. scr. vet. lat.* (1697, 1708, 1712, etc., ed. by EINESE, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1773-4, and a continuation for the Middle Ages 1794-6, 3 vols.); the whole was re-edited by MANSI (6 vols., Padua, 1753, and Florence, 1858-9); LE NOURY, *Apparatus ad Biblioth. Mar. vet. Pat.* (2 vols. fol., Paris, 1703-15, deals with Greek Fathers of the second century and with Latin apologetics; CEILLIER, *Hist. générale des auteurs sacrés et eccl.*, from Moses to 1248, 23 vols., Paris, 1729-63; *Table par. des Mat.*, by RONDET, Paris, 1782; new ed., 16 vols., Paris, 1858-69; SCHRAM, *Analysis Operum SS. PP. et Scriptum eccl.* (Vienna, 1780-96, 18 vols., a valuable work); LEMPER, *Hist. Theologia-eccl. de vita scriptis atque doctrina SS. PP. et scr. eccl. trium primorum sæc.* (Vienna, 1783-96, 13 vols.; a compilation, but good); the Anglican CAVE published a fine work, *Scriptum eccl. historia literaria* (London, 1688; best ed., Oxford, 1740-3); ORDIN, a Premonstratensian, who became a Protestant, *Commentarius de Scripturis eccl.* (founded on Bellarmine, 3 vols. fol., Leipzig, 1722). On the editions of the Latin Fathers, SCHOENEMANN, *Bibliotheca historico-literaria Patrum Latinorum a Tert. ad Greg. M. et Iul. Hisp.* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1792-4).

**PATROLOGIES** (smaller works).—GERHARD, *Patrologia* (Jena, 1633); HILSEMAN, *Patrologia* (Leipzig, 1670); OLEARIUS, *Abacus Patrologicus* (Jena, 1673; these are old-fashioned Protestant books. German Catholic works are: GOLDWITZER, *Bibliographie der Kirchenhistoriker und Kirchenlehrer* (Landshut, 1828); IDEM, *Patrologie verbunden mit Patristik* (Nürnberg, 1833-4); the older distinction in Germany between patrology, the knowledge of the Fathers and their use, and patristic, the science of the theology of the Fathers, is now somewhat antiquated; BUSSE, *Grundriss der chr. Lit.* (Münster, 1828-9); MOHLER, *Patrologie*, an important posthumous work of this great man, giving the first three centuries (Fatisbon, 1840); PERMANER, *Bibliotheca patristica* (2 vols., Landshut, 1841-4); FESSLER, *Institutiones Patrologia* (Innsbruck, 1851; a new ed. by JUNGMAN is most valuable (Innsbruck, 1890-6); ALZOG, *Grundriss der Patrologie* (Freiburg im Br., 1866 and 1888); same in French by BELLET (Paris, 1867); NIRSCHL, *Handbuch der Patrologie und Patristik* (Mainz, 1881-5); RESBANTY, *Compendium Patrologia et Patristica* (Funkirchen in Hungary, 1894); CARVAJAL, *Institutiones Patrologia* (Oviedo, 1906); BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie* (Freiburg im Br., 1894; new ed. 1901)—this is at present by far the best handbook; the author is a professor in the Cath. theol. faculty of the Univ. of Munich; a French tr. by GODET and VERSCHAFFEL, *Les Pères de l'Eglise* (3 vols., Paris, 1899); an Italian tr. by A. MERCATI (Rome, 1903); and an English tr. with the bibliography brought up to date, by SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br. and St. Louis, 1908); smaller works, insufficient for advanced students, but excellent for ordinary purposes, are: SCHMID, *Grundrissen der Patrologie* (1879; 4th ed., Freiburg im Br., 1895); an Engl. tr. revised by SCHÖBEL (Freiburg, 1900); SWETE of Cambridge, *Patristic Study* (London, 1902).

**HISTORIES OF THE FATHERS.**—It is unnecessary to catalogue here all the general histories of the Church, large and small, from Baronius onwards; it will be sufficient to give some of those which deal specially with the Fathers and with ecclesiastical literature. The first and chief is the incomparable work of TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccl. des six premiers siècles* (Paris, 1693-1712, 16 vols., and other editions); MARÉCHAL, *Concordance des SS. Pères de l'Eglise, Græci et Latini*, a harmony of their theology (2 vols., Paris, 1739); BÄHR, *Die christlich-römische Literatur* (4th vol. of *Gesch. der römischen Litt.*, Karlsruhe, 1837; a new ed. of the first portion, 1872); SCHANZ, *Gesch. der röm. Litt.*, Part III (Munich, 1896), 117-324; EBERT, *Gesch. der christlich-lateinischen Litt.* (Leipzig, 1874; 2nd ed., 1889); *Antiquæ litteraturæ christiæne* (in *Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'hist. eccl.*, Paris); I; BATIFFOL, *La littérature grecque*, a useful sketch (4th ed., 1903); II; DUYAL, *La littérature syriaque* (3rd ed., 1908); LECLERCQ, *L'Afrique chrétienne* (in same *Bibl. de l'ens. de l'hist. eccl.*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1904); IDEM, *L'Espagne chrétienne* (2nd ed., 1906); BATIFFOL, *L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme*, a fine apologetic account of the development of the Church, from the witness of the Fathers of the first three centuries (Paris, 1909); of general histories the best is DUCHESNE, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise* (2 vols., have appeared, Paris, 1906-7); finally, the first place is being taken among histories of the Fathers by a work to be completed in six volumes, BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (I, to A. D. 200, Freiburg im Br., 1902; II, to A. D. 300, 1903). The following are Protestant: NEWMAN, *The Church of the Fathers* (London, 1840, etc.); DONALDSON, *A critical history of Christian lit. . . to the Nicene Council*; I; *The Apostolic Fathers*, II and III; *The Apologists* (London, 1864-6—unsympathetic); BRIGHT, *The Age of the Fathers* (2 vols., London, 1903); ZÖCKLER, *Gesch. der theologischen Litt. (Patristik)* (Nördlingen, 1889); CRUTTWELL, *A Literary History of Early*

*Christianity . . . Nicene Period* (2 vols., London, 1893; KRIEGER, *Gesch. der altchristlichen Litt. in den ersten 3 Jahrh.* (Freiburg im Br. and Leipzig, 1895-7; tr. GILLET (New York, 1897)—this is the best modern German Prot. history. The following consists of materials: A. HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchr. Litt. bis Eusebius*, I, *Die Überlieferung* (Leipzig, 1893; this vol. enumerates all the known works of each writer, and all ancient references to them, and notices the MSS.; II, 1 (1897), and II, 2 (1901), *Die Chronologie*, discussing the date of each writing; the latter Greek period is dealt with by KREMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litt.* 57-155 (2nd ed. with assistance from EHRHARD, Munich, 1897). The following collected series of studies must be added: *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litt.*, ed. VON GEBHARDT AND A. HARNACK (1st series, 15 vols., Leipzig, 1883-97, 2nd series, *Neue Folge*, 14 vols., 1897-1907, in progress)—the editors are now HARNACK and SCHMIDT; ROBINSON, *Texts and Studies* (Cambridge, 1891—in progress; EHRHARD AND MILLER, *Strassburger theologische Studien* (12 vols., Freiburg im Br., 1894—in progress; EHRHARD AND KIRSCH, *Forschungen zur christl. Litt. und Dogmengeschichte* (7 vols., Paderborn, in progress; *La Pensée chrétienne* (Paris, in progress; *Studi e Testi* (Vatican press, in progress. Of histories of development of dogma, HARNACK, *Dogmengeschichte* (3 vols., 3rd ed., 1894-7, a new ed. is in the press; French tr., Paris, 1898; Engl. tr., 7 vols., Edinburgh, 1894-9), a very clever and rather "viewy" work; LOOFS, *Leitfaden zum Studium der D. G.* (Halle, 1889; 3rd ed., 1893; SEEBERG, *Lehrb. der D. G.* (2 vols., Erlangen, 1895); conservative Protestant; IDEM, *Grundriss der D. G.* (1900; 2nd ed., 1905), a smaller work; SCHWANE, *Dogmengeschichte*, Catholic (2nd ed., 1892, etc.; French tr., Paris, 1903-4; BETHUNE-BAKER, *Introduction to early History of Doctrine* (London, 1903; TIERNOT, *Histoire des Dogmes*, I, *La théologie anti-nicéenne* (Paris, 1905—excellent; and others.

PHILOLOGY.—On the common Greek of the early period see MCLINTON, *Grammar of A. T. Greek*, I, *Prolegomena* (3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1900, and references; on the literary Greek, A. D. 1-250, SCHMID, *Der Atticismus von Dem. Hal. bis auf den letzten Philostratus* (4 vols., Stuttgart, 1887-9); THUMB, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (Strasbourg, 1901). Besides the *Thesaurus* of STEPHANUS (latest ed., 8 vols., fol., Paris, 1831-65) and lexicons of classical and Biblical Greek, special dictionaries of later Greek are DE CANGE, *Glossarium ad scriptores melioris et infimae graecitatis* (2 vols., Lyons, 1680, and new ed., Breslau, 1890-1); SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, 150-1100 (3rd ed., New York, 1888; words wanting in Stephanus and in Sophocles are collected by KUMANTZIS (Σ. Α. Κομαντζής), *Συναγωγή λέξεων ἀσφαλισμένων ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις λέξικοις* (Athens, 1883); general remarks on Byzantine Greek in KREMBACHER, *op. cit.* On patristic Latin, KOFFMANN, *Gesch. des Kirchenlateins*, I, *Entstehung . . . bis auf Augustinus-Hieronymus* (Breslau, 1879-81); NORDEN, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig, 1898), II; there is an immense number of studies of the language of particular Fathers [e. g. HOPPE on Tertullian (1897); WATSON (1896) and BAYARD (1902) on Cyprian; GOELTZER on Jerome (1884); REGNER on Augustine (1886, etc.)], and indices latinitatis to the volumes of the *Vienna Corpus PP. lat.* TRAUPE, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lat. Phil. des Mittelalters*, I (Munich, 1906; much will be found in *Archiv für lat. Lexicographie*, ed. WOLFFLIN (Munich, began 1884).

TRANSLATIONS.—*Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church*, translated by members of the English Ch. (by PUSEY, NEWMAN, etc.) (45 vols., Oxford, 1832-). ROBERTS AND DONALDSON, *The Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (24 vols., Edinburgh, 1866-72; new ed. by COXE, Buffalo, 1884-6, with RICHARDSON's excellent *Bibliographical Synopsis* as a Suppl., 1887); SCHAFF AND WACE, *A Select Library of Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Chr. Ch.*, with good notes (14 vols., Buffalo and New York, 1886-90, and 2nd series, 1900, in progress).

ENCYCLOPEDIA AND DICTIONARIES.—SCICER, *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus, e patribus graecis ordine alphabetico exhibens quaecumque phrases, ritus, dogmata, haereseis et huiusmodi alia spectant* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1682; again 1728; and Utrecht, 1748); HOFFMANN, *Bibliographisches Lexicon der gesammten Litt. der Griechen* (3 vols., 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1838-45); the articles on early Fathers and heresies in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (8th ed.) are, many of them, by HARNACK, and still worth reading; WETTER and WELTE, *Kirchenlex.*, ed. HERGENROTHER, and then by KATLEN and others, 12 vols., one vol. of index (Freiburg im Br., 1882-1903); HERZOG, *Realencyclopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche*, 3rd ed. by HAUCK (21 vols., 1896-1905); VACANT AND MANGENOT, *Dict. de Théol. cath.* (Paris, in progress); CABROL, *Dict. d'archéologie chr. et de liturgie* (Paris, in progress); BAUDRILLART, *Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclésiastiques* (Paris, in progress); SMITH AND WACE, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, is very full and valuable (4 vols., London, 1877-87).

GENERAL BOOKS OF REFERENCE.—ITTING, *De Bibliothecis et Calensis Patrum*, gives the contents of the older collections of Fathers which were enumerated above (Leipzig, 1707); IDEM, *Schediasma de auctoribus et de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis egerunt* (Leipzig, 1711); DOWLING, *Notitia scriptorum SS. PP. . . . quae in collectionibus Anecdotorum post annum MDCC in lucem editis continentur* (a continuation of ITTING's *De Bibl. et Cat.*, Oxford, 1839); an admirable modern work is EHRHARD, *Die altchristliche Litt. und ihre Erforschung seit 1880*; I, *Allgemeine Uebersicht*, 1880-4 (Freiburg im Br., 1894); II, *Ante-Nicene lit.*, 1884-1900 (1900); the bibliographies in the works of HARNACK and of BARDENHEWER (see above) are excellent; for Ante-Nicene period, RICHARDSON, *Bibliographical Synopsis* (in extra vol. of Ante-Nicene Fathers, Buffalo, 1887); for the whole period, CHEVALIER, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen-âge*: *Bio-bibliographie*, gives names of persons (2nd ed., Paris,

1905-07); *Topo-bibliographie* gives names of places and subjects (2nd ed., Paris, 1894-1903); progress each year is recorded in HOLTZMANN AND KRIEGER's *Theologischer Jahresbericht* from 1881; KROLL AND GÜRLITT, *Jahresbericht für klassische Alterthumswissenschaft* (both Protestant); BIEHLMEYER, *Hagiographischer Jahresbericht* for 1904-6 (Kempten and Munich, 1905). A very complete bibliography appears quarterly in the *Revue d'hist. eccl.* (Louvain, since 1900), with index at end of year; in this publ. the names of all *Revueurs* dealing with patristic matters will be found.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

**Fathers of the Faith of Jesus.** See PACCANARISTS.

**Fathers of the Holy Sepulchre.** See HOLY SEPULCHRE, FATHERS OF THE.

**Fathers of the Oratory.** See ORATORIAN.

**Faunt, LAWRENCE ARTHUR**, a Jesuit theologian; b. 1554; d. at Wilna, Poland, 28 February, 1590-91. After two years at Merton College, Oxford (1568-70) under the tuition of John Potts, a well-known philosopher, he went to the Jesuit college at Louvain where he took his B.A. After some time spent in Paris he entered the University of Munich under the patronage of Duke William of Bavaria, proceeding M.A. The date of his entrance into the Society of Jesus is disputed, some authorities giving 1570, others 1575, the year in which he went to the English College, Rome, to pursue his studies in theology. It is certain, however, that on the latter occasion he added Lawrence to his baptismal name, Arthur. He was soon made professor of divinity and attracted the favourable attention of Gregory XIII, who, on the establishment of the Jesuit college at Posen in 1581, appointed him rector. He was also professor of Greek there for three years, of moral theology and controversy for nine more, and was held in highest repute among both ecclesiastical and secular authorities. His chief theological works are: "De Christi in terris Ecclesia, quanam et penes quos existat" (Posen, 1584); "Cœna Lutheranorum et Calvinistarum oppugnatio ac Catholicae Eucharistiae defensio" (Posen, 1586); "Apologia libri sui de invocatione ac veneratione Sanctorum" (Cologne, 1589).

COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s. v.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

F. M. RUDGE.

**Fauriel, CHARLES-CLAUDE**, historian, b. at St-Etienne, France, 27 October, 1772; d. at Paris, 15 July, 1844. He studied first at the Oratorian College of Tournon, then at Lyons. He served in the army of the Pyrénées-Orientales. Under the Directory Fouché, an ex-Oratorian, attached him to his cabinet as private secretary. Under the Empire, he refused office in order to devote all his time to study. Fauriel adopted the new ideas of the Philosophers and the principles of the Revolution, but repudiated them in part in the later years of his life. He was an intense worker and knew Greek, Latin, Italian, German, English, Sanskrit, and Arabic. It was he who made the merits of Ossian and Shakespeare known to the French public, and spread in France the knowledge of German literature, which had been previously looked upon as unimportant. He was one of the first to investigate Romance literature, and the originality of his views in this direction soon popularized this new study. He also gathered the remnants of the ancient Basque and Celtic languages. The first works he published were a translation of "La Parthénide" (Paris, 1811), an idyllic epic by the Danish poet, Baggesen, and of the tragedy of his friend Manzoni, "Il Conte di Carmagnola" (Paris, 1823). The numerous linguistic and archaeological contributions which he wrote for various magazines won for him a great reputation among scholars; it was said of him that "he was the man of the nineteenth century who put in circulation the most ideas, inaugurated the greatest number of branches of study, and gathered the greatest number of new



results in historical science" (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Dec., 1833). The publication of the "Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne", text and translation (Paris, 1824-25), at a moment when Greece was struggling for her independence, made him known to the general public. In 1830 a chair of foreign literature was created for him at the University of Paris. He studied specially the Southern literatures and Provençal poetry. His lectures were published after his death under the title of "Histoire de la poésie provençale" (3 vols., Paris, 1846). In order to study more deeply the origins of French civilization he wrote "Histoire de la Gaule méridionale sous la domination des conquérants germains" (4 vols., Paris, 1836), only a part of a vaster work conceived by him. The merit of these works caused him to be elected (1836), to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. He contributed also to the "Histoire Littéraire de la France", commenced by the Benedictines and taken up after the Revolution by the Institute of France. Having been named assistant curator of the MSS. of the Royal Library, he published an historical poem in Provençal verse (with a translation and introduction), dealing with the crusade against the Albigenses.

GUIGNART, *Notice historique sur la vie et les travaux de M. C. Faustin* (Paris, 1862); OZANAM, *Discours sur Faustin in Le Correspondant* (Paris, 10 May, 1845); SAINTE-BREVE in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Paris, 15 May and 1 June, 1845).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

**Faustinus and Jovita**, SAINTS and MARTYRS, members of a noble family of Brescia; the elder brother, Faustinus, being a priest, the younger, a deacon. For their fearless preaching of the Gospel, they were arraigned before the Emperor Hadrian, who, first at Brescia, later at Rome and Naples, subjected them to frightful torments, after which they were beheaded at Brescia in the year 120, according to the Bollandists, though Allard (*Histoire des Persécutions pendant les Deux Premiers Siècles*, Paris, 1885) places the date as early as 118. The many "Acts" of these saints are chiefly of a legendary character. Fedele Savio, S.J., the most recent writer on the subject, calls in question nearly every fact related of them except their existence and martyrdom, which are too well attested by their inclusion in so many of the early martyrologies and their extraordinary cult in their native city, of which from time immemorial they have been the chief patrons. Rome, Bologna and Verona share with Brescia the possession of their relics. Their feast is celebrated on 15 Feb., the traditional date of their martyrdom.

*Acta SS.*, V, 806; SAVIO, *La Légende des SS. Faustin et Jovite in the Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels, 1896), XV, 5, 113, 377.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Faustus of Milevis.** See MANICHEANS.

**Faustus of Riez**, Bishop of Riez (*Rhegium*) in Southern Gaul (Provence), the best known and most distinguished defender of Semipelagianism, b. between 405 and 410, and according to his contemporaries, Avitus of Vienne and Sidonius Apollinaris, in the island of Britain; d. between 490 and 495. Nothing, however, is known about his early life or his education. He is thought by some to have been a lawyer but owing to the influence of his mother, famed for her sanctity, he abandoned secular pursuits while still a young man and entered the monastery of Lérins. Here he was soon ordained to the priesthood and because of his extraordinary piety was chosen (432) to be head of the monastery, in succession to Maximus who had become Bishop of Riez. His career as abbot lasted about twenty or twenty-five years during which he attained a high reputation for his wonderful gifts as an extempore preacher and for his stern asceticism. After the death of Maximus he became Bishop of Riez. This elevation did not make any change in his manner of life; he continued his ascetic practices, and frequently

returned to the monastery of Lérins to renew his fervour. He was a zealous advocate of monasticism and established many monasteries in his diocese. In spite of his activity in the discharge of his duties as bishop, he participated in all the theological discussions of his time and became known as a stern opponent of Arianism in all its forms. For this, and also, it is said, for his view, stated below, of the corporeity of the human soul, he incurred the enmity of Euric, King of the Visigoths, who had gained possession of a large portion of Southern Gaul, and was banished from his see. His exile lasted eight years, during which time he was aided by loyal friends. On the death of Euric he resumed his labours at the head of his diocese and continued there until his death. Throughout his life Faustus was an uncompromising adversary of Pelagius, whom he styled *Pestifer*, and equally decided in his opposition to the doctrine of Predestination which he styled "erroneous, blasphemous, heathen, fatalistic, and conducive to immortality". This doctrine in its most repulsive form had been expounded by a presbyter named Lucidus and was condemned by two synods, Arles and Lyons (475). At the request of the bishops who composed these synods, and especially Leontius of Arles, Faustus wrote a work, "*Libri duo de Gratia Dei et humanæ mentis libero arbitrio*", in which he refuted not only the doctrines of the Predestinarians but also those of Pelagius (P. L., LVIII, 783). The work was marred, however, by its decided Semipelagianism, for several years was bitterly attacked, and was condemned by the Synod of Orange in 529 (Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, Freiburg, 1908, no. 174 sqq.—old no. 144; P. L., XLV, 1785; Mansi, VIII, 712). Besides this error, Faustus maintained that the human soul is in a certain sense corporeal, God alone being a pure spirit. The opposition to Faustus was not fully developed in his lifetime and he died with a well-merited reputation for sanctity. His own flock considered him a saint and erected a basilica in his honour. Faustus wrote also: "*Libri duo de Spiritu Sancto*" (P. L., LXII, 9), wrongly ascribed to the Roman deacon Paschasius. His "*Libellus parvus adversus Arianos et Macedonianos*", mentioned by Genadius, seems to have perished. His correspondence (*epistolæ*) and sermons are best found in the new and excellent edition of the works of Faustus by Engelbrecht, "*Fausti Reiensis præter sermones pseudo-Eusebianos opera. Accedunt Ruricii Epistula*" in "*Corpus Scrip. eccles. lat.*", vol. XXI (Vienna, 1891). KOCH, *Der hl. Faustus, Bischof von Riez* (Stuttgart, 1895); WÖRTER, *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus* (Münster, 1900), II; BORDENHEWER (tr. SHAHAN), *Patrology* (Freiburg and St. Louis, 1908), 600 sq. For his Sermons see BERGMANN, *Studien zu einer kritischen Sichtung der südgalischen Predigtliteratur des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1898), and MORIN in *Revue Bénédictine* (1892), IX, 49-61. Cf. also CAZENOVE in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

**Faversham Abbey**, a former Benedictine monastery of the Cluniac Congregation situated in the County of Kent about nine miles west of Canterbury. It was founded about 1147 by King Stephen and his Queen Matilda. Clarimbald, the prior of Bermondsey, and twelve other monks of the same abbey were transferred to Faversham to form the new community; Clarimbald was appointed abbot. It was dedicated to Our Saviour and endowed with the manor of Faversham. In the church, which was completed about 1251, Stephen and Matilda, the founders, were buried and also their eldest son Eustace, Earl of Boulogne. We read of chapels in the church dedicated to Our Lady and St. Anne. Henry II confirmed all grants and privileges conferred by Stephen, adding others to them, and all these were again confirmed to the monks by Kings John and Henry III. The abbots had their seat in Parliament and we find them in attendance at thirteen several parliaments during the reigns of Edward I and Edward II, but on account of their reduced state and

poverty, they ceased to attend after the 18th, Edward II. It appears that some bitterness existed for a considerable time between the monks and the people of Faversham, who complained of the abbey's imposts and exactions. Among these grievances were claims, by way of composition, for allowing the inhabitants to send their swine to pannage, for exposing their goods for sale in the market, and for the liberty of brewing beer. Twenty-two abbots are known to us; the last was John Shepey, *alias* Castelocke, who, on 10 December, 1534, along with the sacristan and four monks, is said to have signed the Act of Supremacy. On 8 July, 1538, the abbey was surrendered to the king, at which time the annual revenue was about £350. Henry VIII gave the house and site to John Wheeler for twenty-one years at an annual rent of £3 18s. 8d. Afterwards the property came into the possession of Sir Thomas Cheney, warden of the Cinque Ports. Later it was owned by Thomas Ardern and subsequently came to belong to the family of Sondes. The two entrance gates were standing a century ago, but had to be taken down on account of their ruinous condition. At the present day there is nothing left except some portions of the outer walls.

TANNER, *Notitia Monastica* (London, 1787), s. v. Kent; Southouse, *Monasticon Favershamense* (London, 1671); Lewis, *History of Faversham* (London, 1727); DUGDALE, *Monast. Anglicanum* (London, 1846), IV, 568.

G. E. HIND.

**Fawkes, GUY.** See GUNPOWDER PLOT.

**Faye, HERVÉ-AUGUSTE-ÉTIENNE-ALBANS**, astronomer, b. at Saint-Benoît-du-Sault (Indre, France), 1 Oct., 1814; d. at Paris, 4 July, 1902. The son of a civil engineer, he entered the Ecole Polytechnique in 1832 to prepare for a similar career. He left the school before the end of the second year and went to Holland. In 1836 he entered the Paris Observatory as a pupil. There, in 1843, he discovered the periodic comet bearing his name. This discovery gained for him the *Prix Lalande*. As early as 1847 he was elected member of the Academy of Sciences. From 1848 to 1854 he taught geodesy at the Ecole Polytechnique and then went to Nancy as rector of the academy and professor of astronomy. In 1873 he was called to succeed Delaunay in the chair of astronomy at the Ecole Polytechnique, where he worked and lectured until 1893. He held other official positions: inspector-general of secondary education (1857); member (1862) and later (1876) president of the Bureau des Longitudes; for a few weeks only, minister of public instruction, then inspector-general of higher education (1877); and member of the superior council of public instruction (1892). Chevalier of the Legion of Honour in 1843, he became officer in 1855 and commander in 1870. He was honoured with other decorations and by election to the membership of the principal European academies and societies.

Faye's fame rests both on his practical and on his theoretical work. He improved the methods of astronomical measurement, invented the zenithal collimator, suggested and applied photography and electricity to astronomy, and dealt with problems of physical astronomy, the shape of comets, the spots of the sun, meteors, etc. Credit is given by him as well as by his friends to the great influence of his wife, whom he met on his early trip to Holland. His religious nature finds corroboration in his knowledge of the wonders of the universe. *Cœli enarrant gloriam Dei*, he quotes in "Sur l'origine du Monde", and goes on to say: "We run no risk of deceiving ourselves in considering it [the Superior Intelligence] the author of all things, in referring to it those splendours of the heavens which aroused our thoughts; and finally we are ready to understand and accept the traditional formula: God, Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth". He contributed over 400 mémoires and notes to the "Comptes rendus", the "Bulletin de la société astronomi-

que", "Monthly Notices of the R. A. S.", and "Astronomische Nachrichten". His larger works are: "Cours d'astronomie de l'école polytechnique" (Paris, 1883); Humbolt's "Cosmos", tr. by Faye and Galusky (Paris, 1849-59); "Cours d'astronomie nautique" (Paris, 1880); "Sur l'origine du monde" (Paris, 1885).

Loewy in *Ciel et Terre* (Brussels, 1902); POINCARÉ in *Bulletin de la Société astron. de France* (Paris, 1902); *The Observatory*, files (London), July, 1902; *Nature*, files (London), 17 July, 1902.

WILLIAM FOX.

**Fayum.** See EGYPT.

**Fear** (IN CANON LAW), a mental disturbance caused by the perception of instant or future danger. Since fear, in greater or less degree, diminishes freedom of action, contracts entered into through fear may be judged invalid; similarly fear sometimes excuses from the application of the law in a particular case; it also excuses from the penalty attached to an act contrary to the law. The cause of fear is found in oneself or in a natural cause (intrinsic fear) or it is found in another person (extrinsic fear). Fear may be grave, such for instance as would influence a steadfast man, or it may be slight, such as would affect a person of weak will. In order that fear may be considered grave certain conditions are requisite: the fear must be grave in itself, and not merely in the estimation of the person fearing; it must be based on a reasonable foundation; the threats must be possible of execution; the execution of the threats must be inevitable. Fear, again, is either just or unjust, according to the justness or otherwise of the reasons which lead to the use of fear as a compelling force. Reverential fear is that which may exist between superiors and their subjects. Grave fear diminishes will power but cannot be said to totally take it away, except in some very exceptional cases. Slight fear (*metus levis*) is not considered even to diminish the will power, hence the legal expression "Foolish fear is not a just excuse".

The following cases may be taken as examples to illustrate the manner in which fear affects contracts, marriage, vows, etc., made under its influence. Grave fear excuses from the law and the censure attached thereto, if the law is ecclesiastical and if its non-observance will not militate against the public good, the Faith, or the authority of the Church; but if there is question of the natural law, fear excuses only from the censure (Commentators on Decretals, tit. "De his quæ vi metusve causâ fiunt"; Schmalzgrueber, tit. "De sent. excomm." n. 79). Fear that is grave, extrinsic, unjust, and inflicted with a view to forcing consent, nullifies a marriage contract, but not if the fear be only intrinsic. The burden of proof lies with the person who claims to have acted through fear. Reverential fear, if it be also extrinsic, i.e., accompanied by blows, threats, or strong entreaty, and aimed at extorting consent, will also invalidate marriage. Qualified as just stated, fear is a diriment impediment of marriage when coupled with violence or threats (*vis et metus*). For further details see any manual of Canon Law, e.g., Santi-Leitner, "Prælect. Jur. Can." (Ratisbon, 1905), IV, 56-59; Heiner, "Kathol. Eherecht" (Münster, 1905), 82-86; also Ploch, "De Matr. vi ac metu contracto" (1853). For the history of this impediment see Esmein, "Le mariage en droit canonique" (Paris, 1891), I, 309; II, 252; also Freisen, "Gesch. des kanon. Eherechts etc." (Tübingen, 1888).

Resignation of office extorted by unjust fear is generally considered to be valid, but may be rescinded unless the resignation has been confirmed by oath. On the other hand, if fear has been justly brought to bear upon a person, the resignation holds good (S. Cong. Conc. 24 April, 1880). Ordination received under grave and unjust fear is valid, but the obligations of the order are not contracted unless there is subsequent spontaneous acceptance of the obligation (Sanchez, "De matrim.", VII, Disp. xxix, n. 5). In

such cases if freedom is desired the Holy See should be petitioned for a dispensation (S. Cong. Cone. 13 Aug., 1870). The same holds good with regard to the vows of religious profession, and all other vows made under the influence of fear which is grave, extrinsic, unjust or reverential (see Vow). In English law, on proof of force and fear, the law restores the parties to the contract to the position in which they were before it was entered into, and will find the constraining party liable to damages as reparation for any injury done to the party constrained. The maxim of the common law is that "What otherwise would be good and just, if sought by force or fraud becomes bad and unjust." See CONSENT; CONTRACT; VIOLENCE.

TACONOT, *Law of the Church*, s. v. *Fear* (London, 1906); BARGILLIAT, *Inst. Juris Canon.*, index s. v. *Metus* (Paris, 1907); ST. ALPHONSE, *Theol. Moral.*; TANQUEREY, *Synopsis Theol. Moral.* (Paris, 1902); FELJE, *De impol. et disp. matr.* (Louvain, 1903); LAURENTIUS, *Inst. Jur. eccl.* (Freiburg, 1903), nn. 615-17.

DAVID DUNFORD.

**Fear** (FROM MORAL STANDPOINT). An unsettlement of soul consequent upon the apprehension of some present or future danger. It is here viewed from the moral standpoint, that is, in so far as it is a factor to be reckoned with in pronouncing upon the freedom of human acts, as well as offering an adequate excuse for failing to comply with positive law, particularly if the law be of human origin. Lastly, it is here considered in so far as it impugns or leaves intact, in the court of conscience, and without regard to explicit enactment, the validity of certain deliberate engagements or contracts. The division of fear most commonly in vogue among theologians is that by which they distinguish serious fear (*metus gravis*), and trifling fear (*metus levis*). The first is such as grows out of the discernment of some formidable impending peril: if this be really, and without qualification, of large proportions, then the fear is said to be absolutely great; otherwise it is only relatively so, as for instance, when account is taken of the greater susceptibility of certain classes of persons, such as old men, women, and children. Trifling fear is that which arises from being confronted with harm of inconsiderable dimensions, or, at any rate, of whose happening there is only a slender likelihood.

It is customary also to note a fear in which the element of reverence is uppermost (*metus reverentialis*), which has its source in the desire not to offend one's parents and superiors. In itself this is reputed to be but trifling, although from circumstances it may easily rise to the dignity of a serious dread. A criterion rather uniformly employed by moralists, to determine what really, and apart from subjective conditions is, a serious fear, is that contained in this assertion. It is the feeling which is calculated to influence a solidly balanced man (*cadere in virum constantem*). Another important classification is that of fear which comes from some source within the person, for example, that which is created by the knowledge that one has contracted a fatal disease; and fear which comes from without, or is produced, namely, by some cause extrinsic to the terror-stricken subject. In the last named instance the cause may be either natural, such as probable volcanic eruptions, or recognizable in the attitude of some free agent. Finally it may be observed that one may have been submitted to the spell of fear either justly or unjustly, according as the one who provokes this passion remains within his rights, or exceeds them, in so doing. Actions done under stress of fear, unless of course it be so intense as to have dethroned reason, are accounted the legitimate progeny of the human will, or are, as the theologians say, simply voluntary, and therefore imputable. The reason is obvious. Such acts lack neither adequate advertence nor sufficient consent, even though the latter be elicited only to avoid a greater evil or one conceived to be greater. Inas-

much, however, as they are accompanied by a more or less vehement repugnance, they are said to be in a limited and partial sense involuntary.

The practical inference from this teaching is that an evil act having otherwise the bad eminence of grievous sin remains such, even though done out of serious fear. This is true when the transgression in question is against the natural law. In the case of obligations emerging from positive precepts, whether Divine or human, a serious and well-founded dread may often operate as an excuse, so that the failure to comply with the law under such circumstances is not regarded as sinful. The lawgiver is not presumed to have it in mind to impose an heroic act. This, however, does not hold good when the catering to such a fear would involve considerable damage to the common weal. Thus, for instance, a parish priest, in a parish visited by a pestilence, is bound by the law of residence to stay at his post, no matter what his apprehensions may be. It ought to be added here that attrition, or sorrow for sin even though it be the fruit of dread inspired by the thought of eternal punishment, is not in any sense involuntary. At least it must not be so, if it is to avail in the Sacrament of Penance for the justification of the sinner. The end aimed at by this imperfect sort of sorrow is precisely a change of will, and the giving up of sinful attachment is an unreservedly good and reasonable thing. Hence there is no room for that concomitant regret, or dislike, with which other things are done through fear.

It is, of course, needless to observe that in what has been said hitherto we have been referring always to what is done as a result of fear, not to what takes place merely in, or with, fear. A vow taken out of fear produced by natural causes, such as a threatened shipwreck, is valid; but one extorted as the effect of fear unjustly applied by another is invalid; and this last is probably true even when the fear is trifling, if it be the sufficient motive for making the vow. The reason is that it is difficult to conceive such a promise being acceptable to Almighty God. So far as natural law is concerned, fear does not invalidate contracts. Nevertheless, when one of the parties has suffered duress at the hands of the other, the contract is voidable within the choosing of the one so injured. As to marriage, unless the fear prompting its solemnization is so extreme as to take away the use of reason, the common teaching is that such consent, having regard for the moment only to the natural law, would be binding. Its standing in ecclesiastical law is discussed in another article. It is worthy of note that mere insensibility to fear, having its root whether in stolidity, or pride, or want of a proper rating of even temporal things, is not a valuable character asset. On the contrary, it represents a vicious temper of soul, and upon occasion its product may be notably sinful.

SLATER, *Manual of Moral Theology* (New York, 1908); JOSEPH RICKABY, *Aquinas Ethicus* (London, 1896); BALLERINI, *Opus Theologicum Morale* (Prato, 1898); GENICOT, *Theologia Moralis Institutiones* (Louvain, 1898).

JOSEPH F. DELANT.

**Feast of the Ass.** See ASSES, FEAST OF.

**Feast of the Fools.** See FOOLS, FEAST OF.

**Feasts** (Lat. *Festum*; Gr. *εορτή*), ECCLESIASTICAL, or Holy Days, are days which are celebrated in commemoration of the sacred mysteries and events recorded in the history of our redemption, in memory of the Virgin Mother of Christ, or of His apostles, martyrs, and saints, by special services and rest from work. A feast not only commemorates an event or person, but also serves to excite the spiritual life by reminding us of the event it commemorates. At certain hours Jesus Christ invites us to His vineyard (Matt., xx, 1-15); He is born in our hearts at Christmas; on Good Friday we nail ourselves to the cross with Him; at Easter we rise from the tomb of sin; and at Pentecost we receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Every religion

has its feasts, but none has such a rich and judiciously constructed system of festive seasons as the Catholic Church. The succession of these seasons forms the ecclesiastical year, in which the feasts of Our Lord form the ground and framework, the feasts of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints the ornamental tracery.

Prototypes and starting-points for the oldest ecclesiastical feasts are the Jewish solemnities of Easter and Pentecost. Together with the weekly Lord's Day, they remained the only universal Christian feasts down to the third century (Tertullian, "De bapt.," 19; Origen, "Contra Celsum", VIII, 22). Two feasts of Our Lord (Epiphany, Christmas) were added in the fourth century; then came the feasts of the Apostles and martyrs, in particular provinces; later on also those of some confessors (St. Martin, St. Gregory); in the sixth and seventh centuries feasts of the Blessed Virgin were added. After the triumph of Christianity, in the fourth and fifth centuries, the sessions of the civil courts were prohibited on all feasts, also the games in the circus and theatrical performances, in order to give an opportunity to all to hear Mass. In the course of centuries the ecclesiastical calendar expanded considerably, because in earlier ages every bishop had a right to establish new feasts. Later on a reduction of feasts took place, partly by regular ecclesiastical legislation, partly in consequence of revolutions in State and Church. The Statutes of Bishop Sonnatius of Reims (see CALENDAR, III, 163), in 620, mention eleven feasts; the Statutes of St. Boniface ("Statuta", Mansi XII, 383), nineteen days, "*in quibus sabbatizandum*", i. e., days of rest. In England (ninth century) the feasts were confined to Christmas, Epiphany, three days of Easter, Assumption, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. Gregory, and All Saints. Before the reign of King Edgar (959-75), three festivals of the B. V. Mary, and the days kept in honour of the Apostles were added; in the tenth year of Ethelred (989), the feast of St. Edward the Martyr (18 March), and in the reign of Canute, or Cnut (1017-35), that of St. Dunstan (19 May), were added. The feasts in the Statutes of Lanfranc (d. 1089) are quite numerous, and are divided into three classes (Migne, P. L., CL, 472-78).

The Decree of Gratian (about 1150) mentions forty-one feasts besides the diocesan patronal celebrations; the Decretals of Gregory IX (about 1235) mention forty-five public feasts and Holy Days, which means eighty-five days when no work could be done, and ninety-five days when no court sessions could be held. In many provinces eight days after Easter, in some also the week after Pentecost (or at least four days), had the sabbath rest. From the thirteenth to the eighteenth century there were dioceses in which the Holy Days and Sundays amounted to over one hundred, not counting the feasts of particular monasteries and churches. In the Byzantine empire there were sixty-six entire Holy Days (Constitution of Manuel Comnenus, in 1166), exclusive of Sundays, and twenty-seven half Holy Days. In the fifteenth century, Gerson, Nicolas de Clémanges and others protested against the multiplication of feasts, as an oppression of the poor, and proximate occasions of excesses. The long needed reduction of feast days was made by Urban VIII (Universa per orbem, 13 Sept., 1642). There remained thirty-six feasts or eighty-five days free from labour. Pope Urban limited the right of the bishops to establish new Holy Days; this right is now not abrogated, but antiquated. A reduction for Spain by Benedict XIII (1727) retained only seventeen feasts; and on the nineteen abrogated Holy Days only the hearing of Mass was obligatory. This reduction was extended (1748) to Sicily. For Austria (1745) the number had been reduced to fifteen full Holy Days; but since the hearing of Mass on the abrogated feasts, or half Holy Days, and the fast on the vigils of the Apostles were poorly observed, Clement XIV

ordered that sixteen full feasts should be observed; he did away with the half Holy Days, which however continued to be observed in the rural districts (peasant Holy Days, *Bauernfeiertage*). The parish priests have to say Mass for the people on all the abrogated feasts. The same reduction was introduced into Bavaria in 1775, and into Spain in 1791; finally Pius VI extended this provision to other countries and provinces.

By the French revolution the ecclesiastical calendar had been radically abolished, and at the reorganization of the French Church, in 1806, only four feasts were retained: Christmas, the Ascension, the Assumption, and All Saints; the other feasts were transferred to Sunday. This reduction was valid also in Belgium and in Germany on the left bank of the Rhine. For the Catholics in England Pius VI (19 March, 1777) established the following list of feasts: Easter and Pentecost two days each, Christmas, New Year's Day, Epiphany, Ascension, Corpus Christi, Annunciation, Assumption, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. George, and All Saints. After the restoration of the hierarchy (1850), the Annunciation, St. George, and the Monday after Easter and Pentecost were abolished. Scotland keeps also the feast of St. Andrew, Ireland the feasts of St. Patrick and the Annunciation. In the United States, the number of feasts was not everywhere the same; the Council of Baltimore wanted only four feasts, but the decree was not approved by Rome; the third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), by a general law, retained six feasts: Christmas, New Year's Day, Ascension, Assumption, the Immaculate Conception, and All Saints. Sts. Peter and Paul and Corpus Christi were transferred to the next following Sunday. In the city of Rome the following feasts are of double precept (i. e. of hearing Mass, and rest from work): Christmas, New Year's Day, Epiphany, Purification, St. Joseph, Annunciation, Ascension, St. Philip Neri (26 May), Corpus Christi, Nativity of the B. V. M., All Saints, Conception of the B. V. M., St. John the Evangelist. The civil law in Italy acknowledges: Epiphany, Ascension, Sts. Peter and Paul, Assumption, Nativity, Conception, Christmas, and the patronal feasts.

The Greek Church at present observes the following Holy Days: Nativity of Mary, Exaltation of the Cross (14 Sept.), St. Demetrius (26 Oct.), St. Michael (8 Nov.), Entrance of Mary into the Temple (21 Nov.), St. Nicholas (6 Dec.), Conception of St. Anne (9 Dec.), Nativity of Christ, Commemoration of Mary (26 Dec.), St. Stephen (27 Dec.), Circumcision (1 Jan.), Epiphany, the Doctors St. Basil, St. Gregory, St. John Chrysostom (30 Jan.), the Meeting of Christ and Simeon (2 Febr.), Annunciation, St. George (23 Apr.), Nativity of St. John, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. Elias (20 July), Transfiguration (6 Aug.), Assumption, Beheading of St. John (29 Aug.), the Monday after Easter and Pentecost, Ascension of Christ, and the patronal feasts. The Russians have only nine ecclesiastical Holy Days which do not fall on a Sunday, viz.: Nativity, Epiphany, Ascension, Transfiguration, Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, Presentation of Mary (21 Nov.), and the Exaltation of the Cross. But they have fifty festivals (birthdays, etc.) of the imperial family, on which days not even a funeral can be held.

**DIVISION OF FEASTS.**—Feasts are divided: (a) According to external celebration (*feriatio*): (1) *festu fori*, or feasts of precept, with double obligation, to rest from work and to hear Mass; (2) *festu chori*, which are kept only in the liturgy, by the celebration of Mass, and the recitation of the Divine Office. Besides these there were, and still are, in some dioceses (e. g. in Holland), the Half Holy Days, on which the people after having heard Mass can do servile work (Candlemas, Nativity of Mary, and the Immaculate Conception, in the Diocese of Utrecht).

(b) According to extension: (1) *Universal feasts*, celebrated everywhere, at least in the Latin Church;



(2) Particular feasts, celebrated "only by certain religious orders, countries, provinces, dioceses or towns. These latter are either prescribed by the general rubrics, like the patronal feasts, or are specially approved by the Apostolic See, and prescribed by bishops or synods, for particular countries or dioceses *festa pro aliquibus locis* in the Breviary. The universal feasts are contained in the Roman Calendar.

(c) According to their position in the calendar: (1) Movable feasts, which always fall on a certain day of the week, depending on the date of Easter, or the position of the Sunday, e. g. Ascension of Christ (forty days after Easter), or the feast of the Holy Rosary, the first Sunday of October; (2) Immovable feasts, which are fixed to a certain date of the month, e. g. Christmas, 25 December. In the Armenian Church all the feasts of the year are movable, except six: Epiphany, Purification (14 Febr.), Annunciation (7 April), Nativity (8 Sept.), Presentation (21 Nov.), and (8 Dec.) Conception of Mary (Tondini, "Calendrier liturgique de la Nation Arménienne", Rome, 1906).

(d) According to the solemnity of the office or rite (see CALENDAR and DUPLEX). Since the thirteenth century there are three kinds of feasts: *festum simplex*, *semiduplex*, and *duplex*, all three regulated by the recitation of the Divine Office or Breviary. The simple feast commences with the chapter (*capitulum*) of First Vespers, and ends with None. It has three lessons and takes the psalms of Matins from the ferial office; the rest of the office is like the semiduplex. The semiduplex feast has two Vespers, nine lessons in Matins, and ends with Compline. The antiphons before the psalms are only intoned. In the Mass, the semiduplex has always at least three "orations" or prayers. On a double feast the antiphons are sung in their entirety, before and after the psalms. In Lauds and Vespers there are no *suffragia* of the saints, and the Mass has only one "oratio" (if there be no commemoration prescribed). The ordinary double feasts are called *duplicita minora*; occurring with feasts of a higher rank, they can be simplified, except the octave days of some feasts and the feasts of the Doctors of the Church, which are transferred. The feasts of a higher rank are the *duplicita majora* (introduced by Clement VIII), the *duplicita secunda classis* and the *duplicita prima classis*. Some of the latter two classes are kept with octaves. Before the reformation of the Breviary by Pius V (1566-72), the terms by which the solemnity of a feast could be known were, in many churches, very different from the terms we use now. We give a few examples from Grotefend, "Zeitrechnung", etc. (Hanover, 1891-98, II-III): Chur: "Festum summum, plenum officium trium lectionum, commemoratio." Havelberg: "Festum summum, semisummum, secundum, tertium, novem majus, novem minus, compulsatio 3 lect., antiphona." Halle: "Festum præpositi, apostolicum, dominicale, 9 lect., compulsatio 3 lect., antiphona." Breslau: "Festum Triplex, duplex, 9 lectionum, 3 lect., commemoratio." Carthusians: "Festum Candelarum, capituli, 12 lect., missa, commemoratio." Lund: "Festum Prælatorum, canonicorum, vicariorum, duplex, simplex, 9 lect., 3 lect., memoria."

Some of the religious orders which have their own breviary, did not adopt the terms now used in the Roman Breviary. For example, the Cistercians have the following terminology: "Festum sermonis majus, sermonis minus, duarum missarum majus, 2 miss. minus, 12 lectionum, 3 lect. commemoratio." The Dominicans: "Totum duplex, duplex, simplex, 3 lect., memoria." The Carmelites: "Duplex majus I. classis solemniss, dupl. maj. I. cl., duplex majus 2. classis, duplex minus I. classis, duplex minus 2. classis, semiduplex, simplex, simplicissimum."

Among the feasts of the same rite there is a difference in dignity. There are (1) primary feasts which

commemorate the principal mysteries of our religion, or celebrate the death of a saint; (2) secondary feasts, the object of which is a particular feature of a mystery, e. g. the feast of the Crown of Thorns, of the relics of a saint or of some miracle worked by him, e. g. the feast of the translation of St. Stephen, the Apparition of Our Lady of Guadalupe. The list of primary and secondary feasts has been determined by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (22 Aug., 1893), and is found in the introduction to the Roman Breviary. (3) Within the two classes mentioned the feasts of Christ take the first place, especially those with privileged vigils and octaves (Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, and Corpus Christi); then follow the feasts of the Blessed Virgin, the Holy Angels, St. John the Baptist, St. Joseph, the Apostles and Evangelists, and the other saints.

DUCHENE, *Origines du Culte Chrétien* (Paris, 1889); tr. McCURE (London, 1904); KELLER, *Hortology* (tr. London, 1909); PROBST, *Liturgie des vierten Jahrh.* (Münster, 1893); BAUMEH, *Geschichte des Breviers* (Freiburg, 1895); BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (Münz, 1829); LINGARD, *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (London, 1858); MAXIMILIAN, PRINCE OF SAXONY, *Prælect. de Liturgiis Orientalibus* (Freiburg, 1908); *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (Münster, 1907); *Kirchenlexikon* (Freiburg, 1886); IV; NILLES, *Kalendarium manuale*, etc. (Innsbruck, 1897); MORISOT, *Instructions sur les fêtes de l'année* (Paris, 1908).

F. G. HOLWECK.

**Feasts among the Jews.** See ATONEMENT; BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES; DEDICATION; JUBILEE; PASS-OVER; PENTECOST; PURIM; SABBATH; TABERNACLES; TRUMPETS.

**Febronianism**, the politico-ecclesiastical system outlined by Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim, Auxiliary Bishop of Trier, under the pseudonym Justinus Febronius, in his work entitled "Justinus Febronii Juris consulti de Statu Ecclesie et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis Liber singularis ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione christianos compositus" (Bullioni apud Guillelmum Evrardi, 1763; in reality the work was published by Esslinger at Frankfort-on-the-Main). Taking as a basis the Gallican principles which he had imbibed from the canonist Van Espen while pursuing his studies in Louvain, Hontheim advanced along the same lines, in spite of many inconsistencies, to a radicalism far outstripping traditional Gallicanism. He develops in this work a theory of ecclesiastical organization founded on a denial of the monarchical constitution of the Church. The ostensible purpose was to facilitate the reconciliation of the Protestant bodies with the Church by diminishing the power of the Holy See.

According to Febronius (cap. i), the power of the keys was entrusted by Christ to the whole body of the Church, which holds it *principaliter et radicaliter*, but exercises it through her prelates, to whom only the administration of this power is committed. Among these the pope comes first, though even he is subordinate to the Church as a whole. The Divine institution of the primacy in the church is acknowledged (cap. ii), but Febronius holds that its connexion with the Roman See does not rest on the authority of Christ, but on that of Peter and the Church, so that the Church has the power to attach it to another see. The power of the pope, therefore, should be confined to those essential rights inherent in the primacy which were exercised by the Holy See during the first eight centuries. The pope is the centre with which the individual Churches must be united. He must be kept informed of what is taking place everywhere throughout the Church, that he may exercise the care demanded by his office for the preservation of unity. It is his duty to enforce the observance of the canons in the whole Church; he has the authority to promulgate laws in the name of the Church, and to depute legates to exercise his authority as primate. His power, as head of the whole Church, however, is of an administrative and unifying character, rather than a power of

jurisdiction. But since the ninth century, chiefly through the influence of the False Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore, the constitution of the Church has undergone a complete transformation, in that the papal authority has been extended beyond proper bounds (cap. iii). By a violation of justice, questions which at one time were left to the decision of provincial synods and metropolitans gradually came to be reserved to the Holy See (cap. iv), as, for instance, the condemnation of heresies, the confirmation of episcopal elections, the naming of coadjutors with the right of succession, the transfer and removal of bishops, the establishment of new dioceses, and the erection of metropolitan and primate sees. The pope, whose infallibility is expressly denied (cap. v), cannot, on his own authority, without a council or the assent of the entire episcopate, give forth any decisions on matters of faith of universal obligation. Likewise in matters of discipline, he can issue no decrees affecting the whole body of the faithful; the decrees of a general council have binding power only after their acceptance by the individual churches. Laws once promulgated cannot be altered at the pope's will or pleasure. It is also denied that the pope, by the nature and authority of the primacy, can receive appeals from the whole Church.

According to Febronius, the final court of appeal in the Church is the oecumenical council (cap. vi), the rights of which exclude the pretended monarchical constitution of the Church. The pope is subordinate to the general council; he has neither the exclusive authority to summon one, nor the right to preside at its sessions, and the conciliar decrees do not need his ratification. Oecumenical councils are of absolute necessity, as even the assent of a majority of bishops to a papal decree, if given by the individuals, outside a council, does not constitute a final, irrevocable decision. Appeal from the pope to a general council is justified by the superiority of the council over the pope. According to the Divine institution of the episcopate (cap. vii), all bishops have equal rights; they do not receive their power of jurisdiction from the Holy See. It is not within the province of the pope to exercise ordinary episcopal functions in dioceses other than that of Rome. The papal reservations regarding the granting of benefices, annates, and the exemption of religious orders are thus in conflict with the primitive law of the Church, and must be abolished. Having shown, as he believes, that the existing ecclesiastical law with reference to papal power is a distortion of the original constitution of the Church, due chiefly to the False Decretals, Febronius demands that the primitive discipline, as outlined by him, be everywhere restored (cap. viii). He then suggests as means for bringing about this reformation (cap. ix), that the people shall be properly enlightened on this subject, that a general council with full freedom be held, that national synods be convened, but especially that Catholic rulers take concerted action, with the co-operation and advice of the bishops, that secular princes avail themselves of the *Regium Placet* to resist papal decrees, that obedience be openly refused to a legitimate extent, and finally that secular authority be appealed to through the *Appellatio ab abusu*. The last measures reveal the real trend of Febronian principles; Febronius, while ostensibly contending for a larger independence and greater authority for the bishops, seeks only to render the Churches of the different countries less dependent on the Holy See, in order to facilitate the establishment of national Churches in these states, and reduce the bishops to a condition in which they would be merely servile creatures of the civil power. Wherever an attempt was made to put his ideas into execution, it proceeded along these lines.

The book was formally condemned, 27 February, 1764, by Clement XIII. By a Brief of 21 May, 1764, the pope required the German episcopate to suppress the work. Ten prelates, among them the Elector of

Trier, complied. Meanwhile no steps had been taken against the author personally, who was well known in Rome. Despite the ban of the Church, the book, harmonizing as it did with the spirit of the times, had a tremendous success. A second edition, revised and enlarged, was issued as early as 1765; it was reprinted at Venice and Zurich, and translations appeared in German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. In the three later volumes, which Hontheim issued as supplementary to the original work, and numbered II to IV (Vol. II, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1770; Vol. III, 1772; Vol. IV, Parts 1 and 2, 1773-74), he defended it, under the name of Febronius and various other pseudonyms, against a series of attacks. Later he published an abridgment under the title: "Justinus Febronius abbreviatus et emendatus" (Cologne and Frankfurt, 1777). In addition to the "Judicium academicum" of the University of Cologne (1765), refutations appeared from a large number of Catholic authors, the most important being: Ballerini, "De vi ac ratione primatus Romanorum Pontificum et de ipsorum infallibilitate in definiendis controversis fidei" (Verona, 1766); Idem, "De potestate ecclesiastica Summorum Pontificum et Conciliorum generalium liber, una cum vindiciis auctoritatis pontificiae contra opus Just. Febronii" (Verona, 1768; Augsburg, 1770; new ed. of both works, Munster in W., 1845, 1847); Zaccaria, "Antifebronio, ossia apologia polemico-storica del primato del Papa, contra la dannata opera di Giust. Febronio" (2 vols., Pesaro, 1767; 2nd ed., 4 vols., Cesena, 1768-70; tr. German, Reichenberger, Augsburg, 1768); Idem, "Antifebronius vindicatus" (4 vols., Cesena, 1771-2); Idem, "In tertium Justinii Febronii tomum animadversiones Romano-catholicae" (Rome, 1774); Mamachi, "Epistolae ad Just. Febronium de ratione regendae christianae reipublicae deque legitimâ Romani Pontificis potestate" (3 vols., Rome, 1776-78). There were, besides, refutations written from the Protestant standpoint, to repudiate the idea that a diminution of the papal power was all that was necessary to bring the Protestants back into union with the Church, for instance Karl Friedrich Bahrdt, "Dissertatio de eo, an fieri possit, ut sublato Pontificio imperio reconciliantur Dissidentes in religione Christiani" (Leipzig, 1763), and Johann Friedrich Bahrdt, "De Romanâ Ecclesiâ irreconciliabili" (Leipzig, 1767); Karl Gottl. Hofmann, "Programma continens examen regulæ exegeticæ ex Vincentio Lerinensi in Febronio repetitæ" (Wittenberg, 1768).

The first measures against the author were taken by Pius VI, who urged Clemens Wenzeslaus, Elector of Trier, to prevail on Hontheim to recall the work. Only after prolonged exertions, and after a retraction, couched in general terms, had been adjudged unsatisfactory in Rome, the elector forwarded to Rome Hontheim's emended recantation (15 November, 1778). This was communicated to the cardinals in consistory by Pius VI on Christmas Day. That this retraction was not sincere on Hontheim's part is evident from his subsequent movements. That he had by no means relinquished his ideas appears from his "Justinii Febronii Jcti. Commentarius in suam Retractionem Pio VI. Pont. Max. Kalendis Nov. anni 1778 submissam" (Frankfurt, 1781; German ed., Augsburg, 1781), written for the purpose of justifying his position before the public. Meanwhile, notwithstanding the prohibition, the "Febronius" had produced its pernicious effects, which were not checked by the retraction. The ideas advanced in the work, being in thorough accord with the absolutistic tendencies of civil rulers, were eagerly accepted by the Catholic courts and governments of France, the Austrian Netherlands, Spain and Portugal, Venice, Austria, and Tuscany; and they received further development at the hands of court theologians and canonists who favoured the scheme of a national Church. Among the advocates of the theory of Febronianism

in Germany, mention should be made of the Trier professor, Franz Anton Haubs, "Themata ex historia ecclesiastica de hierarchia sacra primorum V. saeculorum" (Trier, 1756; "Systema primatum de potestate episcopali ejusque applicatio ad episcopalia quaedam jura in specie punctationibus I. II. et IV. congressus Emsani exposita" (Trier, 1788); and Wilhelm Joseph Castello, "Dissertatio historica de variis causis, quibus accidentaliter Romani Pontificis potestas successively ampliata fuit" (Trier, 1788). It was the Austrian canonists, however, who contributed most towards the compilation of a new law code regulating the relations of Church and State, which was reduced to practice under Joseph II. Especially noteworthy as being conceived in this spirit were the textbooks on canon law prescribed for the Austrian universities, and compiled by Paul Joseph von Riegger, "Institutiones juris ecclesiastici" (4 vols., Vienna, 1768-72; frequently reprinted), and Pehem, "Praelectiones in jus ecclesiasticum universum", also, in a more pronounced way, the work of Johann Valentin Eybel, "Introductio in jus ecclesiasticum Catholicorum" (4 vols., Vienna, 1777; placed on the Index, 1784).

The first attempt to give Febronian principles a practical application was made in Germany at the Coblenz Conference of 1769, where the three ecclesiastical Electors of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier, through their delegates, and under the directions of Hontheim, compiled a list of thirty grievances against the Roman See, in consonance with the principles of the "Febronius" (Gravamina trium Archiepiscoporum Electorum, Moguntinensis, Trevirensis et Coloniensis contra Curiam Apostolicam anno 1769 ad Cæsarem delata; printed in Le Bret, "Magazin zum Gebrauch der Staaten- und Kirchengeschichte", Pt. VIII, Ulm, 1783, pp. 1-21). More significant was the Ems Congress of 1786, at which the three ecclesiastical electors and the Prince-Bishop of Salzburg, in imitation of the Coblenz Congress, and in conformity with the basic principles of the "Febronius", made a fresh attempt to readjust the relations of the German Church with Rome, with a view to securing for the former a greater measure of independence; they also had their representatives draw up the Ems Punctuation in twenty-three articles; they achieved, however, no practical results. An attempt was made to realize the principles of the "Febronius" on a large scale in Austria, where under Joseph II a national Church was established according to the plan outlined. Efforts in the same direction were made by Joseph's brother Leopold in his Grand-Duchy of Tuscany. The resolutions adopted at the Synod of Pistoia, under Bishop Scipio Ricci, along these lines, were repudiated by the majority of the bishops of the country.

MEYER, *Febronius, Weibischof Johann Nicolaus von Hontheim und sein Widerruf* (Tübingen, 1880, 2nd ed., 1885), anti-Roman; KUNTZIGER, *Febronius et le Fébronianisme in Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiés par l'Académie Royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique*, Vol. XLIV (Brussels, 1891), also anti-Roman; STRUMPER, *Die kirchenrechtlichen Ideen des Febronius*, inaugural dissertation presented to the faculty of jurisprudence and political economy of the University of Würzburg (Aschaffenburg, 1908), Catholic; RÖSCH, *Das Kirchenrecht im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. I. Der Fébronianismus in Archiv f. kath. Kirchenrecht*, LXXXIII (Mainz, 1903), 446-82, 620-52. Also WALCH, *Neueste Religions-Geschichte*, Pt. I (Lemgo, 1771), 145-98; Pt. VI (1777), 175-208; Pt. VII (1779), 193-240, 453-64; Pt. VIII (1781), 529-42; *Briefwechsel zwischen weiland ihrer Durchlaucht dem Herrn Kurfürsten von Trier, Clemens Wenzelsaus und dem Herrn Weibischof Nik. von Hontheim über das Buch, Just. Febronii de statu Ecclesiae* (Frankfurt, 1813); PHILLIPS, *Kirchenrecht* (Ratisbon, 1848), III, 365-74; MARX, *Gesch. des Erzbistums Trier* (Trier, 1864), V, 90-129; BRÜCK, *Die rationalistischen Bestrebungen von katholischen Deutschland* (Mainz, 1865); von SCHULTZ, *Die Gesch. der Quellen und Lit. des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1880), Vol. III, Pt. I, 193-205; BILLERHEIM in *Historisch-politische Blätter*, LXXXVI (1880), 529-44; KRAUS in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, s. v. Hontheim; BRÜCK in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. Hontheim; ANON., *Neller, Hontheim und Clemens Wenzelsaus (Die Anfänge der febronianischen Häresie)* in *Katholik*, I (1891), 537-57; II, 19-39; ZILLICH, *Febronius in Hallesche Abhandlungen zur neueren Geschichte*, XLIV (Halle, 1906).

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

Febronius, JUSTINUS. See FEBRONIANISM.

Feckenham, JOHN DE, last Abbot of Westminster, and confessor of the Faith, b. in Feckenham Forest, Worcestershire, in 1515 ? of poor parents named Howman; d. at Wisbech Castle, 16 Oct., 1585. He became a Benedictine monk at Evesham, and studied at Gloucester Hall, Oxford (B.D., 11 June, 1539), returned to Evesham to teach junior monks till the dissolution, 27 Jan., 1540, when he received a pension of 15 marks. Rector of Solihull, Worcestershire (1544?-1554), he became known as an orator and controversialist. He was domestic chaplain to Bishop Bell of Worcester till 1543, and then to Bonner of London till 1549. He was sent to the Tower by Cranmer for defending the Faith, but in 1551 was "borrowed out of prison" to hold public disputations with the new men, e. g. with Jewel and Hooper. Again relegated to the Tower, he was released by Queen Mary, 5 Sept., 1553, and was much employed as a preacher in London; he was advanced to benefices, and in March, 1554, made dean of St. Paul's. He showed great mildness to the heretics, many of whom he converted, and saved others from the stake. He prepared Lady Jane Grey for death, though he could not convince her of her errors, as he did Sir John Cheke, the king's tutor. Feckenham interceded for Elizabeth after Wyatt's rebellion, obtaining her life and subsequent release. He took the degree of D.D. at Oxford, May, 1556, and on 7 Sept., 1556, was appointed abbot of the royal Abbey of Westminster, restored to the order by the queen. The Benedictines took possession on 21 November (since known as *dies memorabilis*), and the abbot was installed on 29 November, beginning his rule over a community of about twenty-eight, gathered from the dissolved abbeys. He successfully defended in Parliament, 11 Feb., 1557, the threatened privileges of sanctuary, and restored the shrine of the Confessor in his abbey church.

Elizabeth at her accession offered (November, 1558) to preserve the monastery if he and his monks would accept the new religion, but Feckenham steadily refused, bravely and eloquently defending the old Faith in Parliament and denouncing the sacrilegious innovations of the Anglicans. He gave sanctuary to Bishop Bonner, and quietly went on planting trees while awaiting the expulsion, which took place 12 July, 1559. He generously resigned a large part of the money due him to the dean who succeeded him. Nevertheless, in May, 1560, he was sent to the Tower "for railing against the changes that had been made". Three years later he was given into the custody of Horne, the intruded Bishop of Winchester, but in 1564 he was sent back to the Tower, his episcopal jailer having failed to pervert him. Feckenham himself said that he preferred the prison to the pseudo-bishop's palace. In 1571 he prepared his fellow-prisoner, Blessed John Storey, for death, and a little later was sent to the Marshalsea. In the Tower he and his fellow-confessors had been "hailed by the arms to Church in violent measure, against our wills, there to hear a sermon, not of persuading us but of railing upon us." He was released on bail, 17 July, 1574, after fourteen years' confinement, and lived in Holborn, where he devoted himself to works of charity. He encouraged boys in manly sports on Sundays, preferring that they should practise archery rather than attend the heretical services. But falling ill, he was permitted to go to Bath, where, in 1576, he built a hospice for poor patients and did much good. But his zeal for the Faith excited fresh rancour, and in 1577 he was committed to the custody of Cox, Bishop of Ely, who was requested to bring him to conformity. Feckenham's so-called "Confession" (British Museum, Lansdowne MSS., No. 30, fol. 199) shows how egregiously Cox failed, and in 1580 he petitioned the council to remove the abbot, who was accordingly sent to

Wisbech Castle, a dismal prison belonging to the Bishops of Ely, which he shared with Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, and other confessors. Here he died a holy death, fortified by the Sacred Viaticum, and was buried in Wisbech Church. He was worn out by an imprisonment of twenty-three years for conscience's sake; a striking example of Elizabeth's ingratitude. Protestant writers unite in praising his virtues, especially his kindness of heart, gentleness, and charity to the poor. Even Burnet calls him "a charitable and generous man". His best-known work is against Horne, "The Declaration of such Scruples and Stays of Conscience touching the Oath of Supremacy", etc. He also wrote "Caveat Emptor", a caution against buying abbey lands, and a commentary on the Psalms, but these are lost.

Most complete life in TAUNTON, *English Black Monks of St. Benedict* (London, 1897; BRADLEY in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v., with good bibliography; WOOD, *Athene Oxon.*, II, 222; WELDON, *Chronological Notes on English Congregation O. S. B.* (Stanbrook Abbey, 1881; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II; GASQUET, *Last Abbot of Glastonbury and other Essays* (London, 1908), s. v. *Fickenham* at Bath, STAPLETON (vire HARPSFIELD), *Counterblast to Mr. Horn's rayne blast against Mr. Fickenham* (Louvain, 1567; REYNER, *Apotholitus Benedictinorum in Angliâ* (Dona, 1626); *State Papers, Elizabeth, Domestic*, XXII, XXXVI, CNIV, CXXXI, CXXXII, CXLIII, etc.; DIXON, *History of the Church of England* (London, 1891), IV, V.

BEDE CAMM.

**Feder, JOHANN MICHAEL**, German theologian, b. 25 May, 1753, at Oellingen in Bavaria; d. 26 July, 1824, at Würzburg. He studied in the episcopal seminary of Würzburg from 1772-1777; in the latter year he was ordained priest and promoted to the licentiate in theology. For several years Feder was chaplain of the Julius hospital; in 1785 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology and Oriental languages at the University of Würzburg; was created a Doctor of Divinity in 1786; director of the university library, 1791; ordinary professor of theology and censor of theological publications, 1795. After the reorganization of the University of Würzburg, 1803-4, he was appointed chief librarian, resigning the professorship of theology in 1805. Shortly after his removal from office as librarian, November, 1811, he suffered a stroke of apoplexy, from which he never fully recovered. Feder was a prolific writer, editor, and translator, but was imbued with the liberal views of his time. His most meritorious work is a revision of Dr. Heinrich Braun's German translation of the Bible (1803), 2 vols. This revision served as the basis for Dr. Allioli's well-known translation. He also translated the writings of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (1786); the sermons of St. Chrysostom on Matthew and John, in conjunction with the unfortunate Eulogius Schneider (1786-88); Theodoret's ten discourses on Divine Providence (1788); Gerard's lectures on pastoral duties (1803); de Bausset's life of Fénelon (1809-12), 3 vols., and the same author's life of Bossuet (1820); Fabert's "Meditations" (1786). He was editor of the "Magazin zur Beförderung des Schulwesens" (1791-97), 3 vols., of the "Prakt.-theol. Magazin für katholische Geistliche" (1798-1800), and of the "Würzburger Gelehrten Anzeigen" (1788-92). He also wrote several volumes of sermons.

HURTER, *Nomenclator*; BUCHBERGER, *Kirchl. Handlexikon*, I; SCHRODL in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; BINDER, *Realencyclopädie* (1847); BRÜCK, *Geschichte der kath. Kirche in Deutschland* (Mainz, 1902), I.

ALEXIUS HOFFMANN.

**Feehan, DANIEL F.** See FALL RIVER, DIOCESE OF.

**Fees (HONORARIA), ECCLESIASTICAL.** See MASS; OFFERING; SACRAMENTS; STIPEND.

**Feilding, RUDOLPH WILLIAM BASIL**, eighth Earl of Denbigh, and ninth Earl of Desmond, b. 9 April, 1823; d. 1892. He was educated at Eton College and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took the degree of Master of Arts. He was received into the Church in 1850, and took an active part in many Catholic works of

charity under Cardinal Wiseman. As Viscount Feilding he was appointed honorary treasurer, jointly with Viscount Campden and Mr. Archibald J. Dunn, of the Peter's Pence Association. He was a man of great courage and independence of character, qualities needed in the middle of the nineteenth century when the English Protestant mind was much inflamed in consequence of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in England. As a thanksgiving for his conversion, he built the Franciscan monastery at Pentasap North Wales.

ARCHIBALD J. DUNN.

**Feilire of Aengus the Culdee.** See AENGUS.

**Feilmoser, ANDREAS BENEDICT**, theologian and Biblical scholar, b. 8 April, 1777, at Hopfgarten, Tyrol, d. at Tübingen, 20 July, 1831, studied at Salzburg from 1789 to 1794, took a two years' course in philosophy at the University of Innsbruck (1794-96), entered the Benedictine Order at Fiecht, Tyrol, 1 September, 1796. At this abbey he studied the Oriental languages under Dom Georg Maurer, a monk of St. George's Abbey, Villingen. For his theological studies he was sent to Villingen, where he again heard Dom Maurer and Dom Gottfried Lumper, both eminent scholars. Returning to Fiecht in 1800, he taught Biblical exegesis and was ordained priest in 1801; later in the same year he was appointed master of novices; in 1802 professor of Christian ethics and in 1803 of ecclesiastical history. A number of theses which he published in 1803 aroused the suspicions of the ecclesiastical authorities of the Diocese of Brixen. The Abbot of Fiecht was sharply rebuked for permitting Feilmoser to teach unsound doctrine. In 1804 appeared Feilmoser's "Animadversiones in historiam ecclesiasticam", which did not meet the approval of the diocesan authorities, who threatened, in case Feilmoser did not desist from advancing dangerous opinions, to institute proceedings against the abbot. To Feilmoser's request for a specification of the objectionable passages in his writings no reply was made, but the entire matter was reported to the emperor at Vienna. An investigation instituted by order of the emperor resulted favourably for Feilmoser. He was nevertheless, removed from the office of master of novices and in 1806 was made assistant in the parish of Achenthal. By the Treaty of Presburg (26 Dec 1805) Tyrol was cut off from Austria and became part of Bavaria. The new Government, in November 1806, appointed him professor of Oriental language and of introduction to the Old Testament at the University of Innsbruck. The monastery of Fiecht having been suppressed in 1807, he left the order. At Innsbruck he received the degree of Doctor of Theology in 1808 and was appointed to the chair of New Testament exegesis. During the Tyrolean insurrection August, 1809, he, with a number of other professors, was taken prisoner and carried to Pusterthal by order of Andreas Hofer. In 1810 he returned to Innsbruck; in 1811 he was made professor of catechetics; in 1812 of Latin and Greek philology, and in 1813 was reappointed professor of New-Testament exegesis in the face of much opposition. About this time the old charges against him were revived, and in 1811 he was bitterly attacked in an anonymous work published at Augsburg. He was denied the opportunity of publicly defending himself, inasmuch as the imperial censor at Vienna, on 17 July, 1819, decided that since the anonymous work was published in a foreign country, it was under Austrian censure and must be regarded as non-existent. On 25 April, 1820, he was formally appointed a professor at the University of Tübingen, where he continued to teach New-Testament exegesis until his death.

He wrote: "Sätze aus der christlichen Sittenlehre für die öffentliche Prüfung in dem Benedictinerstifte zu Fiecht" (Innsbruck, 1803); "Sätze aus der Einleitun



in die Bücher des alten Bundes und den hebräischen Alterthümern" (Innsbruck, 1803); "Animadversiones in historiam ecclesiasticam" (Innsbruck, 1803); "Sätze aus der Einleitung in die Bücher des neuen Bundes und der bibl. Hermeneutik" (Innsbruck, 1804); "Einleitung in die Bücher des neuen Bundes" (Innsbruck, 1810); "Auszug des hebr. Sprachlehre nach Jahn" (Innsbruck, 1812); "Die Verkörperungssucht" (Rottweil, 1820). His principal work, "Einleitung in die Bücher des neuen Bundes", published in a revised edition (Tübingen, 1830), is inaccurate and was praised far beyond its due. He also contributed papers and criticisms to the "Annalen der österreichischen Literatur und Kunst" and the "Theologische Quartalschrift" of Tübingen. His exegetical writings are influenced by the rationalistic spirit of his day. He denied the genuineness of the *Comma Johanneum* and maintained that the Books of Job, Jonas, Tobias, and Judith are merely didactic poems.

HURTER, *Nomenclator*: WELTE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; *Scriptores O.S.B.* (Vienna, 1881); WACKERNELL, *Beila Weber* (Innsbruck, 1893); *Theol. Quartalschrift* (Tübingen, 1831); GREINZ in *BUCHBERGER, Kirch. Handlexikon*, s. v.

ALEXIUS HOFFMANN.

**Felbiger, JOHANN IGNAZ VON**, a German educational reformer, pedagogical writer, and canon regular of the Order of St. Augustine, b. 6 January, 1724, at Gross-Glogau in Silesia; d. 17 May, 1788, at Presburg in Hungary. He was the son of a postmaster, who had been ennobled by Emperor Charles VI. The death of his parents constrained him, after studying theology at the University of Breslau, to accept (1744) the position of teacher in a private family. In 1746 he joined the Order of Canons Regular of St. Augustine at Sagan in Silesia, was ordained a priest in 1748, and ten years later became abbot of the monastery of Sagan. Noting the sad condition of the local Catholic schools, he strove to remedy the evil by publishing his first school-ordinance in 1761. During a private journey to Berlin, in 1762, he was favourably impressed with Hecker's Realschule and Hahn's method of instructing by initials and tables (*Literal- or Tabellen-methode*), and became an enthusiastic propagator of this method. A school-ordinance for the dependencies of the monastery of Sagan was issued in 1763, a teachers' college was established, and Felbiger's school-reforms soon attracted the attention of Catholics and Protestants alike. He was supported by the Silesian minister von Schlabendorff, and at the latter's request, after a second journey to Berlin he elaborated a general school-ordinance for the Catholic elementary schools in Silesia (1765). Three graded catechisms, the joint work of the prior and the abbot of Sagan, appeared in 1766 under the title, "Silesian Catechism", and enjoyed a wide circulation. The death of von Schlabendorff in 1769 marked the end of the Silesian government's educational efforts. Felbiger's suggestions were heeded, however, by King Frederick II in the regulations issued (1774) for Silesian higher schools.

At the request of the empress, Maria Theresa, he repaired to Vienna in 1774, and was appointed General Commissioner of Education for all the German lands of her dominions. The same year he published his general school-ordinance, and in 1775 his most important pedagogical production: "Methodenbuch für Lehrer der deutschen Schulen". His school-reform was copied by Bavaria and other German lands and was not without influence on Russia. Considerable opposition, aroused by Felbiger's arbitrariness, developed in Austria against his plan of founding special schools for the neglected instruction of soldiers. Maria Theresa, however, always remained his faithful protectress. But his strictly religious principles of education displeased Joseph II, who deprived him of his position, assigned him to his provostship at Presburg, and advised him to look after educational interests in Hungary (1782). The chief peculiarity of Fel-

biger's too mechanical method was the use of tables containing the initials of the words which expressed the lesson to be imparted. Other features were the substitution of class-instruction for individual instruction and the practice of questioning the pupils. He aimed at raising the social standing, financial condition, and professional qualification of the teaching body, and at giving a friendly character to the mutual relations between teacher and pupil. For a list of his 78 publications, which are mainly of a pedagogical character, see Panholzer's "Methodenbuch" (46-66).

VOLKMER, *Johann Ignaz von Felbiger* (Habelschwerdt, 1800); PANHOLZER, *J. I. von Felbiger's Methodenbuch*, Vol. V of *Bibliothek der koth. Pädagogik* (Freiburg, 1892); KAHL, *Felbiger's Eigenschaften, Wissenschaften u. Bezüge in rechtlicher Schullehre* (24 ed., Paderborn, 1905); WILLIAMS, *History of Modern Education* (Sydney, 1899), 354, 355; STÖCKL, *Lehrbuch d. Gesch. d. Pädagogik* (Mainz, 1876), 351-35.

N. A. WEBER.

**Feldkirch.** See BRIXEN.

**Felicianists.** See ADOPTIONISM.

**Felician Sisters, O. S. F.**, founded 21 November, 1855, at Warsaw, Poland, by Mother Mary Angela, under the direction of Father Honorat, O. M. Cap. On their suppression, in 1864, by the Russian Government they transferred the mother-house to Cracow, Austria. In the province of Cracow there are forty-four houses of this congregation, and in the United States, where the first foundation was made in 1874, there are two provinces, 820 choir and lay sisters, 100 novices, 168 postulants; in charge of 87 schools with 36,700 pupils, 5 orphanages with 416 inmates, 2 homes for the aged, an emigrant home, working girls' home, and a day nursery.

MOTHER MARY JEROME.

**Felicissimus**, a deacon of Carthage who, in the middle of the third century, headed a short-lived but dangerous schism, to which undue doctrinal importance has been given by a certain class of writers, Neander, Ritschl, Harnack, and others, who see in it "a presbyterial reaction against episcopal autocracy". Of the chief figure in the revolt, Felicissimus, not much can be said. The movement of which he was afterwards the leader originated in the opposition of five presbyters of the church in Carthage to St. Cyprian's election as bishop of that see. One of these presbyters, Novatus, selected Felicissimus as deacon of his church in the district called Mons, and because of the importance of the office of deacon in the African Church, Felicissimus became the leader of the malcontents. The opposition of this faction, however, led to no open rupture until after the outbreak of the Decian persecution in 250, when St. Cyprian was compelled to flee from the city. His absence created a situation favourable to his adversaries, who took advantage of a division already existing in regard to the methods to be followed in dealing with those who had apostatized (*lapsi*) during persecution and who afterwards sought to be readmitted to Christian fellowship. It was easy under the circumstances to arouse much hostility to Cyprian, because he had followed an extremely rigorous policy in dealing with those lapsi. The crisis was reached when St. Cyprian sent from his place of hiding a commission consisting of two bishops and two priests to distribute alms to those who had been ruined during the persecution. Felicissimus, regarding the activities of these men as an encroachment on the prerogatives of his office, attempted to frustrate their mission. This was reported to St. Cyprian, who at once excommunicated him. Felicissimus immediately gathered around him all those who were dissatisfied with the bishop's treatment of the lapsi and proclaimed an open revolt. The situation was still further complicated by the fact that the thirty years' peace preceding the Decian persecution had caused much laxity in the Church, and that on the

first outbreak of hostilities multitudes of Christians had openly apostatized, or resorted to the expedient of purchasing certificates from the venal officials, attesting their compliance with the emperor's edict. Besides this the custom of readmitting apostates to Christian fellowship, if they could show tickets from confessors or martyrs in their behalf, had resulted in widespread scandals.

While St. Cyprian was in exile he did not succeed in checking the revolt even though he wisely refrained from excommunicating those who differed from him in regard to the treatment of the lapsi. After his return to Carthage (251) he convoked a synod of bishops, priests, and deacons, in which the sentence of excommunication against Felicissimus and the heads of the faction was reaffirmed, and in which definite rules were laid down regarding the manner of readmitting the lapsi. The sentence against Felicissimus and his followers did not deter them from appearing before another council, which was held in Carthage the following year, and demanding that the case be reopened. Their demand was refused, and they sought to profit by the division in the Roman Church which had arisen from similar causes, except that in this case the charge of laxity was levelled against the orthodox party. This proceeding and the fact that the Council of Carthage had decided with so much moderation in regard to the lapsi, mollifying as it did the rigoristic policy of Cyprian by a judicious compromise, soon detached from Felicissimus all his followers, and the schism disappeared.

MONCEAUX, *Hist. Litt. de l'Afrique Chrét.* (Paris, 1901—), II, 208 sq.; LÉCLERCQ, *L'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1904), I, 175 sq.; BENSON, *Cyprian, His Life, His Times, His Work* (London, 1897), 133-150; IDEM in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

**Felicitas, SAINT, Martyr.**—The earliest list of the Roman feasts of martyrs, known as the "Depositio Martyrum" and dating from the time of Pope Liberius, i. e. about the middle of the fourth century (Ruinart, *Acta sincera*, Ratisbon, p. 632), mentions seven martyrs whose feast was kept on 10 July. Their remains had been deposited in four different catacombs, viz. in three cemeteries on the Via Salaria and in one on the Via Appia. Two of the martyrs, Felix and Philip, reposed in the catacomb of Priscilla; Martial, Vitalis and Alexander, in the *Cæmeterium Jordanorum*; Silanus (or Silvanus) in the catacomb of Maximus, and Januarius in that of Prætextatus. To the name of Silanus is added the statement that his body was stolen by the Novatians (*hunc Silanum martyrem Novatiani furati sunt*). In the Acts of these martyrs, that certainly existed in the sixth century, since Gregory the Great refers to them in his "Homilie super Evangelia" (Lib. I, hom. iii, in P. L., LXXVI, 1087), it is stated that all seven were sons of Felicitas, a noble Roman lady. According to these Acts Felicitas and her seven sons were imprisoned because of their Christian Faith, at the instigation of pagan priests, during the reign of Emperor Antoninus. Before the prefect Publius they adhered firmly to their religion, and were delivered over to four judges, who condemned them to various modes of death. The division of the martyrs among four judges corresponds to the four places of their burial. St. Felicitas herself was buried in the catacomb of Maximus on the Via Salaria, beside Silanus.

These Acts were regarded as genuine by Ruinart (op. cit., 72-74), and even distinguished modern archaeologists have considered them, though not in their present form corresponding entirely to the original, yet in substance based on genuine contemporary records. Recent investigations of Führer, however (see below), have shown this opinion to be hardly tenable. The earliest recension of these Acts, edited by Ruinart, does not antedate the sixth century, and appears to be based not on a Roman, but on a Greek original.

Moreover, apart from the present form of the Acts, various details have been called in question. Thus, if Felicitas were really the mother of the seven martyrs honoured on 10 July, it is strange that her name does not appear in the well-known fourth-century Roman calendar. Her feast is first mentioned in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum", but on a different day (23 Nov.). It is, however, historically certain that she, as well as the seven martyrs called her sons in the Acts, suffered for the Christian Faith. From a very early date her feast was solemnly celebrated in the Roman Church on 23 November, for on that day Gregory the Great delivered a homily in the basilica that rose above her tomb. Her body then rested in the catacomb of Maximus; in that cemetery on the Via Salaria all Roman itineraries, or guides to the burial-places of martyrs, locate her burial-place, specifying that her tomb was in a church above this catacomb (De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, I, 176-77), and that the body of her son Silanus was also there. The crypt where Felicitas was laid to rest was later enlarged into a subterranean chapel, and was rediscovered in 1885. A seventh-century fresco is yet visible on the rear wall of this chapel, representing in a group Felicitas and her seven sons, and overhead the figure of Christ bestowing upon them the eternal crown.

Certain historical references to St. Felicitas and her sons antedate the aforesaid Acts, e. g. a fifth-century sermon of St. Peter Chrysologus (*Sermo cxxxiv*, in P. L., LII, 565) and a metrical epitaph either written by Pope Damasus (d. 384) or composed shortly after his time and suggested by his poem in praise of the martyr:—

Discite quid meriti præstet pro rege feriri;  
Femina non timuit gladium, cum natis obivit,  
Confessa Christum meruit per sæcula nomen.

[Learn how meritorious it is to die for the King (Christ). This woman feared not the sword, but perished with her sons. She confessed Christ and merited an eternal renown.—Ihm, *Damasi Epigrammata* (Leipzig, 1895), p. 45.] We possess, therefore, confirmation for an ancient Roman tradition, independent of the Acts, to the effect that the Felicitas who reposed in the catacomb of Maximus, and whose feast the Roman Church commemorated 23 Nov., suffered martyrdom with her sons; it does not record, however, any details concerning these sons. It may be recalled that the tomb of St. Silanus, one of the seven martyrs (10 July), adjoined that of St. Felicitas and was likewise honoured; it is quite possible, therefore, that tradition soon identified the sons of St. Felicitas with the seven martyrs, and that this formed the basis for the extant Acts. The tomb of St. Januarius in the catacomb of Prætextatus belongs to the end of the second century, to which period, therefore, the martyrdoms must belong, probably under Marcus Aurelius. If St. Felicitas did not suffer martyrdom on the same occasion we have no means of determining the time of her death. In an ancient Roman edifice near the ruins of the Baths of Titus there stood in early medieval times a chapel in honour of St. Felicitas. A faded painting in this chapel represents her with her sons just as in the above-mentioned fresco in her crypt. Her feast is celebrated 23 Nov.

RUINART, *Acta sincera martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859), 72-74; *Acta SS.*, July, III, 5-18; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, I, 429-30; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions* (2nd ed., Paris, 1892), I, 345-68; AUBÉ, *Histoire des persécutions de l'Eglise jusqu'à la fin des Antonins* (Paris, 1845), 345 sq., 439 sq.; DOULCET, *Essai sur les rapports de l'Eglise chrétienne avec l'Etat romain pendant les trois premiers siècles* (Paris, 1883), 187-217; DUFOURCO, *Gesta Martyrum romains* (Paris, 1900), I, 223-24; DE ROSSI, *Bullettino di archeol. crist.* (1884-85), 149-84; FÜHRER, *Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Felicitasfrage* (Freising, 1890); IDEM, *Zur Felicitasfrage* (Leipzig, 1894); KÜNSTLE, *Hagiographische Studien über die Passio Felicitatis cum VII filiis* (Paderborn, 1894); MARUCCI, *La catacomba romane* (Rome, 1903), 388-400.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Felicitas and Perpetua**, SAINTS, martyrs, suffered at Carthage, 7 March, 203, together with three companions, Revocatus, Saturus, and Saturninus. The details of the martyrdom of these five confessors in the North African Church have reached us through a genuine, contemporary description, one of the most affecting accounts of the glorious warfare of Christian martyrdom in ancient times. By a rescript of Septimius Severus (193-211) all imperial subjects were forbidden under severe penalties to become Christians. In consequence of this decree, five catechumens at Carthage were seized and cast into prison, viz. Vibia Perpetua, a young married lady of noble birth; the slave Felicitas, and her fellow-slave Revocatus, also Saturninus and Secundulus. Soon one Saturus, who deliberately declared himself a Christian before the judge, was also incarcerated. Perpetua's father was a pagan; her mother, however, and two brothers were Christians, one being still a catechumen; a third brother, the child Dinocrates, had died a pagan.

After their arrest, and before they were led away to prison, the five catechumens were baptized. The sufferings of the prison life, the attempts of Perpetua's father to induce her to apostatize, the vicissitudes of the martyrs before their execution, the visions of Saturus and Perpetua in their dungeons, were all faithfully committed to writing by the last two. Shortly after the death of the martyrs a zealous Christian added to this document an account of their execution. The darkness of their prison and the oppressive atmosphere seemed frightful to Perpetua, whose terror was increased by anxiety for her young child. Two deacons succeeded, by sufficiently bribing the jailer, in gaining admittance to the imprisoned Christians and alleviated somewhat their sufferings. Perpetua's mother also, and her brother, yet a catechumen, visited them. Her mother brought in her arms to Perpetua her little son, whom she was permitted to nurse and retain in prison with her. A vision, in which she saw herself ascending a ladder leading to green meadows, where a flock of sheep was browsing, assured her of her approaching martyrdom.

A few days later Perpetua's father, hearing a rumour that the trial of the imprisoned Christians would soon take place, again visited their dungeon and besought her by everything dear to her not to put this disgrace on his name; but Perpetua remained steadfast to her Faith. The next day the trial of the six confessors took place, before the Procurator Hilarianus. All six resolutely confessed their Christian Faith. Perpetua's father, carrying her child in his arms, approached her again and attempted, for the last time, to induce her to apostatize; the procurator also remonstrated with her but in vain. She refused to sacrifice to the gods for the safety of the emperor. The procurator thereupon had the father removed by force, on which occasion he was struck with a whip. The Christians were then condemned to be torn to pieces by wild beasts, for which they gave thanks to God. In a vision Perpetua saw her brother Dinocrates, who had died at the early age of seven, at first seeming to be sorrowful and in pain, but shortly thereafter happy and healthy. Another apparition, in which she saw herself fighting with a savage Ethiopian, whom she conquered, made it clear to her that she would not have to do battle with wild beasts but with the Devil. Saturus, who also wrote down his visions, saw himself and Perpetua transported by four angels, towards the East to a beautiful garden, where they met four other North African Christians who had suffered martyrdom during the same persecution, viz. Jocundus, Saturninus, Artaxius, and Quintus. He also saw in this vision Bishop Optatus of Carthage and the priest Aspasius, who prayed the martyrs to arrange a reconciliation between them. In the meanwhile the birthday festival of the Emperor Geta approached, on which occasion the condemned Christians were to fight with wild

beasts in the military games; they were therefore transferred to the prison in the camp. The pater Pudens had learnt to respect the confessors, and he permitted other Christians to visit them. Perpetua's father was also admitted and made another fruitless attempt to pervert her.

Secundulus, one of the confessors, died in prison. Felicitas, who at the time of her incarceration was with child (in the eighth month), was apprehensive that she would not be permitted to suffer martyrdom at the same time as the others, since the law forbade the execution of pregnant women. She prayed God to permit her to die with her companions. Happily, two days before the games she gave birth to a daughter, who was adopted by a Christian woman. On 7 March, the five confessors were led into the amphitheatre. At the demand of the pagan mob they were first scourged; then a boar, a bear, and a leopard, were set at the men, and a wild cow at the women. Wounded by the wild animals, they gave each other the kiss of peace and were then put to the sword. Their bodies were interred at Carthage. Their feast day was solemnly commemorated even outside Africa. Thus under 7 March the names of Felicitas and Perpetua are entered in the Philocalian calendar, i. e. the calendar of martyrs venerated publicly in the fourth century at Rome. A magnificent basilica was afterwards erected over their tomb, the Basilica Majorum; that the tomb was indeed in this basilica has lately been proved by Père Delattre, who discovered there an ancient inscription bearing the names of the martyrs.

The feast of these saints is still celebrated on 7 March. The Latin description of their martyrdom was discovered by Holstenius and published by Poussines. Chapters iii-x contain the narrative and the visions of Perpetua; chapters xi-xiii the vision of Saturus; chapters i, ii and xiv-xxi were written by an eyewitness soon after the death of the martyrs. In 1890 Rendel Harris discovered a similar narrative written in Greek, which he published in collaboration with Seth K. Gifford (London, 1890). Several historians maintain that this Greek text is the original, others that both the Greek and Latin texts are original and contemporary; but there is no doubt that the Latin text is the original and that the Greek is merely a translation. That Tertullian is the author of these Acts is an unproved assertion. The statement that these martyrs were all or in part Montanists also lacks proof; at least there is no intimation of it in the Acts.

HOLSTENIUS, *Passio SS. MM. Perpetue et Felicitatis*, ed. POSSINUS (Rome, 1663); RUTNART, *Acta sincera martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1839), 137 sqq.; ACTA SS. MARCH, I, 633-38; HARRIS AND GIFFORD, *The Acts of Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas* (London, 1890); ROBINSON, *The Passion of S. Perpetua in Text and Studies*, I (Cambridge, 1891), 2; FRANCHI DE CAVALIERI, *La Passio SS. Perpetue et Felicitatis in Rom. Quartalschr.*, supplement V (Rome, 1896); *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, ed. BOLLANDISTS, II, 964; *Analecta Bollandiana* (1892), 100-02, 369-72; ORSI, *Dissertatio apologetica pro SS. Perpetue, Felicitatis et sociorum martyrum orthodoxorum* (Florence, 1728); PILLET, *Les martyrs d'Afrique, Histoire de Ste Perpetue et de ses compagnons* (Paris, 1885); ARBÉ, *Les actes des SS. Felicité, Perpetue et de leurs compagnons in Les chrétiens dans l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1881), 509-25; NEUMANN, *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche*, I (Leipzig, 1890), 170-76, 299-300; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions*, II (Paris, 1888), 96 sqq.; MONCEAUX, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, I (Paris, 1901), 70-96; DELATTRE, *La Basilica Majorum, tombeau des SS. Perpetue et Felicité in Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1907), 516-31.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Felinus.** See SANDEO, FELIXA-MARIA.

**Felix I.** SAINT, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. 274. Early in 269 he succeeded Saint Dionysius as head of the Roman Church. About this time there arrived at Rome, directed to Pope Dionysius, the report of the Synod of Antioch which in that very year had deposed the local bishop, Paul of Samosata, for his heretical teachings concerning the doctrine of the Trinity (see ANTIOCH). A letter, probably sent by Felix to the East in response to the synodal report,

containing an exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity, was at a later date interpolated in the interest of his sect by a follower of Apollinaris (see APOLLINARIANISM). This spurious document was submitted to the Council of Ephesus in 431 (Mansi, "Coll. conc.", IV, 1188; cf. Harnack, "Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur", I, 659 sqq.; Bardenhewer, "Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur", II, 582 sq.). The fragment preserved in the Acts of the council lays special emphasis on the unity and identity of the Son of God and the Son of Man in Christ. The same fragment gives Pope Felix as a martyr; but this detail, which occurs again in the biography of the pope in the "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne, I, 58), is unsupported by any authentic earlier evidence and is manifestly due to a confusion of names. According to the notice in the "Liber Pontificalis", Felix erected a basilica on the Via Aurelia; the same source also adds that he was buried there ("Hic fecit basilicam in Via Aurelia, ubi et sepultus est"). The latter detail is evidently an error, for the fourth century Roman calendar of feasts says that Pope Felix was interred in the Catacomb of St. Callistus on the Via Appia ("III Kal. Januarii, Felicis in Callisti", it reads in the "Depositio episcoporum"). The statement of the "Liber Pontificalis" concerning the pope's martyrdom results obviously from a confusion with a Roman martyr of the same name buried on the Via Aurelia, and over whose grave a church was built. In the Roman "Feriale" or calendar of feasts, referred to above, the name of Felix occurs in the list of Roman bishops (Depositio episcoporum), and not in that of martyrs. The notice in the "Liber Pontificalis" ascribes to this pope a decree that Masses should be celebrated on the tombs of martyrs ("Hic constituit supra memorias martyrum missas celebrare"). The author of this entry was evidently alluding to the custom of celebrating the Holy Sacrifice privately, at the altars near or over the tombs of the martyrs in the crypts of the catacombs (*missa ad corpus*), while the solemn celebration of the Sacred Mysteries always took place in the basilicas built over the catacombs. This practice, still in force at the end of the fourth century (Prudentius, "Peristephanon", XI, vv. 171 sqq.), dates apparently from the period when the great cemeterial basilicas were built in Rome, and owes its origin to the solemn commemoration services of martyrs, held at their tombs on the anniversary of their burial, as early as the third century. Felix probably issued no such decree, but the compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis" attributed it to him because he made no departure from the custom in force in his time. According to the above-mentioned detail of the "Depositio episcoporum", Felix was interred in the catacomb of St. Callistus, 30 December. In the present Roman Martyrology his name occurs 30 May, the date given in the "Liber Pontificalis" as that of his death (III Kal. Jun.); it is probably an error which could easily occur through a transcriber writing Jun. for Jan.

*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, I, introd. cxxv; text, 158, with the notes; DE ROSSI, *Roma sotterranea*, II, 98-104; *Acta SS.*, May, VII, 236-37; LANGEN, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1881), I, 365-69; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutiones*, III, 243 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Felix II, POPE** (more properly ANTIPOPE), 355-58; d. 22 Nov., 365. In 355 Pope Liberius was banished to Beroea in Thrace by the Emperor Constantius because he upheld tenaciously the Nicene definition of faith and refused to condemn St. Athanasius of Alexandria (see LIBERIUS). The Roman clergy pledged itself in solemn conclave not to acknowledge any other Bishop of Rome while Liberius was alive ("Marcellini et Fausti Libellus precum", no. 1: "Quæ gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos" in "Collectio Avellana", ed. Günther; Hieronymus, "Chronicon", ad an. Abr. 2365). The emperor, however, who was

supplanting the exiled Catholic bishops with bishops of Arian tendencies, exerted himself to install a new Bishop of Rome in place of the banished Liberius. He invited to Milan Felix, archdeacon of the Roman Church; on the latter's arrival, Acacius of Cæsarea succeeded in inducing him to accept the office from which Liberius had been forcibly expelled, and to be consecrated by Acacius and two other Arian bishops. The majority of the Roman clergy acknowledged the validity of his consecration, but the laity would have nothing to do with him and remained true to the banished but lawful pope.

When Constantius visited Rome in May, 357, the people demanded the recall of their rightful bishop Liberius, who, in fact, returned soon after signing the third formula of Sirmium. The bishops, assembled in that city of Lower Pannonia, wrote to Felix and the Roman clergy advising them to receive Liberius in all charity and to put aside their dissensions; it was added that Liberius and Felix should together govern the Church of Rome. The people received their legitimate pope with great enthusiasm, but a great commotion arose against Felix, who was finally driven from the city. Soon after, he attempted, with the help of his adherents, to occupy the Basilica Julii (Santa Maria in Trastevere), but was finally banished in perpetuity by unanimous vote of the Senate and the people. He retired to the neighbouring Porto, where he lived quietly till his death. Liberius permitted the members of the Roman clergy, including the adherents of Felix, to retain their positions. Later legend confounded the relative positions of Felix and Liberius. In the apocryphal "Acta Felicis" and "Acta Liberii", as well as in the "Liber pontificalis", Felix was portrayed as a saint and confessor of the true Faith. This distortion of the true facts originated most probably through confusion of this Felix with another Felix, a Roman martyr of an earlier date.

According to the "Liber Pontificalis", which may be registering here a reliable tradition, Felix built a church on the Via Aurelia. It is well known that on this road was buried a Roman martyr, Felix; hence it seems not improbable that apropos of both there arose a confusion (see FELIX I) through which the real story of the antipope was lost and he obtained in local Roman history the status of a saint and a confessor. As such he appears in the Roman Martyrology on 29 July.

*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, I, Introd., cxxiii sqq.; 211 and notes; *Acta SS.*, July, VII, 43-50; *Analecta Boll.* (1883), II, 322-24; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, I, 430; *Gesta Liberii*, ed. COUSTANT in *Epistole Romanorum Pontificum*, I (Paris, 1721), appendix, 89-94; *Lettere in difesa dell' epistola di san Felice II* (Rome, 1790); PAOLI, *Dissertazioni su san Felice II papa e martire* (Rome, 1790); DOLLINGER, *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters* (2nd ed.), 126-45; LANGEN, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, I, 471 sqq.; DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, II (Paris, 1907), 290 sqq., 452 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Felix III, SAINT, POPE** (483-492), b. of a Roman senatorial family and said to have been an ancestor of Saint Gregory the Great. Nothing certain is known of Felix, till he succeeded St. Simplicius in the Chair of Peter (483). At that time the Church was still in the midst of her long conflict with the Eutychian heresy. In the preceding year, the Emperor Zeno, at the suggestion of Acacius, the perfidious Patriarch of Constantinople, had issued an edict known as the Henoticon or Act of Union, in which he declared that no symbol of faith, other than that of Nice, with the additions of 381, should be received. The edict was intended as a bond of reconciliation between Catholics and Eutychians, but it caused greater conflicts than ever, and split the Church of the East into three or four parties. As the Catholics everywhere spurned the edict, the emperor had driven the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria from their sees. Peter the Tanner, a notorious heretic, had again intruded himself into the See of



Antioch, and Peter Mongus, who was to be the real source of trouble during the pontificate of Felix, had seized that of Alexandria. In his first synod Felix excommunicated Peter the Tanner, who was likewise condemned by Acacius in a synod at Constantinople. In 481, Felix also excommunicated Peter Mongus—an act, which brought about a schism between East and West, that was not healed for thirty-five years. This Peter, being a time-server and of a crafty disposition, ingratiated himself with the emperor and Acacius by subscribing to the Henoticon, and was thereupon, to the displeasure of many of the bishops, admitted to communion by Acacius.

Felix, having convened a synod, sent legates to the emperor and Acacius, with the request that they should expel Peter Mongus from Alexandria and that Acacius himself should come to Rome to explain his conduct. The legates were detained and imprisoned; then, urged by threats and promises, they held communion with the heretics by distinctly uttering the name of Peter in the reading of the sacred diptychs. When their treason was made known at Rome by Simeon, one of the "Acœmeti" monks, Felix convened a synod of seventy-seven bishops in the Lateran Basilica, in which Acacius as well as the papal legates were excommunicated. Supported by the emperor, Acacius disregarded the excommunication, removed the pope's name from the sacred diptychs, and remained in the see till his death, which took place one or two years later. His successor Phravitass, sent messengers to Felix, assuring him that he would not hold communion with Peter, but, the pope learning that this was a deception, the schism continued. Peter having died in the meantime, Euthymius, who succeeded Phravitass, also sought communion with Rome, but the pope refused, as Euthymius would not remove the names of his two predecessors from the sacred diptychs. The schism, known as the Acacian Schism, was not finally healed till 518 in the reign of Justinian. In Africa, the Arian Vandals, Genseric and his son Huneric, had been persecuting the Church for more than 50 years and had driven many Catholics into exile. When peace was restored, numbers of those who through fear had fallen into heresy and had been rebaptized by the Arians desired to return to the Church. On being repulsed by those who had remained firm, they appealed to Felix, who convened a synod in 487, and sent a letter to the bishops of Africa, expounding the conditions under which they were to be received back. Felix died in 492, having reigned eight years, eleven months and twenty-three days.

*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE (Paris, 1886), I, 252-593; BARMBY, in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*, s. v.; EVAGRUS, *Eccles. Hist.*, 431-594; (tr. London, 1854), p. 357; *Acta SS.*, Feb., III, 507; ALEXANDER, *Hist. Eccles.* (Venice, 1776), V, 9; FLEURY, *Hist. Eccles.*, IV, xxix, 53; ORSI, *Storia Eccles.*, XIV, iii, 27-28; ROHRBACHER, *Hist. Eccles.* (Liège, 1850), VIII, 382; DOLLINGER, *Hist. of the Church* (London, 1840), II, 172; BARONIUS, *Annales Eccl. ad annum*; *Acta Juris Pontif.* (Paris, 1869), X, 785-95. AMBROSE COLEMAN.

**Felix IV, POPE (526-530).**—On 18 May, 526, Pope John I (q. v.) died in prison at Ravenna, a victim of the angry suspicions of Theodoric, the Arian king of the Goths. When, through the powerful influence of this ruler, the cardinal-priest, Felix of Samnium, son of Castorius, was brought forward in Rome as John's successor, the clergy and laity yielded to the wish of the Gothic king and chose Felix pope. He was consecrated Bishop of Rome 12 July, 526, and took advantage of the favour he enjoyed at the court of Theodoric to further the interests of the Roman Church, discharging the duties of his office in a most worthy manner. On 30 August, 526, Theodoric died, and, his grandson Athalaric being a minor, the government was conducted by Athalaric's mother Amalasuntha, daughter of Theodoric and favourably disposed towards the Catholics. To the new ruler the Roman clergy addressed a complaint on the usurpation of

their privileges by the civil power. A royal edict, drawn up by Cassiodorus in terms of the deepest respect for the papal authority, confirmed the ancient custom that every civil or criminal charge of a layman against a cleric should be submitted to the pope, or to an ecclesiastical court appointed by him. A fine of ten pounds of gold was imposed as a punishment for the violation of this order, and the money thus obtained was to be distributed amongst the poor by the pope (Cassiodorus, "Variae", VIII, n. 24, ed. Mommsen, "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Auctores antiquiss.", XII, 255). The pope received as a gift from Amalasuntha two ancient edifices in the Roman Forum, the Temple of Romulus, son of the Emperor Maxentius, and the adjoining *Templum sacre urbis*, the Roman land-registry office. The pope converted the buildings into the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damian, which still exists and in the apse of which is preserved the large and magnificent mosaic executed by order of Felix, the figure of the pope, however, being a later restoration (see COSMAS AND DAMIAN). Felix also took part in the so-called Semipelagian conflict in Southern Gaul concerning the nature and efficiency of grace. He sent to the bishops of those parts a series of "capitula", regarding grace and free will, compiled from Scripture and the Fathers. These capitula were published as canons at the Synod of Orange (529). In addition Felix approved the work of Cæsarius of Arles against Faustus of Riez on grace and free will (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*). Rendered anxious by the political dissensions of the Romans, many of whom stood for the interests of Byzantium, while others supported Gothic rule, Felix IV, when he fell seriously ill in the year 530, wished to ensure the peace of the Roman Church by naming his successor. Having given over to Archdeacon Boniface his pallium, he made it known publicly that he had chosen Boniface to succeed him, and that he had apprised the court of Ravenna of his action ("Neues Archiv", XI, 1886, 367; Duchesne, "Liber Pontificalis", I, 282, note 4). Felix IV died soon afterwards, but in the papal election which followed his wishes were disregarded (see BONIFACE II). The feast of Felix IV is celebrated on 30 January. The day of his death is uncertain, but it was probably towards the end of September, 530.

*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, I, 279 sq.; LANGEN, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, I, 300 sq.; GRISAR, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter* (Freiburg im Br., 1901), I, 183 sq., 493 sq., 513; HOLDBER, *Die Demignatur der Nachfolger durch die Päpste* (Fribourg, 1892), 29 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Felix V (AMADEUS OF SAVOY), ANTI-POPE (1440-1449),** b. 4 Dec., 1383; d. at Ripaille, 7 Jan., 1451. The schismatic Council of Basle, having declared the rightful pope, Eugene IV, deposed, proceeded immediately with the election of an anti-pope (see BASLE, COUNCIL OF). Wishing to secure additional influence and increased financial support, they turned their attention towards the rich and powerful prince, Duke Amadeus VIII of Savoy. Amadeus had exercised over his dependencies a mild and equitable sway, and had evinced a great zeal for the interests of the Church, especially in connexion with the Western Schism regarding the papal succession, brought to a close by the Council of Constance. Emperor Sigismund had shown his appreciation of this ruler's services by raising, in 1416, the former county of Savoy to the status of a duchy, and in 1422 conferred on Amadeus the county of Geneva. On the death of his wife, Maria of Burgundy, Duke Amadeus resolved to lead henceforth a life of contemplation, without however entirely resigning the government of his territories. He appointed his son Ludwig regent of the duchy, and retired to Ripaille on the Lake of Geneva, where, in company with five knights whom he had formed into an Order of St. Maurice, he led a semi-monastic life in accordance with a rule drawn up by himself.

Amadeus had been in close relations with the schismatic Council of Basle; and was elected pope, 30 October, 1439, by the electoral college of that council, including one cardinal (d'Allemand of Arles), eleven bishops, seven abbots, five theologians, and nine canonists. After long negotiations with a deputation from the council, Amadeus acquiesced in the election, 5 Feb., 1440, completely renouncing at the same time all further participation in the government of his duchy. Ambition and a certain fantastic turn of character induced him to take this step. He took the name of Felix V, and was solemnly consecrated and crowned by the Cardinal d'Allemand, 24 July, 1440. Eugene IV had already excommunicated him, 23 March, at the Council of Florence. Until 1442, the famous Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, later Pius II, was the anti-pope's secretary. This renewal of the schism ruined any surviving prestige of the Basle assembly, just closed at Constance. Subsequently, Amadeus took up his residence in Savoy and Switzerland; his efforts to surround himself with a curia met with little success; many of those whom he named cardinals declined the dignity. He found general recognition only in Savoy and Switzerland, but his claims were also recognized by the Dukes of Austria, Tyrol, and Bayern-München, the Count-Palatine of Simmern, the Teutonic Order, some orders in Germany and some universities, hitherto adherents of Basle. He was soon embroiled in a quarrel with the Council of Basle concerning his rights and the distribution of revenues. The rightful pope, Eugene IV, and his successor Nicolas V (1447), who were universally recognized from the first in Spain and Poland, found their claims even more widely admitted in France and Germany. In 1442, Felix left Basle; and on 16 May, 1443, occurred the last session of the Basle assembly. Felix, who had for the sake of its revenue assumed the administration of the Diocese of Geneva, clung for six years more to his usurped dignity, but finally submitted (1449) to Nicolas V, received the title of Cardinal of St. Sabina, and was appointed permanent Apostolic vicar-general for all the states of the House of Savoy and for several dioceses (Basle, Strasbourg, Chur, etc.). Thus ended the last papal schism.

ÆNEAS SYLVIUS, *Commentarii de gestis Concilii Basiliensis in Opera Omnia* (Basle, 1531); FEA, *Pius II, Pontifex maximus* (Rome, 1823); GABOTTO, *Lo Stato Sabauda da Amedeo VIII ad Emanuele Filiberto I* (Turin, 1892); MONOD, *Amedeo Pacificus seu de Eugenio IV et Amedeo Sabaudia ducti, in sua obedientia Felici papæ V nuncupati, controversiarum commentarius* (Turin, 1624); LECQY DE LA MARCHE, *Amédée VIII et son séjour à Ripaille in Recue des quest. Hist.*, 1866, I, 192-203; BRUCHET, *Notice sur le bullaire de Félix V, conservé aux archives de Turin in Mém. et docum. publiés par la Société savoyenne*, 1898, XII, XXX-XXXIII; IDEM, *Le Château de Ripaille* (Paris, 1907); PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, 4th ed., I, 317 sq.; BAUMGARTEN, *Die ersten Kardinalskonsistorien des Gegenpapstes Felix V in Rom. Quartalschrift für christl. Altert. u. für Kirchengesch.*, 1908, *Geschichte*, 133 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Félix**, CÉLESTIN-JOSEPH, French Jesuit, b. at Neuville-sur-l'Escaut (Nord), 28 June, 1810; d. at Lille, 7 July, 1891. He began his studies under the Brothers of Christian Doctrine, going later to the preparatory seminary at Cambrai, where he completed his secondary studies. In 1833 he was named professor of rhetoric, received minor orders and the diaconate, and in 1837 entered the Society of Jesus. He began his noviceship at Tronchiennes in Belgium, continued it at Saint-Acheul, and ended it at Brugelette, where he studied philosophy and the sciences. Having completed his theological studies at Louvain, he was ordained in 1842 and returned to Brugelette to teach rhetoric and philosophy. His earliest Lenten discourses, preached at Ath, and especially one on true patriotism, soon won him a brilliant reputation for eloquence.

Called to Amiens in 1850, he introduced the teaching of rhetoric at the Collège de la Providence and preached during Advent and Lent at the cathedral.

His oratorical qualities becoming more and more evident, he was called to Paris. He first preached at St. Thomas d'Aquin in 1851, and in 1852 preached Lenten sermons at Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and those of Advent at Saint-Sulpice. It was then that Mgr. Sibour named him to succeed the Dominican, Father Lacordaire, and the Jesuit, Father de Ravignan in the pulpit of Notre-Dame (1853 to 1870). He became one of its most brilliant orators. The conferences of the first three years have not been published in full. In 1856 Père Félix began the subject which he made the master-work of his life: "Progrès par le Christianisme". This formed the matter of a series of Lenten conferences which are preserved for us in fifteen volumes, and which have lost none of their reality. True progress in all its forms, whether of the individual or of the family, in science, art, morals, or government, is herein treated with great doctrinal exactness and breadth of view. The practical conclusions of these conferences Père Félix summed up every year in his preaching of the Easter retreat, which had been inaugurated by Père de Ravignan. This was the side of his ministry which lay nearest his heart. While he was in Paris, and especially during his stay at Nancy (1867-1883), and at Lille (1883-1891), the illustrious Jesuit spoke in nearly all the great cathedrals of France and Belgium. In 1881 he even went to Copenhagen to conduct the Advent exercises, and there he held a celebrated conference on authority. Félix founded the Society of St. Michael for the distribution of good books, and employed the leisure moments of his last years in the composition of several works and in the revision of his "Retraites à Notre-Dame", which he published in six volumes.

The eloquence of Père Félix was characterized by clearness, vigorous logic, unction, and pathos, even in his reasoning. He lacked imagination and the enthusiasm of Lacordaire, but he was more skilled in dialectic and surer in doctrine. His diction was richer than that of de Ravignan, and while he was less didactic than Monsabré he was more original. A list of his works is given by Sommervogel.

JENNER, *Le R. P. Félix*, with the catalogue of SOMMERVOGEL as appendix (Paris, 1892), 260; CORNUT, *Le R. P. Félix in the Etudes* (1891), Aug.; PONTMARTIN, *Le R. P. Félix* (Paris, 1881).

LOUIS LALANDE.

**Felix and Adauctus**, SAINTS, martyrs at Rome, 303, under Diocletian and Maximian. The Acts, first published in Ado's Martyrology, relate as follows: Felix, a Roman priest, and brother of another priest, also named Felix, being ordered to offer sacrifice to the gods, was brought by the prefect Dracus to the temples of Serapis, Mercury, and Diana. But at the prayer of the saint the idols fell shattered to the ground. He was then led to execution. On the way an unknown person joined him, professed himself a Christian, and also received the crown of martyrdom. The Christians gave him the name Adauctus (added). These Acts are considered a legendary embellishment of a misunderstood inscription by Pope Damasus. A Dracus cannot be found among the prefects of Rome; the other Felix of the legend is St. Felix of Nola; and Felix of Monte Pincio is the same Felix honoured on the Garden Hill. The brother is imaginary (Anal. Boll., XVI, 19-29). Their veneration, however, is very old; they are commemorated in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great and in the ancient martyrologies. Their church in Rome, built over their graves, in the cemetery of Commodilla, on the Via Ostiensis, near the basilica of St. Paul, and restored by Leo III, was discovered about three hundred years ago and again unearthed in 1905 (Civiltà Catt., 1905, II, 608). Leo IV, about 850, is said to have given their relics to Irmen-gard, wife of Lothair I; she placed them in the abbey of canonesses at Eschau in Alsace. They were brought

to the church of St. Stephen in Vienna in 1361. The heads are claimed by Anjou and Cologne. According to the "Chronicle of Anlechs" (Donauworth, 1877, p. 68), Henry, the last count, received the relics from Honorius III and brought them to the Abbey of Anlechs. Their feast is kept on 30 August.

Stokes in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Felix* (1217); *Acta SS.*, Aug., VI, 515; STADLER, *Heiligenlexicon*, s. v.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Felix of Cantalice**, SAINT, Capuchin friar, b. at Cantalice, on the north-western border of the Abruzzi; d. at Rome, 18 May, 1557. His feast is celebrated amongst the Franciscans and in certain Italian dioceses on 18 May. He is usually represented in art as holding in his arms the Infant Jesus, because of a vision he once had, when the Blessed Virgin appeared to him and placed the Divine Child in his arms.

His parents were peasant folk, and very early he was set to tend sheep. When nine years of age he was hired out to a farmer at Città Ducale with whom he remained for over twenty years, first as a shepherd-boy and afterwards as a farm labourer. But from his earliest years Felix evinced signs of great holiness, spending all his leisure time in prayer, either in the church or in some solitary place. A friend of his having read to him the lives of the Fathers of the Desert, Felix conceived a great desire for the eremitical life, but at the same time feared to live otherwise than under the obedience of a superior. After seeking light in prayer, he determined to ask admittance amongst the Capuchins. At first the friars hesitated to accept him, but he eventually received the habit, in 1543, at Anticoli in the Roman Province. It was not without the severest temptations that he persevered and made his profession. These temptations were so severe as to injure his bodily health. In 1547 he was sent to Rome and appointed questor for the community. Here he remained for the rest of his life, and in fulfilling his lowly office became a veritable apostle of Rome.

The influence which he speedily gained with the Roman people is an evidence of the inherent power of personal holiness over the consciences of men. He had no learning; he could not even read; yet learned theologians came to consult him upon the science of the spiritual life and the Scriptures. Whenever he appeared in the streets of Rome vicious persons grew abashed and withdrew from his sight. Sometimes Felix would stop them and earnestly exhort them to live a better life; especially did he endeavour to restrain young men. But judges and dignitaries also at times incurred his rebuke; he was no respecter of persons when it was a matter of preventing sin. On one occasion, during a Carnival, he and St. Philip Neri organized a procession through the streets. The Oratorians headed the procession with their crucifix; then came the Capuchin friars; last came Felix leading Fra Lupo, a well-known Capuchin preacher, by a rope round his neck, to represent Our Lord led to judgment by his executioners. Arrived in the middle of the revels, the procession halted and Fra Lupo preached to the people. The Carnival, with its open vice, was broken up for that year.

But Felix's special apostolate was amongst the children of the city, with whom his childlike simplicity made him a special favourite. His method with these was to gather them together in bands and, forming a circle, set them to sing canticles of his own composing, by which he taught them the beauty of a good life and the ugliness of sin. These canticles became popular, and frequently, when on his rounds in quest of alms, Felix would be invited into the houses of his benefactors and asked to sing. He would seize the opportunity to bring home some spiritual truth in extemporized verse. During the famine of 1580 the directors of the city's charities asked his superiors to place Felix at their disposal to collect alms for the starving, and he was untiring in his quest.

VI.—3

St. Philip Neri had a deep affection for the Capuchin lay brother, whom he once proclaimed the greatest saint then living in the Church. When St. Charles Borromeo sought St. Philip's aid in drawing up the constitutions of his Oblates, St. Philip took him to St. Felix as the most competent adviser in such matters. But through all, Felix kept his wonderful humility and simplicity. He was accustomed to style himself "The Ass of the Capuchins". Acclaimed a saint by the people of Rome, immediately after his death, he was beatified by Urban VIII in 1625, and canonized by Clement XI in 1712. His body rests under an altar dedicated to him in the church of the Immaculate Conception in Rome.

*Acta SS.*, ed. PALME (Paris, 1866), 18 May, XVII; *Bullarium Ord. F. M. Cap.* (Rome, 1749), I; BOFFET, *Annal. Cap.*, ad ann. 1557; KERR, *A Son of Saint Francis* (London, 1900).

FATHER CUTHBERT.

**Felix of Nola**, SAINT, b. at Nola, near Naples, and lived in the third century. After his father's death he distributed almost all his goods amongst the poor, and was ordained priest by Maximus, Bishop of Nola. In the year 250, when the Decian persecution broke out, Maximus was forced to flee. The persecutors seized on Felix and he was cruelly scourged, loaded with chains, and cast into prison. One night an angel appeared to him and bade him go to help Maximus. His chains fell off, the doors opened, and the saint was enabled to bring relief to the bishop, who was then speechless from cold and hunger. On the persecutors making a second attempt to secure Felix, his escape was miraculously effected by a spider weaving her web over the opening of a hole into which he had just crept. Thus deceived, they sought their prey elsewhere. The persecution ceased the following year, and Felix, who had lain hidden in a dry well for six months, returned to his duties. On the death of Maximus he was earnestly desired as bishop, but he persuaded the people to choose another, his senior in the priesthood. The remnant of his estate having been confiscated in the persecution, he refused to take it back, and for his subsistence rented three acres of land, which he tilled with his own hands. Whatever remained over he gave to the poor, and if he had two coats at any time he invariably gave them the better. He lived to a ripe old age and died 14 January (on which day he is commemorated), but the year of his death is uncertain. Five churches were built in his honour, outside Nola, where his remains are kept, but some relics are also at Rome and Benevento. St. Paulinus, who acted as porter to one of these churches, testifies to numerous pilgrimages made in honour of Felix. The poems and letters of Paulinus on Felix are the source from which St. Gregory of Tours, Venerable Bede, and the priest Marcellus have drawn their biographies (see PAULINUS OF NOLA). There is another Felix of Nola, bishop and martyr under a Prefect Martianus. He is considered by some to be the same as the above.

*Acta SS.*, Jan., II, 219; PHILLOTT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Felix* (186); STOKES, *ibid.*, s. v. *Felix* (122); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 14 Jan.; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints* (London, 1893), I, 199-201.

AMBROSE COLEMAN.

**Felix of Valois**, SAINT, b. in 1127; d. at Cerfroi, 4 November, 1212. He is commemorated 20 November. He was surnamed Valois because, according to some, he was a member of the royal branch of Valois in France; according to others, because he was a native of the province of Valois. At an early age he renounced his possessions and retired to a dense forest in the Diocese of Meaux, where he gave himself to prayer and contemplation. He was joined in his retreat by St. John of Matha, who proposed to him the project of founding an order for the redemption of captives. After fervent prayer, Felix in company with John set out for Rome and arrived there in the beginning of the pontificate of Innocent III. They had letters of recommendation from the Bishop of Paris, and the new

pope received them with the utmost kindness and lodged them in his own palace. The project of founding the order was considered in several solemn conclaves of cardinals and prelates, and the pope after fervent prayer decided that these holy men were inspired by God, and raised up for the good of the Church. He solemnly confirmed their order, which he named the Order of the Holy Trinity for the Redemption of Captives. The pope commissioned the Bishop of Paris and the Abbot of St. Victor to draw up for the institute a rule, which was confirmed by the pope, 17 December, 1198. Felix returned to France to establish the order. He was received with great enthusiasm, and King Philip Augustus authorized the institute in France and fostered it by signal benefactions. Margaret of Blois granted the order twenty acres of the wood where Felix had built his first hermitage, and on almost the same spot he erected the famous monastery of Cerfroi, the mother-house of the institute. Within forty years the order possessed six hundred monasteries in almost every part of the world. St. Felix and St. John of Matha were forced to part; the latter went to Rome to found a house of the order, the church of which, Santa Maria in Navicella, still stands on the Caelian Hill. St. Felix remained in France to look after the interests of the congregation. He founded a house in Paris attached to the church of St. Maturinus, which afterwards became famous under Robert Guiguin, master general of the order. Though the Bull of his canonization is no longer extant, it is the constant tradition of his institute that he was canonized by Urban IV in 1262. Du Plessis tells us that his feast was kept in the Diocese of Meaux in 1215. In 1666 Alexander VII declared him a saint because of immemorial cult. His feast was transferred to 20 November by Innocent XI in 1679.

Du PLESSIS, *Hist. de l'eglise de Meaux* (Paris, 1731); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*; *Acta SS.*, 20 Nov.

MICHAEL M. O'KANE.

**Feller, François-Xavier de**, author and apologist, b. at Brussels 18 August, 1735; d. at Ratisbon 22 May, 1802. He received his primary scientific education in the Jesuit College at Luxemburg, studied philosophy and the exact sciences at Reims, 1752-54, after which he joined the Society of Jesus at Tournai. Appointed professor of humanities soon after, he edited the "Musae Leodienses" (Liège, 1761), a collection of Latin poems in two volumes composed by his pupils. Later he taught theology in various institutions of the order in Luxemburg and Tyrnau (Hungary). After the suppression of the order he was active as preacher in Liège and Luxemburg until, at the approach of the French army in 1794, he emigrated to Paderborn and joined the local college of the ex-Jesuits. After staying there two years, he accepted the invitation of the Prince of Hohenlohe to come to Bavaria and join the court of the Prince-Bishop of Freising and Ratisbon, Joseph Konrad von Schroffenburg, with whom he remained, dividing his time between Freising, Ratisbon, and Berchtesgaden.

Feller was very amiable and talented, gifted with a prodigious memory, and combined diligent study with these abilities. His superiors had given him every opportunity during his travels of cultivating all the branches of science then known, and the wealth and diversity of his writings prove that he made good use of his advantages. All his writings attest his allegiance to the Jesuit Order and his untiring zeal for the Catholic religion and the Holy See.

Although he became prominent as a literary man only after the suppression of his order, he had previously contributed articles of note to the periodical "La clef du cabinet des princes de l'Europe, ou recueil historique et politique sur les matières du temps" (Luxemburg, 1760). During the years 1773-1794 he was the sole contributor to this journal, which com-

prised in all sixty volumes and was, from the first mentioned date (1773), published under the title "Journal historique et littéraire". Because he publicly denounced the illegal and despotic attempts at reform on the part of Joseph II, the journal was suppressed in Austrian territory and was, consequently, transplanted first to Liège and then to Maastricht. Its principal articles were published separately as "Mélanges de politique, de morale chrétienne et de littérature" (Louvain, 1822), and as "Cours de morale chrétienne et de littérature religieuse" (Paris, 1826). His next work of importance is entitled "Dictionnaire historique, ou histoire abrégée de tous les hommes qui se sont fait un nom par le génie, les talents, les vertus, les erreurs, etc., depuis le commencement du monde jusqu'à nos jours" (Augsburg, 1781-1784), 6 vols. He shaped this work on the model of a similar one by Chaudon without giving the latter due credit; he also showed a certain amount of prejudice, for the most part lauding the Jesuits as masters of science and underrating others, especially those suspected of Jansenistic tendencies. This work was frequently revised and republished, e.g. by Ecuy, Ganith, Henrio Pérennes, Simonin, Weiss, etc.; from 1837 it appeared under the title of "Biographie universelle". His principal work, which first appeared under the pen-name "Flexier de Reval", is "Catéchisme philosophique ou recueil d'observations propres à défendre la religion chrétienne contre ses ennemis" (Liège, 1772). In his treatise, "Jugement d'un écrivain protestant sur le chant le livre de Justinus Febronius" (Leipzig, 1770) he attacked the tenets of that anti-papal writer. Many of his works are only of contemporary interest. *Biographie Universelle*, XIII, 505; HERTER, *Nomenclatur* PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Felton, Thomas.** See MORTON, ROBERT.

**Feltre, Diocese of.** See BELLUNO-FELTRE, DIocese of.

**Feneberg, Johann Michael Nathanael**, b. Oberdorf, Allgau, Bavaria, 9 Feb., 1751; d. 12 Oct. 1812. He studied at Kaufbeuren and in the Jesuit gymnasium at Augsburg, and in 1770 entered the Society of Jesus, at Landsberg, Bavaria. When the Society was suppressed in 1773, he left the town, but continued his studies, was ordained in 1775 and appointed professor in the gymnasium of St. Paul at Ratisbon. From 1778-85 he held a modest benefice at Oberdorf and taught a private school; in 1785 he was appointed professor of rhetoric and poetry at the gymnasium of Dillingen, but was removed in 1793, together with several other professors suspected of leanings towards Illuminism. A plan of studies drawn up by him for the gymnasium brought him many enemies also. He was next given the parish of Seeg comprising some two thousand five hundred souls, and received as assistants the celebrated author Christof Schmid, and X. Bayer. He was a model pastor in every respect. Within a short time he executed a chart of the eighty-five villages in his parish, and took a census of the entire district.

In the first year of his pastoral service he sustained severe injuries by a fall from his horse, which necessitated the amputation of one leg just below the knee. He bore the operation without an anæsthetic, and excused himself for the loss of the limb by saying: *Non pedibus, sed corde diligimus Deum* (We love God with our feet but with our hearts). Shortly after, relations with the priest Martin Boos led him to be suspected of false mysticism. Boos had created a sensation by his sermons that he was compelled to flee for safety. He took refuge at Seeg with Feneberg, who was a relation, and assisted him in parochial work for nearly a year. In the meantime he strove to convert or "awaken" Feneberg to the higher Christian life, the life of faith and love to the exclusion of good works. Boos's followers were called the Erweck-



Bruder (Awakened Brethren). Among these brethren, many of whom were priests, Feneberg was called Nathanael and his two assistants Markus and Silas.

Boos's preaching and conduct at Seeg was reported to the ordinary of Augsburg, and Feneberg, with his assistants, Bayer and Siller, were also involved. In February, 1797, an episcopal commissioner arrived in Seeg, and in Feneberg's absence seized all his papers, private correspondence and manuscripts, and carried them to Augsburg. Feneberg, with his assistants, appeared before an ecclesiastical tribunal at Augsburg in August, 1797; they were required to subscribe to the condemnation of ten erroneous propositions, and then permitted to return to their parish. They all protested that they had never held any of the propositions in the sense implied. It does not appear that Feneberg was subsequently molested in this connexion, nor did he ever fail to show due respect and obedience to the ecclesiastical authorities. In 1805 he resigned the parish of Seeg and accepted that of Vohringen, which was smaller but returned slightly better revenues. This appointment and the assistance of generous friends enabled him to pay the debts he had incurred on account of his trouble and the political disturbances of the time. For a month before his death he suffered great bodily pain, but he prayed unceasingly, and after devoutly receiving the sacraments expired.

He remained friendly to Boos even after the latter's condemnation, and regretted that his friend, Bishop Sailer, was not more sympathetic to mysticism. Feneberg was a man of singular piety, candour, and zeal, but failed to see the dangers lurking in Boos's pietism. Numbers of the disciples of Boos—as many as four hundred at one time—became Protestants, although he himself remained nominally in the Church. Feneberg is the author of a translation of the New Testament, which was published by Bishop Wittmann of Ratisbon.

JOCHAM in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HABLITZEL in *Buchberger, Kirchl. Handlexikon*, s. v.; AICHINGER, Johann M. *Sailer* (Freiburg im Br., 1865); BRÜCK, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in Deutschland*, I (Mainz, 1902); SAILER, *Aus Fenebergs Leben* (Munich, 1814); SILBERNAGEL, *Die kirchenpolitischen u. religiösen Zustände im 19. Jahrhundert* (Landshut, 1901); GOSSNER, *Boss Martin* (Leipzig, 1826); BODEMANN, *Leben J. M. Fenebergs in Sonntagsbibliothek* (Bielefeld, 1856); BRAUN, *Geschichte der Bischöfe von Augsburg* (Augsburg, 1815), IV.

ALEXIUS HOFFMANN.

**Fénelon**, FRANÇOIS DE SALIGNAC DE LA MOTHE-, a celebrated French bishop and author, b. in the Château de Fénelon in Périgord (Dordogne), 6 August, 1651; d. at Cambrai, 7 January, 1715. He came of an ancient family of noble birth but small means, the most famous of his ancestors being Bertrand de Salignac (d. 1599), who fought at Metz under the Duke of Guise and became ambassador to England; also François de Salignac I, Louis de Salignac I, Louis de Salignac II, and François de Salignac II, bishops of Sarlat between 1567 and 1688. Fénelon was the second of the three children of Pons de Salignac, Count de La Mothe-Fénelon, by his second wife, Louise de La Cropte. Owing to his delicate health Fénelon's childhood was passed in his father's château under a tutor, who succeeded in giving him a keen taste for the classics and a considerable knowledge of Greek literature, which influenced the development of his mind in a marked degree. At the age of twelve he was sent to the neighbouring University of Cahors, where he studied rhetoric and philosophy, and obtained his first degrees. As he had already expressed his intention of entering the Church, one of his uncles, Marquis Antoine de Fénelon, a friend of Monsieur Olier and St. Vincent de Paul, sent him to Paris and placed him in the Collège du Plessis, whose students followed the course of theology at the Sorbonne. There Fénelon became a friend of Antoine de Noailles, afterwards Cardinal and Archbishop of Paris, and showed such de-

cided talent that at the age of fifteen he was chosen to preach a public sermon, in which he acquitted himself admirably. To facilitate his preparation for the priesthood, the marquis sent his nephew to the Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice (about 1672), then under the direction of Monsieur Tronson, but the young man was placed in the small community reserved for ecclesiastics whose health did not permit them to follow the excessive exercises of the seminary. In this famous school, of which he always retained affectionate memories, Fénelon was grounded not only in the practice of piety and priestly virtue, but above all in solid Catholic doctrine, which saved him later from Jansenism and Gallicanism. Thirty years later, in a letter to Clement XI, he congratulates himself on his training by M. Tronson in the knowledge of his Faith and the duties of the ecclesiastical life. About 1675 he was ordained priest and for a while thought of devoting himself to the Eastern missions. This was, however, only a passing inclination. Instead, he joined the community of Saint-Sulpice and gave himself up to the works of the priesthood, especially preaching and catechizing.

In 1678 Harlay de Champvallon, Archbishop of Paris, entrusted Fénelon with the direction of the house of "Nouvelles-Catholiques", a community founded in 1634 by Archbishop Jean-François de Gondi for Protestant young women about to enter the Church or converts who needed to be strengthened in the Faith. It was a new and delicate form of apostolate which thus offered itself to Fénelon's zeal, and required all the resources of his theological knowledge, persuasive eloquence, and magnetic personality. Within late years his conduct has been severely criticized, and he has been even called intolerant, but these charges are without serious foundation, and have not been accepted even by the Protestant authors of the "Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses"; their verdict on Fénelon is "that in justice to him it must be said that in making converts he ever employed persuasion rather than severity".

When Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, by which Henry IV had granted freedom of public worship to the Protestants, missionaries were chosen from among the greatest orators of the day, e. g. Bourdaloue, Fléchier, and others, and were sent to those parts of France where heretics were most numerous, to labour for their conversion. At the suggestion of his friend Bossuet, Fénelon was sent with five companions to Saintonge, where he manifested great zeal, though his methods were always tempered by gentleness. According to Cardinal de Bausset, he induced Louis XIV to remove all troops and all evidences of compulsion from the places he visited, and it is certain that he proposed and insisted on many methods of which the king did not approve. "When hearts are to be moved", he wrote to Seignelay, "force avails not. Conviction is the only real conversion." Instead of force he employed patience, established classes, and distributed New Testaments and catechisms in the vernacular. Above all, he laid especial emphasis on preaching, provided the sermons were "by gentle preachers who have a faculty not only for instructing, but for winning the confidence of their hearers". It is doubtless true, as recently published documents prove, that he did not altogether repudiate measures of force, but he only allowed them as a last resource. Even then his severity was confined to exiling from their villages a few recalcitrants, and to constraining others under the small penalty of five sous to attend the religious instructions in the churches. Nor did he think that preachers ought to advocate openly even these measures; similarly, he was unwilling to have known the Catholic authorship of pamphlets against Protestant ministers which he proposed to have printed in Holland. This was certainly an excess of cleverness; but it proves at least that Fénelon was not in sympathy with that vague tolerance

founded on scepticism which the eighteenth-century rationalists charged him with. In such matters he shared the opinions of all the other great Catholics of his day. With Bossuet and St. Augustine he held that "to be obliged to do good is always an advantage, and that heretics and schismatics, when forced to apply their minds to the consideration of truth, eventually lay aside their erroneous beliefs, whereas they would never have examined these matters had not authority constrained them".

Before and after his mission at Saintonge, which lasted but a few months (1686-1687), Fénelon formed many dear friendships. Bossuet was already his friend; the great bishop was at the summit of his fame, and was everywhere looked up to as the oracle of the Church of France. Fénelon showed him the utmost deference, visited him at his country-house at Germigny, and assisted at his spiritual conferences and his lectures on the Scriptures at Versailles. It was under his inspiration, perhaps even at his request, that Fénelon wrote about this time his "*Réfutation du système de Malebranche sur la nature et sur la grâce*". In this he attacks with great vigour and at length the theories of the famous Oratorian on optimism, the Creation, and the Incarnation. This treatise, though annotated by Bossuet, Fénelon considered it unwise to publish; it saw the light only in 1820. First among the friends of Fénelon at this period were the Duc de Beauvilliers and the Duc de Chevreuse, two influential courtiers, eminent for their piety, who had married two daughters of Colbert, minister of Louis XIV. One of these, the Duchesse de Beauvilliers, mother of eight daughters, asked Fénelon for advice concerning their education. His reply was the "*Traité de l'éducation des filles*", in which he insists on education beginning at an early age and on the instruction of girls in all the duties of their future condition of life. The religious teaching he recommends is one solid enough to enable them to refute heretics if necessary. He also advises a more serious course of studies than was then customary. Girls ought to be learned without pedantry; the form of instruction should be concrete, sensible, agreeable, and prudent, in a manner to aid their natural abilities. In many ways his pedagogy was ahead of his time, and we may yet learn much from him.


The Duc de Beauvilliers, who had been the first to test in his own family the value of the "*Traité de l'éducation des filles*", was in 1689 named governor of the grandchildren of Louis XIV. He hastened to secure Fénelon as tutor to the eldest of these princes, the Duke of Burgundy. It was a most important post, seeing that the formation of a future King of France lay in his hands; but it was not without great difficulties, owing to the violent, haughty, and passionate character of his pupil. Fénelon brought to his task a whole-hearted zeal and devotion. Everything, down to the Latin themes and versions, was made to serve in the taming of this impetuous spirit. Fénelon prepared them himself in order to adapt them the better to his plans. With the same object in view, he wrote his "*Fables*" and his "*Dialogues des Morts*", but especially his "*Télémaque*", in which work, under the guise of pleasant fiction, he taught the young prince lessons of self-control, and all the duties required by his exalted position. The results of this training were wonderful. The historian Saint-Simon, as a rule hostile to Fénelon, says: "De cet abîme sortit un prince, affable, doux, modéré, humain, patient, humble, tout appliqué à ses devoirs." It has been asked in our day if Fénelon did not succeed too well. When the prince grew to man's estate, his piety seemed often too refined; he was continually examining himself, reasoning for and against, till he was unable to reach a definite decision, his will being paralysed by fear of doing the wrong thing. However, these defects of character, against which Fénelon in

his letters was the first to protest, did not show then selves in youth. About 1695 every one who came in contact with the prince was in admiration at the change in him.

To reward the tutor, Louis XIV gave him, in 1691, the Abbey of Saint-Valéry, with its annual revenue of fourteen thousand livres. The Académie had opened its doors to him, and Madame de Maintenon, the monastic wife of the king, began to consult him on matters of conscience, and on the regulation of the house of Saint-Cyr, which she had just established for the training of young girls. Soon afterwards the archiepiscopal See of Cambrai, one of the best in France, fell vacant, and the king offered it to Fénelon, at the same time expressing a wish that he would continue to instruct the Duke of Burgundy. Nominated in February, 1695, Fénelon was consecrated in August of the same year by Bossuet in the chapel of Saint-Cyr. The future of the young prelate looked brilliant, when he fell into deep disgrace.

The cause of Fénelon's trouble was his connexion with Madame Guyon, whom he had met in the society of his friends, the Beauvilliers and the Chevreuse. She was a native of Orléans, which she left when about twenty-eight years old, a widowed mother of three children, to carry on a sort of apostolate of mysticism, under the direction of Père Lacombe, Barnabite. After many journeys to Geneva, and through Provence and Italy, she set forth her ideas in two works, "*Le moyen court et facile de faire oraison*" and "*Les torrents spirituels*". In exaggerated language characteristic of her visionary mind, she presented a system too evidently founded on the Quietism of Molinos, that had just been condemned by Innocent XI in 1687. There were, however, great divergences between the two systems. Whereas Molinos maintained that man's earthly perfection consisted in a state of uninterrupted contemplation and love, which would disengage the soul from all active virtue and reduce it to a solute inaction, Madame Guyon rejected with horror the dangerous conclusions of Molinos as to the cessation of the necessity of offering positive resistance to temptation. Indeed, in all her relations with Père Lacombe, as well as with Fénelon, her virtuous life was never called in doubt. Soon after her arrival in Paris she became acquainted with many pious persons in the court and in the city, among them Madame de Maintenon and the Ducs de Beauvilliers and Chevreuse, who introduced her to Fénelon. In turn, she was attracted by her piety, her lofty spirituality, the charm of her personality, and of her books. It was not long, however, before the Bishop of Chartres, whose diocese Saint-Cyr was, began to unsettle the mind of Madame de Maintenon by questioning the orthodoxy of Madame Guyon's theories. The latter thereupon, begged to have her works submitted to an ecclesiastical commission composed of Bossuet, Noailles, who was then Bishop of Châlons, later Archbishop of Paris, and M. Tronson, superior of Saint-Sulpice. After an examination which lasted six months, the commission delivered its verdict in thirty-four articles known as the "*Articles d'Issy*", from the place near Paris where the commission sat. The articles, which were signed by Fénelon and the Bishop of Chartres, also by the members of the commission, condemned very briefly Madame Guyon's ideas, and gave a short exposition of the Catholic teaching of prayer. Madame Guyon submitted to the condemnation, but her teaching spread in England, and Protestants, who have had her books reprinted, have always expressed sympathy with her views. Cowper translated some of her hymns into English verse; and her autobiography was translated into English by Thor Digby (London, 1805) and Thomas Upham (New York, 1848). Her books have been long forgotten in France.

In accordance with the decisions taken at Issy, B



FÉNELON—PORTRAIT BY JOSEPH VIVIEN  
THE PINAKOTHEK, MUNICH





suet now wrote his instruction on the "Etats d'oraison", as an explanation of the thirty-four articles. Fénelon refused to sign it, on the plea that his honour forbade him to condemn a woman who had already been condemned. To explain his own views of the "Articles d'Issy", he hastened to publish the "Explication des Maximes des Saints", a rather arid treatise in forty-five articles. Each article was divided into two paragraphs, one laying down the true, the other the false, teaching concerning the love of God. In this work he undertakes to distinguish clearly every step in the upward way of the spiritual life. The final end of the Christian soul is pure love of God, without any admixture of self-interest, a love in which neither fear of punishment nor desire of reward has any part. The means to this end, Fénelon points out, are those long since indicated by the Catholic mystics, i. e. holy indifference, detachment, self-abandonment, passiveness, through all of which states the soul is led by contemplation. Fénelon's book was scarcely published when it aroused much opposition. The king, in particular, was angry. He distrusted all religious novelties, and he reproached Bossuet with not having warned him of the ideas of his grandsons' tutor. He appointed the Bishops of Meaux, Chartres, and Paris to examine Fénelon's work and select passages for condemnation, but Fénelon himself submitted the book to the judgment of the Holy See (27 April, 1697). A vigorous conflict broke out at once, particularly between Bossuet and Fénelon. Attack and reply followed too fast for analysis here. The works of Fénelon on the subject fill six volumes, not to speak of the 646 letters relating to Quietism, the writer proving himself a skilful polemical writer, deeply versed in spiritual things, endowed with quick intelligence and a mental suppleness not always to be clearly distinguished from quibbling and a straining of the sense. After a long and detailed examination by the consultants and cardinals of the Holy Office, lasting over two years and occupying 132 sessions, "Les Maximes des Saints" was finally condemned (12 March, 1699) as containing propositions which, in the obvious meaning of the words, or else because of the sequence of the thoughts, were "temerarious, scandalous, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, pernicious in practice, and false in fact". Twenty-three propositions were selected as having incurred this censure, but the pope by no means intended to imply that he approved the rest of the book. Fénelon submitted at once. "We adhere to this brief", he wrote in a pastoral letter in which he made known Rome's decision to his flock, "and we accept it not only for the twenty-three propositions but for the whole book, simply, absolutely, and without a shadow of reservation." Most of his contemporaries found his submission adequate, edifying, and admirable. In recent times, however, scattered expressions in his letters have enabled a few critics to doubt its sincerity. In our opinion a few words written impulsively, and contradicted by the whole tenor of the writer's life, cannot justify so grave a charge. It must be remembered, too, that at the meeting of the bishops held to receive the Brief of condemnation, Fénelon declared that he laid aside his own opinion and accepted the judgment of Rome, and that if this act of submission seemed lacking in any way, he was ready to do whatever Rome would suggest. The Holy See never required anything more than the above-mentioned spontaneous act.

Louis XIV, who had done all he could to bring about the condemnation of the "Maximes des Saints", had already punished its author by ordering him to remain within the limits of his diocese. Vexed later at the publication of "Télémaque", in which he saw his person and his government subjected to criticism, the king could never be prevailed upon to revoke this command. Fénelon submitted without complaint or regret, and gave himself up entirely to the care of his

flock. With a revenue of two hundred thousand livres and eight hundred parishes, some of which were on Spanish territory, Cambrai, which had been regained by France only in 1678, was one of the most important sees in the kingdom. Fénelon gave up several months of each year to a visitation of his archdiocese, which was not even interrupted by the War of the Spanish Succession, when opposing armies were camped in various parts of his territory. The captains of these armies, full of veneration for his person, left him free to come and go as he would. The remainder of the year he spent in his episcopal palace at Cambrai, where with his relatives and his friends, the Abbés de Langeron, de Chanterac, and de Beaumont, he led an uneventful life, monastic in its regularity. Every year he gave a Lenten course in one or other important parish of his diocese, and on the principal feasts he preached in his own cathedral. His sermons were short and simple, composed after a brief meditation, and never committed to writing; with the exception of some few preached on more important occasions, they have not been preserved. His dealings with his clergy were always marked by condescension and cordiality. "His priests", says Saint-Simon, "to whom he made himself both father and brother, bore him in their hearts." He took a deep interest in their seminary training, assisted at the examination of those who were to be ordained, and gave them conferences during their retreat. He presided over the concursus for benefices and made inquiries among the pastors concerning the qualifications of each candidate.

Fénelon was always approachable, and on his walks often conversed with those he chanced to meet. He loved to visit the peasants in their houses, interested himself in their joys and sorrows, and, to avoid paining them, accepted the simple gifts of their hospitality. During the War of the Spanish Succession the doors of his palace were open to all the poor who took refuge in Cambrai. The rooms and stairways were filled with them, and his gardens and vestibules sheltered their live stock. He is yet remembered in the vicinity of Cambrai and the peasants still give their children the name Fénelon, as that of a saint.

Engrossed as Fénelon was with the administration of his diocese, he never lost sight of the general interests of the Church. This became evident when Jansenism, quiescent for nearly thirty years, again raised its head on the occasion of the famous *Cas de Conscience*, by which an anonymous writer endeavoured to put new life into the old distinction between the "question of law" and "question of fact" (*question de droit et question de fait*), acknowledging that the Church could legally condemn the famous five propositions attributed to Jansenius, but denying that she could oblige any one to believe that they were really to be found in the "Augustinus" of that writer. Fénelon multiplied publications of every kind against the reviving heresy; he wrote letters, pastoral instructions, memoirs, in French and in Latin, which fill seven volumes of his works. He set himself to combat the errors of the *Cas de Conscience*, to refute the theory known as "respectful silence", and to enlighten Clement XI on public opinion in France. Père Quesnel brought fresh fuel to the strife by his "Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament", which was solemnly condemned by the Bull "Unigenitus" (1713). Fénelon defended this famous pontifical constitution in a series of dialogues intended to influence men of the world. Great as was his zeal against error, he was always gentle with the erring, so that Saint-Simon could say "The Low Countries swarmed with Jansenists, and his Diocese of Cambrai, in particular, was full of them. In both places they found an ever-peaceful refuge, and were glad and content to live peaceably under one who was their enemy with his pen. They had no fears of their archbishop, who, though

opposed to their beliefs, did not disturb their tranquillity."

In spite of the multiplicity of his labours, Fénelon found time to carry on an absorbing correspondence with his relatives, friends, priests, and in fact every one who sought his advice. It is in this mass of correspondence, ten volumes of which have reached us, that we may see Fénelon as a director of souls. People of every sphere of life, men and women of the world, religious, soldiers, courtiers, servants, are here met with, among them Mesdames de Maintenon, de Gramont, de la Maisonfort, de Montebon, de Noailles, members of the Colbert family, the Marquis de Seignelay, the Duc de Chaulnes, above all the Ducs de Chevreuse and de Beauvilliers, not forgetting the Duke of Burgundy. Fénelon shows how well he possessed all the qualities he required from directors, patience, knowledge of the human heart and the spiritual life, equanimity of disposition, firmness, and straightforwardness, "together with a quiet gaiety altogether removed from any stern or affected austerity". In return he required docility of mind and entire submission of will. He aimed at leading souls to the pure love of God, as far as such a thing is humanly possible; for though the errors of the "Maximes des Saints" do not reappear in the letters of direction, it is still the same Fénelon, with the same tendencies, the same aiming at self-abandonment and detachment from all personal interests, all kept, however, within due limits; for as he says "this love of God does not require all Christians to practise austerities like those of the ancient solitaries, but merely that they be sober, just, and moderate in the use of all things expedient"; nor does piety, "like temporal affairs, exact a long and continuous application"; "the practice of devotion is in no way incompatible with the duties of one's state in life". The desire to teach his disciples the secret of harmonizing the duties of religion with those of everyday life suggests to Fénelon all sorts of advice, sometimes most unexpected from the pen of a director, especially when he happens to be dealing with his friends at court. This has given occasion to some of his critics to accuse him of ambition, and of being as anxious to control the State as to guide souls.

It is especially in the writings intended for the Duke of Burgundy that his political ideas are apparent. Besides a great number of letters, he sent him through his friends, the Ducs de Beauvilliers and de Chevreuse, an "Examen de conscience sur les devoirs de la Royauté", nine memoirs on the War of the Spanish Succession, and "Plans de Gouvernement, concrétés avec le Duc de Chevreuse". If we add to this the "Télémaque", the "Lettre à Louis XIV", the "Essai sur le Gouvernement civil", and the "Mémoires sur les précautions à prendre après la mort du Duc de Bourgogne", we have a complete exposition of Fénelon's political ideas. We shall indicate only the points in which they are original for the period when they were written. Fénelon's ideal government was a monarchy limited by an aristocracy. The king was not to have absolute power; he was to obey the laws, which he was to draw up with the co-operation of the nobility; extraordinary subsidies were to be levied only with the consent of the people. At other times he was to be assisted by the States-General, which was to meet every three years, and by provincial assemblies, all to be advisory bodies to the king rather than representative assemblies. The State was to have charge of education; it was to control public manners by sumptuary legislation and to forbid both sexes unsuitable marriages (*mésalliances*). The temporal arm and the spiritual arm were to be independent of each other, but to afford mutual support. His ideal state is outlined with much wisdom; in his political writings are to be found many observations remarkably judicious, but also not a little Utopianism.

Fénelon also took much interest in literature and philosophy. Monsieur Dacier, perpetual secretary to the Académie Française, having requested him, in the name of that body, to furnish him with his views on the works it ought to undertake when the "Dictionnaire" was finished, Fénelon replied in his "Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie Française", a work still much admired in France. This letter, which treats of the French tongue, of rhetoric, poetry, history, and ancient and modern writers, exhibits a well-balanced mind acquainted with all the masterpieces of antiquity, alive to the charm of simplicity, attached to classical traditions, yet discreetly open to new ideas (especially in history), also, however, to some chimerical theories, at least concerning things poetical. At this very time the Duc d'Orléans, the future regent, was consulting him on quite different subjects. This prince, a sceptic through circumstances rather than by any force of reasoning, profited by the appearance of Fénelon's "Traité de l'existence de Dieu" to ask its author some questions on the worship due to God, the immortality of the soul, and free will. Fénelon replied in a series of letters, only the first three of which are answers to the difficulties proposed by the prince. Together they form a continuation of the "Traité de l'existence de Dieu", the first part of which had been published in 1712 without Fénelon's knowledge. The second part appeared only in 1718, after its author's death. Though an almost forgotten work of his youth, it was received with much approval, and was soon translated into English and German. It is from his letters and this treatise that we learn something about the philosophy of Fénelon. It borrows from both St. Augustine and Descartes. For Fénelon the strongest arguments for the existence of God were those based on final causes and on the idea of the infinite, both developed along broad lines and with much literary charm, rather than with precision or originality.

Fénelon's last years were saddened by the death of his best friends. Towards the end of 1710 he lost Abbé de Langeron, his lifelong companion; in February, 1712, his pupil, the Duke of Burgundy, died. A few months later the Duc de Chevreuse was taken away, and the Duc de Beauvilliers followed in August, 1714. Fénelon survived him only a few months, making a last request to Louis XIV to appoint a successor firm against Jansenism, and to favour the introduction of Sulpicians into his seminary. With him disappeared one of the most illustrious members of the French episcopate, certainly one of the most attractive men of his age. He owed his success solely to his great talents and admirable virtues. The renown he enjoyed during life increased after his death. Unfortunately, however, his fame among Protestants was largely due to his opposition to Bossuet, and among the philosophers to the fact that he opposed and was punished by Louis XIV. Fénelon is therefore for them a precursor of their own tolerant scepticism and their infidel philosophy, a forerunner of Rousseau, beside whom they placed him on the façade of the Pantheon. In our days a reaction has set in, due to the cult of Bossuet and the publication of Fénelon's correspondence, which has brought into bolder relief the contrasts of his character, showing him at once an ancient and a modern, Christian and profane, a mystic and a statesman, democrat and aristocrat, gentle and obstinate, frank and subtle. He would perhaps have seemed more human in our eyes were he a lesser man; nevertheless he remains one of the most attractive, brilliant, and puzzling figures that the Catholic Church has ever produced.

The most convenient and best edition of Fénelon's works is that begun by Lebel at Versailles in 1820 and completed at Paris by Leclère in 1830. It comprises twenty-two volumes, besides eleven volumes of letters, in all thirty-three volumes, not including an

index volume. The various works are grouped under five headings: (1) Theological and controversial works (Vols. I-XVI), of which the principal are: "Traité de l'existence et des attributs de Dieu"; letters on various metaphysical and religious subjects; "Traité du ministère des pasteurs"; "De Summi Pontificis auctoritate"; "Réfutation du système du P. Malebranche sur la nature et la grâce"; "Lettre à l'Evêque d'Arras sur la lecture de l'Ecriture Sainte en langue vulgaire"; works on Quietism and Jansenism. (2) Works on moral and spiritual subjects (Vols. XVII and XVIII): "Traité de l'éducation des filles"; sermons and works on piety. (3) Twenty-four pastoral charges (Vol. XVIII). (4) Literary works (Vols. XIX-XXII): "Dialogues des Morts"; "Télémaque"; "Dialogues sur l'éloquence". (5) Political writings (Vol. XXII): "Examen de conscience sur les devoirs de la Royauté"; various memoirs on the War of the Spanish Succession; "Plans du Gouvernement concertés avec le Duc de Chevreuse". The correspondence includes letters to friends at court, as Beauvilliers, Chevreuse, and the Duke of Burgundy; letters of direction, and letters on Quietism. To these must be added the "Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure" (Paris, 1697).

DE RAMSAY, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Fénelon* (London, 1733); DE BALSSEN, *Histoire de Fénelon* (Paris, 1808); TABARAT, *Supplément aux histoires de Bossuet et de Fénelon* (Paris, 1822); DE BROQUE, *Fénelon à Cambrai* (Paris, 1884); JANET, *Fénelon* (Paris, 1892); CROISIL, *Fénelon et Bossuet* (2 vols., Paris, 1894); DRON, *Fénelon archevêque de Cambrai* (Paris, 1905); CAGNAC, *Fénelon directeur de conscience* (Paris, 1903); BRUNETIÈRE in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v.; IDEM, *Etudes critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1893); DUCEN, *L'intolérance de Fénelon* (2d ed., Paris, 1876); VERLAQUE, *Lettres inédites de Fénelon* (Paris, 1874); IDEM, *Fénelon Missionnaire* (Marseille, 1884); GUERRIER, *Madame Guyon, sa vie, sa doctrine, et son influence* (Orléans, 1881); MASSON, *Fénelon et Madame Guyon* (Paris, 1907); DELPHANQUE, *Fénelon et la doctrine de l'amour pur* (Lille, 1907); SCANNELL, *François Fénelon in Irish Eccl. Record*, XI, (1901) 1-15, 413-432.

ANTOINE DEGERT.

**Fenn, JAMES, VENERABLE.** See HAYDOCK, GEORGE.

**Fenn, JOHN**, b. at Montacute near Wells in Somersetshire; d. 27 Dec., 1615. He was the eldest brother of Ven. James Fenn, the martyr, and Robert Fenn, the confessor. After being a chorister at Wells Cathedral, he went to Winchester School in 1547, and in 1550 to New College, Oxford, of which he was elected fellow in 1552. Next year he became head master of the Bury St. Edmunds' grammar-school, but was deprived of this office and also of his fellowship for refusing to take the oath of supremacy under Elizabeth. He thereupon went to Rome where after four years' study he was ordained priest about 1566. Having for a time been chaplain to Sir William Stanley's regiment in Flanders he settled at Louvain, where he lived for forty years. A great and valuable work to which he contributed was the publication, in 1583, by Father John Gibbons, S.J., of the various accounts of the persecution, under the title "Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in Angliâ", which was the groundwork of the invaluable larger collection published by Bridgewater under the same name in 1588. He also collected from old English sources some spiritual treatises for the Brigettine nuns of Syon. In 1609, when the English Augustinian Canonesses founded St. Monica's Priory at Louvain, he became their first chaplain until in 1611 when his sight failed. Even then he continued to live in the priory and the nuns tended him till his death. Besides his "Vitæ quorundam Martyrum in Angliâ", included in the "Concertatio", he translated into Latin Blessed John Fisher's "Treatise on the penitential Psalms" (1597) and two of his sermons; he also published English versions of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, Osorio's reply to Haddon's attack on his letter to Queen Elizabeth (1568), Guerra's "Treatise of Tribulation", an Italian life of St. Catherine of Sienna (1609; 1867), and Loarte's "Instructions How to Meditate the Mysteries of the Rosarie".

PITS, *De Illustribus Anglorum Scripturibus* (Paris, 1623; Donn, *Church History* (Brussels, 1737-42, I, 311; WOOD, ed. BLISS, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, II; GILLLOW, *Bibl. Diet. Eng. Cath.*, s. v; COOPER in *Diet. Nat. Biog.*, s. v; HAMILTON, *Chronicle of the English Augustinian Canonesses of St. Monica's*, Louvain (London, 1901).

EDWIN BURTON.

**Fenwick, BENEDICT.** See BOSTON, DIOCESE OF.

**Fenwick, EDWARD.** See CINCINNATI, DIOCESE OF.

**Ferber, NICOLAUS**, Friar Minor and controversialist, b. at Herborn, Germany, in 1485; d. at Toulouse, 15 April, 1534. He was made prior of the Franciscan province of Cologne and was honoured by Clement VII with the office of vicar-general of that branch of the order known as the Cismontane Observance, in which capacity he visited the various provinces of the order in England, Germany, Spain, and Belgium. At the instance of the bishops of Denmark, he was called to Copenhagen to champion the Catholic cause against Danish Lutheranism, and there he composed, in 1530, the "Confutatio Lutheranismi Danieli", first edited by L. Schmitt, S.J., and published at Quaracchi (1902), which earned for him the sobriquet of Stagefyr (firebrand). Ferber's principal work is entitled: "Locorum communium adversus hujus temporis hæreses Enchiridion", published at Cologne in 1528, with additions in 1529. Besides this he wrote "Assertiones CCCXXV adversus Fr. Lambertii paradoxa impia" etc. (Cologne, 1526, and Paris, 1534); and "Enarrationes latine Evangeliorum quadragesimalium", preached in German and published in Latin (Antwerp, 1533).

SCHMITT, *Der Kölner Theolog Nicolaus Stagefyr und der Franziskaner Nicolaus Herborn* (Freiburg, 1906); HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1906), II, 1253-56; SBARALEA, *Supplementum ad scriptores Ordinis Minorum*, 536.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

**Ferdinand, BLESSED**, Prince of Portugal, b. in Portugal, 29 September, 1402; d. at Fez, in Morocco, 5 June, 1443. He was one of five sons, his mother being Philippa, daughter of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and his father King John I, known in history for his victories over the Moors and in particular for his conquest of Ceuta, a powerful Moorish stronghold, and his establishment of an episcopal see within its walls. In early life Ferdinand suffered much from sickness, but bodily weakness did not hinder his growth in spirit, and even in his boyhood and youth he gave evidence of remarkable qualities of soul and intellect. With great strength of character and a keen sense of justice and order he combined an innocence, gentleness, and charity which excited the wonder of the royal court. He had a special predilection for prayer and for the ceremonies and devotions of the Church. After his fourteenth year he recited daily the canonical hours, rising at midnight for Matins. Always severe with himself, he was abstemious in his diet and fasted on Saturdays and on the eves of the feasts of the Church. He cared for the spiritual as well as the corporal necessities of his domestics, while his solicitude for the poor and oppressed was unbounded. His generosity towards the monasteries was impelled by his desire to share in their prayers and good works. He had himself enrolled for the same reason in all the pious congregations of the kingdom.

Upon the death of his father in 1433, his brother Edward (Duarte) ascended the throne, while he himself received but a small inheritance. It was then that he was induced to accept the grand-mastership of Aviz, in order that he might be better able to help the poor. As he was not a cleric, his brother, the king, obtained for him the necessary papal dispensation. The fame of his charity went abroad, and Pope Eugene IV, through the papal legate, offered him the cardinal's hat. This he refused, not wishing, as he declared, to burden his conscience.

Though living a life of great sanctity in the midst of the court, Ferdinand was not a mere recluse. He was

also a man of action, and in his boyhood his soul was stirred by the heroic campaign against Ceuta. His mother, the queen, had nurtured the martial spirit of her sons, and it is even said that on her deathbed she gave them each a sword, charging them to use it in defence of widows, orphans, and their country, and in particular against unbelievers. An opportunity soon presented itself. In 1437 Edward planned an expedition against the Moors in Africa and placed his brothers Henry and Ferdinand in command. They set sail 22 Aug., 1437, and four days later arrived at Ceuta. During the voyage Ferdinand became dangerously ill, in consequence of an abscess and fever which he had concealed before the departure, in order not to delay the fleet. Through some mismanagement the Portuguese numbered only 6000 men, instead of 14,000, as ordered by the king. Though advised to wait for reinforcements, the two princes, impatient for the fray, advanced towards Tangiers, to which they laid siege. Ferdinand recovered slowly, but was not able to take part in the first battle.

The Portuguese fought bravely against great odds, but were finally compelled to make terms with the enemy, agreeing to restore Ceuta in return for a safe passage to their vessels. The Moors likewise demanded that one of the princes be delivered into their hands as a hostage for the delivery of the city. Ferdinand offered himself for the dangerous post, and with a few faithful followers, including João Alvarez, his secretary and later his biographer, began a painful captivity which ended only with his death. He was first brought to Arsilla by Salā ben Salā, the Moorish ameer. In spite of sickness and bodily sufferings, he continued all his devotions and showed great charity towards his Christian fellow-captives. Henry at first repaired to Ceuta, where he was joined by his brother John. Realizing that it would be difficult to obtain the royal consent to the restoration of the fortress, they proposed to exchange their brother for the son of Salā ben Salā, whom Henry held as a hostage. The Moors scornfully rejected the proposal, and both returned to Portugal to devise means of setting the prince free. Though his position was perilous in the extreme, the Portuguese Cortes refused to surrender Ceuta, not only on account of the treachery of the Moors, but because the place had cost them so dearly and might serve as a point of departure for future conquests. It was resolved to ransom him if possible. Salā ben Salā refused all offers, his purpose being to recover his former seat of government.

Various attempts were made to free the prince, but all proved futile and only served to make his lot more unbearable. On 25 May, 1438, he was sent to Fez and handed over to the cruel Lazurac, the king's vizier. He was first condemned to a dark dungeon and, after some months of imprisonment, was compelled to work like a slave in the royal gardens and stables. Amid insult and misery Ferdinand never lost patience. Though often urged to seek safety in flight, he refused to abandon his companions and grieved more for their sufferings, of which he considered himself the cause, than for his own. His treatment of his persecutors was respectful and dignified, but he would not descend to flattery to obtain any alleviation of his sufferings. During the last fifteen months of his life he was confined alone in a dark dungeon with a block of wood for his pillow and the stone floor for a bed. He spent most of his time in prayer and in preparation for death, which his rapidly failing health warned him was near at hand. In May, 1443, he was stricken with the fatal disease to which he finally succumbed. His persecutors refused to change his loathsome abode, although they allowed a physician and a few faithful friends to attend him. On the evening of 5 June, after making a general confession and a profession of faith, he peacefully gave up his soul to God. During the day he had confided to his confessor, who frequently visited

him, that the Blessed Virgin with St. John and the Archangel Michael had appeared to him in a vision. Lazurac ordered the body of the prince to be opened and the vital organs removed, and then caused it to be suspended head downwards for four days on the walls of Fez. Nevertheless he was compelled to pay tribute to the constancy, innocence, and spirit of prayer of his royal victim. Of Ferdinand's companions, four shortly afterwards followed him to the grave, one joined the ranks of the Moors, and the others regained their liberty after Lazurac's death. One of the latter, João Alvarez, his secretary and biographer, carried his heart to Portugal in 1451, and in 1473 his body was brought to Portugal, and laid to rest in the royal vault at Batalha amid imposing ceremonies.

Prince Ferdinand has ever been held in great veneration by the Portuguese on account of his saintly life and devotion to country. Miracles are said to have been wrought at his intercession, and in 1470 he was beatified by Paul II. Our chief authority for the details of his life is João Alvarez, already referred to. Calderon made him a hero of one of his most remarkable dramas, "El Príncipe Constante y Mártir de Portugal".

ALVAREZ, in *Acta SS.*, June, I; OLFERS, *Leben des standhaften Prinzen* (Berlin, 1827); DUNHAM, *History of Spain and Portugal* (New York), III.

HENRY M. BROCK.

**Ferdinand II**, emperor, eldest son of Archduke Karl and the Bavarian Princess Maria, b. 1578; d. 15 February, 1637. In accordance with Ferdinand I's disposition of his possessions, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola fell to his son Karl. As Karl died in 1590, when his eldest son was only twelve years old, the government of these countries had to be entrusted to a regent during the minority of Ferdinand. The latter began his studies under the Jesuits at Graz, and continued them in company with Maximilian of Bavaria at the University of Ingolstadt, also in charge of the Jesuits. According to the testimony of his professors, he displayed remarkable diligence, made rapid progress in the mathematical sciences, and above all gave evidence of a deeply religious spirit. On the completion of his studies, he took up the reins of government, although not yet quite seventeen. During a subsequent visit to Italy he made a vow in the sanctuary of Loreto to banish all heresy from the territories which might fall under his rule. He was of middle height, compact build, with reddish-blond hair and blue eyes. His dress and the cut of his hair suggested the Spaniard, but his easy bearing towards all with whom he came into contact was rather German than Spanish. Even in the heat of conflict, a sense of justice and equity never deserted him. On two occasions, when his tenure of power was imperilled, he was unflinching and showed a true greatness of mind. Ferdinand was a man of unspotted morals, but lacking in statesmanlike qualities and independence of judgment. He was wont to lay the responsibility for important measures on his counsellors (Freiherr von Eggenberg, Graf von Harrach, the Bohemian Chancellor, Zdencko von Lobkowitz, Cardinal-Prince Dietrichstein, etc.). Liberal even to prodigality, his exchequer was always low. In pursuance of the principle laid down by the Diet of Augsburg, 1555 (*cuius regio eius et religio*), he established the Counter-Reformation in his three duchies, while his cousin Emperor Rudolf II reluctantly recognized the Reformation.

As Ferdinand was the only archduke of his day with sufficient power and energy to take up the struggle against the estates then aiming at supreme power in the Austrian hereditary domains, the childless Emperor Matthias strove to secure for him the succession to the whole empire. During Matthias's life, Ferdinand was crowned King of Bohemia and of Hungary, but, when Matthias died during the heat of the religious war (20 March, 1619), Ferdinand's position was en-

compassed with perils. A united army of Bohemians and Silesians stood before the walls of Vienna; in the city itself Ferdinand was beset by the urgent demands of the Lower-Austrian estates, while the Bohemian estates chose as king in his place the head of the Protestant Union in Germany (the Palatine Frederick V., who could also count on the support of his father-in-law, James I of England). When the Austrian estates entered into an alliance with the Bohemians, and Bethlen Gabor, Prince of Transylvania, marched triumphantly through Hungary with the assistance of the Hungarian evangelical party, and was crowned king of that country, the end of the Hapsburg dynasty seemed at hand. Notwithstanding these troubles in his hereditary states, Ferdinand was chosen German Emperor by the votes of all the electors except Bohemia and the Palatinate. Spaniards from the Netherlands occupied the Palatinate, and the Catholic League (Bund der katholischen Fürsten Deutschlands) headed by Maximilian of Bavaria declared in his favour, although to procure this support Ferdinand was obliged to mortgage Austria to Maximilian. On 22 June, 1619, the Imperial General Buquoy repulsed from Vienna the besieging General Thurn; Mansfeld was crushed at Budweis, and on 8 November, 1620, the fate of Bohemia and of Frederick V was decided by the Battle of the White Mountain, near Prague.

The firm re-establishment of the Hapsburg dynasty was the signal for the introduction of the Counter-Reformation (q. v.) into Bohemia. Ferdinand annulled the privileges of the estates, declared void the concessions granted to the Bohemian Protestants by the Majestätsbrief of Rudolf II, and punished the heads of the insurrection with death and confiscation of goods. Protestantism was exterminated in Bohemia, Moravia, and Lower Austria; in Silesia alone, on the intercession of the Lutheran Elector of Saxony, the Reformers were treated with less severity.

The establishment of a general peace might perhaps now have been possible, if the emperor had been prepared to return his possessions to the outlawed and banished Palatine Elector Frederick. At first, Ferdinand seemed inclined to adopt this policy out of consideration for the Spanish, who did not wish to give mortal offence to James I, the father-in-law of the elector. However, the irritating conduct of Frederick and the Protestant Union, and the wish to recover Austria by indemnifying Maximilian in another way led Ferdinand to continue the war. Entrusted with the execution of the ban against the Elector Palatine, Maximilian assisted by the Spaniards took possession of the electoral lands, and in 1632 was himself raised to the electoral dignity.


Uneasy at the rapidly increasing power of the em-

peror, the estates of the Lower Saxon circle (*Kreis*) had meanwhile formed a confederation, and resolved under the leadership of their head, King Christian IV of Denmark, to oppose the emperor (1625). In face of this combination, the Catholic Union or League under Count Tilly proved too weak to hold in check both its internal and external enemies; thus the recruiting of an independent imperial army was indispensable, though the Austrian exchequer was unable to meet the charge. However, Albrecht von Wallenstein (usually known as Wallenstein), a Bohemian nobleman whom Ferdinand had a short time previously raised to the dignity

of prince, offered to raise an army of 40,000 men at his own expense. His offer was accepted, and soon Wallenstein and Tilly repeatedly vanquished the Danes, Ernst von Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick, the leaders of the Protestant forces. On the defeat of Christian at Lutteram Barbenberge (27 August, 1626), the Danish Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein fell into the hands of the victorious Tilly, Christian was compelled to make the equitable peace of Lubeck on 12 May, 1629, and Wallenstein was invested with the lands of the Dukes of Mecklenburg, allies of Christian.

Contemporaneously, an insurrection broke out among the Austrian peasants for the recovery of their ecclesiastical rights abrogated by the emperor. This rising was soon quelled, but, as Wallenstein did not conceal his intention to establish the emperor's rule in Germany on a more absolute basis, the princes of the empire were unceasing in their complaints, and demanded Wallenstein's dismissal. The excitement of the princes, especially those of the Protestant faith, ran still higher when Ferdinand published, in 1629, the "Edict of Restitution",

which directed Protestants to restore all ecclesiastical property taken from the Catholics since the Convention of Passau, in 1552 (2 archbishoprics, 12 bishoprics and many monastic seigniories, especially in North Germany). At the meeting of the princes in Ratisbon (1630), when Ferdinand wished to procure the election of his son as King of Rome, the princes headed by Maximilian succeeded in prevailing on the emperor to remove Wallenstein. The command of the now reduced imperial troops was entrusted to Tilly, who with these forces and those of the League marched against Magdeburg; this city, formerly the see of an archbishop, energetically opposed the execution of the Edict of Restitution. Even before Wallenstein's dismissal on 4 July, 1630, Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, had landed at the mouth of the Oder, but, as the Protestant estates (notably Brandenburg and Saxony) hesitated to enter into an alliance with him, he was unable at first to accomplish anything decisive. When, however, in May, 1631, Tilly stormed and reduced to ashes



EMPEROR FERDINAND II  
Frans Pourbus the Younger, Museo del Prado, Madrid



the town of Magdeburg, the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony openly espoused the cause of Gustavus Adolphus. After the utter defeat of Tilly at Breitenfeld (September, 1631), Gustavus Adolphus advanced through Thuringia and Franconia to the Rhine, while the Saxon army invaded Bohemia and occupied its capital, Prague. In 1632, the Swedish King invaded Bavaria. Tilly faced him on the Lech, but was defeated, and mortally wounded. Gustavus Adolphus was now master of Germany, the League was overthrown, and the emperor threatened in his hereditary domain. In this crisis Ferdinand induced Wallenstein to raise another army of 40,000 men, and entrusted him with unlimited authority. On 6 November, 1632, a battle was fought at Lützen near Leipzig, where Gustavus Adolphus was slain, though the Swedish troops remained masters of the battle-field. Wallenstein was now in a position to continue the war with energy, but after the second half of 1633 he displayed an incomprehensible inactivity. The explanation is that Wallenstein had formed the resolution to betray the emperor, and, with the help of France, to seize Bohemia. His plan miscarried, however, and led to his assassination at Eger on 25 February, 1634. The emperor had no hand in this murder. On 27 August of the same year, the imperial army under the emperor's eldest son, Ferdinand, inflicted so crushing a defeat on the Swedes at Nördlingen that the Protestants of south-western Germany turned for help to France. On 30 May, 1636, by the cession of both Upper and Lower Lausitz, Ferdinand became reconciled with Saxony, which became his ally. On 24 September, the combined imperial and Saxon armies were defeated at Wittstock by the Swedes under Baner. France now revealed its real policy, and dispatched a powerful army to join the ranks of the emperor's foes. Ferdinand lived to witness the election of his son as German Emperor (22 December, 1636), and his coronation as King of Bohemia and Hungary. He died, however, 15 February, 1637, without witnessing the end of this destructive conflict, known as the Thirty Years War. In his will, he expressly provided for the succession of the first-born of his house and the indivisibility of his hereditary states.

HUTER, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II. und seiner Zeit* (11 vols. Schaffhausen, 1850-1864); GINDELY, *Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges* (3 vols., Prague, 1882); KLOPP, *Tilly im dreissigjährigen Kriege* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1861); HUBER, *Geschichte Oesterreichs* (5 vols., Prague and Leipzig, 1894).

KARL KLAAR.

**Ferdinand III**, SAINT, King of Leon and Castile, member of the Third Order of St. Francis, b. in 1198 near Salamanca; d. at Seville, 30 May, 1252. He was the son of Alfonso IX, King of Leon, and of Berengaria, the daughter of Alfonso III, King of Castile, and sister of Blanche, the mother of St. Louis IX.

In 1217 Ferdinand became King of Castile, which crown his mother renounced in his favour, and in 1230 he succeeded to the crown of Leon, though not without civil strife, since many were opposed to the union of the two kingdoms. He took as his counsellors the wisest men in the State, saw to the strict administration of justice, and took the greatest care not to overburden his subjects with taxation, fearing, as he said, the curse of one poor woman more than a whole army of Saracens. Following his mother's advice, Ferdinand, in 1219, married Beatrice, the daughter of Philip of Swabia, King of Germany, one of the most virtuous princesses of her time. God blessed this union with seven children: six princes and one princess. The highest aims of Ferdinand's life were the propagation of the Faith and the liberation of Spain from the Saracen yoke. Hence his continual wars against the Saracens. He took from them vast territories, Granada and Alicante alone remaining in their power at the time of his death. In the most important towns he founded bishoprics, re-established Catholic worship

everywhere, built churches, founded monasteries, and endowed hospitals. The greatest joys of his life were the conquests of Cordova (1236) and Seville (1248). He turned the great mosques of these places into cathedrals, dedicating them to the Blessed Virgin. He watched over the conduct of his soldiers, confiding more in their virtue than in their valour, fasted strictly himself, wore a rough hairshirt, and often spent his nights in prayer, especially before battles. Amid the tumult of the camp he lived like a religious in the cloister. The glory of the Church and the happiness of his people were the two guiding motives of his life. He founded the University of Salamanca, the Athens of Spain. Ferdinand was buried in the great cathedral of Seville before the image of the Blessed Virgin, clothed, at his own request, in the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis. His body, it is said, remains incorrupt. Many miracles took place at his tomb, and Clement X canonized him in 1671. His feast is kept by the Minorites on the 30th of May.

LEO, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1886), II, 300 sq.; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints* (New York, 1896), II, 444 sq.; ACTA SS., May, VII, 280 sq., where the Lives by his prime minister RODRIGO XIMENES, Archbishop of Seville, and LUKE of TUY, as well as the *Chronicon S. Ferdinandi* are to be found; WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, VI, 189-221; NOS SAINTS (Quebec, 1899), 126 sq.; SCHRÖDLIN *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; DE LIGNY, *La Vie de S. Ferdinand, roi de Castille et de Léon* (Paris, 1759); FERRERA, *Geschichte Spaniens*, Germ. tr. (Halle, 1755).

FERDINAND HECKMANN.

**Ferentino** (FERENTINUM), DIOCESE OF, in the province of Rome, immediately subject to the Holy See. The town was in antiquity the chief place of the Hernici. Its ancient origin is borne out by the numerous remains of its cyclopean walls, especially near the site of the ancient fortress where the cathedral now stands. In the days of the kings there was strife between Rome and Ferentinum which then belonged to the Volscians. The Consul Furius gave it over to the Hernici, and in 487, A. V. C., it became a Roman town (*municipium*), and shared thenceforth the fortunes of Rome. Local legend attributes the first preaching of the Gospel in Ferentinum to Sts. Peter and Paul; they are said to have consecrated St. Leo as its first bishop. In the persecution of Diocletian the centurion Ambrose suffered martyrdom (304) at Ferentino; possibly also the martyrdom of St. Eutychius belongs to that period. In the time of Emperor Constantine the town had its own bishop; but the first known to us by name is Bassus, present at Roman synods, 487 and 492-493. St. Redemptus (about 570) is mentioned in the "Dialogues" of St. Gregory the Great; and he also refers to a Bishop Boniface. Other known bishops are Trasmondo Sognino (1150), who died in prison; Ubaldo (1150), legate of Adrian IV to the princes of Christendom in favour of a crusade, later the consecrator of the antipope Victor IV; Giacomo (A. D. 1276), legate of John XXI to Emperor Michael Palæologus; Landolfo Rosso (1297), who rendered good service to Boniface VIII; Francesco Filippeschi (1799), legate of Julius II to the Emperor Maximilian.

Ferentino has (1909) 19 parishes and 45,000 souls; 3 boys' and 2 girls' schools; 6 monasteries for men; and 8 convents for women.

CAFFELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia*, VI, 391; *Ann. Eccl.* (Rome, 1908).

U. BENIGNI.

**Fergus**, SAINT, d. about 730, known in the Irish martyrologies as St. Fergus Cruithneach, or the Pict. The Breviary of Aberdeen states that he had been a bishop for many years in Ireland when he came on a mission to Alba with some chosen priests and other clerics. He settled first near Strageath, in the present parish of Upper Strathearn, in Upper Perth, and erected three churches in that district. The churches of Strageath, Blackford, and Dolpatrick are found there to-day dedicated to St. Patrick. He next

evangelized Caithness and established there the churches of Wick and Halkirk. Thence he crossed to Buchan in Aberdeenshire and founded a church at Lungley, a village now called St. Fergus. Lastly, he established a church at Glammis in Forfarshire. He went to Rome in 721 and was present with Sedulius and twenty other bishops at a synod in the basilica of St. Peter, convened by Gregory II. His remains were deposited in the church of Glammis and were the object of much veneration in the Middle Ages. The Abbot of Scone transferred his head to Scone church, and encased it in a costly shrine. There is an entry in the accounts of the treasurer of James IV, October, 1503, "An offerand of 13 shillings to Sanct Fergus' heide in Scone". The churches of Wick, Glammis, and Lungley had St. Fergus as their patron. His festival is recorded in the Martyrology of Tallaght for the 8th of September but seems to have been observed in Scotland on the 18th of November.

KELLY (ed.), *Martyrology of Tallaght*, 33; O'HANLON, *Lives of Irish Sts.*, 8 Sept., IX, 196; *Bremary of Aberdeen*, Latin text (London, 1854); SKENE, *Celtic Scotland* (Edinburg, 1877), II, 232.

FERGUS, SAINT, Bishop of Duleek, d. 778, mentioned by Duall MacFirbis, *Annals of the Four Masters*, *Annals of Ulster*.

FERGUS, SAINT, Bishop of Downpatrick, d. 583. He was sixth in descent from Coelbad, King of Erin. He built a church or monastery called Killmbian, identified by some as Killyban, Co. Down, and afterwards was consecrated bishop and ruled the cathedral church of Druimleithglais (Down). He was probably the first bishop of that see. His feast is kept on the 30th of March.

Ten saints of this name are mentioned in the martyrology of Donegal.

COLGAN, *Acta SS. Hib.*, 30 Mar.; O'HANLON, *op. cit.*, 30 Mar.; LANTIGAN, *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829), II, 183.

C. MULCAHY.

**Feria** (Lat. for "free day"), a day on which the people, especially the slaves, were not obliged to work, and on which there were no court sessions. In ancient Roman times the *feriæ publicæ*, legal holidays, were either *stativæ*, recurring regularly (e. g. the Saturnalia), *conceptivæ*, i. e. movable, or *imperativæ*, i. e. appointed for special occasions. When Christianity spread, the *feriæ* were ordered for religious rest, to celebrate the feasts instituted for worship by the Church. The faithful were obliged on those days to attend Mass in their parish church; such assemblies gradually led to mercantile enterprise, partly from necessity and partly for the sake of convenience. This custom in time introduced those market gatherings which the Germans call *Messen*, and the English call fairs. They were fixed on saints' days (e. g. St. Barr's fair, St. Germanus's fair, St. Wenn's fair, etc.).

To-day the term *feria* is used to denote the days of the week with the exception of Sunday and Saturday. Various reasons are given for this terminology. The Roman Breviary, in the sixth lesson for 31 Dec., says that Pope St. Silvester ordered the continuance of the already existing custom, "that the clergy, daily abstaining from earthly cares, would be free to serve God alone". Others believe that the Church simply Christianized a Jewish practice. The Jews frequently counted the days from their Sabbath, and so we find in the Gospels such expressions as *una Sabbati* and *prima Sabbati*, the first from the Sabbath. The early Christians reckoned the days after Easter in this fashion, but, since all the days of Easter week were holy days, they called Easter Monday, not the first day after Easter, but the second feria or feast day; and since every Sunday is the *dies Dominica*, a lesser Easter day, the custom prevailed to call each Monday a *feria secunda*, and so on for the rest of the week.

The ecclesiastical style of naming the week days was adopted by no nation except the Portuguese, who

alone use the terms *Segunda Feira* etc. The old use of the word *feria*, for *feast day*, is lost, except in the derivative *feriato*, which is equivalent to our *obligation*. To-day those days are called *ferial* upon which no feast is celebrated. *Feriæ* are either *major* or *minor*. The major, which must have at least a commemoration, even on the highest feasts, are the *feriæ* of Advent and Lent, the Ember days, and the Monday of Rogation week; the others are called minor. Of the major feria Ash Wednesday and the days of Holy Week are privileged, so that their office must be taken, no matter what feast may occur.

Dublin Review, CXXIV, 350; WAPLEHORST, *Compendium S. Liturgæ* (New York, 1905); HEUSER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Ferland**, JEAN-BAPTISTE-ANTOINE, French Canadian historian, b. at Montreal, 25 December, 1805; d. at Quebec, 11 January, 1865. He studied at the college of Nicolet and was ordained priest 14 September, 1828. He ministered to country parishes until 1841, when he was made director of studies in the college of Nicolet. He became its superior in 1848. Being named a member of the council of the Bishop of Quebec, he took up his residence in that city, where he was also chaplain to the English garrison. From his college days he had devoted himself to the study of Canadian history; the numerous notes which he collected had made him one of the most learned men of the country. It was not, however, until he had reached the age of forty that he thought of writing a history of Canada. In 1853 he published his "Observations sur l'histoire ecclésiastique du Canada", a refutation and criticism of the work of the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg; it was reprinted in France in 1854. In the latter year he published "Notes sur les registres de Notre-Dame de Québec", a second edition of which, revised and augmented, appeared in the "Foyer Canadien" for 1863. In 1855 he was appointed professor of Canadian history at the University of Laval (Quebec), and went at once to France to collect new documents to perfect him in his work. He returned in 1857, bringing with him valuable notes. The public courses which he delivered from 1858 to 1862 attracted large audiences, and his lectures, printed as "Cours d'Histoire du Canada", established Ferland's reputation. The first volume appeared in 1861; the second was not published till after the author's death in 1865. This work, written in a style at once simple and exact, is considered authoritative by competent judges. It is, however, incomplete, ending as it does with the conquest of Canada by the English (1759). Ferland aimed above all at establishing the actual facts of history. He desired also to make known the work of the Catholic missions. His judgments are correct and reliable. Ferland also published in the "Soirées Canadiennes" of 1863 the "Journal d'un voyage sur les côtes de la Gaspésie", and in "Littérature Canadienne" for 1863 an "Etude sur le Labrador", which had previously appeared in the "Annales de l'Association pour la Propagation de la Foi". For the "Foyer Canadien" of 1863 he wrote a "Vie de Mgr Plessis", Bishop of Quebec, translated later into English.

LÉGARE, *Notice biographique in Courrier du Canada*, 13 Jan., 1865; GÉRIN-LAJOLIE, *L'abbé J.-B.-A. Ferland in Foyer Canadien*, III (1865), I-XXII; ROYAL, *Cours d'histoire du Canada de Ferland; Revue Canadienne* (1864), IV, 552.

J. EDMOND ROY.

**Fermo**, ARCHDIOCESE OF (FIRMANA), in the province of Ascoli Piceno (Central Italy). The great antiquity of the episcopal city is attested by the remains of its cyclopean walls. It was the site of a Roman colony, established in 264 B. C., consisting of 6000 men. With the Pentapolis it passed in the eighth century under the authority of the Holy See and underwent thenceforth the vicissitudes of the March of Ancona. Under the predecessors of Honorius III the bishops of

the city became the counts, and later princes, of Fermo. In the contest between the Hohenstaufen and the papacy, Fermo was several times besieged and captured; in 1176 by Archbishop Christian of Mainz, in 1192 by Henry VI, in 1208 by Marquard, Duke of Ravenna, in 1241 by Frederick II, in 1245 by Manfred. After this it was governed by different lords, who ruled as more or less legitimate vassals of the Holy See, e. g. the Monteverdi, Giovanni Visconti, and



THE CATHEDRAL, FERMO, XII CENTURY

Francesco Sforza (banished 1446), Oliverotto Uffreducci (murdered in 1503 by Caesar Borgia), who was succeeded by his son Ludovico, killed at the battle of Monte Giorgio in 1520, when Fermo became again directly subject to the Holy See. Boniface VIII (1294-1303) established a university there. Fermo is the birthplace of the celebrated poet, Annibale Caro.

Local legend attributes the first preaching of the Gospel at Fermo to Sts. Apollinaris and Maro. The martyrdom of its bishop, St. Alexander, with seventy companions, is placed in the persecution of Decius (250), and the martyrdom of St. Philip under Aurelian (270-75). Among the noteworthy bishops are: Passinus, the recipient of four letters from Gregory III; Cardinal Domenico Capranica (1426); Sigismondo Zanettini (1584), under whom Fermo was made the seat of an archdiocese; Giambattista Rinuccini, nuncio in Ireland; and Alessandro Borgia. The suffragans of Fermo are Macerata-Tolentino, Montalto, Ripatransone, and San Severino. The archdiocese has (1908) a population of 185,000; 147 parishes; 368 secular priests and 86 regular; 2 male and 5 female educational institutions; 6 religious houses of men and 50 of women; and a Catholic weekly, the "Voce delle Marche".

CAPPILLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), II; NAPOLETTANI, *Fermo nel Pierno* (Rome, 1907); CATALANI, *De Ecclesiâ Firmanâ ejusque episcopis* (Fermo, 1783).

U. BENIGNI.

**Fernández, ANTONIO**, Jesuit missionary; b. at Lisbon, c. 1569; d. at Goa, 12 November, 1642. About 1602 he was sent to India, whence two years later he

went to Abyssinia, where he soon won favour with King Melek Seghed. This monarch, converted to the Faith in 1622, after the arrival of the Latin patriarch, for whom he had petitioned the Holy See, publicly acknowledged the primacy of the Roman See and constituted Catholicism the State religion (1626). For a time innumerable conversions were made, the monarch in his zeal resorting even to compulsory measures. The emperor's son, however, took sides with the schismatics, headed a rebellion, seized his father's throne, and reinstalled the former faith, proscribing the Catholic religion under the penalty of death. The missionaries, on their expulsion, found a temporary protector in one of the petty princes of the country, by whom, however, they were soon abandoned. Those who reached the port of Massowah were held for a ransom. Father Fernández, then over eighty years of age, was one of those detained as hostage, but a younger companion persuaded the pasha to substitute him, and Father Fernández was allowed to return to India, where he ended his days. On his missions for the king Father Fernández had traversed vast tracts of hitherto unexplored territory. He translated various liturgical books into Ethiopian, and was the author of ascetical and polemical works against the heresies prevalent in Ethiopia.

MIGNÉ, *Dict. des missions catholiques*, BREMER in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v.

F. M. RUDGE.

**Fernández, JUAN**, Jesuit lay brother and missionary; b. at Cordova; d. 12 June, 1567, in Japan. In a letter from Malacca, dated 20 June, 1549, St. Francis Xavier begs the prayers of the Goa brethren for those about to start on the Japanese mission, mentioning among them Juan Fernández, a lay brother. On their arrival in Japan Juan rendered active service in the work of evangelizing. In September, 1550, he accompanied St. Francis to Firando (Hirado), thence to Amanguchi (Yamaguchi), and on to Miako (Saikio), a difficult journey, from which they returned to Amanguchi, where he was left with Father Cosmo Torres in charge of the Christians, when Francis started for China. There is still in the records of the Jesuit college at Coimbra a lengthy document professed to be the translation of an account rendered St. Francis by Fernández of a controversy with the Japanese on such questions as the nature of God, creation, the nature and immortality of the soul. The success of Brother Fernández on this occasion in refuting his Japanese adversaries resulted in the ill will of the bonzes, who stirred up a rebellion against the local prince, who had become a Christian. The missionaries were concealed by the wife of one of the nobles until they were able to resume their work of preaching. St. Francis says in one of his letters: "Joam Fernández, though a simple layman, is most useful on account of the fluency of his acquaintance with the Japanese language and of the aptness and clearness with which he translates whatever Father Cosmo suggests to him." His humility under insults impressed all, and on one occasion resulted in the conversion of a brilliant young Japanese doctor, who later became a Jesuit and one of the shining lights in the Japanese Church. Brother Fernández compiled the first Japanese grammar and lexicon.

BREMER in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v.; COLERIDGE, *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier* (London, 1902), II.

F. M. RUDGE.

**Fernández de Palencia, DIEGO**, Spanish conqueror and historian; b. at Palencia in the early part of the sixteenth century. He took up a military career, and went to Peru shortly after the conquest (about 1545). In 1553 and 1554 he took part in the civil struggle among the Spaniards, fighting under the banner of Alonso de Alvarado, Captain-General of Los Charcos, against the rebel Francisco Hernández de Giron. In



1555 Hurtado de Mendoza, Marquess of Cañete, came to Peru as viceroy, and charged Fernández to write a history of the troubles in which he had just taken part. He then began his history of Peru, and later, when he had returned to Spain, upon the suggestion of Sandoval, President of the Council of the Indies, Fernández enlarged the scope of his work, and added to it a first part, dealing with the movements of Pizarro and his followers. The whole work was published under the title "Primera y segunda parte de la Historia del Peru" (Seville, 1571). Having taken part in many of the events, and known the men who figured in most of the scenes which he describes, Fernández may be regarded as an historian whose testimony is worth consideration. Garcilaso de la Vega, the Peruvian, who quotes long passages from Fernández, fiercely attacks his story and accuses him of partiality and of animosity against certain personages. Whatever the reason may have been, however, possibly because of the truth of the story, the fact is, that the Council of the Indies prohibited the printing and sale of the book in the provinces under its jurisdiction. A perusal of the book conveys the impression that Fernández was a man of sound judgment, who set down the facts only after a thorough investigation. The reproaches of the Inca historian may, therefore, be regarded as without foundation.

PRESCOTT, *History of the conquest of Peru* (Philadelphia, 1882).  
VENTURA FUENTES.



RUINS OF SELSKAR (ST. SEPULCHRE) PRIORY, WEXFORD

of St. Mullins (*Teach Moling*), County Carlow. The ancient monastery of Ferns included a number of cells, or oratories, and the cathedral was built in the Irish style. At present the remains of the abbey (refounded for Austin Canons, in 1160, by Dermot MacMurrough) include a round tower, about seventy-five feet high, in two stories, the lower of which is quadrangular, and the upper polygonal. Close by is the Holy Well of St. Mogue.

Ferns was raided by the Scandinavians in 834, 836, 839, 842, 917, 920, 928, and 930, and was burned in 937. St. Peter's Church, Ferns, dates from about the year 1060, and is of the Hiberno-Romanesque style, having been built by Bishop O'Lynam, who died in 1062. The bishops were indifferently styled as of Ferns, Hy Kinsellagh, or Wexford; thus, Maeleoin O'Donegan (d. 1125) is called "Bishop of Wexford", while Bishop O'Cathan (d. 1135) is named "Archbishop of Hy Kinsellagh". This was by reason of the fact that the bound-

aries of the diocese are coextensive with the territory of Hy Kinsellagh, on which account Ferns includes County Wexford with small portions of Wicklow and Carlow. Dermot MacMurrough, King of Leinster, burned the city of Ferns in 1166, "for fear that the Connacht men would destroy his castle and his house", and, three years later, he brought over a pioneer force of Welshmen. He died in 1171, and, at his own request, was buried "near the shrines of St. Maedhog and St. Moling". The same year Henry II of England landed in Ireland, where he remained for six months.

Ailbe O'Molloy, a Cistercian, who ruled from 1185 to

**Ferns, DIOCESE OF (FERNENSIS)**, in the province of Leinster (Ireland), suffragan of Dublin. It was

founded by St. Aedan, whose name is popularly known as Moedhog, or "My dear little Aedh", in 598. Subsequently, St. Aedan was given a quasi-supremacy over the other bishops of Leinster, with the title of Ard-Escop, or chief bishop, on which account he and some of his successors have been regarded as having archiepiscopal powers. The old annalists style the see Fearnam-moedhog, that is, "the great plain of the alder-trees of St. Moedhog". Even yet Moedhog (Mogue)—the Irish endearing form of Aedan—is a familiar Christian name in the diocese, while it is also perpetuated in Tubbermogue, Bovlavogue, Cromogue, Island Mogue, etc. The bell and shrine of St. Aedan (*Breacc Maedog*) are to be seen in the National Museum, Dublin. Many of his successors find a place in Irish martyrologies, including St. Mochua, St. Moling and St. Cillene. Of these the most famous is St. Moling, who died 13 May, 697. His book-shrine is among the greatest art treasures of Ireland, and his "well" is still visited, but he is best known as patron



RUINS OF FERNS ABBEY

1222, was the last Irish bishop in the pre-Reformation history of Ferns. He attended the Fourth General Council of Lateran (1215) and, on his return, formed a cathedral chapter. His successor, Bishop St. John, was granted by Henry III (6 July, 1226) a weekly market at Ferns and an annual fair, also a weekly market at Enniscorthy. This bishop (8 April, 1227) assigned the manor of Enniscorthy to Philip de Prendergast, who built a castle, still in excellent preservation. In exchange, he acquired six plough-lands forever for the See of Ferns. He held a synod at Selskar (St. Sepulchre) Priory, Wexford (8 September, 1240). The appointment of a dean was confirmed by Clement IV (23 August, 1265). Bishop St. John rebuilt the cathedral of Ferns, which from recent discoveries seems to have been 180 feet in length, with a crypt. A fine stone statue of St. Aedan, evidently early Norman work, is still preserved. In 1346 the castle of Ferns was made a royal appanage, and constables were appointed by the Crown, but it was recovered by Art

1222, was the last Irish bishop in the pre-Reformation history of Ferns. He attended the Fourth General Council of Lateran (1215) and, on his return, formed a cathedral chapter. His successor, Bishop St. John, was granted by Henry III (6 July, 1226) a weekly market at Ferns and an annual fair, also a weekly market at Enniscorthy. This bishop (8 April, 1227) assigned the manor of Enniscorthy to Philip de Prendergast, who built a castle, still in excellent preservation. In ex-

MacMurrough in 1386. Patrick Barret, who ruled from 1400 to 1415, removed the episcopal chair of Ferns to New Ross, and made St. Mary's his cathedral. His successor, Robert Whitty, had an episcopate of forty years, dying in February, 1458. Under John Purcell (1459-1479), Franciscan friars acquired a foundation in Enniscorthy, which was dedicated 18 October, 1460. Lawrence Neville (1479-1503) attended a provincial council at Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, on 5 March, 1495. His successor, Edmund Comerford, died in 1509, whereupon Nicholas Comyn was elected. Bishop Comyn resided at Fethard Castle, and assisted at the provincial councils of 1512 and 1518. He was transferred to Waterford and Lismore in 1519, and was replaced by John Purcell, whose troubled episcopate ended on 20 July, 1539. Though schismatically consecrated, Alexander Devereux was rehabilitated under Queen Mary as Bishop of Ferns, and died at Fethard Castle on 6 July, 1566—the last pre-Reformation bishop. Peter Power was appointed his successor in 1582, but the temporalities of the see were held by John Devereux. Bishop Power died a confessor, in exile, 15 December, 1588. Owing to the disturbed state of the diocese and the lack of revenue, no bishop was provided till 19 April, 1624, but meantime Father Daniel O'Drohan, who had to adopt the *alias* of "James Walshe", acted as vicar Apostolic (1606-1624). John Roche was succeeded by another John Roche, 6 February, 1644, who never entered on possession, the see being administered by William Devereux from 1636 to 1644. Dr. Devereux was an able administrator at a trying period, and he wrote an English catechism, which was used in the diocese until a few years ago. Nicholas French was made Bishop of Ferns 15 September, 1644, and died in exile at Ghent, 23 August, 1679. His episcopate was a remarkable one, and he himself was a most distinguished prelate. Bishop Wadding (1678-1691) wrote some charming Christmas carols, which are still sung in Wexford. His successors, Michael Rossiter (1695-1709), John Verdon (1709-1729), and the Franciscan Ambrose O'Callaghan (1729-1744), experienced the full brunt of the penal laws. Nicholas Sweetman (1745-1786) was twice imprisoned on suspicion of "disloyalty", while James Caulfield (1786-1814) was destined to outlive the "rebellion" of '98. One of the Ferns priests, Father James Dixon, who was transported as a "felon", was the first Prefect Apostolic of Australia. All the post-Reformation bishops lived mostly at Wexford until 1809, in which year Dr. Ryan, coadjutor bishop, commenced the building of a cathedral in Enniscorthy, which had been assigned him as a mensal parish. As Bishop Caulfield was an invalid from the year 1809 the diocese was administered by Dr. Ryan, who, with the permission of the Holy See, transferred the episcopal residence to Enniscorthy. Bishop Ryan died 9 March, 1819, and was buried in the cathedral. His successor, James Keating (1819-1849), ruled for thirty years, and commenced building the present cathedral, designed by Pugin. Myles Murphy (1850-1856) and Thomas Furlong (1857-1875) did much for the diocese, while Michael Warren (1875-1884) is still lovingly remembered.

From an interesting *Relatio* forwarded to the Propaganda by Bishop Caulfield in 1796, the Diocese of Ferns is described as 38 miles in length and 20 in breadth, with eight borough towns, and a chapter of nineteen members. In pre-Reformation days it had 143 parishes; 17 monasteries of Canons Regular of St. Augustine; 3 priories of Knights Templars; 2 Cistercian abbeys; 3 Franciscan friaries; 2 Austin friaries; 1 Carmelite friary, and 1 Benedictine priory. It never had a nunnery nor a Dominican friary. (The Jesuits had a flourishing college in New Ross in 1675.) The population was 120,000, of which 114,000 were Catholics, and there were 80 priests, including regulars. There were 36 parishes, many of which had no curates.

At present (1909), the population is 108,750, of which 99,000 are Catholics. There are 41 parishes, two of which (Wexford and Enniscorthy) are mensal. The parish priests are 39 and the curates are 66, while the churches number 92. The religious orders include Franciscans (one house), Augustinians (two houses), and Benedictines (one house). The total clergy are 140. In addition, there are 14 convents for religious women, and a House of Missions (Superior Father John Rossiter), as also 6 Christian Brothers schools, a diocesan college, a Benedictine college, and several good schools for female pupils. Enniscorthy cathedral was not completed until 1875, and the interior was not completely finished till 1908. Most Rev. Dr. James Browne was consecrated Bishop of Ferns 14 September, 1884. He was born at Mayglass, County Wexford in 1842, finished his studies at Maynooth College, where he was ordained in 1865, and served for nineteen years as curate and parish priest with conspicuous ability.


COLGAN, *Acta Sanct. Hib.* (Louvain, 1648); BRENNAN, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1840); ROTHE, *Analecta*, ed. MORAN (Dublin, 1884); WARE, *Bishops of Ireland*, ed. HARRIS (Dublin, 1739); RENEHAN, *Collections on Irish Church History*, ed. MCCARTHY (Dublin, 1874); II, GRATAN-FLOOD, *Hist. of Enniscorthy* (Enniscorthy, 1898); IDEM, *The Episcopal City of Ferns in Irish Eccl. Record*, II, no. 358; IV, no. 368; VI, no. 380; BASSET, *Wexford* (Dublin, 1885).

W. H. GRATAN-FLOOD.

**Ferrandus.** See FULGENTIUS FERRANDUS.

**Ferrara**, ARCHDIOCESE OF (FERRARIENSIS), immediately subject to the Holy See. The city, which is the capital of the similarly named province, stands on the banks of the Po di Volano, where it branches off to form the Po di Primaro, in the heart of a rich agricultural district. The origin of Ferrara is doubtful. No mention is made of it before the eighth century. Until the tenth century it followed the fortunes of Ravenna. In 986 it was given as a papal fief to Tedaldo, Count of Canossa, the grandfather of Countess Matilda against whom it rebelled in 1101. From 1115 it was directly under the pope, though often claimed by the emperors. During this period arose the commune of Ferrara. Gradually the Salinueria family became all-powerful in the city. They were expelled in 1208 for their fidelity to the emperor, whereupon the citizens offered the governorship to Azzo VI d'Este, whose successors kept it, as lieges of the pope, until 1598, with the exception of the brief period from 1313 to 1317, when it was leased to the King of Sicily for an annual tribute. Alfonso I d'Este, hoping to cast off the overlordship of the pope, kept up relations with Louis XII of France long after the League of Cambrai (1508) had been dissolved. In 1510 Julius II attempted in person to bring him back to a sense of duty, but was not successful. In 1519 Leo X tried to capture the town by surprise, but he too failed; in 1522, however, Alfonso of his own accord made his peace with Adrian VI. In 1597 Alfonso II died without issue and named his cousin Cesare as his heir. Clement VIII refused to recognize him and sent to Ferrara his own nephew, Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, who in 1598 brought the town directly under papal rule. In 1796 it was occupied by the French, and became the chief town of the Bas-Po. In 1815 it was given back to the Holy See, which governed it by a legate with the aid of an Austrian garrison. In 1831 it proclaimed a provisional government, but the Austrian troops restored the previous civil conditions, which lasted until 1859, when the territory was annexed to the Kingdom of Italy.

The dukes of Ferrara, especially Alfonso I (1505-1534) and Alfonso II (1559-1597), were generous patrons of literature and the arts. At their court lived Tasso, Ariosto, Boiardo, V. Strozzi, G. B. Guarini, the historian Guido Bentivoglio, and others. It counted many artists of renown, whose works adorn even yet the churches and palaces of the city, e. g. the ducal palace,



CATHEDRAL, FERRARA—XII AND XV CENTURY



the Schifanoia, Diamanti, Rovella, Scrofa-Calcegnini, and other palaces. The more famous among the painters were Benvenuto Tisi (Garofalo), Ercole Grandi, Ippolito Scarsello, the brothers Dossi, and Girolamo da Carpi. Alfonso Cittadella, the sculptor, left immortal works in the duomo, or cathedral (Christ and the Apostles), and in San Giovanni (Madonna). Churches of note are the cathedral, SS. Benedetto and Francesco, San Domenico (with its beautiful carved choir stalls of the fourteenth century). The most famous work of ecclesiastical architecture is the magnificent Certosa. The university was founded in 1391 by Boniface IX. Ferrara was the birthplace of Savonarola and of the great theologian, Silvestro di Ferrara, both Dominicans.

The earliest bishop of certain date is Constantine, present at Rome in 861; St. Maurelius (patron of the city) must have lived before this time. Some think that the bishops of Ferrara are the successors to those of Vigonza (the ancient Vicuhabentia). Other bishops of note are Filippo Fontana (1243), to whom Innocent IV entrusted the task of inducing the German princes to depose Frederick II; Blessed Alberto Pandonni (1261) and Blessed Giovanni di Tossignano (1431); the two Ippolito d'Este (1520 and 1550) and Luigi d'Este (1553), all three munificent patrons of learning and the arts; Alfonso Rossetti (1563), Paolo Leoni (1579), Giovanni Fontana (1590), and Lorenzo Magalotti (1628), all four of whom eagerly supported the reforms of the Council of Trent; finally, the saintly Cardinal Carlo Odescalchi (1823). Up to 1717 the Archbishop of Ravenna claimed metropolitan rights over Ferrara; in 1735 Clement XII raised the see to archiepiscopal rank, without suffragans. It has 89 parishes and numbers 130,752 souls; there are two educational institutions for boys and six for girls, nine religious houses of men and nineteen of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1846), IV, 9-11, 24-226; FRIZZI, *Memorie per la Storia di Ferrara* (Ferrara, 1791); AGNELLI, *Ferrara in Italia Artistica* (Bergamo, 1902).

**COUNCIL OF FERRARA.**—When Salonic (Thessalonica) fell into the hands of the Turks (1429) the Emperor John Palæologus approached Martin V, Eugene IV, and the Council of Basle to secure help against the Turks and to convoke a council for the reunion of the two Churches, as the only means of efficaciously resisting Islam. At first it was proposed to hold the council in some seaport town of Italy; then Constantinople was suggested. The members of the Council of Basle held out for Basle or Avignon. Finally (18 September, 1437), Eugene IV decided that the council would be held at Ferrara, that city being acceptable to the Greeks. The council was opened 8 January, 1438, by Cardinal Nicolò Albergati, and the pope attended on 27 January. The synodal officers were divided into three classes: (1) the cardinals, archbishops, and bishops; (2) the abbots and prelates; (3) doctors of theology and canon law. Before the arrival of the Greeks, proclamation was made that all further action by the Council of Basle as such would be null and void. The Greeks, i. e. the emperor with a train of archbishops, bishops, and learned men (700 in all), landed at Venice 8 February and were cordially received and welcomed in the pope's name by Ambrogio Traversari, the General of the Camaldolese. On 4 March the emperor entered Ferrara. The Greek bishops came a little later. Questions of precedence and ceremonial caused no small difficulty. For preparatory discussions on all controverted points a committee of ten from either side was appointed. Among them were Marcus Eugenicius, Archbishop of Ephesus; Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicæa; Balsamon; Siropolos and others, for the Greeks; while Cardinals Giuliano Cesarini and Nicolò Albergati, Giovanni Turrecremata, and others represented the Latins. The Greek Emperor prevented a discussion on the Procession of the Holy Spirit and on the use of leavened bread. For months

the only thing discussed or written about was the ecclesiastical teaching on purgatory. The uncertainty of the Greeks on this head was the cause of the delay. The emperor's object was to bring about a general union without any concessions on the part of the Greeks in matters of doctrine. Everybody deplored the delay, and a few of the Greeks, among them Marcus Eugenicius, attempted to depart secretly, but they were obliged to return.

The sessions began 8 October, and from the opening of the third session the question of the Procession of the Holy Spirit was constantly before the council. Marcus Eugenicius blamed the Latins for having added the "Filioque" to the Nicene Creed despite the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus (431). The chief speakers on behalf of the Latins were Andrew, Bishop of Rhodes, and Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, who pointed out that the addition was dogmatically correct and not at all contrary to the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus, nor to the teaching of the Greek Fathers. Bessarion admitted the orthodoxy of the "Filioque" teaching, but maintained it ought not to have been added to the Creed. Twelve sessions were (III-XV) taken up with this controversy. On both sides many saw no hope of an agreement, and once more many Greeks were eager to return home. Finally the emperor permitted his followers to proceed to the discussion of the orthodoxy of the "Filioque". In the meantime the people of Florence had invited the pope to accept for himself and the council the hospitality of their city. They hoped in this way to reap great financial profit. The offer was accompanied by a large gift of money. Eugene IV, already at a loss for funds and obliged to furnish hospitality and money to the Greeks (who had come to Italy in the pope's own fleet), gladly accepted the offer of the Florentines. The Greeks on their part agreed to the change. The council thus quitted Ferrara without having accomplished anything, principally because the emperor and Marcus Eugenicius did not wish to reach an agreement in matters of doctrine. (See FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.)

MANSI, *Coll. Conc.*, XXIX; HARDUIN, *Coll. Conc.*, IX; HEFELÉ, *Koncilien-geschichte* (2nd ed.), VII; CECCONI, *Studi storici sul concilio di Firenze* (Florence, 1869).

U. BENIGNI.

**Ferrari, BARTHELEMY, VENERABLE.** See BARNABITES.

**Ferrari, GAUDENZIO**, an Italian painter and the greatest master of the Piedmontese School, b. at Valduggia, near Novara, Italy, c. 1470; d. at Milan, 31 January, 1546. His work is vast but poorly known. He seems never to have left his beloved Piedmont or Lombardy save perhaps on one occasion. He had seen Leonardo at work in Milan (1490-98), and had learned from him lessons in expression and in modeling. But he owed more to his compatriots in the North: to Bramante and Bramantino in architectural details, above all to Mantegna, whose frescoes of the "Life of St. James" inspired more than one of his paintings at Varallo.

Nothing is more uncertain than the history of the great man. His earliest known works belong to the years 1508 and 1511; at that time he was about forty years of age. He would seem to have been formed in the good old Milanese school of such men as Borgognone, Zenale, and Butinone, which kept aloof from the brilliant fashion in art favoured by the court of the Sforzas, and which prolonged the fifteenth century with its archaisms of expression. Gaudenzio, the youngest and frankest of this group, never fell under the influence of Leonardo, and hence it is that on one point he always held out against the new spirit; he would never dally with the paganism or rationalism of Renaissance art. He was as passionately naturalistic as any painter of his time, before all else, however, he was a Christian artist. He is the only truly religious master of the Italian Renaissance, and this trait it is

which makes him stand out in an age where faith and single-mindedness were gradually disappearing, as a man of another country, almost of another time.

When we consider the works of Gaudenzio, more especially his earlier ones, in the light of the fact that the district in which he was born was in the direct line of communication between North and South; and reflect that what might be termed the "art traffic" between Germany and Italy was very great in his time, we are forced to recognize that German influence played a considerable part in the development of his genius, in so far at least as his mind was amenable to external stimuli. He is, in fact, the most German of the Italian painters. In the heart of a school where art was becoming more and more aristocratic, he remained the people's painter. In this respect his personality stands out so boldly amongst the Italian painters of the time that it seems natural to infer that Gaudenzio in his youth travelled to the banks of the Rhine, and bathed long and deep in its mystic atmosphere.

Like the Gothic masters, he is perhaps the only sixteenth-century painter who worked exclusively for churches or convents. He is the only one in Italy who painted lengthy sacred dramas and legends from the lives of the saints: a "Passion" at Varallo; a "Life of the Virgin", and a "Life of St. Magdalen", at Vercelli; and at times, after the fashion of the *cinquecento*, he grouped many different episodes in one scene, at the expense of unity in composition, till they resembled the mysteries, and might be styled "sectional paintings". He was not aiming at art, but at edification. Hence arose a certain negligence of form and a carelessness of execution still more pronounced. The "Carrying of the Cross" at Cannobio, the "Calvary" at Vercelli, the "Deposition" at Turin, works of great power in many ways, and unequalled at the time in Italy for pathos and feeling, are somehow wanting in proportion, and give one the impression that the conventional grouping has been departed from. The soul, being filled as it were with its object, is overpowered by the emotions; and the intellect confesses its inability to synthesize the images which rise tumultuously from an over-excited sensibility. Another consequence of this peculiarity of mental conformation is, perhaps, the abuse of the materials at his disposal. Gaudenzio never refrained from using doubtful methods, such as ornaments in relief, the use of gilded stucco worked into harness, armour, into the aureolas, etc. And to heighten the effect he does not even hesitate to make certain figures stand out in real, palpable relief; in fact some of his frescoes are as much sculpture as they are painting, by reason of this practice.

His history must always remain incomplete until we get further enlightenment concerning that strange movement of the Pietist preachers, which ended in establishing (1487-93) a great Franciscan centre on the Sacro Monte de Varallo. It was in this retreat that Gaudenzio spent the years which saw his genius come to full maturity; it was there he left his greatest works, his "Life of Christ" of 1513, in twenty-one frescoes at Santa Maria delle Grazie, and other works on the Sacro Monte dating between 1523 and 1528. It was there that the combined use of painting and sculpture produced a most curious result. Fresco is only used as an ornament, a sort of background to a scene presenting a *tableau vivant* of figures in terracotta. Some of the groups embrace no less than thirty figures. Forty chapels bring out in this way the principal scenes in the drama of the Incarnation. Gaudenzio is responsible for the chapels of the Magi, the Pietà, and the Calvary.

In his subsequent works, at Vercelli (1530-34) and at Saronno (in the cupola of Santa Maria dei Miracoli, 1535), the influence of Correggio is curiously blended with the above-mentioned German leanings. The freshness and vigour of his inspiration remain un-

touched in all their homely yet stern grace. The "Assumption" at Vercelli is perhaps the greatest lyric in Italian art; this lyric quality in his painting is still more intense in the wonderful "Glory of Angels", in the cupola at Saronno, the most enthusiastic and jubilant symphony that any art has ever produced. In all Correggio's art there is nothing more charming than the exquisite sentiment and tender rusticity of "The Flight into Egypt", in the cathedral of Como. The artist's latest works were those he executed at Milan, whither he retired in 1536. In these paintings, the creations of a man already seventy years of age, the vehemence of feeling sometimes becomes almost savage, the presentation of his ideas abrupt and apocalyptic. His method becomes colossal and more and more careless; but still in the "Passion" at Santa Maria delle Grazie (1542) we cannot fail to trace the hand of a master.

Gaudenzio was married at least twice. By his first marriage a son was born to him in 1509 and a daughter in 1512. He married, in 1528, Maria Mattia della Foppa who died about 1540, shortly after the death of his son. These sorrows doubtless affected the character of his later works. Gaudenzio's immediate influence was scarcely appreciable. His pupils Lanino and Della Cerva are extremely mediocre. Nevertheless when the day of Venice's triumph came with Tintoretto, and Bologna's with the Carraccis in the counter-reform movement, it was the art of Gaudenzio Ferrari that triumphed in them. The blend of Northern and Latin genius in his work, so characteristic of the artists of the Po valley, was carried into the ateliers of Bologna by Dionysius Calvaert. It became the fashion, displacing, as it was bound to do, the intellectual barrenness and artistic exoticism of the Florentine School.

LOMAZZO, *Idea del tempio della pittura* (Milan, 1584); IDEM, *Trattato dell' arte della pittura* (Milan, 1590); ZUCCARO, *Il passaggio per l'Italia con la dimora di Parma* (Bologna, 1668); BORDIGA, *Notizie intorno alle opere di G. Ferrari* (Milan, 1821); IDEM, *Guida al Sacro Monte di Varallo* (1851); COLOMBO, *Vita ed opere di G. Ferrari* (Turin, 1881); HALSEY, *Gaudenzio Ferrari* (London, 1903); DE WYZEWA, *Peintres italiens d'autrefois: Ecoles du Nord* (Paris, 1907).

LOUIS GILLET.

Ferraris, Lucius, an eighteenth-century canonist of the Franciscan Order. The exact dates of his birth and death are unknown, but he was born at Solero, near Alessandria in Northern Italy. He was also professor, provincial of his order, and consultor of the Holy Office. It would seem he died before 1763. He is the author of the "Prompta Bibliotheca canonica, juridica, moralis, theologica, necnon ascetica, polemica, rubricistica, historica," a veritable encyclopedia of religious knowledge. The first edition of this work appeared at Bologna, in 1746. A second edition, much enlarged, also a third, were published by the author himself. The fourth edition, dating from 1763, seems to have been published after his death. This, like those which followed it, contains the additions which the author had made to the second edition under the title of *additiones auctoris*, and also other enlargements (*additiones ex aliena manu*) inserted in their respective places in the body of the work (and no longer in the appendix as in the former editions) and supplements. The various editions thus differ from each other. The most recent are: that of the Benedictines (Naples, 1844-55), reproduced by Migne (Paris, 1861-1863), and an edition published at Paris in 1884. A new edition was published at Rome in 1899, at the press of the Propaganda in eight volumes, with a volume of supplements, edited by the Jesuit, Bucceroni, containing several dissertations and the most recent and important documents of the Holy See. This supplement serves to keep up to date the work of Ferraris, which will ever remain a precious mine of information, although it is sometimes possible to reproach the author with laxism.



SCHULTE, *Gesch. der Quel. und Lit. des can. Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1875-80), III, 531; VON SCHERER in *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 1380.  
A. VAN HOVE.

**Ferre, VICENTE**, theologian, b. at Valencia, Spain; d. at Salamanca in 1682. He entered the Dominican Order at Salamanca, where he pursued his studies in the Dominican College of St. Stephen. After teaching in several houses of study of his order in Spain, he was called from Burgos to Rome, where for eighteen years he was *regens primarius* of the Dominican College of St. Thomas ad Minervam. From Rome he went to Salamanca, where he became prior of the convent and, after three years, regent of studies. In his own time he was recognized as one of the best Thomists of the seventeenth century, and posterity acknowledges that his published works possess extraordinary fullness, clearness, and order. He died while publishing his commentaries on the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas. We have two folio volumes on the *Secunda Secundæ*, covering the treatises of faith, hope, and charity, and the opposite vices, published at Rome in 1669; three on the *Prima*, published at Salamanca, in 1675, 1676, and 1678 respectively; and three on the *Prima Secundæ*, down to Q. cxiii, published at Salamanca, 1679, 1681, and 1690. His confrère Pérez à Lerma added to Q. cxiv the treatise on merit.

QUÉTFE and ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 696; ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Hisp. Nova* (Madrid, 1783), II, 261.

A. L. McMAHON.

**Ferreira, ANTONIO**, poet, important both for his lyric and his dramatic compositions, b. at Lisbon, Portugal, in 1528; d. there of the plague in 1569. He studied law at Coimbra, where, however, he gave no less attention to belles-lettres than to legal codes, ardently reading the poetry of classic antiquity. Successful in his chosen profession, he became a judge of the Supreme Court at Lisbon, and enjoyed close relations with eminent personages of the court of John III. Ferreira stands apart from the great majority of the Portuguese poets of his time in that he never used Spanish, but wrote constantly in his native language. Yet he is to be classed with the reformers of literary taste, for, like Sá de Miranda, he abandoned the old native forms, to further the movement of the Renaissance. He manifested a decided interest in the Italian lyric measures, already given some elaboration by Sá de Miranda, and displayed some skill in the use of the hendecasyllable. The sonnet, the elegy, the idyll, the verse epistle, the ode, and kindred forms he cultivated with a certain felicity, revealing not only his study of the Italian Renaissance poets, but also a good acquaintance with the Greek and Latin masters.

It is by his dramatic endeavours that he attained to greatest prominence, for his tragedy "Ines de Castro", in particular, is regarded as one of the chief monuments of Portuguese literature. He began his work on the drama while still a student at Coimbra, writing there for his own amusement his first comedy, "Bristo", dealing with the old classic theme of lost children and later agnitions, which was so often utilized for the stage of the Renaissance and has been made familiar by Shakespeare. Much improvement in dramatic technique is evinced by his second comedy, "O Cioso", which treats realistically the figure of a jealous husband. It is considered as the earliest character-comedy in modern Europe. Written in prose, it exhibits a clever use of dialogue and has really comical scenes. None of the compositions of Ferreira appeared in print during his lifetime and the first edition of his two comedies is that of 1622. An English translation of the "Cioso" made by Musgrave was published in 1825. His tragedy, "Ines de Castro", imitates in its form the models of ancient Greek literature, and shows Italian influence in its use of blank verse, but it owes its subject-matter to native Portuguese history, concerning itself with the love of

King Pedro for the beautiful Ines de Castro, an incident which has also been splendidly treated by Camões in his "Lusiadas", and has furnished the theme for at least ten Portuguese and four Spanish plays, and over a score of compositions in foreign languages. If tested by the requirements of the theatre, the play is doubtless far from perfect, but the purity of its style and diction ensures its popularity with its author's compatriots. It was rendered into English by Musgrave in 1826. The rather free Spanish version of 1577 was made on the basis of a manuscript copy of the Portuguese original, for the first Portuguese printed edition is of 1587.

CASTILLO, *Antonio Ferreira, poeta quinhentista* (Rio de Janeiro, 3 vols., 1875); DI VASCONCILLOS in GROBLER, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (Straßburg, 1897, II, ii, 219; BRAGA in *Historia dos Quinhentistas* (Oporto, 1871).

J. D. M. FORD.

**Ferreol, SAINTS.** See BESANÇON; UZES.

**Ferrer, RAFAEL**, Spanish missionary and explorer; b. at Valencia, in 1570; d. at San José, Peru, in 1611. His father had destined him for a military career, but he entered the Society of Jesus, and in 1593 was sent to Quito, Ecuador. In 1601 he penetrated the territory of the Cofanis, a hostile tribe who had been a source of great trouble to the Spanish Government. Within three years the Indians of several villages were so civilized by the influence of religion that the surrounding country was open to colonists.

In 1605, at the command of the viceroy of Quito, Ferrer went among the uncivilized tribes of the River Napo. He was well received by the Indians, and on this journey, which lasted two and a half years, he travelled 3600 miles into the interior, bringing back with him a chart of the basin of the Napo, a map of the country he had explored, and an herbarium which he presented to the viceroy. He was appointed governor and chief magistrate of the Cofanis, and received the title of "Chief of the Missions of the Cofanis". After a period of rest at the mission he next journeyed northward from Quito through unexplored forests, and discovered a large lake and the River Pilcomago. In 1610 he returned to his labours among the Indians, bending his energies to the civilization of the few tribes of the Cofanis who were not yet within the range of his influence. He met his death at the hands of the chief of one of these tribes, whom he had compelled to abandon polygamy. The murderer was slain in turn by his tribesmen, who were enraged on learning of his deed. An extract from Father Ferrer's account of his explorations was published by Fr. Detré in the "Lettres Edifiantes", and the same extract was also published by Father Bernard de Bologne in the "Bibliotheca Societatis Jesu", but the original manuscript was lost and has never been published in its entirety. Besides compiling his "Arte de la Lengua Cofana," Father Ferrer translated the catechism and selections from the Gospels for every Sunday in the year into the language of the Cofanis.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

**Ferrer, VINCENT, SAINT.** See VINCENT FERRER, SAINT.

**Ferrières, ABBEY OF**, situated in the Diocese of Orléans, département of Loiret, and arrondissement of Montargis. The Benedictine Abbey of Ferrières-en-Gâtinais has been most unfortunate from the point of view of historical science, having lost its archives, its charters, and everything which would aid in the reconstruction of its history. Thus legend and credulity have had full play. But it is interesting to encounter in the work of an obscure Benedictine of the eighteenth century, Dom Philippe Mazoyer, information perhaps the most accurate and circumspect obtainable. According to Dom Mazoyer there was formerly at Ferrières a chapel dedicated to the Blessed Virgin under the title Notre-Dame de Beth-



lém de Ferrières. With regard to the foundation of the abbey, he thinks it cannot be traced beyond the reign of Dagobert (628-38), and he rightly regards as false the Acts of St. Savinian and the charter of Clovis, dated 508, despite the favourable opinion of Dom Morin. Some have based conjectures on the antiquity of portions of the church of Saint-Pierre et Saint-Paul de Ferrières, which they profess to trace back to the sixth century, but this is completely disproved by archaeological testimony. On the other hand the existence of the abbey about the year 630 seems certain, and rare documents, such as the diploma of Charles the Bald preserved in the archives of Orléans, bear witness to its prosperity. This prosperity reached its height in the time of the celebrated Loup (Lupus) of Ferrières (c. 850), when the abbey became a rather active literary centre. The library must have benefited thereby, but it shared the fate of the monastery, and is represented to-day by rare fragments. One of these, preserved at the Vatican library (Reg. 1573), recalls the memory of St. Aldric (d. 836), Abbot of Ferrières before he became Archbishop of Sens. There is here also a loosely arranged catalogue of some of the abbots of Ferrières between 887 and 987, which, imperfect though it is, serves to rectify and complete that of the "Gallia Christiana". Among the last names in the list of the abbots of Ferrières is that of Louis de Blanchefort, who in the fifteenth century almost entirely restored the abbey. Grievously tried during the wars of religion, Ferrières disappeared with all the ancient abbeys at the time of the French Revolution. Its treasures and library were wasted and scattered. To-day there are only to be seen some ruins of the ancient monastic buildings. At the time of the Concordat of 1802 and the ecclesiastical reorganization of France, Ferrières passed from the Archdiocese of Sens to the Diocese of Orléans.

CROCHET, *Origine miraculeuse et histoire de la chapelle de Notre-Dame de Bethléem, de Ferr. en Gât.* (Orléans, 1890); *Annales de la Soc. Hist. et Arch. du Gâtinais*, IX (1891), 155-56; *Gallia Christiana*, XII, 161-62; AUVRAY, *Deux manuscrits de Fleury-sur-Loire et de Ferrures conservés au Vatican en Annales de la Soc. Hist. et Arch. du Gâtinais*, VII (1889), 45-54; STEIN, *Lettre d'un bénédictin sur l'abbaye de Ferrures-Gâtinais*, *ibid.*, X (1892), 387-93; MORIN, *Discours des miracles faits en la chapelle de Notre-Dame de Bethléem* (Paris, 1605); MOREL, *La naissance miraculeuse de la chapelle de Bethléem en France* (Paris, 1610). H. LECLERCQ.

**Ferstel**, HEINRICH, FREIHERR VON, architect; with Hansen and Schmidt, the creator of modern Vienna; b. 7 July, 1828, at Vienna; d. at Grinzing, near Vienna, 14 July, 1883. His father was a bank-clerk. After wavering for some time between the different arts, all of which possessed a strong attraction for him, the talented youth finally decided on architecture, which he studied at the Academy under Van der Null, Siccardsburg, and Rösner. After several years during which he was in dispute because of his part in the Revolution, he entered the atelier of his uncle, Stache, where he worked at the votive altar for the chapel of St. Barbara in the cathedral of St. Stephen and co-operated in the restoration and construction of many castles, chiefly in Bohemia. Journeys of some length into Germany, Belgium, Holland, and England confirmed him in his tendency towards Romanticism. It was in Italy, however, where he was sent as a bursar in 1854, that he was converted to the Renaissance style of architecture. This was thenceforth his ideal, not because of its titanic grandeur, but because of its beauty and symmetrical harmony of proportion, realized pre-eminently in Bramante, his favourite master. He turned from the simplicity and restraint of the Late Renaissance to the use of polychromy by means of graffito decoration and terra-cotta. This device, adapted from the Early Renaissance and intended to convey a fuller sense of life, he employed later with marked success in the Austrian Museum.

While still in Italy he was awarded the prize in the


competition for the votive church (Votivkirche) of Vienna (1855) over seventy-four contestants, for the most part celebrated architects. In this masterpiece of modern ecclesiastical architecture he produced a structure of marvellous symmetry designed along strong architectural principles, with a simple, well-defined ground-plan, a harmonious correlation of details, and a sumptuous scheme of decoration (1856-79). After his death this edifice was proposed by Sykes as a model for the new Westminster cathedral in London. Another of Ferstel's monumental works belonging to the same period is the Austro-Hungarian bank in Vienna, in the style of the Early Italian Renaissance (1856-60). The expansion of the city of Vienna enabled Ferstel, with Eitelberger, to develop civic architecture along artistic lines (burgomaster's residence, stock exchange, 1859). At the same time he had also the opportunity of putting his ideas into practice in a number of private dwellings and villas at Brunn and Vienna.

The more important buildings designed during his later years, passing over the churches at Brunn and Schönau near Teplitz, really products of his earlier activity, are the palace of Archduke Ludwig Victor, his winter palace at Klessheim, the palace of Prince Johann Liechtenstein in the Rossau near Vienna, the palace of the Austro-Hungarian Lloyd's, at Trieste, but above all the Austrian Museum (completed in 1871), a masterpiece of interior economy of space with its imposing arcaded court. Next to his civic and ecclesiastical masterpieces comes the Vienna University, of masterly construction with wonderfully effective stairways (1871-84). Through a technical error his design for the Berlin Reichstag building received no award.

Ferstel is the most distinctively Viennese of all Viennese architects; able to give a structure beauty of design and harmony without prejudice to the purpose it was to subserve, and this because of his artistic versatility and inexhaustible imagination. These qualities also assured him success as a teacher, and were evident in his memoirs and numerous treatises, which are masterpieces of clearness. Special mention should be made of those which appeared in Förster's architectural magazine. In 1866 Ferstel was appointed professor at the Polytechnic School, in 1871 chief government inspector of public works and in 1879 was raised to the rank of Freiherr. At the time of his death he was still in the full vigour of his strength.

PECHT, *Deutsche Künstler des 19. Jahrhunderts*, III (Nordlingen, 1881), 140-70; FERSTEL, in *Allg. Deutsch. Biographie*, 48, 521 sqq.; LUTZOW in suppl. to *Zeitschrift f. Kunstwissenschaft*, XVIII, 658 sqq.; HEVESI, *Oesterreichische Kunst im 19. Jhd.* (Leipzig, 1903), II, 141 sqq. JOSEPH SAUER.

**Fesch**, JOSEPH, cardinal, b. at Ajaccio, Corsica, 3 January, 1763; d. at Rome, 13 May, 1839. He was the son of a captain of a Swiss regiment in the service of Genoa, studied at the seminary of Aix, was made archdeacon and provost of the chapter of Ajaccio before 1789, but was obliged to leave Corsica when his family sided with France against the English, who came to the island in answer to Paoli's summons. The young priest was half-brother to Letizia Ramolino, the mother of Napoleon I and upon arriving in France he entered the commissariat department of the army; later, in 1795, became commissary of war under Bonaparte, then in command of the Armée d'Italie. When religious peace was re-established, Fesch made a month's retreat under the direction of Emery, the superior of Saint-Sulpice and re-entered ecclesiastical life. During the Consulate he became canon of Bastia and helped to negotiate the Concordat of 1801; on 15 August, 1802, Caprara consecrated him Archbishop of Lyons, and in 1803 Pius VII created him cardinal.



VOTIVKIRCHE, VIENNA  
DESIGNED BY HEINRICH FREIHERR VON FERSTEL



On 4 April, 1803, Napoleon appointed Cardinal Fesch successor to Cacault as ambassador to Rome, giving him Châteaubriand for secretary. The early part of his sojourn in the Eternal City was noted for his differences with Châteaubriand and his efforts to have the Concordat extended to the Italian Republic. He prevailed upon Pius VII to go to Paris in person and crown Napoleon. This was Fesch's greatest achievement. He accompanied the pope to France and, as grand almoner, blessed the marriage of Napoleon and Josephine before the coronation ceremony took place. By a decree issued in 1805, the missionary institutions of Saint-Lazare and Saint-Sulpice were placed under the direction of Cardinal Fesch, who, laden with this new responsibility, returned to Rome. In 1806, after the occupation of Ancona by French troops, and Napoleon's letter proclaiming himself



JOSEPH CARDINAL FESCH

Emperor of Rome, Alquier was named to succeed Fesch as ambassador to Rome. Returning to his archiepiscopal See of Lyons, the cardinal remained in close touch with his nephew's religious policy and strove, occasionally with success, to obviate certain irreparable mistakes. He accepted the coadjutorship to Dalberg, prince-primate, in the See of Ratisbon, but, in 1808, refused the emperor's offer of the Archbishopric of Paris, for which he could not have obtained canonical institution. Although powerless to prevent either the rupture between Napoleon and the pope in 1809 or the closing of the seminaries of Saint-Lazare, Saint-Esprit, and the Missions Etrangères, Fesch nevertheless managed to deter Napoleon from signing a decree relative to the independence of the Gallican Church. He consented to bless Napoleon's marriage with Marie-Louise, but, according to the researches of Geoffroy de Grandmaison, he was not responsible to the same extent as the members of the diocesan *officialité* for the illegal annulment of the emperor's first marriage.

In 1809 and 1810 Fesch presided over the two ecclesiastical commissions charged with the question of canonical institution of bishops, but the proceedings were so conducted that neither commission adopted any schismatic resolutions. As its president, he opened the National Council of 1811, but at the very outset he took and also administered the oath (*forma juramenti professionis fidei*) required by the Bull "Injunctum nobis" of Pius IV; it was decided by eight votes out of eleven that the method of canonical institution could not be altered independently of the pope. A message containing the assurance of the cardinal's loyalty, and addressed to the supreme pontiff, then in exile at Fontainebleau, caused Fesch to incur the emperor's disfavor and to forfeit the subsidy of 150,000 florins which he had received as Dalberg's coadjutor. Under the Restoration and the Monarchy of July, Fesch lived at Rome, his Archdiocese of Lyons being in charge of an administrator. He died without again returning to France and left a splendid collection of pictures, a part of which was bequeathed to his episcopal city.

As a diplomat, Fesch sometimes employed questionable methods. His relationship to the emperor

and his cardinalitial dignity often made his position a difficult one; at least he could never be accused of approving the violent measures resorted to by Napoleon. As archbishop, he was largely instrumental in re-establishing the Brothers of Christian Doctrine and recalling the Jesuits, under the name of Pacanarists. The Archdiocese of Lyons is indebted to him for some eminently useful institutions. It must be admitted, moreover, that in his pastoral capacity Fesch took a genuine interest in the education of priests.

LYONNET, *Le cardinal Fesch, archevêque de Lyon, primate des Gaules* (Paris, 1841); CATTET, *La vérité sur le cardinal Fesch* (Lyons, 1842); ID., *Défense de la vérité sur le cardinal Fesch et sur l'administration apostolique de Lyon* (Lyons, 1843); RICARD, *Le cardinal Fesch* (Paris, 1893); GRANDMAISON, *Napoléon et les cardinaux noirs* (Paris, 1898).

GEORGES GOYAT.

**Fessler, JOSEF**, Bishop of St. Polten in Austria, and secretary of the Vatican Council; b. 2 December, 1813, at Lochau near Bregenz in the Vorarlberg; d. 25 April, 1872. His parents were peasants. He early showed great abilities. His classical studies were done at Feldkirch, his philosophy at Innsbruck, including a year of legal studies, and his theology at Brixen. He was ordained priest in 1837, and, after a year as master in a school at Innsbruck, studied for two more years in Vienna. He then became professor of ecclesiastical history and canon law in the theological school at Brixen, 1841-52. He published at the request of the Episcopal Conference of Würzburg, in 1848, a useful little book "Ueber die Provincial-Concilien und Diöcesan-Synoden" (Innsbruck, 1849), and in 1850-1 the well-known "Institutiones Patrologiæ, quas ad frequentiore utiorem et faciliorem SS. Patrum lectionem promovendam concinnavit J. Fessler" (Innsbruck, 2 vols., 8vo). This excellent work superseded the unfinished books of Mohler and Permander, and was not surpassed by the subsequent works of Alzog and Nirschl. In its new edition by the late Prof. Jungmann of Louvain (Innsbruck, 1890-6), it is still of great value to the student, in spite of the newer information given by Bardenhewer. From 1856 to 1861 Fessler was professor of canon law in the University of Vienna, after making special studies for six months at Rome. He was consecrated as assistant bishop to the Bishop of Brixen, Dr. Gasser, on 31 March, 1862, and became his vicar-general for the Vorarlberg. On 23 Sept., 1864, he was named by the emperor Bishop of St. Polten, not far from Vienna. When at Rome in 1867 he was named assistant at the papal throne. In 1869 Pope Pius IX proposed Bishop Fessler to the Congregation for the direction of the coming Vatican Council as secretary to the council. The appointment was well received, the only objection being from Cardinal Caterini who thought the choice of an Austrian might make the other nations jealous. Bishop Fessler was informed of his appointment on 27 March, and as the pope wished him to come with all speed to Rome, he arrived there on 8 July, after hastily dispatching the business of his diocese. He had a pro-secretary and two assistants. It was certainly wise to choose a prelate whose vast and intimate acquaintance with the Fathers and with ecclesiastical history was equalled only by his thorough knowledge of canon law. He seems to have given universal satisfaction by his work as secretary, but the burden was a heavy one, and in spite of his excellent constitution his untiring labours were thought to have been the cause of his early death. Before the council he published an opportune work "Das letzte und das nächste allgemeine Konzil" (Freiburg, 1869), and after the council he replied in a masterly brochure to the attack on the council by Dr. Schulte, professor of canon law and German law at Prague. Dr. Schulte's pamphlet on the power of the Roman popes over princes, countries, peoples, and individuals, in the light of their acts since the reign of Gregory VII, was very similar in character

to the Vaticanism pamphlet of Mr. Gladstone, and rested on just the same fundamental misunderstanding of the dogma of Papal Infallibility as defined by the Vatican Council. The Prussian Government promptly appointed Dr. Schulte to a professorship at Bonn, while it imprisoned Catholic priests and bishops. Fessler's reply, "Die wahre und die falsche Unfehlbarkeit der Papste" (Vienna, 1871), was translated into French by Cosquin, editor of "Le Français", and into English by Father Ambrose St. John, of the Birmingham Oratory (The true and false Infallibility of the Popes, London, 1875). It is still an exceedingly valuable explanation of the true doctrine of Infallibility as taught by the great Italian "Ultramontane" theologians, such as Bellarmine in the sixteenth century, P. Ballerini in the eighteenth, and Perrone in the nineteenth. But it was difficult for those who had been fighting against the definition to realize that the "Infallibilists" had wanted no more than this. Bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, who had strongly opposed the definition, and afterwards loyally accepted it, said he entirely agreed with the moderate view taken by Bishop Fessler, but doubted whether such views would be accepted as sound in Rome. It was clear, one would have thought, that the secretary of the council was likely to know; and the hesitations of the pious and learned Hefele were removed by the warm Brief of approbation which Pius IX addressed to the author.

ANTON ERDINGER, *Dr. Joseph Fessler, Bischof v. St. Pollen, ein Lebensbild* (Brünn, 1874); MITTERRUTZNER in *Kirchenzeitung*: GRANFERTH AND KIRCH, *Geschichte des Vaticanischen Konzils* (Freiburg im Br., 2 vols., 1903).

JOHN CHAPMAN.

**Feti**, DOMENICO, an Italian painter; b. at Rome, 1589; d. at Venice, 1624. He was a pupil of Cigoli (Ludovico Cardì, 1539-1613), or at least was much influenced by this master during his sojourn in Rome. From the end of the sixteenth century Rome again became what she had ceased to be after the sack of 1527, the metropolis of the beautiful. The jubilee of the year 1600 marked the triumph of the papacy. Art, seeking its pole now at Parma, now at Venice, now at Bologna, turning towards Rome, concentrated itself there. Crowds of artists flocked thither. This was the period in which were produced the masterpieces of the Carracci, Caravaggio, Domenichino, Guido, not counting those of many cosmopolitan artists, such as the brothers Bril, Elsheimer, etc., and between 1600 and 1610 Rubens, the great master of the century, paid three visits to Rome. This exceptional period was that of Domenico's apprenticeship; the labour, the unique fermentation in the world of art, resulted, as is well known, in the creation of an art which in its essential characteristics became for more than a century that of all Europe. For the old local and provincial schools (Florentine, Umbrian, etc.) Rome had the privilege of substituting a new one which was characterized by its universality. Out of a mixture of so many idioms and dialects she evolved an international language, the style which is called baroque. The discredit thrown on this school should not lead us to ignore its grandeur. In reality, the reorganization of modern painting dates from it.

Domenico is one of the most interesting types of this great evolution. Eclecticism, the fusion of divers characteristics of Correggio, Barrochi, Veronese, was already apparent in the work of Cigoli. To these Feti added much of the naturalism of Caravaggio. From him he borrowed his vulgar types, his powerful mobs, his Bohemians, his beggars in heroic rags. From him also he borrowed his violent illuminations, his novel and sometimes fantastic portrayal of the picturesque, his rare lights and strong shadows, his famous chiaroscuro, which, nevertheless, he endeavoured to develop into full daylight and the diffuse atmosphere of out-of-doors. He did not have time to succeed completely in this. His colouring is often dim, crude,

and faded, though at times it assumes a golden patina and seems to solve the problem of conveying mysterious atmospheric effects.

At an early age Domenico went to Mantua with Cardinal Gonzaga, later Duke of Mantua, to whom he became court painter (hence his surname of Mantovano), and he felt the transient influence of Giulio Romano. His frescoes in the cathedral, however, are the least characteristic and the feeblest of his works. Domenico was not a good frescoist. Like all modern painters he made use of oils too frequently. By degrees he abandoned his decorative ambitions. He painted few altar-pieces, preference leading him to execute easel pictures. For the most part these dealt with religious subjects, but conceived in an intimate manner for private devotion. Scarcely any of his themes were historical, and few taken from among those, such as the Nativity, Calvary, or the entombment, which had been presented so often by painters. He preferred subjects more human and less dogmatic, more in touch with daily life, romance, and poetry. He drew by preference from the parables, as in "The Labourers in the Vineyard", "The Lost Coin" (Pitti Palace, Florence), "The Good Samaritan", "The Return of the Prodigal Son" (and others at the Museum of Dresden). Again he chose picturesque scenes from the Bible, such as "Elias in the Wilderness" (Berlin) and the history of Tobias (Dresden and St. Petersburg).

It is astonishing to find in the canvases of this Italian nearly the whole repertoire of Rembrandt's subjects. They had a common liking for the tenderest parts of the Gospel, for the scenes of every day, of the "eternal present", themes for *genre* pictures. But this is not all. Domenico was not above reproach. It was his excesses which shortened his life. May we not assume that his art is but a history of the sinful soul, a poem of repentance such as Rembrandt was to present? There is found in both painters the same confidence, the same sense of the divine Protection in spite of sin (cf. Feti's beautiful picture, "The Angel Guardian" at the Louvre), and also, occasionally, the same anguish, the same disgust of the world and the flesh as in that rare masterpiece, "Melancholy", in the same museum. Thus Domenico was in the way of becoming one of the first masters of lyric painting, and he was utilizing to the perfection of his art all that he could learn at Venice when he died in that city, worn out with pleasure, at the age of thirty-four. There is no good life of this curious artist. His principal works are to be found at Dresden (11 pictures), St. Petersburg, Vienna, Florence, and Paris.

BAGLIONE, *Le vite de' pittori* (Rome, 1642), 155; LANZI, *Storia pittorica dell' Italiana* (Milan, 1809); tr. ROSCOE (London, 1847), I, 471; II, 339; CHARLES BLANC, *Histoire des peintres: Ecole romaine* (Paris, s. d.); BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, ed. BODE, Fr. tr. (Paris, 1897), 809, 816; WOERMANN, *Malerei* (Leipzig, 1888), III, 233.

LOUIS GILLET.

**Fetishism** means the religion of the fetish. The word *fetish* is derived through the Portuguese *feitico* from the Latin *factitius* (*facere*, to do, or to make), signifying made by art, artificial (cf. Old English *fetys* in Chaucer). From *facio* are derived many words signifying idol, idolatry, or witchcraft. Later Latin has *facturari*, to bewitch, and *factura*, witchcraft. Hence Portuguese *feitico*, Italian *fatatura*, O. Fr. *faiture*, meaning witchcraft, magic. The word was probably first applied to idols and amulets made by hand and supposed to possess magic power. In the early part of the sixteenth century, the Portuguese, exploring the West Coast of Africa, found the natives using small material objects in their religious worship. These they called *feitico*, but the use of the term has never extended beyond the natives on the coast. Other names are *bohsum*, the tutelary fetishes of the Gold Coast; *suhman*, a term for a private fetish; *gree-gree* on the Liberian coast; *monda* in the Gabun

country; *bian* among the cannibal Fang; in the Niger Delta *ju-ju*—possibly from the French *joujou*, i. e. a doll or toy (Kingsley)—and *grou-grou*, according to some of the same origin, according to others a native term, but the natives say that it is “a white man’s word”. Every Congo leader has his *m’kissi*; and in other tribes a word equivalent to “medicine” is used.

C. de Brosses first employed fetishism as a general descriptive term, and claimed for it a share in the early development of religious ideas (Du Culte des Dieux Fétiches, 1760). He compared the phenomena observed in the negro worship of West Africa with certain features of the old Egyptian religion. This comparison led Pietschmann to emphasize the elements of fetishism in the Egyptian religion by starting with its magic character. Basthold (1805) claimed as fetish “everything produced by nature or art, which receives divine honor, including sun, moon, earth, air, fire, water, mountains, rivers, trees, stones, images, animals, if considered as objects of divine worship”. Thus the name became more general, until Comte employed it to designate only the lowest stage of religious development. In this sense the term is used from time to time, e. g. de la Rialle, Schultze, Menzies, Höffding. Taking the theory of evolution as a basis, Comte affirmed that the fundamental law of history was that of historic filiation, that is, the Law of the Three States. Thus the human race, like the human individual, passed through three successive stages: the theological or imaginative, illustrated by fetishism, polytheism, monotheism; the metaphysical or abstract, which differed from the former in explaining phenomena not by divine beings but by abstract powers or essences behind them; the positive or scientific, where man enlightened perceives that the only realities are not supernatural beings, e. g. God or angels, nor abstractions, e. g. substances or causes, but phenomena and their laws as discovered by science. Under fetishism, therefore, he classed worship of heavenly bodies, nature-worship, etc. This theory is a pure assumption, yet a long time passed before it was cast aside. The ease with which it explained everything recommended it to many. Spencer formally repudiated it (Principles of Sociology), and with Tylor made fetishism a subdivision of animism.

While we may with Tylor consider the theory of Comte as abandoned, it is difficult to admit his own view. For the spirit supposed to dwell in the fetish is not the soul or vital power belonging to that object, but a spirit foreign to the object, yet in some way connected with and embodied in it. Lippert (1881), true to his exaggerated animism, defines fetishism as “a belief in the souls of the departed coming to dwell in anything that is tangible in heaven or on earth”. Schultze, analysing the consciousness of savages, says that fetishism is a worship of material objects. He claims that the narrow circle of savages’ ideas leads them to admire and exaggerate the value of very small and insignificant objects, to look upon these objects anthropopathically as alive, sentient, and willing, to connect them with auspicious or inauspicious events and experiences, and finally to believe that such objects require religious veneration. In his view these four facts account for the worship of stocks and stones, bundles and bows, gores and stripes, which we call fetishism. But Schultze considers fetishism as a portion, not as the whole, of primitive religion. By the side of it he puts a worship of spirits, and these two forms run parallel for some distance, but afterwards meet and give rise to other forms of religion. He holds that man ceases to be a fetish-worshipper as soon as he learns to distinguish the spirit from the material object. To Müller and Brin-ton the fetish is something more than the mere object (Rel. of Prim. Peop., Philadelphia, 1898). Menzies (History of Religion, p. 129) holds that primitive man, like the untutored savage of to-day, in worshipping a

tree, a snake, or an idol, worshipped the very objects themselves. He regards the suggestion that these objects represented or were even the dwelling-place of some spiritual being, as an afterthought, up to which man has grown in the lapse of ages. The study of the African negro refutes this view. Ellis writes, “Every native with whom I have conversed on the subject has laughed at the possibility of its being supposed that he could worship or offer sacrifice to some such object as a stone, which of itself would be perfectly obvious to his senses was a stone only and nothing more”.

De La Saussaye regards fetishism as a form of animism, i. e. a belief in spirits incorporated in single objects, but says that not every kind of worship paid to material objects can be called fetishism, but only that which is connected with magic; otherwise the whole worship of nature would be fetishism. The stock and stone which forms the object of worship is then called the fetish. Tylor has rightly declared that it is very hard to say whether stones are to be regarded as altars, as symbols, or as fetishes. He strives to place nature-worship as a connecting link between fetishism and polytheism, though he is obliged to admit that the single stages of the process defy any accurate description. Others, e. g. Reville, de La Saussaye, separate the worship of nature from animism. To Höffding, following Usener, the fetish is only the provisional and momentary dwelling-place of a spirit. Others, e. g. Lubbock, Happel, insist that the fetish must be considered as a means of magic—not being itself the object of worship, but a means by which man is brought into close contact with the deity—and as endowed with divine powers. De La Saussaye holds that to savages fetishes are both objects of religious worship and means of magic. Thus a fetish may often be used for magic purposes, yet it is more than a mere means of magic, as being itself anthropopathic, and often the object of religious worship.

Within the limits of animism, Tiele and Höffding distinguish between fetishism and spiritism. Fetishism contents itself with particular objects in which it is supposed a spirit has for a longer or a shorter time taken up its abode. In spiritism, spirits are not bound up with certain objects, but may change their mode of revelation, partly at their own discretion, partly under the influence of magic. Thus Höffding declares that fetishism, as the lowest form of religion, is distinguished from spiritism by the special weight it attributes to certain definite objects as media of psychical activity. In selecting objects of fetishism, religion appears, according to Höffding, under the guise of desire. He holds that religious ideas are only religious in virtue of this connexion between need and expectation, i. e., as elements of desire, and that it is only when thus viewed that fetishism can be understood. Hübner-Schleiden, on the contrary, holds that fetishism is not a proper designation for a religion, because Judaism and Christianity have their fetishes as well as the nature religions, and says the word *fetish* should be used as analogous to a word-symbol or emblem. Haddon considers fetishism as a stage of religious development. Jevons holds magic and fetishism to be the negation of religion. He denies that fetishism is the primitive religion, or a basis from which religion developed, or a stage of religious development. To him, fetishism is not only anti-social, and therefore anti-religious, he even holds that the attitude of superiority manifested by the possessor towards the fetish deprives it of religious value, or rather makes it anti-religious.

The fetish differs from an idol or an amulet, though at times it is difficult to distinguish between them. An amulet, however, is the pledge of protection of a divine power. A fetish may be an image, e. g. the New Zealand *wakapakoko*, or not, but the divine power or spirit is supposed to be wholly incorporated in it. Farnell says an image may be viewed as a symbol, or



as infused with divine power, or as the divinity itself. Idolatry in this sense is a higher form of fetishism. Farnell does not distinguish clearly between fetish and amulet, and calls relics, crucifixes, the Bible itself, fetishes. In his view any sacred object is a fetish. But objects may be held as sacred by external association with sacred persons or places without having any intrinsic sanctity. This loose use of the word has led writers to consider the national flag (especially a tattered battle-flag), the Scottish stone of Scone, the mascot, the horse-shoe, as fetishes, whereas these objects have no value in themselves, but are prized merely for their associations—real in the case of the battle-flag, fancied in the case of the horse-shoe.

The theory advanced by certain writers that fetishism represents the earliest stage of religious thought, has a twofold basis: (1) philosophical; (2) sociological.

(1) *Philosophical Basis: the Theory of Evolution.*—Assuming that primitive man was a semi-brute, or a semi-idiot, some writers of the Evolutionist School under the influence of Comte taught that man in the earliest stage was a fetish-worshipper, instancing in proof the African tribes, who in their view represent the original state of mankind. This basis is a pure assumption. More recent investigation reveals clearly the universal belief in a Great God, the Creator and Father of mankind, held by the negroes of Africa; Comber (Gram. and Dict. of the Congo Language) and Wilson (West Guinea) prove the richness of their languages in structure and vocabulary; while Tylor, Spencer, and most advocates of the animistic theory look upon fetishism as by no means primitive, but as a decadent form of the belief in spirit and souls. Finally, there are no well-authenticated cases of savage tribes whose religion consists of fetish-worship only.

(2) *Sociological Basis.*—Historians of civilization, impressed by the fact that many customs of savages are also found in the highest stages of civilized life, concluded that the development of the race could best be understood by taking the savage level as a starting-point. The life of savages is thus the basis of the higher development. But this argument can be inverted. For if the customs of savages may be found among civilized races, evident traces of higher ideals are also found among savages. Furthermore, the theory that a savage or a child represents exclusively, or even prominently, the life of primitive man, cannot be entertained. Writers on the philosophy of religion have used the word *fetishism* in a vague sense, susceptible of many shades of meaning. To obtain a correct knowledge of the subject, we must go to authorities like Wilson, Norris, Ellis, and Kingsley, who have spent years with the African negroes and have made exhaustive investigations on the spot. By fetish or *ju-ju* is meant the religion of the natives of West Africa. Fetishism, viewed from the outside, appears strange and complex, but is simple in its underlying idea, very logically thought out, and very reasonable to the minds of its adherents. The prevailing notion in West Guinea seems to be that God, the Creator (Anyambé, Anzám), having made the world and filled it with inhabitants, retired to some remote corner of the universe, and allowed the affairs of the world to come under the control of evil spirits. Hence the only religious worship performed is directed to these spirits, the purpose being to court their favour or ward off their displeasure. The Ashantis recognize the existence of a Supreme Being, whom they adore in a vague manner although, being invisible, He is not represented by an idol. At the commencement of the world, God was in daily relations with man. He came on earth, conversed with men, and all went well. But one day He retired in anger from the world, leaving its management to subaltern divinities. These are spirits which dwell everywhere—in waters, woods, rocks—and it is necessary to conciliate them, unless

one wishes to encounter their displeasure. Such a phenomenon then as fetish- or spirit-worship, existing alone without an accompanying belief in a Supreme Being who is above all fetishes and other objects of worship, has yet to be discovered. Other nations, holding the fundamental idea of one God who is Lord and Creator, say that this God is too great to interest Himself in the affairs of the world; hence after having created and organized the world, He charged His subordinates with its government. Hence they neglect the worship of God for the propitiation of spirits. These spirits correspond in their functions to the gods of Greek and Roman mythology, but are never confounded with the Supreme Being by the natives. Fetishism therefore is a stage where God is quietly disregarded, and the worship due to Him is quietly transferred to a multitude of spiritual agencies under His power, but uncontrolled by it. "All the air and the future is peopled by the Bantu", says Dr. Norris, "with a large and indefinite company of spiritual beings. They have personality and will, and most of the human passions, e. g., anger, revenge, generosity, gratitude. Though they are all probably malevolent, yet they may be influenced and made favorable by worship."

In the face of this animistic view of nature and the peculiar logic of the African mind, all the seemingly weird forms and ceremonies of fetishism, e. g. the fetish or witch-doctor, become but the natural consequences of the basal idea of the popular religious belief. There are grades of spirits in the spirit-world. Miss Kingsley holds that fourteen classes of spirits are clearly discernible. Dr. Nassau thinks the spirits commonly affecting human affairs can be classified into six groups. These spirits are different in power and functions. The class of spirits that are human souls, always remain human souls; they do not become deified, nor do they sink in grade permanently. The locality of spirits is not only vaguely in the surrounding air, but in prominent natural objects, e. g. caves, enormous rocks, hollow trees, dark forests. While all can move from place to place, some belong peculiarly to certain localities. Their habitations may be natural (e. g. large trees, caverns, large rocks, capes, and promontories; and for the spirits of the dead, the villages where they had dwelt during the lifetime of the body, or graveyards) or acquired, e. g. for longer or shorter periods under the power wielded by the incantations of the *nganga* or native doctor. By his magic art any spirit may be localized in any object whatever, however small, and thus placed it is under the control of the "doctor" and subservient to the wishes of the possessor or wearer of the object in which it is confined. This constitutes a fetish. The fetish-worshipper makes a clear distinction between the reverence with which he regards a certain material object and the worship he renders to the spirit for the time being inhabiting it. Where the spirit, for any reason, is supposed to have gone out of that thing and definitively abandoned it, the thing itself is no longer revered, but thrown away as useless, or sold to the curio-hunting white man.

Everything the African negro knows by means of his senses, he regards as a twofold entity—partly spirit, partly not spirit or, as we say, matter. In man this twofold entity appears as a corporeal body, and a spiritual or "astral" body in shape and feature like the former. This latter form of "life" with its "heart" can be stolen by magic power while one is asleep, and the individual sleeps on, unconscious of his loss. If the life-form is returned to him before he awakes, he will be unaware that anything unusual has happened. If he awakes before this portion of him has been returned, though he may live for a while, he will sicken and eventually die. If the magician who stole the "life" has eaten the "heart", the victim sickens at once and dies. The connexion of a certain spirit with

a certain mass of matter is not regarded as permanent. The native will point out a lightning-struck tree, and tell you its spirit has been killed, i. e., the spirit is not actually dead, but has fled and lives elsewhere. When the cooking pot is broken, its spirit has been lost. If his weapon fails, it is because some one has stolen the spirit, or made it sick by witchcraft. In every action of life he shows how much he lives with a great, powerful spirit-world around him. Before starting to hunt or fight, he rubs medicine into his weapons to strengthen the spirit within them, talking to them the while, telling them what care he has taken of them and what he has given them before, though it was hard to give, and begging them not to fail him now. He may be seen bending over the river, talking with proper incantations to its spirit, asking that, when it meets an enemy, it will upset the canoe and destroy the occupant. The African believes that each human soul has a certain span of life due or natural to it. It should be born, grow up through childhood, youth, and manhood to old age. If this does not happen, it is because some malevolent influence has blighted it. Hence the Africans' prayers to the spirits are always: "Leave us alone!" "Go away!" "Come not into this town, plantation, house; we have never injured you. Go away!" This malevolent influence which cuts short the soul-life may act of itself in various ways, but a coercive witchcraft may have been at work. Hence the vast majority of deaths—almost all deaths in which no trace of blood is shown—are held to have been produced by human beings, acting through spirits in their command, and from this idea springs the widespread belief in witches and witchcraft.

Thus every familiar object in the daily life of these people is touched with some curious fancy, and every trivial action is regulated by a reference to unseen spirits who are unceasingly watching an opportunity to hurt or annoy mankind. Yet upon close inspection the tenets of this religion are vague and unformulated, for with every tribe and every district belief varies, and rites and ceremonies diverge. The fetish-man, *jetizero*, *nganga*, *chitbone*, is the authority on all religious observances. He offers the expiatory sacrifice to the spirits to keep off evil. He is credited with a controlling influence over the elements, winds and waters obey the waving of his charm, i. e. a bundle of feathers, or the whistle through the magic antelope horn. He brings food for the departed, prophesies, and calls down rain. One of his principal duties is to find out evil-doers, that is, persons who by evil magic have caused sickness or death. He is the exorcist of spirits, the maker of charms (i. e. fetishes), the prescriber and regulator of ceremonial rites. He can discover who "ate the heart" of the chief who died yesterday; who caused the canoe to upset and gave lives to the crocodiles and the dark waters of the Congo; or even "who blighted the palm trees of the village and dried up their sap, causing the supply of *malafu* to cease; or who drove away the rain from a district, and withheld its field of *nguba*" (ground-nuts). The fetish doctors can scarcely be said to form a class. They have no organization, and are honoured only in their own districts, unless they be called specially to minister in another place. In their ceremonies they make the people dance, sing, play, beat drums, and they spot their bodies with their "medicines". Anyone may choose the profession for himself, and large fees are demanded for services.

Among the natives on the lower Congo is found the ceremony of *n'kimba*, i. e. the initiation of young men into the mysteries and rites of their religion. Every village in this region has its *n'kimba* enclosure, generally a walled-in tract of half an acre in extent buried in a thick grove of trees. Inside the enclosure are the huts of the *nganga* and his assistants, as well as of those receiving instruction. The initiated alone are permitted to enter the enclosure, where a new lan-

guage is learned in which they can talk on religious matters without being understood by the people. In other parts of the Congo the office falls on an individual in quite an accidental manner, e. g. because fortune has in some way distinguished him from his fellows. Every unusual action, display of skill, or superiority is attributed to the intervention of some supernatural power. Thus the future *nganga* usually begins his career by some lucky adventure, e. g. prowess in hunting, success in fishing, bravery in war. He is then regarded as possessing some charm, or as enjoying the protection of some spirit. In consideration of payment he pretends to impart his power to others by means of charms, i. e. fetishes consisting of different herbs, stones, pieces of wood, antelope horns, skin and feathers tied in little bundles, the possession of which is supposed to yield to the purchaser the same power over spirits as the *nganga* himself enjoys.

The fetish-man always carries in his sack a strange assortment of articles out of which he makes the fetishes. The flight of the poisonous arrow, the rush of the maddened buffalo, or the venomous bite of the adder, can be averted by these charms; with their assistance the waters of the Congo may be safely crossed. The *Moloki*, ever ready to pounce on men, is checked by the power of the *nganga*. The eye-teeth of leopards are an exceedingly valuable fetish on the Kroo coast. The Kabinda negroes wear on their necks a little brown shell sealed with wax to preserve intact the fetish-medicine within. A fetish is anything that attracts attention by its curious shape (e. g. an anchor) or by its behaviour, or anything seen in a dream, and is generally not shaped to represent the spirit. A fetish may be such by the force of its own proper spirit, but more commonly a spirit is supposed to be attracted to the object from without (e. g. the *suhman*), whether by the incantations of the *nganga* or not. These wandering spirits may be natural spirits or ghosts. The Melanesians believe that the souls of the dead act through bones, while the independent spirits choose stones as their mediums (Brinton, *Religions of Prim. Peoples*, New York, 1897). Ellis says, if a man wants a *suhman* (a fetish), he takes some object (a rudely cut wooden image, a stone, a root of a plant, or some red earth placed in a pan), and then calls on a spirit of *Sasabonsum* (a genus of deities) to enter the object prepared, promising it offerings and worship. If a spirit consents to take up its residence in the object, a low hissing sound is heard, and the *suhman* is complete.

Every house in the Congo village has its *m'kissi*; they are frequently put over the door or brought inside, and are supposed to protect the house from fire and robbery. The selection of the object in which the spirit is to reside is made by the native *nganga*. The ability to conjure a free wandering spirit into the narrow limits of this material object, and to compel or subordinate its power to the service of some designated person and for a special purpose, rests with him. The favourite articles used to confine spirits are skins (especially tails of bushcats), horns of the antelope, nutshells, snail-shells, eagles' claws and feathers, tails and heads of snakes, stones, roots, herbs, bones of any animal (e. g. small horns of gazelles or of goats), teeth and claws of leopards, but especially human bones—of ancestors or of renowned men, but particularly of enemies or white men. Newly made graves are rifled for them, and among the bodily parts most prized are portions of human skulls, human eyeballs, especially those of white men. But anything may be chosen—a stick, string, bead, stone, or rag of cloth. Apparently there is no limit to the number of spirits; there is literally no limit to the number and character of the articles in which they may be confined. As, however, the spirits may quit the objects, it is not always certain that fetishes possess extraordinary powers; they must be tried and give proof of their efficiency before

they can be implicitly trusted. Thus, according to Ellis, the natives of the Gold Coast put their *bolsum* in fire as a probation, for the fire never injures the true *bolsum*. A fetish then, in the strict sense of the word, is any material object consecrated by the *nganga* or magic doctor with a variety of ceremonies and processes, by virtue of which some spirit is supposed to become localized in that object, and subject to the will of the possessor.

These objects are filled or rubbed by the *nganga* with a mixture compounded of various substances, selected according to the special work to be accomplished by the fetish. Its value, however, depends not on itself, nor solely on the nature of these substances, but on the skill of the *nganga* in dealing with spirits. Yet there is a relation, difficult sometimes for the foreigner to grasp, between the substances selected and the object to be attained by the fetish. Thus, to give the possessor bravery or strength, some part of a leopard or of an elephant is selected; to give cunning, some part of a gazelle; to give wisdom, some part of the human brain; to give courage, a portion of the heart; to give influence, some part of the eye. These substances are supposed to please and attract some spirit, which is satisfied to reside in them and to aid their possessor. The fetish is compounded in secret, with the accompaniment of drums, dancing, invocations, looking into mirrors or limpid water to see faces human or spiritual, and is packed into the hollow of the shell or bone, or smeared over the stick or stone. If power over some one be desired, the *nganga* must receive crumbs from the food, clippings of the finger-nails, some hair, or even a drop of blood of the person, which is mixed in the compound. So fearful are the natives of power being thus obtained over them, that they have their hair cut by a friend; and even then it is carefully burned, or cast into the river. If one is accidentally cut, he stamps out the blood that has dropped on the ground, or cuts away the wood which it has saturated.

The African negro in appealing to the fetish is prompted by fear alone. There is no confession, no love, rarely thanksgiving. The being to whom he appeals is not God. True he does not deny that God is; if asked, he will acknowledge His existence. Very rarely and only in extreme emergencies, however, does he make an appeal to Him, for according to his belief God is so far off, so inaccessible, so indifferent to human wants, that a petition to Him would be almost vain. He therefore turns to some one of the mass of spirits whom he believes to be ever near and observant of human affairs, in which, as former human beings, some of them once had part. He seeks not spiritual, but purely physical, safety. A sense of moral and spiritual need is lost sight of, although not quite eliminated, for he believes in a good and a bad. But the dominant feeling is fear of possible natural injury from human or subsidized spiritual enemies. This physical salvation is sought either by prayer, sacrifice, and certain other ceremonies rendered to the spirit of the fetish or to non-localized spirits, or by the use of charms or amulets. These charms may be material, i. e. fetishes; vocal, e. g. utterances of cabalistic words which are supposed to have power over the local spirits; ritual, e. g. prohibited food, i. e. *orunda*, for which any article of food may be selected and made sacred to the spirit. At night the Congo chief will trace a slender line of ashes round his hut, and firmly believe that he has erected a barrier which will protect him and his till morning against the attacks of the evil spirit.

The African believes largely in preventive measures, and his fetishes are chiefly of this order. When least conscious, he may be offending some spirit with power to work him ill; he must therefore be supplied with charms for every season and occasion. Sleeping, eating, drinking, he must be protected from hostile in-

fluences by his fetishes. These are hung on the plantation fence, or from the branches of plants in the garden, either to prevent theft or to sicken the thief; over the doorway of the house, to bar the entrance of evil; from the bow of the canoe, to ensure a successful voyage; they are worn on the arm in hunting to ensure an accurate aim; on any part of the person, to give success in loving, hating, planting, fishing, buying; and so through the whole range of daily work and interests. Some kinds, worn on a bracelet or necklace, ward off sickness. The new-born infant has a health-knot tied about its neck, wrist, or loins. Before every house in Whydah, the seaport of Dahomey, one may perceive a cone of baked clay, the apex of which is discoloured with libations of palm-oil, etc. To the end of their lives the people keep on multiplying, renewing, or altering these fetishes.

In fetish-worship the African negro uses prayer and sacrifice. The stones heaped by passers-by at the base of some great tree or rock, the leaf cast from a passing canoe towards a point of land on the river bank, are silent acknowledgements of the presence of the *omb-wiris* (i. e. spirits of the place). Food is offered, as also blood-offerings of a fowl, a goat, or a sheep. Until recently human sacrifices were offered, e. g. to the sacred crocodiles of the Niger Delta; to the spirits of the oil-rivers on the upper Guinea coast, where annual sacrifices of a maiden were made for success in foreign commerce; the thousands of captives killed at the "annual custom" of Dahomey for the safety of the king and nation. In fetishism prayer has a part, but it is not prominent, and not often formal and public. Ejaculatory prayer is constantly made in the utterance of cabalistic words, phrases, or sentences adopted by, or assigned to, almost every one by parent or doctor. According to Ellis no coercion of the fetish is attempted on the Gold Coast, but Kidd states that the negro of Guinea beats his fetish, if his wishes are frustrated, and hides it in his waistcloth when he is about to do anything of which he is ashamed.

The fetish is used not only as a preventive of or defence against evil (i. e. *white art*), but also as a means of offence, i. e. *black art* or witchcraft in the full sense, which always connotes a possible taking of life. The half-civilized negro, while repudiating the fetish as a black art, feels justified in retaining it as a white art, i. e. as a weapon of defence. Those who practise the black art are all "wizards" or "witches"—names never given to practisers of the white art. The user of the white art uses no concealment; a practitioner of the black art denies it, and carries on its practice secretly. The black art is supposed to consist of evil practices to cause sickness and death. Its medicines, dances, and enchantments are also used in the professed innocent white art; the difference is in the work which the spirit is entrusted to perform. Not every one who uses white art is able to use also the black art. Anyone believing in the fetish can use the white art without subjecting himself to the charge of being a wizard. Only a wizard can cause sickness or death. Hence witchcraft belief includes witchcraft murder.

There exists in Bantu a society called the "Witchcraft Company", whose members hold secret meetings at midnight in the depths of the forest to plot sickness or death. The owl is their sacred bird, and their signal-call is an imitation of its hoot. They profess to leave their corporeal bodies asleep in their huts, and it is only their spirit-bodies that attend the meeting, passing through walls and over tree-tops with instant rapidity. At the meeting they have visible, audible, and tangible communications with spirits. They have feasts, at which is eaten "the heart-life" of some human being, who through this loss of his "heart" falls sick and dies unless the "heart" be restored. The early cock-crow is a warning for them to disperse, for they fear the advent of the morning star, as, should

the sun rise upon them before they reach their corporeal bodies, all their plans would fail and they would sicken. They dread cayenne pepper; should its bruised leaves or pods be rubbed over their corporeal bodies during their absence, their spirits are unable to re-enter, and their bodies die or waste miserably away. This society was introduced by black slaves to the West Indies, e. g. Jamaica and Hayti, and to the Southern States as Voodoo worship. Thus Voodooism or Odoism is simply African fetishism transplanted to American soil. Authentic records are procurable of midnight meetings held in Hayti, as late as 1888, at which human beings, especially children, were killed and eaten at the secret feasts. European governments in Africa have put down the practice of the black art, yet so deeply is it implanted in the belief of the natives that Dr. Norris does not hesitate to say it would revive if the whites were to withdraw.

Fetishism in Africa is not only a religious belief; it is a system of government and a medical profession, although the religious element is fundamental and colours all the rest. The fetish-man, therefore, is priest, judge, and physician. To the believers in the fetish the killing of those guilty of witchcraft is a judicial act; it is not murder, but execution. The fetish-man has power to condemn to death. A judicial system does not exist. Whatever rules there are, are handed down by tradition, and the persons familiar with these old sayings and customs are present in the trial of disputed matters. Fetishes are set up to punish offenders in certain cases where it is considered specially desirable to make the law operative though the crimes cannot be detected (e. g. theft). The fetish is supposed to be able not only to detect but to punish the transgressor. In cases of death the charge of witchcraft is made, and the relatives seek a fetish-man, who employs the ordeal by poison, fire or other tests to detect the guilty person. Formerly *mbwaye* (i. e. ordeal by poison) was performed by giving to the accused a poisonous drink, the accuser also having to take the test to prove their sincerity. If he vomited immediately he was innocent; if he was shown guilty, the accusers were the executioners. On the upper coast of Guinea the test is a solution of the sassa-wood, and is called "red water"; at Calabar, the solution of a bean; in the Gabon country, of the akazya leaf or bark; farther south in the Nkama country, it is called *mbundu*. The distinction between poison and fetish is vague in the minds of many natives, to whom poison is only another material form of a fetish power. It has been estimated that for every natural death at least one—and often ten or more—has been executed.

The judicial aspect of fetishism is revealed most plainly in the secret societies (male and female) of crushing power and far-reaching influence, which before the advent of the white man were the court of last appeal for individual and tribal disputes. Of this kind were the Egbo of the Niger Delta, Ukuku of the Corisco region, Yasi of the Ogowe, M'wetyi of the Shekani, Bweti of the Bakele, Inda and Njembé of the Mpongwe, Ukuku and Malinda of the Batanga region. All of these societies had for their primary object the laudable one of government, and, for this purpose, they fostered the superstitious dread with which the fetish was regarded by the natives. But the arbitrary means employed in their management, the oppressive influences at work, the false representations indulged in, made them almost all evil. They still exist among the interior tribes; on the coast, they have either been entirely suppressed or exist only for amusement (e. g. Ukuku in Gabon), or as a traditional custom (e. g. Njembé). The Ukuku society claimed the government of the country. To put "Ukuku on the white man" meant to boycott him, i. e. that no one should work for him, no one should sell food or drink to him; he was not allowed to go to his own spring. In Dahomey the fetish-priests are a kind of secret police

for the despotic king. Thus, while witchcraft was the religion of the natives, these societies constituted their government.

Although sickness is spoken of among the natives as a disease, yet the patient is said to be sick because of an evil spirit, and it is believed that when this is driven out by the magician's benevolent spirit, the patient will recover. When the heathen negro is sick, the first thing is to call the "doctor" to find out what spirit by invading the body has caused the sickness. The diagnosis is made by drum, dance, frenzied song, mirror, fumes of drugs, consultation of relics, and conversation with the spirit itself. Next must be decided the ceremony peculiar to that spirit, the vegetable and mineral substances supposed to be either pleasing or offensive to it. If these cannot be obtained, the patient must die. The witch-doctor believes that his incantations have subsidized the power of a spirit, which forthwith enters the body of the patient and, searching through its vitals, drives out the antagonizing spirit which is the supposed actual cause of the disease. The *nkinda*, "the spirit of disease", is then confined by the doctor in a prison, e. g. in a section of sugar-cane stalk with its leaves tied together. The component parts of any fetish are regarded by the natives as we regard the drugs of our materia medica. Their drugs, however, are esteemed operative not through certain inherent chemical qualities, but in consequence of the presence of the spirit to whom they are favourite media. This spirit is induced to act by the pleasing enchantments of the magic-doctor. The *nganga*, as surgeon and physician, shows more than considerable skill in extracting bullets from wounded warriors, and in the knowledge of herbs as poisons and antidotes.

Whether the black slaves brought to America the okra or found it already existing on the continent is uncertain, but the term *gumbo* is undoubtedly of African origin, as also is the term *mbenda* (peanuts or ground-nuts), corrupted into *pindar* in some of the Southern States. The folk-lore of the African slave survives in Uncle Remus's tales of "Br'er Rabbit". Br'er Rabbit is an American substitution for Brother *Nja* (Leopard) or Brother *Ihili* (Gazelle) in *Paia N'jambi's* (the Creator's) council of speaking animals. Jevons holds that fetishes are private only, although, in fact, not only individuals, but families and tribes have fetishes. The fetish *Deute* at Krakje and *Atia Yaw* of Okwaou were known and feared for leagues around. In the Benga tribe of West Africa the family fetish is known by the name of *Yākā*. It is a bundle of the parts of bodies of their dead, i. e. first joints of fingers and toes, lobe of ear, hair. The value of *Yākā* depends on the spirits of the family dead being associated with the portions of their bodies, and this combination is effected by the prayer and incantation of the doctor. The *Yākā* is appealed to in family emergencies, e. g. disease, death, when ordinary fetishes fail. This rite is very expensive and may require a month, during which time all work is suspended.

The observances of fetish-worship fade away into the customs and habits of everyday life by gradations, so that in some of the superstitious beliefs, while there may be no formal handling of a fetish amulet containing a spirit nor actual prayer nor sacrifice, nevertheless spiritism is the thought and is more or less consciously held, and consequently the term *fetish* might perhaps be extended to them. The superstition of the African negro is different from that of the Christian, for it is the practical and logical application of his religion. To the Christian it is a pitiful weakness; to the negro, a trusted belief. Thus some birds and beasts are of ill omen, others of good omen. The mournful hooting of an owl at midnight is a warning of death, and all who hear the call will hasten to the wood and drive away the messenger of ill-tidings with sticks and stones. Hence arises the belief in the

power of *Ngoi*, *Moloki*, *N'doshi* or *U'rengwa* (i. e., evil-spirited leopard, like the German werewolf), viz., that certain possessors of evil spirits have ability to assume the guise of an animal, and reassume at will the human form. To this superstition must be referred the reverence shown fetish leopards, hippopotami, crocodiles, sokos (large monkeys of the gorilla type).

(See AMULET, ANIMISM, DEITY, IDOLATRY, MAGIC, NATURISM, RELIGION, SPIRITISM, TOTEMISM, SHAMANISM, SYMBOLISM.)

BRINTON, *The Religions of Primitive Peoples* (New York, 1897); ELLIS, *The T. his-speaking Peoples of the Gold Coast of W. Africa* (London, 1887); IDEM, *The Yumbia-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of W. Africa* (London, 1894); FARNELL, *Evolution of Religion* (London and New York, 1905); HADDON, *Magic and Fetishism in Religions, Ancient and Modern* (London, 1906); HOFFDING, *The Philosophy of Religion*, tr. MEYER (London and New York, 1906); JEVONS, *Introduction to Study of Comparative Religion* (New York, 1908); KELLOG, *Genesis and Growth of Religion* (London and New York, 1892); KIDD, *The Essential Kaffir* (London, 1904); KINGSLEY, *Travels in West Africa* (London, 1898); IDEM, *West African Studies* (London, 1899); LEPPERT, *Die Religionen der europäischen Kulturvölker* (Berlin, 1881); MÜLLER, *Natural Religion* (London, 1892); IDEM, *Origin and Growth of Religion* (London, 1878); NORRIS, *Fetichism in W. Africa* (New York, 1904); SCHULZE, *Psychologie der Naturvölker* (Leipzig, 1900); SPENCER ST. JOHN, *Hafti and the Black Republic* (2d ed., London, 1889); TYLOR, *Primitive Culture* (2d ed., London, 1873); WILSON, *Western Africa* (New York, 1856); AMES, *African Fetishism (Heli Chateaux) in Folk-Lore* (Oct., Dec., 1894); GLAC, *Fetichism in Congo Land in Century* (April, 1901); KINGSLEY, *The Fetish Power of the Human Soul in Folk-Lore* (June, 1897); NIPESLEY, *Fetich Faith in W. Africa in Pop. Sc. Monthly* (Oct., 1887); LE ROY, *La religion des primitifs* (Paris, 1909).

JOHN T. DRISCOLL.

**Feuardent**, FRANÇOIS, Franciscan, theologian and preacher of the Ligue, b. at Coutances, Normandy, in 1539; d. at Paris, 1 Jan., 1610. Having completed his humanities at Bayeux, he joined the Friars Minor. After the novitiate, he was sent to Paris to continue his studies, where he received (1576) the degree of Doctor in Theology and taught with great success at the university. He took a leading part in the political and religious troubles in which France was involved at that time. With John Boucher and Bishop Rose of Senlis, he was one of the foremost preachers in the cause of the Catholic Ligue, and, as Roennus remarks in an appendix to Feuardent's "Theomachia", there was not a church in Paris in which he had not preached. Throughout France and beyond the frontiers in Lorraine and Flanders, he was an eloquent and ardent defender of the Faith. Nevertheless, even Pierre de l'Etoile, a fierce adversary of the Ligue, recognizes in his "Mémoires" the merits of Feuardent's subsequent efforts in pacifying the country. In his old age he retired to the convent of Bayeux, which he restored and furnished with a good library. His works can be conveniently grouped in three classes: (1) Scriptural; (2) patristical; (3) controversial. Only some of the most remarkable may be pointed out here. (1) A new edition of the medieval Scripturist, Nicholas of Lyra: "Biblia Sacra, cum glossâ ordinariâ . . . et postillâ Nicolai Lyrani" (Paris, 1590, 6 vols. fol.). He also wrote commentaries on various books of Holy Scripture, viz. on Ruth, Esther, Job, Jonas, the two Epistles of St. Peter, the Epistles of St. Jude and St. James, the Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon, and others. (2) "S. Irenæi Lugd. episcopi adversus Valentinianum . . . hæreses libri quinque" (Paris, 1576); "S. Ildephonsi archiepiscopi Toletani de virginitate Mariz liber" (Paris, 1576). Feuardent also wrote an introduction and notes to "Michaelis Pselli Dialogus de energiâ seu operatione dæmonum translatus a Petro Morello" (Paris, 1577). (3) "Appendix ad libros Alphonsi a Castro (O.F.M.) contra hæreses" (Paris, 1578). "Theomachia Calvinistica", his chief work is based on some earlier writings, such as: "Semaine première des dialogues auxquels sont examinées et réfutées 174 erreurs des Calvinistes" (1585); "Seconde semaine des dialogues . . ."

(Paris, 1598); "Entremangeries et guerres ministrales . . ." (Caen, 1601).

FÉRET, *La Faculté de Théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres* (Paris, 1900), II, 244-254; WADDING-SBARALEA, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum*, ed. NARDECCHI, I (Rome, 1906), 80 sq.; II (1908), 268 sq.; JOANNES A. S. ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca universalis*, I, 383; WEINAND in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. GAUDENTIUS, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts* (Bozen, 1880), 102-104; HURTER, *Nomenclator, 1564-1665*, p. 157. LIVARIUS OLIGER.

**Feuchtersleben**, BARON ERNST VON, an Austrian poet, philosopher, and physician; b. at Vienna, 29 April, 1806; d. 3 September, 1849. After completing his course at the Theresian Academy, he took up the study of medicine in 1825, receiving the degree of Doctor of Medicine in 1833. In 1844 he began a series of free lectures on psychiatry at the University of Vienna, the next year became dean of the medical faculty, and in 1847 was made vice-director of medico-surgical studies. In July, 1848, he was appointed under-secretary of state in the ministry of public instruction, and in this capacity he attempted to introduce some important reforms in the system of education, but, discouraged by the difficulties which he encountered, he resigned in December of the following year. As a medico-philosophical writer, Feuchtersleben attained great popularity, especially through his book "Zur Diätetik der Seele" (Vienna, 1838), which went through many editions (46th in 1896). Hardly less famous is his "Lehrbuch der ärztlichen Seelenkunde" (Vienna, 1845), translated into English by H. Evans Lloyd under the title of "Principles of Medical Psychology" (revised and edited by B. G. Babington, London, 1847). He also wrote an essay, "Die Gewissheit und Würde der Heilkunst" (Vienna, 1839), a new edition of which appeared under the title "Ärzte und Publikum" (Vienna, 1845). As a poet Feuchtersleben is chiefly known by the well-known song, "Es ist bestimmt in Gottes Rat", which appeared in "Gedichte" (Stuttgart, 1836) and was set to music by Mendelssohn. His later poems are more philosophical and critical. His essays and other prose writings were published under the title "Beiträge zur Litteratur-, Kunst- und Lebenstheorie" (Vienna, 1837-41). His complete works (exclusive of his medical writings) were edited by Friedrich Hebbel (7 vols., Vienna, 1851-53).

Consult the autobiography prefixed to the above-mentioned edition; also NECKER, *Ernst v. Feuchtersleben, der Freund Grillparzers in Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, III (Vienna, 1893).

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

**Feudalism**.—This term is derived from the Old Aryan *pe'ku*, hence Sanskrit *pagu*, "cattle"; so also Lat. *pecus* (cf. *pecunia*); Old High German *jehu*, *fiu*, "cattle"; "property"; "money"; Old Frisian *fiu*; Old Saxon *jeu*; Old English *jeoh*, *fiow*, *feo*, *jee*. It is an indefinable word, for it represents the progressive development of European organization during seven centuries. Its roots go back into the social conditions of primitive peoples, and its branches stretch out through military, political, and judicial evolution to our own day. Still, it can so far be brought within the measurable compass of a definition if sufficient allowance be made for its double aspect. For feudalism (like every other systematic arrangement of civil and religious forces in a state) comprises duties and rights, according as it is looked at from a central or local point of view. (1) As regards the duties involved in it, feudalism may be defined as a contractual system by which the nation as represented by the king lets its lands out to individuals who pay rent by doing governmental work not merely in the shape of military service, but also of suit to the king's court. Originally indeed it began as a military system. It was in imitation of the later Roman Empire, which met the Germanic inroads by grants of lands to individuals on



condition of military service (Palgrave, "English Commonwealth", I, 350, 495, 505), that the Carolingian Empire adopted the same expedient. By this means the ninth-century Danish raids were opposed by a semi-professional army, better armed and more tactically efficient than the old Germanic levy. This method of forming a standing national force by grants of lands to individuals is perfectly normal in history, witness the Turkish *timar* fiefs (Cambridge Modern History, I, iii, 99, 1902), the *pief de soudie* of the Eastern Latin Kingdoms (Bréhier, "L'Eglise et l'Orient au moyen âge", Paris, 1907, iv, 94), and, to a certain extent, the Welsh *uchelwyr* (Rhys and Jones, "The Welsh People", London, 1900, vi, 205). On the whole, feudalism means government by amateurs paid in land, rather than professionals paid in money. Hence, as we shall see, one cause of the downfall of feudalism was the substitution in every branch of civil life of the "cash-nexus" for the "land-nexus". Feudalism, therefore, by connecting ownership of land with governmental work, went a large way towards solving that ever-present difficulty of the land-question; not, indeed, by any real system of land-nationalization, but by inducing lords to do work for the country in return for the right of possessing landed property. Thus gradually it approximated to, and realized, the political ideal of Aristotle, "Private possession and common use" (Politics, II, v, 1263, a). To a certain extent, therefore, feudalism still exists, remaining as the great justification of modern landowners wherever—as sheriffs, justices of the peace, etc.—they do unpaid governmental work. (2) As regards the rights it creates, feudalism may be defined as a "graduated system based on land-tenure in which every lord judged, taxed, and commanded the class next below him" (Stubbs, "Constitutional History", Oxford, 1897, I, ix, 278). One result of this was that, whenever a Charter of Liberties was wrung by the baronage from the king, the latter always managed to have his concessions to his tenants-in-chief paralleled by their concessions to their lower vassals (cf. Stubbs, "Select Charters", Oxford, 1900, §4, 101; §60, 304). Another more serious, less beneficent, result was that, while feudalism centrally converted the sovereign into a landowner, it locally converted the landowner into a sovereign.

ORIGIN.—The source of feudalism arises from an intermingling of barbarian usage and Roman law (Maine, "Ancient Law", London, 1906, ix). To explain this reference must be made to a change that passed over the Roman Empire at the beginning of the fourth century. About that date Diocletian reorganized the Empire by the establishment of a huge bureaucracy, at the same time disabling it by his crushing taxation. The obvious result was the depression of free classes into unfree, and the barbarization of the empire. Before A. D. 300 the absentee landlord farmed his land by means of a *familia rustica* or gang of slaves, owned by him as his own transferable property, though others might till their fields by hired labour. Two causes extended and intensified this organized slave-system: (1) Imperial legislation that two-thirds of a man's wealth must be in land, so as to set free hoarded specie and prevent attempts to hide wealth and so escape taxation. Hence land became the medium of exchange instead of money, i. e. land was held not by rent, but by service. (2) The pressure of taxation falling on land (*tributum soli*) forced smaller proprietors to put themselves under their rich neighbours, who paid the tax for them, but for whom they were accordingly obliged to perform service (*obsequium*) in work and kind. Thus they became tied to the soil (*ascripti glebae*), not transferable dependents. Over them the lord had powers of correction, not, apparently, of jurisdiction.

Meanwhile the slaves themselves had become also territorial, and not personal. Further, the public land

(*ager publicus*) got manorialized by grants partly to free veterans (as at Colchester in England), partly to *luti*—a semi-servile class of conquered peoples (as the Germans in England under Marcus Antonius), paying, besides the *tributum soli*, manual service in kind (*sordida munera*). Even in the Roman towns, by the same process, the urban landlords (*curiales*) became debased into the manufacturing population (*collegiati*). In a word, the middle class disappeared; the empire was split into two opposing forces: an aristocratic bureaucracy and a servile labouring population. Over the Roman Empire thus organized poured the Teutonic flood, and these barbarians had also their organization, rude and changeful though it might be. According to Tacitus (Germania), the Germans were divided into some forty *civitates*, or *populi*, or folks. Some of these, near the Roman borders, lived under kings, others, more remote, were governed by folk-moots or elective princes. Several of these might combine to form a "stem", the only bond of which consisted in common religious rites. The *populus* or *civitas*, on the other hand, was a political unity. It was divided into *pagi*, each *pagus* being apparently a jurisdictional limit, probably meeting in a court over which a *princeps*, elected by the folk-moot, presided, but in which the causes were decided by a body of freemen usually numbering about a hundred. Parallel with the *pagus*, according to Tacitus (Germania, xii), though in reality probably a division of it, was the *vicus*, an agricultural unit. This *vicus* was (though Seebohm, "English Historical Review", July, 1892, 444-465, thought not) represented in two types (1) the dependent village, consisting of the lord's house and cottages of his subordinates (perhaps the relics of indigenous conquered peoples) who paid rent in kind, corn, cattle, (2) the free village of scattered houses, each with its separate enclosure. Round this village stretched great meadows on which the villagers pastured their cattle. Every year a piece of new land was set apart to be ploughed, of which each villager got a share proportioned to his official position in the community. It was the amalgamation of these two systems that produced feudalism.

But here, precisely as to the relative preponderance of the Germanic and Roman systems in manorial feudalism, the discussion still continues. The question turns to a certain extent on the view taken of the character of the Germanic invasions. The defenders of Roman preponderance depict these movements as mere raids, producing indeed much material damage, but in reality not altering the race or institutions of the Romanized peoples. Their opponents, however, speak of these incursions rather as people-wanderings—of warriors, women and children, cattle, even, and slaves—indelibly stamping and moulding the institutions of the race which they encountered. The same discussion focuses round the medieval manor, which is best seen in its English form. The old theory was that the manor was the same as the Teutonic mark, plus the intrusion of a lord (Stubbs, "Constitutional History", Oxford, 1897, I, 32-71). This was attacked by Fustel de Coulanges (*Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, Paris, 1901) and by Seebohm (*The English Village Community*, London, 1883, viii, 252-316), who insisted on a Latin ancestry from the Roman villa, contending for a development not from freedom to serfdom, but from slavery through serfdom to freedom. The arguments of the Latin School may be thus summarized: (1) the "mark" is a figment of the Teutonic brain (cf. Murray's "Oxford English Dictionary", s. v., 167; "mark moot" probably means "a parsley bed"). (2) Early German law is based on assumption of private ownership. (3) Analogies of Maine and others from India and Russia not to the point. (4) Romanized Britons, for example, in south-eastern Britain had complete manorial system before the Saxons came from Ger-



many.—They are thus answered by the Teutonic School (Elton, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July, 1886; Vinogradoff, "Growth of the Manor", London, 1905, 87; Maitland, "Domesday Book and Beyond", Cambridge, 1897, 222, 232, 327, 337): (1) the name *mark* may not be applied in England, but the thing existed. (2) It is not denied that there are analogies between the Roman *vill* and the later manor, but analogies do not necessarily prove derivation. (3) The manor was not an agricultural unit only, it was also judicial. If the manor originated in the Roman *vill*, which was composed of a servile population, how came it that the suitors to the court were also judges? or that villagers had common rights over waste land as against their lord? or that the community was represented in the hundred court by four men and its reeve? (4) Seebohm's evidence is almost entirely drawn from the position of villas and villeins on the demesnes of kings, great ecclesiastical bodies, or churchmen. Such villages were admittedly dependent. (5) Most of the evidence comes through the tainted source of Norman and French lawyers who were inclined to see serfdom even where it did not exist. On the whole, the latest writers on feudalism, taking a legal point of view, incline to the Teutonic School.

**CAUSES.**—The same cause that produced in the later Roman Empire the disappearance of a middle class and the confronted lines of bureaucracy and a servile population, operated on the teutonized Latins and latinized Teutons to develop the complete system of feudalism.

(1) Taxation, whether by means of *jeorm-fultum*, *dane gelt*, or *gubelle*, forced the poorer man to commend himself to a lord. The lord paid the tax, but demanded in exchange conditions of service. The service-doing dependent therefore was said to have "taken his land" to a lord in payment for the tax, which land the lord restored to him to be held in fief, and this (i. e. land held in fief from a lord) is the germ-cell of feudalism.

(2) Another, and more outstanding, cause was the royal grant of fole-land. Around this, too, historians at one time ranged in dispute. The older view was that fole-land was simply private land, the authoritative possession of which was based upon the witness of the people as opposed to the bók-land, with its written title deeds. But in 1830 John Allen (*Rise and Growth of Royal Prerogative*) tried to show that fole-land was in reality public property, national, waste, or unappropriated land. His theory was that all land-books (conveyances of land) made by the Anglo-Saxon kings were simply thefts from the national demesne, made for the benefit of the king, his favourites, or the Church. The land-book was an ecclesiastical instrument introduced by the Roman missionaries, first used by that zealous convert, Ethelbert of Kent, though not becoming common till the ninth century. Allen based his theory on two grounds: (a) the king occasionally *books* land to himself, which could not therefore have been his before; (b) the assent of the Witan was necessary to grants of fole-land, which, therefore, was regarded as a national possession. To this Professor Vinogradoff (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Jan., 1893, 1-17) made answer: (a) that even the village knew nothing of common ownership, and that *a fortiori* the whole nation would not have had such an idea; (b) that the king in his charters never speaks of *terram gentis* but *terram juris sui*; (c) that the land thus conveyed away is often expressly described as being inhabited, cultivated, etc., and therefore cannot have been unappropriated or waste land. Finally, Professor Maitland (*Domesday Book and Beyond*, Cambridge, 1897, 244) clearly explains what happened, by distinguishing two sorts of ownership, economic and political. Economic ownership is the right to share in the agricultural returns of the land, as does the modern landlord, etc. Political ownership

is the right to the judicial returns from the soil—ownership, therefore, in the sense of governing it or exercising jurisdiction over it. By the land-bók, therefore, land was handed over to be owned, not economically, but politically; and the men suing on the courts of justice, paying toll, etc., directed their fines, not to the royal exchequer, but to the newly-intruded lord, who thus possessed suzerainty and its fiscal results. In consequence the local lord received the privilege of the *jeorm-fultum*, or right to be entertained for one night or more in progress. So, too, in Ireland, till the seventeenth century, the chieftains enjoyed "coigne and livery" of their tribesmen; and in mediæval France there was the lord's *droit de gîte*. This land-tax in kind, not unnaturally, helped in villeinizing the freemen. Moreover the king surrendered to the new lord the profits of justice and the rights of toll, making, therefore, the freeman still more dependent on his lord. However, it must also be stated that the king nearly always retained the more important criminal and civil cases in his own hands. Still the result of the king's transference of rights over fole-land was easy enough to foresee, i. e. the depression of the free village. The steps of this depression may be shortly set out: (a) the Church or lord entitled to food-rents established an overseer to collect this rent in kind. Somehow or other this overseer appropriated land for a demesne, partly in place of, partly alongside of, the food-rents; (b) the Church or the lord entitled by the land-bók to jurisdictional profits made the tenure of land by the villagers depend upon suit to his court; the villagers' transfers came to be made at that court, and were finally conceived as having their validity from the gift or grant of its president.

(3) Meanwhile the action of the State extended this depression (a) by its very endeavour in the tenth-century Capitularies to keep law and order in those rude cattle-lifting societies. For the system evolved was that men should be grouped in such a manner that one man should be responsible for another, especially the lord for his men. As an example of the former may be taken the Capitularies of the Frankish kings, such as of Childebert and Clotaire, and of the English King Edgar (Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 69-74); and of the latter the famous ordinance of Athelstan (*Conc. Treatanea*, c. 930, ii; Stubbs, *Select Charters*, Oxford, 1900, 66): "And we have ordained respecting those lordless men of whom no law can be got, that the hundred be commanded that they domicile him to folk right and find him a lord in the folk-moot"; (b) another way was by the institution of central taxation in the eleventh century—in England by means of *dane gelt*, abroad by various gabelles. These were monetary taxes at a time when other payments were still largely made in kind. Accordingly, just as under the later Roman Empire, the poorer man commended himself to a lord, who paid for him, but demanded instead payment in service, a *tributum soli*. The dependent developed into a retainer, expecting, as in the Lancastrian days of maintenance, to be protected by his lord, even in the royal courts of justice, and repaying his master by service, military and economic, and by the feudal incidents of heriot, wardship, etc. (for details of feudal aids, cf. Maitland, *Constitutional History*, 27-30).

(4) Nor should it be forgotten that a ceorl or merchant could "thrive" (Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 65; probably of eleventh-century date), so as to amass wealth to the loss of his neighbours, and gradually to become a master of villeins—possessing a church, a kitchen where the said villeins must bake their bread (*jus furmi*), a semi-fortified bell-house, and a burgh-gate, where he could sit in judgment.

(5) The last great cause that developed feudalism was war. It is an old saying, nearly a dozen centuries old, that "war begat the king". It is no less true that war, not civil, but international, begat feudalism.

First it forced the kings to cease to surround themselves with an antiquated fyrd or national militia, that had forgotten in its agricultural pursuits that rapidity of movement was the first essential of military success, and by beating the sword into the ploughshare had lost every desire to beat back the iron into its old form. In consequence a new military force was organized, a professional standing army. This army had to be fed and housed in time of peace. As a result its individual members were granted lands and estates, or lived with the king as his personal suite. At any rate, instead of every able-bodied man being individually bound in person to serve his sovereign in the field, the lords or landowners were obliged in virtue of their tenure to furnish a certain quantity of fighting men, armed with fixed and definite weapons, according to the degree, rank, and wealth of the combatant. Secondly, it gave another reason for commendation, i. e. protection. The lord was now asked, not to pay a tax, but to extend the sphere of his influence so as to enable a lonely, solitary farmstead to keep off the attacks of a foe, or at least to afford a place of shelter and retreat in time of war. This the lord would do for a consideration, to wit, that the protected man should acknowledge himself to be judicially, politically, economically, the dependent of his high protector. Finally, the king himself was pushed up to the apex of the whole system. The various lords commended themselves to this central figure to aid them in times of stress, for they saw the uselessness of trying singly to repel a foe. They were continually being defeated because "shire would not help shire" (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, ann. 1010). Thus the very reason why the English left Ethelred the Unready to accept Sweyn as full king (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, ann. 1012) was simply because Ethelred had no idea of centralizing and unifying the nation; just as in the contrary sense the successful resistance of Paris to the Northmen gave to its dukes, the Lords of the Isle of France, the royal titles which the Carolingians of Laon were too feeble to defend; and the lack of a defensive national war prevented any unification of the unwieldy Holy Roman Empire. This is effectually demonstrated by the real outburst of national feeling that centred round one of the weakest of all the emperors, Frederick III, at the siege of Neuss, simply because Charles the Bold was thought to be threatening Germany by his attack on Cologne. From these wars, then, the kings emerged, no longer as mere leaders of their people but as owners of the land upon which their people lived, no longer as *Reges Francorum* but as *Reges Francie*, nor as *Duces Normannorum* but as *Duces Normannie*, nor as Kings of the Anglecyn but of Engla-land. This exchange of tribal for territorial sovereignty marks the complete existence of feudalism as an organization of society in all its relations (economic, judicial, political), upon a basis of commendation and land-tenure.

ESSENCE.—We are now, therefore, in a position to understand what exactly feudalism was. Bearing in mind the double definition given at the beginning, we may, for the sake of clearness, resolve feudalism into its three component parts. It includes a territorial element, an idea of vassalage, and the privilege of an immunity.

(1) The territorial element is the grant of the enfeoffment by the lord to his man. At the beginning this was probably as well of stock and cattle as of land. Hence its etymology. Littré makes the Low Latin *feudum* of Teutonic origin, and thus cognate with the Old High German *fihu*, Gothic *faihu*, Anglo-Saxon *feoh* (our *fee*), modern German *vieh*. That is to say, the word goes back to the days when cattle was originally the only form of wealth; but it came by a perfectly natural process, when the race had passed from a nomadic life to the fixity of abode necessitated by pastoral pursuits, to signify wealth in general, and finally

wealth in land. The cattle, stock, or land was therefore handed over by the lord to his dependent, to be held, not in full ownership, but in usufruct, on conditions originally personal but becoming hereditary. (This whole process can be easily traced in Hector Munro Chadwick's "Studies in Anglo-Saxon Institutions", Cambridge, 1905, ix, 308-354; x, 378-411, where a detailed account is given of how the thegn, a personal servant of the king, developed into a landowner, possessing an average of five hides of land and responsible to his sovereign in matters of war and jurisdiction.) The influence of the Church, too, in this gradual transference of a personal to a territorial vassalage has been very generally admitted. The monastic houses would be the first to find it troublesome (Liber Eliensis, 275) to keep a rout of knights within their cloistral walls. Bishops, too, howsoever magnificent their palaces, could not fail to wish that the fighting men whom they were bound by their barony to furnish to the king should be lodged elsewhere than close to their persons. Consequently they soon developed the system of territorial vassalage. Hence the medieval legal maxim: *nulle terre sans seigneur* (Vinogradoff, English Society in the Eleventh Century, Oxford, 1908, ii, 39-89). This enfeoffment of the lord or landowner by the king and of the dependent by the lord was partly in the nature of a reward for past services, partly in the nature of an earnest for the future. It is this primitive idea of the lord who gives land to his supporter that is answerable for the feudal incidents which otherwise seem so tyrannous. For instance, when the vassal died, his arms, horse, military equipment reverted as heriot to his master. So, too, when the tenant died without heirs, his property escheated to the lord. If, however, he died, with heirs, indeed, but who were still in their minority, then these heirs were in wardship to the feudal superior, who could even dispose of a female ward in marriage to whom he would, on a plea that otherwise she might unite herself and lands to an hereditary enemy. All the way along it is clear that the ever-present idea ruling and suggesting these incidents, was precisely a territorial one. The origin, that is, of these incidents went back to earlier days when all that the feudal dependent possessed, whether arms, or stock, or land, he had received from his immediate lord. Land had become the tie that knitted into one the whole of society. Land was now the governing principle of life (Pollock and Maitland, History of English Law, Cambridge, 1898, i, iii, 66-78). A man followed, not the master whom he chose or the cause that seemed most right, but the master whose land he held and tilled, the cause favoured in the geographical limits of his domain. The king was looked up to as the real possessor of the land of the nation. By him, as representing the nation, baronies, manors, knights-fees, fiefs were distributed to the tenants-in-chief, and they, in turn, divided their land to be held in trust by the lower vassals (Vinogradoff, English Society in the Eleventh Century, 42). The statute of Edward I, known from its opening clause as *Quia Emptores*, shows the extreme lengths to which this sub-infeudation was carried (Stubbs, Select Charters, 478). So much, however, had this territorial idea entered into the legal conceptions of the medieval polity, and been passed on from age to age by the most skilful lawyers of each generation, that, up to within the last half century, there were not wanting some who taught that the very peerages of England might descend, not by means of blood only, nor even of will and bequest, but by the mere possession-at-law of certain lands and tenements. Witness the Berkeley Peerage case of 1861 (Anson, Law and Custom of the Constitution, Oxford, 1897, Part I, I, vi, 200-203).

(2) Feudalism further implies the idea of vassalage. This is partly concurrent with, partly overlapping, the territorial conception. It is certainly prior to, more

primitive than, the notion of a landed enfeoffment. The early banded hordes that broke over Europe were held together by the idea of loyalty to a personal chief. The heretogas were leaders in war. Tacitus says (*Germania*, vii): "The leaders hold command rather by the example of their boldness and keen courage than by any force of discipline or autocratic rule." It was the best, most obvious, simplest method, and would always obtain in a state of incessant wars and raids. But even when that state of development had been passed, the personal element, though considerably lessened, could not fail to continue. Territorial enfeoffment did not do away with vassalage, but only changed the medium by which that vassalage was made evident. The dependent was, as ever, the personal follower of his immediate lord. He was not merely holding land of that lord; the very land that he held was but the expression of his dependence, the outward and visible sign of an inward and invisible bond. The fief showed who the vassal was, and to whom he owed his vassalage. At one time there was a tendency among historians to make a distinction between the theory of feudalism on the Continent and that introduced into England by William I. But a closer study of both has proved their identity (Tout, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Jan., 1905, 141-143). The Salisbury Oath, even on the supposition that it was actually taken by "all the land-owning men of account there were over all England" (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ann. 1068), was nothing more than had been exacted by the Anglo-Saxon kings (Stubbs, *Select Charters*, *Doom of Exeter*, iv, 64; i, 67; but compare Vinogradoff, *Growth of the Manor*, Oxford, 1905, 294-306). In Germany, too, many of the lesser knights held directly of the emperor; and over all, whether immediately subject to him or not, he had, at least in theory, sovereign rights. And in France, where feudal vassalage was very strong, there was a royal court to which a dependent could appeal from that of his lord, as there were also royal cases, which none but the king could try. In fact it was perhaps in France, earlier than elsewhere, that the centralizing spirit of royal interference began to busy itself in social, economic, judicial interests of the individual. Besides, on the other hand, the anarchy of Stephen's reign that spread over the whole country (Davis, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct., 1903) showed how slight even in England was the royal hold over the vassal barons. Moreover, if English feudalism did at all differ from the hierarchic vassalage that caused so much harm abroad, the result was due far more to Henry II and his successors than to the Norman line of kings. And even the work of the Angevins was to no small degree undone by the policy of Edward III. The Statutes of Merton (1278), Mortmain (1279), *Quia Emptores* (1290) all laid the foundations, though such, of course, was foreign to their object, for the aggregations of large estates. Then came the marriage of the royal princes to great heiresses; the Black Prince gained the lands of Kent; Lionel, the dowry of Ulster; Thomas of Woodstock, the linked manors of Eleanor Bohun. Henry IV, before he deposed Richard II, was "Harry of Hereford, Lancaster and Derby", as well as Leicester and Lincoln. The result was that England, no less than France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, had its feudal vassals that acquired ascendancy over the crown, or were only prevented by their mutual jealousy from doing so. In England, too, the substitution of a *fiodalité apanagée*, or nobility of the blood royal, for the old *fiodalité territoriale* worked the same mischief as it did in France; and the Wars of the Roses paralleled the fatal feuds of Burgundians and Armagnacs, the horrors of the Praguerie and the anarchy of the League of the Public Weal. It will be seen, therefore, that all over Europe the same feudal system prevailed of a hierarchic arrangement of classes, as some vast pyramid of which the apex, pushed high up and

separated by intervening layers from its base, represented the king.

(3) Feudalism lastly included the idea of an immunity or grants of the profits of justice over a fief or other piece of land (Vinogradoff, *Eng. Soc. in the Eleventh Century*, 177-207). We have already stated how by the land-books the Anglo-Saxon kings (and the like had been done, and was to be repeated all over the Continent) granted to others political ownership over certain territories that till that time had been, in the medieval phrase, "doing their own law". The result was that, apparently, private courts were set up, typified in England by the alliterative jingle "sac and soc, tol and theam, and infangenthef". Sometimes the lord was satisfied by merely taking the judicial forfeitures in the ordinary courts, without troubling to establish any of his own. But, generally speaking, he seems to have had the right, and to have used it, of keeping his own separate courts. Feudalism, therefore, includes not merely service (military and economic) but also suit (judicial). This suit was as minutely insisted upon as was the service. The king demanded from his tenants-in-chief that they should meet in his *curia regis*. So William I had his thrice-yearly crown-wearings, attended by "all the rich men over all England, archbishops and bishops, abbots and earls, thegns and knights" (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ad ann. 1087). So too in France, there was the *cour du roy*, dating from the earliest Capetian times, the court of the king's demesne or immediate tenants; at this royal court, whether in England or in France, all the tenants-in-chief, at any rate in the days of the full force of feudalism, were obliged to attend. The same court existed in the Holy Roman Empire and was of great importance, at least till the death of Henry V (Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, London, 1904, viii, 120-129). All those who attended these courts did so in virtue of the tenurial obligations. Now, these royal councils were not constitutional bodies, for we have no evidence of any legislation by them. Rather, like the Parlement of France, they simply registered the royal edicts. But their real work was judicial, adjudicating causes too numerous or too complicated for the king alone to deal with. So Philip Augustus summoned John as a vassal prince to the *cour du roy* to answer the charge of the murder of Arthur of Brittany. Just as these royal courts were judicial bodies for dealing with questions relating to the tenants-in-chief, so these tenants-in-chief, and in a descending gradation every lord and master, had their private courts in which to try the cases of their tenants. The private criminal courts were not strictly feudal, but dependent on a royal grant; such were the franchises, or liberties, or regalities, as in the counties Palatine up and down Europe. Besides these, however, there were the *libre curie*, courts baron, courts leet, courts customary, and, in the case of the Church, courts Christian (for details, Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law*, I, 571-594). The very complexity of these courts astonishes us; it astonished contemporaries no less, for Langland in "Piers Plowman" (Passus III, ll. 318-319) looks forward to a golden day when

King's court and common court, consistory  
and chapter,

All shall be one court and one baron-judge.

CHURCH AND FEUDALISM.—The Church too had her place in the feudal system. She too was granted territorial fiefs, became a vassal, possessed immunities. It was the result of her calm, wide sympathy, turning to the new nations away from the Roman Empire, to which many Christians thought she was irrevocably bound. By the baptism of Clovis she showed the baptism of Constantine had not tied her to a political system. So she created a new world out of chaos, created the paradox of barbarian civilization. In gratitude kings and emperors endowed her with property; and ecclesiastical property has not infrequently

brought evils in its train. The result was disputed elections; younger sons of nobles were intruded into bishoprics, at times even into the papacy. Secular princes claimed lay investiture of spiritual offices. The cause of this was feudalism, for a system that had its basis on land-tenure was bound at last to enslave a Church that possessed great landed possessions. In Germany, for example, three out of the mystically numbered seven electors of the empire were churchmen. There were, besides, several prince-bishops within the empire, and mitred abbots, whose rule was more extended and more powerful than that of many a secular baron. As it was in Germany, so it was in France, England, Scotland, Spain, etc. Naturally there was a growing desire on the part of the king and the princes to force the Church to take her share in the national burdens and duties. Moreover, since by custom the secular rulers had obtained the right of presentation to various benefices or the right of veto, with the title on the Continent of *advocates* or *vogt*, the numerous claimants for the livings were only too ready to admit every possible demand of their lord, if only he would permit them to possess the bishopric, abbacy, or whatever else it might be. In short, the Church was in danger of becoming the annex of the State; the pope, of becoming the chaplain of the emperor. Simony and concubinage were rife. Then came the Reforms of Cluny and the remedy of the separation of Church and State, in this sense, that the Church would confer the dignity or office, and the State the barony. But even when this concordat had been arranged (in England between Henry I and St. Anselm in 1107; the European settlement did not take place till 1122 at Worms), the Church still lay entangled with feudalism. It had to perform its feudal duties. It might owe suit and service to a lord. Certainly, lesser vassals owed suit and service to it. So it was brought into the secular fabric of society. A new tenure was invented for it, tenure by frankalmoin. But it had more often than not to provide its knights and war-men, and to do justice to its tenants. The old ideal of a world-monarchy and a world-religion, the pope as spiritual emperor, the emperor as temporal pope, as set out with matchless skill in the fresco of the Dominican Church in Florence, S. Maria Novella, had ceased to influence public opinion long before Dante penned his "De Monarchia". Feudalism had shattered that ideal (Barry, in Dublin Review, Oct., 1907, 221-243). There was to be not so much a universal Church, as a number of national Churches under their territorial princes, so that feudalism in the ecclesiastical sphere prepared the way for the Renaissance principle, *Cujus regio ejus religio*. For while at the beginning the Church sanctified the State and anointed with sacred chrism the king vested in priestly apparel, in the end the State secularized the Church amid the gilded captivity of Avignon. Royal despotism followed the indignities of Anagni; the Church sank under the weight of her feudal duties.

RESULTS.—(1) *Evil Results*.—(a) The State instead of entering into direct relations with individuals, entered into relation with heads of groups, losing contact with the members of those groups. With a weak king or disputed succession, these group-heads made themselves into sovereigns. First of all viewing themselves as sovereigns they fought with one another as sovereigns, instead of coming to the State as to the true sovereign to have their respective claims adjudicated. The result was what the chroniclers call *guerra* or private war (Coxe, House of Austria, I, London, 1807, 306-7). This was forbidden in England even under its mock form the tournament. Still it was too much tangled with feudalism to be fully suppressed, breaking out as fiercely here from time to time as it did elsewhere. (b) The group-heads tempted their vassals to follow them as against their overlords. So Robert of Belleme obtained the help of his feudatories

against Henry I. So Albert of Austria headed the electors against the Emperor Adolf of Nassau. So Charles of Navarre led his vassals against King John of France. So James of Urgel formed the Privileged Union at Saragossa. (c) These group-heads claimed the rights of private coinage, private castles, full judicial authority, full powers of taxation. There was always a struggle between them and their sovereigns, and between them and their lesser vassals as to the degree of their independence. Each manorial group or honour or fief endeavoured to be self-sufficient and to hold itself apart from its next overlord. Each overlord endeavoured more and more to consolidate his domains and force his vassals to appeal to him rather than to their direct superior. This continual struggle, the success and failure of which depended on the personal characters of lord and overlord, was the chief cause of the instability of life in medieval times. (d) A last evil may perhaps be added in the power given to the Church. In times of disputed succession the Church claimed the right to defend herself, then to keep order, and eventually to nominate the ruler. This, however justifiable in itself and however at times beneficial, often drove the ecclesiastical order into the arms of one or other political party; and the cause of the Church often became identified with a particular claimant for other than Church reasons; and the penalties of the Church, even excommunication, were at times imposed to defend worldly interests. As a rule, however, the influence of the Church was directed to control and soften the unjust and cruel elements of the system.

(2) *Good Results*.—(a) Feudalism supplied a new cohesive force to the nations. At the break-up alike of the Roman Empire and of the Germanic tribal loyalty to the tribal chief, a distinct need was felt for some territorial organization. As yet the idea of nationality was non-existent, having indeed little opportunity of expression. How then were the peoples to be made to feel their distinct individuality? Feudalism came with its ready answer, linked Germanic with Roman political systems, built up an inter-connected pyramid that rested on the broad basis of popular possession and culminated in the apex of the king. (b) It introduced moreover into social and political life the bond of *legalitas*. Every war of medieval, or rather feudal, times was based on some legal claim, since other *casus belli* there was none. Political expediency or national expansion were unknown doctrines. No doubt this *legalitas*, as in the English claim to the French throne, often became sheer hypocrisy. Yet on the whole it gave a moral restraint to public opinion in the midst of a passionate age; and the inscription on the simple tomb of Edward I: *PACTUM SERVA*, however at times disregarded by the king himself, still sums up the great bulwark raised in medieval days against violence and oppression. To break the feudal bond was felony; and more, it was dishonour. On the side of the king or lord, there was the investiture by banner, lance, or other symbol; on the side of the man or tenant, homage for the land, sworn on bended knees with hands placed between the hands of the lord, the tenant standing upright while taking the fealty, as the sign of a personal obligation. (c) Feudalism gave an armed force to Europe when she lay defenceless at the feet of the old mountains over which so many peoples had wandered to conquer the Western world. The onrush of Turk, Saracen, and Moor was checked by the feudal levy which substituted a disciplined professional force for the national fyrd or militia (Oman, Art of War, IV, ii, 357-377, London, 1898). (d) From a modern point of view its most interesting advantage was the fact of its being a real, if only temporary, solution of the land-question. It enforced a just distribution of the territorial domains included within the geographical limits of the nation, by allowing individuals to carve out

estates for themselves on condition that each landlord, whether secular baron, churchman, even abbeſs, rendered ſuit and ſervice to his overlord and demanded them in return from each and every vaſſal. This effectually taught the principle that owners of land, preciſely as ſuch, had to perform in exchange governmental work. Not that there was exactly land-nationalization (though many legal and theological expreſſions of mediæval literature ſeem to imply the exiſtence of this), but that the nation was paid for its land by ſervice in war and by judicial, administrative, and, later, legislative duties.

**DECLINE OF FEUDALISM.**—This was due to a multiplicity of cauſes acting upon one another. Since feudalism was based on the idea of land-tenure paid for by governmental work, every proceſs that tended to alter this adjustment tended alſo to diſplace feudalism.

(1) The new ſystem of raiſing troops for war helped to ſubſtitute money for land. The old ſystem of feudal levy became obſolete. It was found impracticable for the lords to retain a hoſt of knights at their ſervice, waiting in illneſs for the call of war. Inſtead, the barons, headed by the Church, enfeoffed theſe knights on land which they were to own on conditions of ſervice. Gradually theſe knights too found military ſervice exceedingly inopportune and commuted for it a ſum of money, paid at firſt to the immediate lord, eventually demanded directly by the king. Land ceſed to have the ſame value in the eyes of the monarch. Money took its place as the ſymbol of power. But this was further increaſed by a new development in military organization. The ſystem by which ſheriffs, in virtue of royal writs, ſummoned the county-levy had taken the place of the older arrangements. Theſe commiſſions of array iſſued to the tenants-in-chief, or proclaimed for the leſſer vaſſals in all courts, fairs, and markets were now exchanged for indentures, by which the king contracted with individual earls, barons, knights, etc., to furniſh a fixed number of men at a fixed wage ("They ſell the paſture now to buy the horſe."—"Henry V", prologue to Act II). The old conception of the feudal force had completely diſappeared. Further, by means of artillery the attacking force completely dominated the deſenſive, fortified caſtles declined in value, archers and foot increaſed in importance, heavily armoured knights were becoming uſeleſs in battle, and on the Continent the ſupremacy of harquebuſ and pike was aſſured. Moreover as part of this military diſplacement the reaction againſt livery and maintenance (cf. Lingard, *Hiſtory of England*, IV, v, 139-140, London, 1854) muſt be noted. The intense evils occaſioned all over Europe by this baſtard feudalism, or feudalism in caricature, provoked a fierce reaction. In England and on the Continent the new monarchy that ſprang from the "Three Magi" of Bacon ſtimulated popular reſentment againſt the great families of king-makers and broke their power.

(2) A ſecond cauſe of this ſubſtitution was due to the Black Death. For ſome years the emancipation of villeinage had, for reaſons of convenience, been gradually extending. A ſystem had grown up of exchanging tenure by rent for tenure by ſervice, i. e. money was paid in exchange for ſervice, and the lord's fields were tilled by hired labourers. By the Great Peſtilence labour was rendered ſcarce and agriculture was diſorganized. The old ſurplus population that had ever before (Vinogradoff in *Eng. Hiſt. Rev.*, Oct., 1900, 775-81; April, 1906, 356) drifted from manor to manor no longer exiſted. The lords purſued their tenants; capital was begging from labour. All ſtatutory enactments to chain labour to the ſoil proved futile. Villeins eſcaped in numbers to manors, not of their own lords, and entered into ſervice this time as hired labourers. That is, the lord became a landlord, the villein became a tenant-farmer at will or

a landleſs labourer. Then came the Peaſant Revolt over all Europe, the economic complement of the Black Death, by which the old economy was broken up and from which the modern ſocial economy began. On the Continent the reſult was the métayer ſystem or diſſion of national wealth among ſmall landed proprietors. In England under ſtock-and-land leaſes the ſame ſystem prevailed for cloſe on a century, then diſappeared, emerging eventually after ſucceſſive ages as our modern "encloſed" agriculture.

(3) As in things military and economic, ſo alſo in things judicial the idea of landed administrative ſinks below the horizon. All over Europe legal kings, Alfonſo the Wiſe, Philip the Fair, Charles of Bohemia, Edward I of England, were rearranging the conſtitutions of their countries. The old *curia regis* or *cour du roy* ceaſes to be a feudal board of tenants-in-chief and becomes at firſt partly, then wholly, a body of legal advisers. The king's chaplains and clerks with their knowledge of civil and canon law, able to ſpell out the old cuſtomaries, take the place of grim warriors. The *Placita Regis* or *cas royaux* get extended and ſimplified. Appeals are encouraged. Civil as well as criminal litigations come into the royal courts. Finance, the royal auditing of the accounts of ſheriffs, bailiffs, or ſeneſchals, increaſes the royal hold on the country, breaks down the power of the landed claſſes, and draws the king and people into alliance againſt the great nobles. The ſhape of ſociety is no longer a pyramid, but two parallel lines. It can no longer be repreſented as broadening down from king to nobles, from nobles to people; but the apex and baſe have withdrawn, the one from completing, the other from ſupporting, the central block. The riſe to power of popular aſſemblies, whether as States-General, Cortes, Diets, or Parliaments, betokens the growing importance of the middle claſs; and the triumph of the middle claſs (i. e. of the moneyed, not landed, proprietors) is the overthrow of feudalism. The whole literature of the fourteenth century and onward witneſſes to this triumph. Henceforward till the Renaiſſance it is eminently bourgeois. Song is no longer an ariſtocratic monopoly; it paſſes out into the whole nation. The troubadour is no more; his place is taken by the ballad writer composing in the vulgar tongue a *dolce ſtil nuovo*. This new tone is eſpecially evident in "Renard le Contrefait" and "Branche des Royaux Lignage". Theſe ſhow that the old reverence for all that was knightly and of chivalry (q. v.) was paſſing away. The mediæval theory of life, thought, and government had broken down.

STUBBS, *Conſtitutional Hiſtory* (Oxford, 1897); SEEBOHM, *English Village Community* (London, 1883); POLLOCK and MAITLAND, *Hiſtory of English Law* (Cambridge, 1898); MAITLAND, *Conſtitutional Hiſtory* (Cambridge, 1908), 141-164; VINOGRADOFF, *English Society in the Eleventh Century* (Oxford, 1908); ROUND, *Feudal England* (London, 1895), 225-314; BALDWIN, *Scutage and Knight Service* (Chicago, 1897); ROTH, *Geschichte des Beneficialwesens* (Erlangen, 1850); WAITZ, *Deutsche Verfaſſungsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1880); LIPPERT, *Die deutſchen Lehnbücher* (Leipzig, 1903); RHAMEN, *Die Groſshufen der Nordgermanen* (Brunſwick, 1905); LUCHAIRE, *Histoire des Institutions* (Paris, 1883-85); PETIT-DUTAILLIS, *Histoire Conſtitutionnelle* (1907), tr. RHODES (1908); SEIGNOBOS in LAVISSE and RAMBAUD, *Histoire General*, II (Paris, 1893), i, 1-64; GUILMEROT, *Essai ſur l'origine de la noblesse en France* (Paris, 1902); FLACH, *Les origines de l'Ancienne France*, III (Paris, 1904).

BEDÉ JARRETT.

**Feudum.** See TENURE, ECCLESIASTICAL.

**Feuillants.**—The Cistercians who, about 1145, founded an abbey in a ſhady valley in the Diocēſe of Rieux (now Toulouse) named it Fuliens, later Les Feuillans or Notre-Dame des Feuillans (Lat. *folium*, leaf), and the religious were ſoon called Feuillants (Lat. *Fulienses*). Relaxations crept into the Order of Cîteaux as into moſt religious congregations, and in the ſixteenth century the Feuillant monaſtery was diſhonoured by unworthy monks. A reform was ſoon to be introduced, however, by Jean de la Barrière, b. at Saint-Céré, in the Diocēſe of Cahors, 29



April, 1544; d. 25 April, 1600. Having completed a successful course in the humanities at Toulouse and Bordeaux, at the age of eighteen he was made commendatory Abbot of the Feuillants by the King of France, succeeding Charles de Crussol, who had just joined the Reformers. After his nomination he went to Paris to continue his studies, and then began his lifelong friendship with the celebrated Arnaud d'Ossat, later cardinal. In 1573 Barrière, having resolved to introduce a reform into his abbey, took the habit of novice, and after obtaining the necessary dispensations, made his solemn profession and was ordained priest, some time after 8 May, 1573. His enterprise was a difficult one. There were twelve monks at Les Feuillants who refused to accept the reform, and unmoved by the example and exhortations of their abbot, resolved to do away with him, by means of poison. Their attempts, however, were frustrated. In 1577, having received the abbatial benediction, he solemnly announced his intention of reforming his monastery, and made the members of the community understand that they had either to accept the reform or leave the abbey; they chose the latter and dispersed to various Cistercian houses. Their departure reduced the community to five persons, two professed clerics, two novices, and the superior. The rule was interpreted in its most rigid sense and in many ways even surpassed. Sartorius in his work "*Cistercium bis-tertium*" sums up the austerities of the reform in these four points: (1) The Feuillants renounced the use of wine, fish, eggs, butter, salt, and all seasoning. Their nourishment consisted of barley bread, herbs cooked in water, and oatmeal. (2) Tables were abolished; they ate on the floor kneeling. (3) They kept the Cistercian habit, but remained bare-headed and barefoot in the monastery. (4) They slept on the ground or on bare planks, with a stone for pillow. They slept but four hours. Silence and manual labour were held in honour. The community was increased rapidly by the admission of fervent postulants.

In 1581 Barrière received from Gregory XIII a Brief of commendation and in 1589 one of confirmation, establishing the Feuillants as a separate congregation. In spite of the opposition of the abbots and general chapters of Cîteaux, the reform waxed strong. In 1587 Sixtus V called the Feuillants to Rome, where he gave them the church of S. Pudentiana, and the same year, Henry III, King of France, constructed for them the monastery of St. Bernard, in the Rue Saint-Honoré, Paris. In 1590, however, the Peasants' War brought about dissensions. While Barrière remained loyal to Henry III, the majority of his religious declared for the League. As a result, in 1592 Barrière was condemned as a traitor to the Catholic cause, deposed, and reduced to lay communion. It was not until 1600 that, through the efforts of Cardinal Bellarmine, he was exonerated and reinstated. Early in the same year, however, he died in the arms of his friend Cardinal d'Ossat. In 1595 Clement VIII exempted the reform from all jurisdiction on the part of Cistercian abbots, and allowed the Feuillants to draw up new constitutions, containing some mitigations of the primitive rigour. These were approved the same year. In 1598 the Feuillants took possession of a second monastery in Rome, San Bernardo alle Terme. In 1630 Pope Urban VIII divided the congregation into two entirely distinct branches: that of France, under the title of Notre-Dame des Feuillants; and that of Italy, under the name of Bernardoni or Reformed Bernardines. In 1634 the Feuillants of France, and in 1667 the Bernardines of Italy modified somewhat the constitutions of 1595. In 1791 at the time of the suppression of the religious orders, the Feuillants possessed twenty-four abbeys in France; almost all the religious were confessors, exiles, or martyrs. The Bernardines of Italy eventu-

ally combined with the Order of Cîteaux. The congregation of the Feuillants has given a number of illustrious personages to the Church, among others: Cardinal Bona (q.v.), the celebrated liturgist and ascetical writer (d. 1674); Gabriele de Castello (d. 1687), general of the Italian branch, who also received the cardinal's hat; Dom Charles de Saint-Paul, first general of the Feuillants of France, afterwards Bishop of Avranches, who published in 1641 the "*Geographia Sacra*"; among theologians, Pierre Comagère (d. 1662), Laurent Apisius (d. 1681), and Jean Goulu (d. 1629). Special mention should be made of Carlo Giuseppe Morozzi (Morotius), author of the most important history of the order, the "*Cistercii reforescentis... chronologica historia*". Many martyrologies give Jean de la Barrière (25 April) the title of Venerable. The Abbey des Feuillants was authorized by papal Brief to publicly venerate his remains, but the cause of beatification has never been introduced.

The FEUILLANTINES, founded in 1588 by Jean de la Barrière, embraced the same rule and adopted the same austerities as the Feuillants. Matrons of the highest distinction sought admission into this severe order, which soon grew in numbers, but during the Revolution, in 1791, the Feuillantines disappeared.

HÉLYOT, *Hist. des ordres* (Paris, 1719); CARETTO, *Santorie del S. Ordine Cisterciense* (Turin, 1708); SARTORIUS, *Cistercium bis-tertium* (Prague, 1700); BAST, *Vie du Vénérable Jean de la Barrière* (Toulouse, 1888); MOROTIUS, *Cisterci reforescentis... chronologica historia* (Turin, 1690); CHALEMOT, *Seres Sanctorum et Beatorum S. O. Cist.* (Paris, 1670); *Gallia Christiana*, XIII; JANAUSCHEK, *Orig. Cist.* (Vienna, 1877); *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux de la cong. de S. Maur in MARTÈNE AND DURAND* (Paris, 1717); JONGELINUS, *Notitia abbatiarum Ord. Cist.* (Cologne, 1640).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

**Feuillet (FEUILLÉE), LOUIS**, geographer, b. at Mane near Forcalquier, France, in 1660; d. at Marseilles in 1732. He entered the Franciscan Order and made rapid progress in his studies, particularly in mathematics and astronomy. He attracted the attention of members of the Academy of Sciences and in 1699 was sent by order of the king on a voyage to the Levant with Cassini to determine the geographical positions of a number of seaports and other cities. The success of the undertaking led him to make a similar journey to the Antilles. He left Marseilles, 5 Feb., 1703, and arrived at Martinique 11 April. A severe sickness was the cause of considerable delay, but in September of the following year he began a cruise along the northern coast of South America, making observations at numerous ports. He likewise collected a number of botanical specimens. Upon his return to France in 1706, his work won recognition from the Government, and he immediately began preparations for a more extended voyage along the western coast of South America to continue his observations. He received the title of royal mathematician, and armed with letters from the ministry set sail from Marseilles, 14 Dec., 1707. He rounded Cape Horn after a tempestuous voyage and visited the principal western ports as far north as Callao. At Lima he spent several months studying the region. He returned to France in 1711, bringing with him much valuable data and a collection of botanical specimens. Louis XIV granted him a pension and built an observatory for him at Marseilles. Feuillet was of a gentle and simple character, and while an enthusiastic explorer, was also a true ecclesiastic. He was the author of "*Journal des observations physiques, mathématiques, et botaniques*" (Paris, 1714); "*Suite du Journal*" (Paris, 1725).

EYRIES in *Bio. Univ.*, XIV; POGENDORFF, *Biographisch-literarisches Handwörterbuch zur Geschichte der exacten Wissenschaften* (Leipzig, 1863), I.

HENRY M. BROCK.

**Féval, PAUL-HENRI-CORENTIN**, novelist, b. at Rennes, 27 September, 1817; d. in Paris, 8 March,



1887. He belonged to an old family of barristers, and his parents wished him to follow the family traditions. He received his secondary instruction at the *lycée* of Rennes and studied law at the university of the same city. He was admitted to the bar at the age of nineteen, but the loss of his first case disgusted him with the practice of law, and he went to Paris, where he secured a position as a bank clerk. His fondness for reading, which caused him to neglect his professional duties, led to his dismissal a few months later. He is



PAUL-HENRI-CORENTIN FÉVAL

next found in the service of an advertising concern, then on the staff of an obscure Parisian paper, and finally as proof-reader in the offices of "Le Nouvelliste". He had already begun to write. A short story, "Le club des Phoques", which he published in "La Revue de Paris", in 1841, attracted attention and opened to Féval the columns of the most important Parisian newspapers. In 1844, under the pseudonym of Francis Trolopp, he wrote "Les mystères de Londres", which had great success and was translated into several languages. From this time on he hardly ever ceased writing, sometimes publishing as many as four novels at a time. Some of them he also tried to adapt for the stage but, with the exception of "Le Bossu" which was played many times, his ventures in that direction were unsuccessful. Féval's writings had not always been in conformity with the teachings of the Church. In the early seventies he sincerely returned to his early belief, and between 1877 and 1882 published a revised edition of all his books. He also wrote some new works which show the change. His incessant labour and the financial reverses he had suffered told on his constitution; he was stricken with paralysis. The Société des Gens de Lettres, of which he was the president, had him placed in the home of Les Frères de S. Jean de Dieu, where he died.

Most of Féval's novels are romantic; in fact he may be considered as the best imitator of the elder Dumas; his fecundity, his imagination, and his power of interesting the reader rival those of his great predecessor; the style, however, too often betrays the haste in which his novels were written. The list of his works is a very long one; the best known besides those already mentioned are: "Étapes d'une conversion" (Paris, 1877); "Merveilles du Mont-Saint-Michel" (Paris, 1879).

LOUNDEE AND BOURQUELOT, *Littérature contemporaine* (Paris, 1854); DE MIRECOURT, *Les contemporains* (Paris, 1856); BUET, *Médailleurs et camées* (Paris, 1853).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

**Feyjóo y Montenegro, BENITO JERÓNIMO**, a celebrated Spanish writer, b. at Casdemiro, in the parish of Santa Maria de Melias, Galicia, Spain, 8 October, 1676; d. at Oviedo, 26 September, 1764. Intended by his parents for a literary career, he showed from a very early age a predilection for ecclesiastical studies, and in 1688 received the cowl of the Order of St. Benedict at the monastery of San Juan de Samos. A man of profound learning, Feyjóo wrote on a great variety of subjects, embracing nearly every branch of human knowledge. In his writings he attacked many old in-

stitutions, customs, and superstitions. He criticized, among other things, the system of public instruction in Spain, offering suggestions for reforms; and it was owing to his agitation that many universities adopted new and better methods of teaching logic, physics, and medicine. He naturally stirred up many controversies and was the object of bitter attacks, but he was not without his supporters and defenders. In his long life he wrote many works, the full list of which may be found in Vol. LVI of "La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles" (Madrid, 1883). The subjects may be conveniently grouped as follows: arts; astronomy and geography; economics; philosophy and metaphysics; philology; mathematics and physics; natural history; literature; history; medicine. Nearly all are included in the eight volumes which bear the title "Teatro crítico universal ó discursos varios en todo género de materias para desengaño de errores comunes" (Madrid, 1726-39) and in the five volumes of his "Cartas Eruditas" (Madrid, 1742-60). During the life of the author his works were translated into French, Italian, German, and after his death into English. At his death Feyjóo was laid to rest in the church of San Vicente at Oviedo. A fine statue in his memory ornaments the entrance to the National Library at Madrid.

VICENTE DE LA FUENTE, *Vida y Juicio Crítico de Feyjóo en RIVADENEIRA, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* (Madrid, 1848-86), LVI.

VENTURA FUENTES.

**Fiacc, SAINT** (about 415-520), poet, chief bishop of Leinster, and founder of two churches. His father, Mac Dara, was prince of the Hy-Bairrche in the country around Carlow. His mother was sister of Dubhtach, the chief bard and brehon of Erin, the first of Patrick's converts at Tara, and the apostle's lifelong friend. Fiacc was a pupil to his uncle in the bardic profession and soon embraced the Faith. Subsequently, when Patrick came to Leinster, he sojourned at Dubhtach's house in Hy-Kinsellagh and selected Fiacc, on Dubhtach's recommendation, to be consecrated bishop for the converts of Leinster. Fiacc was then a widower; his wife had recently died, leaving him one son named Fiacre. Patrick gave him an alphabet written with his own hand, and Fiacc acquired with marvellous rapidity the learning necessary for the episcopal order. Patrick consecrated him, and in after time appointed him chief bishop of the province. Fiacc founded the church of Domnach-Fiech, east of the Barrow. Dr. Healy identifies its site at Kylebeg. To this church Patrick presented sacred vestments, a bell, the Pauline Epistles, and a pastoral staff. After many years of austere life in this place, Fiacc was led by angelic command to remove to the west of the Barrow, for there "he would find the place of his resurrection". The legends state that he was directed to build his oratory where he should meet a hind, his refectory where he should find a boar. He consulted Patrick, the latter fixed the site of his new church at Sletty—"the highland"—a mile and a half north-west of Carlow. Here Fiacc built a large monastery, which he ruled as abbot, while at the same time he governed the surrounding country as bishop. His annual Lenten retreat to the cave of Drum-Coblai and the rigours of his Lenten fast, on five barley loaves mixed with ashes, are mentioned in his life by Jocelyn of Furness. He suffered for many years from a painful disease, and Patrick, commiserating his infirmity, sent him a chariot and a pair of horses to help him in the visitation of the diocese. He lived to a very old age; sixty of his pious disciples were gathered to their rest before him. His festival has been always observed on the 12th of October. He was buried in his own church at Sletty, his son Fiacre, whom Patrick had ordained priest, occupying the same grave. They are mentioned in several calendars as jointly revered in certain churches.

St. Fiacc is the reputed author of the metrical life of

St. Patrick in Irish, a document of undoubted antiquity and of prime importance as the earliest biography of the saint that has come down to us. A hymn on St. Brigid, "Audite virginis laudes", has been sometimes attributed to him, but on insufficient grounds.

*Acta SS.*, 12 Oct.; COLGAN, *Trias Thaum.* (Louvain, 1647); WARE, *The Writers of Ireland* (Dublin, 1746), I, II, 7; LANIGAN, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829), I; HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1902); *Irish Eccl. Record*, March, 1868; *Liber Hymnorum* (Trinity College, Dublin), ed. TODD (1855-69) and BERNARD AND ATKINSON (1898).

C. MULCAHY.

**Fiacre**, SAINT, Abbot, b. in Ireland about the end of the sixth century; d. 18 August, 670. Having been ordained priest, he retired to a hermitage on the banks of the Nore of which the townland Kilfiachra, or Kilferra, Co. Kilkenny, still preserves the memory. Disciples flocked to him, but, desirous of greater solitude, he left his native land and arrived, in 628, at Meaux, where St. Faro then held episcopal sway. He was generously received by Faro, whose kindly feelings were engaged to the Irish monk for blessings which he and his father's house had received from the Irish missionary Columbanus. Faro granted him out of his own patrimony a site at Brogillum (Breuil) surrounded by forests. Here Fiacre built an oratory in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a hospice in which he received strangers, and a cell in which he himself lived apart. He lived a life of great mortification, in prayer, fast, vigil, and the manual labour of the garden. Disciples gathered around him and soon formed a monastery. There is a legend that St. Faro allowed him as much land as he might surround in one day with a furrow; that Fiacre turned up the earth with the point of his crosier, and that an officious woman hastened to tell Faro that he was being beguiled; that Faro coming to the wood recognized that the wonder-worker was a man of God and sought his blessing, and that Fiacre henceforth excluded women, on pain of severe bodily infirmity, from the precincts of his monastery. In reality, the exclusion of women was a common rule in the Irish foundations. His fame for miracles was widespread. He cured all manner of diseases by laying on his hands; blindness, polypus, fevers are mentioned, and especially a tumour or fistula since called "le fic de S. Fiacre".

His remains were interred in his church at Breuil, where his sanctity was soon attested by the numerous cures wrought at his tomb. Many churches and oratories have been dedicated to him throughout France. His shrine at Breuil is still a resort for pilgrims with bodily ailments. In 1234 his remains were placed in a shrine by Pierre, Bishop of Meaux, his arm being encased in a separate reliquary. In 1479 the relics of Sts. Fiacre and Kilian were placed in a silver shrine, which was removed in 1568 to the cathedral church at Meaux for safety from the destructive fanaticism of the Calvinists. In 1617 the Bishop of Meaux gave part of the saint's body to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and in 1637 the shrine was again opened and part of the vertebrae given to Cardinal Richelieu. A mystery play of the fifteenth century celebrates St. Fiacre's life and miracles. St. John of Matha, Louis XIII, and Anne of Austria were among his most famous clients. He is the patron of gardeners. The French cab derives its name from him. The Hôtel de St-Fiacre, in the Rue St-Martin, Paris, in the middle of the seventeenth century first let these coaches on hire. The sign of the inn was an image of the saint, and the coaches in time came to be called by his name. His feast is kept on the 30th of August.

*Acta SS.*, 30 Aug.; LANIGAN, *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829), II, 446-448; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, 30 Aug., VIII, 421; *Martyrology of Donegal*, 229; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 30 Aug.; LITTRE, *French Dict.*, s. v.; RICARD, *La vie et les miracles de S. Fiacre d'après les Biographes avec pièces justificatives* (Paris, 1865).

C. MULCAHY.

**Fiammingo** (THE FLEMING), DENNIS. See CALVAERT, DIONYSIUS.

**Ficino**, MARSILIO, philosopher, philologist, physician; b. at Florence, 19 Oct., 1433; d. at Correggio, 1 Oct., 1499. Son of the physician of Cosmo de' Medici, he served the Medicis for three generations and received from them a villa at Monte Vecchio. He studied at Florence and at Bologna; and was specially protected in his early work by Cosmo de' Medici, who chose him to translate the works of Plato into Latin. The Council of Florence (1439) brought to the city a number of Greek scholars, and this fact, combined with the founding of the Platonic Academy, of which Ficino was elected president, gave an impetus to the study of Greek and especially to that of Plato. Ficino became an ardent admirer of Plato and a propagator of Platonism, or rather neo-Platonism, to an unwarranted degree, going so far as to maintain that Plato should be read in the churches, and claiming Socrates and Plato as forerunners of Christ. He taught Plato in the Academy of Florence, and it is said he kept a light burning before a bust of Plato in his room. It is supposed that the works of Savonarola drew Ficino closer to the spirit of the Church. He was ordained priest in 1477 and became a canon of the cathedral of Florence. His disposition was mild, but at times he had to use his knowledge of music to drive away melancholy. His knowledge of medicine was applied very largely to himself, becoming almost a superstition in its detail. As a philologist his worth was recognized, and Reuchlin sent him pupils from Germany. Angelo Poliziano was one of his pupils.

As a translator his work was painstaking and faithful, though his acquaintance with Greek and Latin was by no means perfect. He translated the "Argonautica", the "Orphic Hymns", Homer's "Hymns", and Hesiod's "Theogony"; his translation of Plato appeared before the Greek text of Plato was published. He also translated Plotinus, Porphyry, Proclus, Iamblichus, Alcinoüs, Synesius, Psellus, the "Golden Thoughts" of Pythagoras, and the works of Dionysius the Areopagite. When a young man he wrote an "Introduction to the Philosophy of Plato"; his most important work was "Theologia Platonica de animarum immortalitate" (Florence, 1482); a shorter form of this work is found in his "Compendium theologiæ Platonice". He respects Aristotle and calls St. Thomas the "glory of theology"; yet for him Plato is the philosopher. Christianity, he says, must rest on philosophic grounds; in Plato alone do we find the arguments to support its claims, hence he considers the revival of Plato an intervention of Providence. Plato does not stop at immediate causes, but rises to the highest cause, God, in Whom he sees all things. The philosophy of Plato is a logical outcome of previous thought, beginning with the Egyptians and advancing step by step till Plato takes up the mysteries of religion and casts them in a form that made it possible for the neo-Platonist to set them forth clearly. The seed is to be found in Plato, its full expression in the neo-Platonists. Ficino follows this line of thought in speaking of the human soul, which he considered as the image of the God-head, a part of the great chain of existence coming forth from God and leading back



MARSILIO FICINO

to the same source, giving us at the same time a view of the attributes of God and of his relations to the world. His style is not always clear. Perhaps his distinctive merit rests on the fact that he introduced Platonic philosophy into Europe. Besides the works already mentioned, he left: "De religione Christiana et fidei pietate", dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici; "In Epistolas Pauli commentaria"; Marsilii Ficini Epistolae (Venice, 1491; Florence, 1497). His collected works: Opera (Florence, 1491, Venice, 1516, Basel, 1561).

SCHELHORN, *De vita, moribus et scriptis Marsilii Ficini commentatio* in his *Amoenit. Lit.*, Tom. I; CORSI, *Commentarius, etc.*, seu *M. Ficini vita*, ed. BANDINI (Pisa, 1771); SIEVEKING, *Gesch. d. platonisch Akademie zu Florenz* (Göttingen, 1812); TIRABOSCHI, *Storia della letteratura italiana* (Modena, 1771-82); ROSCOE, *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici* (London, 1865); J. A. SYMONDS, *The Renaissance in Italy* (Scribner's, New York, 1898), II; STÜCKEL, *Gesch. d. Philosophie d. Mittelalters* (Mainz, 1866), III; GABOTTO, *L'epicurismo di Ficino* (Milan, 1891).

M. SCHUMACHER.

**Ficker, JULIUS** (more correctly CASPAR) VON, historian, b. at Paderborn, Germany, 30 April, 1826; d. at Innsbruck, 10 June, 1902. He studied history and law at Bonn, Münster, and Berlin, and during 1848-49 lived in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, where he was closely associated with the noted historian, Bohmer, who proved himself a generous friend and patron. In 1852 he proceeded to Bonn, but shortly afterwards accepted an invitation from Count Leo Thun, the reorganizer of the Austrian system of education, to settle at Innsbruck as professor of general history. In 1863, however, he joined the faculty of jurisprudence, and his lectures on political and legal history drew around him a large circle of devoted and admiring pupils. In 1866 he was elected member of the Academy of Sciences, but retired, after being ennobled by the Emperor of Austria, in 1879. His numerous and important works extend over three branches of scientific history (i. e. political and legal history and the science of diplomacy), and in each division he discovered new methods of investigation. Among his writings those of especial note are: "Rainald von Dassel, Reichskanzler und Erzbischof von Köln" (Cologne, 1850); "Münsterische Chroniken des Mittelalters" (Münster, 1851); "Engelbert der Heilige, Erzbischof von Köln" (Cologne, 1853); "Die Ueberreste des deutschen Reichsarchivs in Pisa" (Vienna, 1855). The second division of his works includes "Ueber einen Spiegel deutscher Leute" (Vienna, 1857); "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Sachsenspiegels" (Innsbruck 1859); "Vom Reichsfürstenstande" (Innsbruck, 1861); "Forschungen zur Reichs-u. Rechtsgeschichte Italiens" (4 vols., Innsbruck, 1868-74); "Untersuchungen zur Rechtsgeschichte" (3 vols., Innsbruck, 1891-97). Finally he proved himself a master in diplomatics in his "Beiträge zur Urkundenlehre" (2 vols., Innsbruck, 1877-78). During the period 1859-1866, he was engaged in a literary controversy with the historian, Heinrich von Sybel, on the significance of the German Empire. Ficker advocated and defended the theory that Austria, on account of its blending of races, was best fitted as successor of the old empire to secure the political advancement both of Central Europe and of Germany. In support of his theory, he wrote "Das deutsche Kaiserreich in seinen universalen und nationalen Beziehungen" (Innsbruck, 1871), and "Deutsches Königtum und Kaisertum" (Innsbruck, 1872). As legatee of Böhmér's literary estate, he published the "Acta Imperii selecta" (Innsbruck, 1870) and directed the completion and revision of the "Regesta Imperii".

JUNG, *Zur Erinnerung an J. Ficker*, in *Allgemeine Zeitung*, supplement (1902), 293-95; IDEM, *Beitrag zur deutschen Gelehrten-geschichte* (Innsbruck, 1908); BETTELHEIM, *Biographisches Jahrbuch*, VII (1905), 299-306.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Fidatus, SIMEON A CASCIA.** See SIMON OF CASSIA.

**Fideism** (Lat. *fides*, faith), a philosophical term meaning a system of philosophy or an attitude of mind, which, denying the power of unaided human reason to reach certitude, affirms that the fundamental act of human knowledge consists in an act of faith, and the supreme criterion of certitude is authority. Fideism has divers degrees and takes divers forms, according to the field of truth to which it is extended, and the various elements which are affirmed as constituting the authority. For some fideists, human reason cannot of itself reach certitude in regard to any truth whatever; for others, it cannot reach certitude in regard to the fundamental truths of metaphysics, morality and religion, while some maintain that we can give a firm supernatural assent to revelation on motives of credibility that are merely probable. Authority, which according to fideism is the rule of certitude, has its ultimate foundation in divine revelation, preserved and transmitted in all ages through society and manifested by tradition, common sense or some other agent of a social character. Fideism was maintained by Huet, Bishop of Avranches, in his work "De imbecillitate mentis humanæ" (Amsterdam, 1748); by de Bonald, who laid great stress on tradition in society as the means of the transmission of revelation and the criterion of certitude; by Lamennais, who assigns as a rule of certitude the general reason (*la raison générale*) or common consent of the race (*Défense de l'essai sur l'indifférence*, chs. viii, xi); by Bonnetty in "Annales de philosophie chrétienne"; by Bautain, Ventura, Ubaghs, and others at Louvain. These are sometimes called moderate fideists, for, though they maintained that human reason is unable to know the fundamental truths of the moral and religious orders, they admitted that, after accepting the teaching of revelation concerning them, human intelligence can demonstrate the reasonableness of such a belief (cf. Ubaghs, *Logicæ seu Philosophiæ rationalis elementa*, Louvain, 1860).

In addition to these systematic formulæ of fideism, we find throughout the history of philosophy from the time of the sophists to the present day a fideistic attitude of mind, which became more or less conspicuous at different periods. Fideism owes its origin to distrust in human reason, and the logical sequence of such an attitude is scepticism. It is to escape from this conclusion that some philosophers, accepting as a principle the impotency of reason, have emphasized the need of belief on the part of human nature, either asserting the primacy of belief over reason or else affirming a radical separation between reason and belief, that is, between science and philosophy on the one hand and religion on the other. Such is the position taken by Kant, when he distinguishes between pure reason, confined to subjectivity, and practical reason, which alone is able to put us by an act of faith in relation with objective reality. It is also a fideistic attitude which is the occasion of agnosticism, of positivism, of pragmatism and other modern forms of anti-intellectualism. As against these views, it must be noted that authority, even the authority of God, cannot be the supreme criterion of certitude, and an act of faith cannot be the primary form of human knowledge. This authority, indeed, in order to be a motive of assent, must be previously acknowledged as being certainly valid; before we believe in a proposition as revealed by God, we must first know with certitude that God exists, that He reveals such and such a proposition, and that His teaching is worthy of assent, all of which questions can and must be ultimately decided only by an act of intellectual assent based on objective evidence. Thus, fideism not only denies intellectual knowledge, but logically ruins faith itself.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Church has condemned such doctrines. In 1348, the Holy See proscribed certain fideistic propositions of Nicholas d'Autrecourt (cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 10th ed., nn.

553-570). In his two Encyclicals, one of September, 1832, and the other of July, 1834, Gregory XVI condemned the political and philosophical ideas of Lamennais. On 8 September, 1840, Bautain was required to subscribe to several propositions directly opposed to Fideism, the first and the fifth of which read as follows: "Human reason is able to prove with certitude the existence of God; faith, a heavenly gift, is posterior to revelation, and therefore cannot be properly used against the atheist to prove the existence of God"; and "The use of reason precedes faith and, with the help of revelation and grace, leads to it." The same propositions were subscribed to by Bonnetty on 11 June, 1855 (cf. Denzinger, nn. 1650-1652). In his Letter of 11 December, 1862, to the Archbishop of Munich, Pius IX, while condemning Frohschammer's naturalism, affirms the ability of human reason to reach certitude concerning the fundamental truths of the moral and religious order (cf. Denzinger, 1666-1676). And, finally, the Vatican Council teaches as a dogma of Catholic faith that "one true God and Lord can be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason by means of the things that are made" (Const. "De Fide Catholica", Sess. III, can. i, De Revelatione; cf. Grandérath, "Constitutiones dogmaticæ Conc. Vatic.", Freiburg, 1892, p. 32; cf. Denzinger, n. 1806).

As to the opinion of those who maintain that our supernatural assent is prepared for by motives of credibility merely probable, it is evident that it logically destroys the certitude of such an assent. This opinion was condemned by Innocent XI in the decree of 2 March, 1679 (cf. Denzinger, n. 1171), and by Pius X in the decree "Lamentabili sane" n. 25: "Assensus fidei ultimo innititur in congerie probabilitatum" (The assent of faith is ultimately based on a sum of probabilities). Revelation, indeed, is the supreme motive of faith in supernatural truths, yet the existence of this motive and its validity has to be established by reason. No one will deny the importance of authority and tradition or common consent in human society for our knowledge of natural truths. It is quite evident that to despise the teaching of the sages, the scientific discoveries of the past, and the voice of common consent would be to condemn ourselves to a perpetual infancy in knowledge, to render impossible any progress in science, to ignore the social character of man, and to make human life intolerable; but, on the other hand, it is an error to make these elements the supreme criteria of truth, since they are only particular rules of certitude, the validity of which is grounded upon a more fundamental rule. It is indeed true that moral certitude differs from mathematical, but the difference lies not in the firmness or validity of the certainty afforded, but in the process employed and the dispositions required by the nature of the truths with which they respectively deal. The Catholic doctrine on this question is in accord with history and philosophy. Rejecting both rationalism and fideism, it teaches that human reason is capable (physical ability) of knowing the moral and religious truths of the natural order; that it can prove with certainty the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and can acknowledge most certainly the teaching of God; that, however, in the present conditions of life, it needs (of moral necessity) the help of revelation to acquire a sufficient knowledge of all the natural truths necessary to direct human life according to the precepts of natural religion (Conc. Vatic., "De Fide Cath.", cap. ii; cf. St. Thomas, "Cont. Gent.", Lib. I, c. iv).

PERBONE, *Prælectiones theologice*, vol. I: *De verâ Religione*; OLLÉ-LAFRÈRE, *De la Certitude Morale* (5th ed., Paris, 1905); MERCIER, *Critériologie générale* (4th ed., Louvain, 1900), III, ch. I; JOHN RICKABY, *The First Principles of Knowledge* (4th ed., London, 1901), chs. xii, xiii.

G. M. SAUVAGE.

**Fidelis of Sigmaringen**, SAINT, b. in 1577, at Sigmaringen, Prussia, of which town his father Johan-

nes Rey was burgomaster; d. at Sevis, 24 April, 1622. On the paternal side he was of Flemish ancestry. He pursued his studies at the University of Freiburg in the Breisgau, and in 1604 became tutor to Wilhelm von Stotzingen, with whom he travelled in France and Italy. In the process for Fidelis's canonization Wilhelm von Stotzingen bore witness to the severe mortifications his tutor practised on these journeys. In 1611 he returned to Freiburg to take the doctorate in canon and civil law, and at once began to practise as an advocate. But the open corruption which found place in the law courts determined him to relinquish that profession and to enter the Church. He was ordained priest the following year, and immediately afterwards was received into the Order of Friars Minor of the Capuchin Reform at Freiburg, taking the name of Fidelis. He has left an interesting memorial of his novitiate and of his spiritual development at that time in a book of spiritual exercises which he wrote for himself. This work was re-edited by Father Michael Hetzenauer, O. M. Cap., and republished in 1893 at Stuttgart under the title: "S. Fidelis a Sigmaringen exercitia seraphicæ devotionis". From the novitiate he was sent to Constance to finish his studies in theology under Father John Baptist, a Polish friar of great repute for learning and holiness. At the conclusion of his theological studies Fidelis was appointed guardian first of the community at Rheinfelden, and afterwards at Freiburg and Feldkirch. As a preacher his burning zeal earned for him a great reputation.

From the beginning of his apostolic career he was untiring in his efforts to convert heretics; nor did he confine his efforts in this direction to the pulpit, but also used his pen. He wrote many pamphlets against Calvinism and Zwinglianism, though he would never put his name to his writings. Unfortunately these publications have long been lost. Fidelis was still guardian of the community at Feldkirch when in 1621 he was appointed to undertake a mission in the country of the Grisons with the purpose of bringing back that district to the Catholic Faith. The people there had almost all gone over to Calvinism, owing partly to the ignorance of the priests and their lack of zeal. In 1614 the Bishop of Coire had requested the Capuchins to undertake missions amongst the heretics in his diocese, but it was not until 1621 that the general of the order was able to send friars there. In that year Father Ignatius of Bergamo was commissioned with several other friars to place himself at the disposal of this bishop for missionary work; and a similar commission was given to Fidelis, who, however, still remained guardian of Feldkirch. Before setting out on this mission Fidelis was appointed by authority of the papal nuncio to reform the Benedictine monastery at Pfäfers. He entered upon his new labours in the true apostolic spirit. Since he first entered the order he had constantly prayed, as he confided to a fellow-friar, for two favours: one, that he might never fall into mortal sin; the other, that he might die for the Faith. In this spirit he now set out, ready to give his life in preaching the Faith. He took with him his crucifix, Bible, Breviary, and the book of the rule of his order; for the rest, he went in absolute poverty, trusting to Divine Providence for his daily sustenance. He arrived in Mayenfeld in time for Advent and began at once preaching and catechizing; often preaching in several places the same day. His coming aroused strong opposition and he was frequently threatened and insulted. He not only preached in the Catholic churches and in the public streets, but occasionally in the conventicles of the heretics. At Zizers, one of the principal centres of his activity, he held conferences with the magistrates and chief townsmen, often far into the night. They resulted in the conversion of Rudolph de Salis, the most influential man in the town, whose public recantation was followed by many conversions. Throughout the winter Fidelis laboured indefatigably



and with such success that the heretic preachers were seriously alarmed and set themselves to inflame the people against him by representing that his mission was political rather than religious and that he was preparing the way for the subjugation of the country by the Austrians. During the Lent of 1622 he preached with especial fervour. At Easter he returned to Feldkirch to attend a chapter of the order and settle some affairs of his community. By this time the Congregation of the Propaganda had been established in Rome, and Fidelis was formally constituted by the Congregation, superior of the mission in the Grisons. He had, however, a presentiment that his labours would shortly be brought to a close by a martyr's death. Preaching a farewell sermon at Feldkirch he said as much. On re-entering the country of the Grisons he was met everywhere with the cry: "Death to the Capuchins!" On 24 April, being then at Grusch, he made his confession and afterwards celebrated Mass and preached. Then he set out for Sevis. On the way his companions noticed that he was particularly cheerful. At Sevis he entered the church and began to preach, but was interrupted by a sudden tumult both within and without the church. Several Austrian soldiers who were guarding the doors of the church were killed and Fidelis himself was struck. A Calvinist present offered to lead him to a place of security. Fidelis thanked the man but said his life was in the hands of God. Outside the church he was surrounded by a crowd led by the preachers who offered to save his life if he would apostatize. Fidelis replied: "I came to extirpate heresy, not to embrace it", whereupon he was struck down. He was the first martyr of the Congregation of Propaganda. His body was afterwards taken to Feldkirch and buried in the church of his order, except his head and left arm, which were placed in the cathedral at Coire. He was beatified in 1729, and canonized in 1745. St. Fidelis is usually represented in art with a crucifix and with a wound in the head; his emblem is a bludgeon. His feast is kept on 24 April.

DA CUSINALE, *Storia delle Missioni dei Cappuccini* (Rome, 1872), II; DE PARIS, *Vie de Saint Fidèle* (Paris, 1745); DELLA SCALA, *Der heilige Fidelis von Sigmaringen* (Mainz, 1896).

FATHER CUTHBERT.

**Fides Instrumentorum.** See PROTOCOL.

**Fiefs of the Holy See.** See HOLY SEE.

**Fiesole, DIOCESE OF (FÆSULANA)**, in the province of Tuscany, suffragan of Florence. The town is of Etruscan origin, as may be seen from the remains of its ancient walls. In pagan antiquity it was the seat of a famous school of augurs, and every year twelve young men were sent thither from Rome to study the art of divination. Sulla colonized it with veterans, who afterwards, under the leadership of Manlius, supported the cause of Catiline. Near Fiesole the Vandals and Suevi under Radagaisus were defeated (405) by hunger rather than by the troops of Stilicho. During the Gothic War (536-53) the town was several times besieged. In 539 Justinus, the Byzantine general, captured it and razed its fortifications. In the early Middle Ages Fiesole was more powerful than Florence in the valley below, and many wars arose between them. In 1010 and 1025 Fiesole was sacked by the Florentines, and its leading families obliged to take up their residence in Florence.

According to local legend the Gospel was first preached at Fiesole by St. Romulus, a disciple of St. Peter. The fact that the ancient cathedral (now the Abbazia Fiesolana) stands outside the city is a proof that the Christian origins of Fiesole date from the period of the persecutions. The earliest mention of a Bishop of Fiesole is in a letter of Gelasius I (492-496). A little later, under Vigilius (537-55), a Bishop Rusticus is mentioned as papal legate at one of the Councils of Constantinople. The legendary St. Alexander is said by some to belong to the time of the Lombard


King Autari (end of the sixth century), but the Bollandists assign him to the reign of Lothair (middle of the ninth century). A very famous bishop is St. Donatus, an Irish monk, the friend and adviser of Emperors Louis the Pious and Lothair. He was elected in 826 and is buried in the cathedral, where his epitaph, dictated by himself, may still be seen. He founded the abbey of San Martino di Mensola; Bishop Zanobi in 890 founded that of St. Michael at Passignano, which was afterwards given to the Vallombrosan monks. Other bishops were Hildebrand of Lucca (1220), exiled by the Florentines; St. Andrew Corsini (1352), born in 1302 of a noble Florentine family, and who, after a reckless youth, became a Carmelite monk, studied at Paris, and as bishop was renowned as a peacemaker between individuals and States. He died 6 January, 1373, and was canonized by Urban VIII. Other famous bishops were the Dominican Fra Jacopo Altovita (1390), noted for his zeal against schism; Antonio Aglio (1466), a learned humanist and author of a collection of lives of the saints; the Augustinian Guglielmo Baccio (1470), a celebrated preacher, and author of commentaries on Aristotle and on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard; Francesco Cataneo Diaceto (1570), a theologian at the Council of Trent and a prolific writer; Lorenzo della Robbia (1634), who built the seminary. Among the glories of Fiesole should be mentioned the painter Lorenzo Monaco (1370-1424). But the greatest name associated with the history of the city is that of Blessed Giovanni Angelico, called *da Fiesole* (1387-1455). His baptismal name was Guido, but, entering the convent of the Reformed Dominicans at Fiesole, he took the name of Giovanni in religion; that of Angelico was afterwards given to him in allusion to the beauty and purity of his works.

The Cathedral of St. Romulus was built in 1028 by Bishop Jacopo Bavaro with materials taken from several older edifices; it contains notable sculptures by Mino da Fiesole. The old cathedral became a Benedictine abbey, and in course of time passed into the hands of the regular canons of Lateran. It once possessed a valuable library, long since dispersed. The abbey was closed in 1778. The diocese has 254 parishes and 155,800 souls. Within its limits there are 12 monasteries of men, including the famous Vallombrosa, and 24 convents for women.

The principal holy places of Fiesole are: (1) the cathedral (*Il Duomo*), containing the shrine of St. Romulus, martyr, according to legend the first Bishop of Fiesole, and that of his martyred companions, also the shrine of St. Donatus of Ireland; (2) the Badia or ancient cathedral at the foot of the hill on which Fiesole stands, supposed to cover the site of the martyrdom of St. Romulus; (3) the room in the bishop's palace where St. Andrew Corsini lived and died; (4) the little church of the Primerana in the cathedral square, where the same saint was warned by Our Lady of his approaching death; (5) the church of S. Alessandro, with the shrine of St. Alexander, bishop and martyr; (6) the monastery of S. Francesco on the crest of the hill, with the cells of St. Bernardine of



ALTAR-PIECE  
MADE FOR BISHOP SALUTATI  
Mino da Fiesole, Cathedral of Fiesole



CATHEDRAL, FIESOLE—BEGUN A. D. 1028





Siena and seven Franciscan *Beati*; (7) S. Girolamo, the home of Venerable Carlo dei Conti Guidi, founder of the Hieronymites of Fiesole (1360); (8) S. Domenico, the novice-home of Fra Angelico da Fiesole and of St. Antoninus of Florence; (9) Fontanelle, a villa near S. Domenico where St. Aloysius came to live in the hot summer months, when a page at the court of Grand Duke Francesco de' Medici; (10) Fonte Lucente, where a miraculous crucifix is greatly revered. A few miles distant is (11) Monte Senario, the cradle of the Servite Order, where its seven holy founders lived in great austerity and were cheered at their death by the songs of angels; also (12) S. Martino di Mensola, with the body of St. Andrew, an Irish saint, still incorrupt.

CAPPALLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1846), XVII, 7-72; AMIRATO, *Gli Vescovi di Fiesole* (Florence, 1637); PHILLIMORE, *Fra Angelico* (London, 1881).

U. BENIGNI.

**Figuerola**, FRANCISCO DE, a celebrated Spanish poet, surnamed "the Divine", b. at Alcalá de Henares, c. 1540; d. there, 1620. Little is known of his life, except that he was of noble family, received his education at the University of Alcalá, and followed a military career for a time, taking part in campaigns in Italy and Flanders. From a very early age Figuerola showed unusual poetical talent, and his poems are full of fire and passion. His work first attracted attention in Italy, where he resided for a time, but it was not long before he had earned a brilliant reputation in his own country. Following in the footsteps of Boscan Almogaver and Garcilaso, to whose school he belonged, he wrote pastoral poems in the Italian metres, and was one of the first Spanish poets who used with much success blank verse, which had been introduced by Boscan in 1543. His best-known and most highly praised work is the eclogue "Tirsis", written entirely in blank verse. He was highly praised by Cervantes in his "Galatea". It is unfortunate that but a small part of the works of this brilliant poet have reached us, the greater portion having been burned by his direction just before his death. A small part, however, was preserved and published by Luis Tribaldos de Toledo, at Lisbon in 1625. They were reprinted in 1785 and again in 1804. The best of Figuerola's works appear in "La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles" of Rivadeneira, vol. XLII.

TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (3 vols., New York, 1849).

VENTURA FUENTES.

**Figuerola**, FRANCISCO GARCÍA DE LA ROSA, Franciscan; b. in the latter part of the eighteenth century at Toluca, in the Archdiocese of Mexico; date of death unknown. Figuerola possessed extraordinary administrative powers and for more than forty years directed the affairs of his order with singular prudence and ability, being lector emeritus of his order, prefect of studies of the college of Tlatelulco, superior of several convents, definitor, custodian, twice provincial of the province of Santo Evangelio, and visitor to the other provinces of New Spain. He was much beloved by the people, and highly esteemed by the viceroys and bishops. On 21 Feb., 1790, a royal order was received directing that all documents shedding light on the history of New Spain should be copied and sent to Spain, the order designating in some instances special documents which were wanted. D. Juan Vicente de Güemes Pacheco de Padilla, second Count of Revillagigedo, viceroy from 1789 to 1794, entrusted to Father Figuerola the work of selecting, arranging, and copying these manuscripts. To this task Father Figuerola brought such marvellous activity and rare judgment, both in selecting the material and the copyists, that in less than three years he turned over to the Government thirty-two folio volumes of almost a thousand pages each, in duplicate, containing copies of original

documents collected from the archives of convents and from private collections, for the most part almost forgotten, and of the greatest value for the knowledge of the political and ecclesiastical history of the provinces. Such a collection contained quite inevitably some material not of the first importance; there were documents of all kinds, but the collection as a whole was one of great value. One copy, which was sent to Spain and examined by the chronicler Muñoz, is preserved in the Academia de Historia; the other was kept in Mexico in the Secretaría del Virreinato, and from there was transferred to the general archives of the Palacio Nacional, where it is still kept. The first volume of this was missing, but about 1872 a copy of it was made from that preserved in Madrid. To the original thirty-two volumes another was added, compiled years afterwards by some Franciscans, which contains a minute index of the contents of the work. Two other copies of the thirty-two volumes were found; one is in Mexico, the property of Señor Agueda, and the other in the United States in the H. H. Bancroft collection.

As this work of Figuerola's has never been published it may be of interest to summarize the contents of the different volumes. They are as follows: I. Thirty fragments from the Museo de Boturini, among them four letters from Father Salvatierra. II. Treatise on political virtues by D. Carlos Sigüenza; life and martyrdom of the children of Tlaxcala; narrative of New Mexico by Father Gerónimo Salmerón, Father Velez, and others. III. Report of Father Posadas on Texas; three fragments on ancient history, Canticles of Netzahualcoyotl, etc. IV. Narrative of Ixtlixochitl. V-VI. Conquest of the Kingdom of New Galicia by D. Matías de la Mota Padilla. VII-VIII. Introduction to the history of Michoacán. IX-XI. Chronicle of Michoacán by Fray Pablo Beaumont. XII. Mexican Chronicle by D. Hernando Alvarado Tezozomoc. XIII. History of the Chichimecs by Ixtlixochitl. XIV. Reminiscences of the City of Mexico. XV. Reminiscences for the history of Sinaloa. XVI-XVII. Notes for the history of Sonora. XVIII. Important letters to elucidate the history of Sonora and Sinaloa. XIX-XX. Documents for the history of New Vizcaya (Durango). XXI. Establishment and progress of the Missions of Old California. XXII-XXIII. Notes on New California. XXIV. Log-book kept by the Fathers Garcés, Barbastró, Font, and Capetillo; voyage of the frigate "Santiago"; "Diario" of Urrea and of D. J. B. Anza, etc. XXV-XXVI. Documents for the ecclesiastical and civil history of New Mexico. XXVII-XXVIII. Documents for the civil and ecclesiastical history of the Province of Texas. XXIX. Documents for the history of Coahuila and Central Mexico (*Seno Mexicano*). XXX. Tampico, Río Verde, and Nuevo León. XXXI. Notes on the cities of Vera Cruz, Cordova, Oaxaca, Puebla, Tepetzotlan, Querétaro, Guajuato, Guadalajara, Zacatecas, and Nootka. XXXII. Pious reminiscences of the Indian nation.

BERISTAIN, *Bibl. hisp. amer. septentrional* (2d ed., Mexico, 1883); *Diccionario Univ. de Hist. y Geog.*, published in Spain by a society; revised and enlarged by D. LUCAS ALAMÁN, D. J. GARCÍA ICÁZBALZETA, and others (Mexico, 1853), III; ANTONIO GARCÍA CUBAS, *Diccionario geog., hist. y biog. de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos* (Mexico, 1888), I; LEÓN, *Hist. Gen. de Mexico* (Mexico, 1902).

CAMILLUS CRIVELLI.

Filcock, ROBERT. See LINE, ANNE

**Filelfo**, FRANCESCO, humanist, b. at Tolentino, 25 July, 1398; d. at Florence, 31 July, 1481. He studied grammar, rhetoric, and Latin literature at Padua, where he was appointed professor at the age of eighteen. In 1417 he was invited to teach eloquence and moral philosophy at Venice, where the rights of citizenship were conferred upon him. Two years later he was appointed secretary to the Venetian consul-general at Constantinople. Arriving there in 1420, he at once began the study of Greek under John Chry-

scolas, whose daughter he afterwards married, and he was received with great favour by the Emperor John Palaeologus, by whom he was employed on several important diplomatic missions. In 1427, receiving an invitation to the chair of eloquence at Venice, Filelfo returned there with a great collection of Greek books. The following year he was called to Bologna, and in 1429 to Florence, where he was received with the greatest enthusiasm. During his five years' residence there he engaged in numerous quarrels with the Florentine scholars and incurred the hatred of the Medici, so that in 1434 he was forced to leave the city. He went to Siena and later to Milan, where he was welcomed by Filippo Maria Visconti, who showered

honours upon him. Some years later, after Milan had been forcibly entered by Francesco Sforza, Filelfo wrote a history of Sforza's life in a Latin epic poem of sixteen books, called the "Sforziad". In 1474 he left Milan to accept a professorship at Rome, where, owing to a disagreement with Sixtus IV, he did not remain long. He went back to Milan, but left there in 1481 to teach Greek at Florence, having



FRANCESCO FILELFO

long before become reconciled with the Medici. He died in poverty only a fortnight after his arrival. The Florentines buried him in the church of the Annunziata. Filelfo was the most restless of all the humanists, as is indicated by the number of places at which he taught. He was a man of indefatigable activity, but arrogant, rapacious, fond of luxury, and always ready to assail his literary rivals. His writings include numerous letters (last ed. by Le-grand, Paris, 1892), speeches (Paris, 1515), and satires (Venice, 1502); besides many scattered pieces in prose, published under the title "*Convivia Mediolanensis*", and a great many Latin translations from the Greek. In both these languages he wrote with equal fluency.

SYMONDS, *Renaissance in Italy* (New York, 1900), II: *The Revival of Learning*; ROSMINI, *Vita di Fr. Filelfo* (3 vols., Milan, 1808); VOIGT, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums* (Berlin, 1893), I; SANDYS, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1908), I, 55-57.

EDMUND BURKE.

**Filial Church** (Lat. *filialis*, from *filia*, daughter), a church to which is annexed the cure of souls, but which remains dependent on another church. As this dependence on the mother church may be of various degrees, the term *filial church* has naturally more than one signification as to minor details. Ordinarily, a filial church is a parish church which has been constituted by the dismemberment of an older parish. Its rector is really a parish priest, having all the essential rights of such a dignity, but still bound to defer in certain accidental matters to the pastor of the mother church. The marks of deference required are not so fixed that local custom may not change them. Such marks are: obtaining the baptismal water from the mother church, making a moderate offering of money (fixed by the bishop) to the parish priest of the mother church annually, and occasionally during the year

assisting with his parishioners in a body at services in the older church. In some places this last includes a procession and the presentation of a wax candle. If the filial church has been endowed from the revenues of the mother church, the parish priest of the latter has the right of presentation when a pastor for the dependent church is to be appointed.

This term is also applied to churches established within the limits of an extensive parish, without any dismemberment of the parochial territory. The pastor of such a filial church is really only a curate or assistant of the parish priest of the mother church, and he is removable at will, except in cases where he has a benefice. The parish priest may retain to himself the right of performing baptism, assisting at marriages and similar offices in the filial church, or he may ordain that such functions be performed only in the parish church, restricting the services in the filial church to Mass and Vespers. In practice, however, the curates of such filial churches act as parish priests for their districts, although by canon law the dependence upon the pastor of the mother church remains of obligation, though all outward manifestation of subjection has ceased.

In the union of two parishes in the manner called "union by subjection", the less important of the parish churches may sink into a condition scarcely distinguishable from that of a filial church and be comprehended under this term. In other words, the parish priest may govern such a church by giving it over to one of his assistants. It is true that the subjected church does not lose its parochial rights, yet its dependence on the parish priest of another church and its administration by a vicar has led to its being included loosely under the designation *filial church*. Historically, this term has also been applied to those churches, often in different countries, founded by other and greater churches. In this sense the great patriarchal Sees of Rome, Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Constantinople established many filial churches which retained a special dependence upon the church founding them. The term *Mother Church*, however, as applied to Rome, has a special significance as indicating its headship of all the churches.

AICHNER, *Compendium Juris Eccl.* (Brixen, 1895); FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca Canonica* (Rome, 1886), III, s. v. *Dismemberatio*; LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones Juris Canonici* (Freiburg, 1903).

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

**Filicaja**, VINCENZO DA, lyric poet; b. at Florence, 30 Dec., 1642; d. there 24 Sept., 1707. At Pisa he was trained for the legal profession, which he later pursued, but during his academic career he devoted no little attention to philosophy, literature, and music. Returning to Florence, he was made a member of the Accademia della Crusca and of the Arcadia, and enjoyed the patronage of the illustrious convert to the Catholic faith, Christina, ex-Queen of Sweden, who with her purse helped to lighten his family burdens. A lawyer and magistrate of integrity, he never attained to wealth. His probity and ability, however, were acknowledged by those in power, and he was appointed to several public offices of great trust. Thus, already a senator by the nomination of Grand Duke Cosmo III, he was chosen governor of Volterra in 1696, and of Pisa in 1700, and then was given the important post of Segretario delle Tratte at Florence. An ardent Catholic, he not infrequently gives expression to his religious feeling in his lyrics, which, even though they may not entitle him to rank among the greatest of Italian poets, will always attract attention because of their relative freedom from the literary vices of the time, the bombast, the exaggerations and obscurity of Marinism. Notable among his compositions are the odes or *canzoni*, which deal with the raising of the siege of Vienna by John Sobieski, when in 1683 it was beleaguered by the Turks, and the sonnets in which he bewails the woes of Italy whose beauty

had made her the object of foreign cupidity and whose sons were incapable of fighting for her and could only enlist mercenaries to defend her. The most famous of the sonnets is perhaps the "Italia, Italia, O tu cui feo la sorte", which Byron rendered with skill in the fourth canto of *Childe Harold*. Some letters, *elogi*, *orazioni*, and Latin *carmina*, constitute the rest of his literary output. After the death of Filicaja, an edition of the "Poesie toscane", containing the lyrics, was given to the world by his son (Florence, 1707); a better edition is that of Florence, 1823; selected poems are given in "Lirici del secolo XVII", published by Sonzogno.

AMICO, *Poesie e lettere di Vincenzo da Filicaja* (Florence, 1864), with a preface on his life and work; CASTELLANI, *Studi letterari* (Città di Castello, 1889).

J. D. M. FORD.

**Filioque** is a theological formula of great dogmatic and historical importance. On the one hand, it expresses the Procession of the Holy Ghost from both Father and Son as one Principle; on the other, it was the occasion of the Greek schism. Both aspects of the expression need further explanation.

I. DOGMATIC MEANING OF FILIOQUE.—The dogma of the double Procession of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son as one Principle is directly opposed to the error that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, not from the Son. Neither dogma nor error created much difficulty during the course of the first four centuries. Macedonius and his followers, the so-called Pneumatomachi, were condemned by the local Council of Alexandria (362) and by Pope St. Damasus (378) for teaching that the Holy Ghost derives His origin from the Son alone, by creation. If the creed used by the Nestorians, which was composed probably by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the expressions of Theodoret directed against the ninth anathema by Cyril of Alexandria, deny that the Holy Ghost derives His existence from or through the Son, they probably intend to deny only the creation of the Holy Ghost by or through the Son, inculcating at the same time His Procession from both Father and Son. At any rate, if the double Procession of the Holy Ghost was discussed at all in those early times, the controversy was restricted to the East and was of short duration. The first undoubted denial of the double Procession of the Holy Ghost we find in the seventh century among the heretics of Constantinople when St. Martin I (649-655), in his synodal writing against the Monothelites, employed the expression "Filioque". Nothing is known about the further development of this controversy; it does not seem to have assumed any serious proportions, as the question was not connected with the characteristic teaching of the Monothelites. In the Western church the first controversy concerning the double Procession of the Holy Ghost was conducted with the envoys of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, in the Synod of Gentilly near Paris, held in the time of Pepin (767). The synodal Acts and other sources of information do not seem to exist. At the beginning of the ninth century, John, a Greek monk of the monastery of St. Sabas, charged the monks of Mt. Olivet with heresy, because they had inserted the Filioque into the Creed. In the second half of the same century, Photius the successor of the unjustly deposed Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople (858), denied the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, and opposed the insertion of the Filioque into the Constantinopolitan Creed. The same position was maintained towards the end of the tenth century by the Patriarchs Sisinnius and Sergius, and about the middle of the eleventh century by the Patriarch Michael Cærularius, who renewed and completed the Greek schism. The rejection of the Filioque, or of the dogma of the double Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son, and the denial of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff constitute even to-day the principal

errors of the Greek Church. While outside the Church doubt as to the double Procession of the Holy Ghost grew into open denial, inside the Church the doctrine of the Filioque was declared to be a dogma of faith in the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), the Second Council of Lyons (1274), and the Council of Florence (1438-1445). Thus the Church proposed in a clear and authoritative form the teaching of Sacred Scripture and tradition on the Procession of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity.

As to Sacred Scripture, the inspired writers call the Holy Ghost the Spirit of the Son (Gal., iv, 6), the Spirit of Christ (Rom., viii, 9), the Spirit of Jesus Christ (Phil., i, 19), just as they call Him the Spirit of the Father (Matt., x, 20) and the Spirit of God (I Cor., ii, 11). Hence they attribute to the Holy Ghost the same relation to the Son as to the Father. Again, according to Sacred Scripture, the Son sends the Holy Ghost (Luke, xxiv, 49; John, xv, 26; xvi, 7; xx, 22; Acts, ii, 33; Tit., iii, 6), just as the Father sends the Son (Rom., viii, 3; etc.), and as the Father sends the Holy Ghost (John, xiv, 26). Now, the "mission" or "sending" of one Divine Person by another does not mean merely that the Person said to be sent assumes a particular character, at the suggestion of Himself in the character of Sender, as the Sabellians maintained; nor does it imply any inferiority in the Person sent, as the Arians taught; but it denotes, according to the teaching of the weightier theologians and Fathers, the Procession of the Person sent from the Person Who sends. Sacred Scripture never presents the Father as being sent by the Son, nor the Son as being sent by the Holy Ghost. The very idea of the term "mission" implies that the person sent goes forth for a certain purpose by the power of the sender, a power exerted on the person sent by way of a physical impulse, or of a command, or of prayer, or finally of production; now, Procession, the analogy of production, is the only manner admissible in God. It follows that the inspired writers present the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Son, since they present Him as sent by the Son. Finally, St. John (XVI, 13-15) gives the words of Christ: "What things soever he [the Spirit] shall hear, he shall speak; . . . he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it to you. All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine." Here a double consideration is in place. First, the Son has all things that the Father hath, so that He must resemble the Father in being the Principle from Which the Holy Ghost proceeds. Secondly, the Holy Ghost shall receive "of mine" according to the words of the Son; but Procession is the only conceivable way of receiving which does not imply dependence or inferiority. In other words, the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son.

The teaching of Sacred Scripture on the double Procession of the Holy Ghost was faithfully preserved in Christian tradition. Even the Greek schismatics grant that the Latin Fathers maintain the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. The great work on the Trinity by Petavius (Lib. VII, cc. iii sqq.) develops the proof of this contention at length. Here we mention only some of the later documents in which the patristic doctrine has been clearly expressed: the dogmatic letter of St. Leo I to Turribius, Bishop of Astorga, Ep. XV, c. i (447); the so-called Athanasian Creed; several councils held at Toledo in the years 447, 589 (III), 675 (XI), 693 (XVI); the letter of Pope Hormisdas to the Emperor Justinus, Ep. lxxxix (521); St. Martin I's synodal utterance against the Monothelites, 649-655; Pope Adrian I's answer to the Caroline Books, 772-795; the Synods of Merida (666), Braga (675), and Hatfield (680); the writing of Pope Leo III (d. 816) to the monks of Jerusalem; the letter of Pope Stephen V (d. 891) to the Moravian King Suentopoleus (Suatopluk), Ep. xiii; the symbol of Pope Leo IX (d. 1054); the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215; the Second Council of Lyons, 1274; and the Council of Florence,

1439. Some of the foregoing conciliar documents may be seen in Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte" (2d ed.), III, nn. 109, 117, 252, 411; cf. P. G., XXVIII, 1567 sqq. Bessarion, speaking in the Council of Florence, inferred the tradition of the Greek Church from the teaching of the Latin; since the Greek and the Latin Fathers before the ninth century were members of the same Church, it is antecedently improbable that the Eastern Fathers should have denied a dogma firmly maintained by the Western. Moreover, there are certain considerations which form a direct proof for the belief of the Greek Fathers in the double Procession of the Holy Ghost. First, the Greek Fathers enumerate the Divine Persons in the same order as the Latin Fathers; they admit that the Son and the Holy Ghost are logically and ontologically connected in the same way as the Son and the Father [St. Basil, Ep. cxxv; Ep. xxxviii (*alias* xliii) ad Gregor. fratrem; "Adv. Eunom.", I, xx, III, *sub init.*]. Second, the Greek Fathers establish the same relation between the Son and the Holy Ghost as between the Father and the Son; as the Father is the fountain of the Son, so is the Son the fountain of the Holy Ghost (Athanas., Ep. ad Serap., I, xix, sqq.; "De Incarn.", ix; Orat. iii, adv. Arian., 24; Basil, "Adv. Eunom.", v, in P. G., XXIX, 731; cf. Greg. Naz., Orat. xliii, 9). Third, passages are not wanting in the writings of the Greek Fathers in which the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son is clearly maintained: Greg. Thaumaturgus, "Expos. fidei sec.", vers. sec. IV, in Rufinus, Hist. Eccl., VII, xxv; Epiphanius, Har., c. lxii, 4; Greg. Nyssa, Hom. iii in orat. domin. (cf. Mai, "Bibl. nova Patrum", IV, 40 sqq.); Cyril of Alexandria, "Thes.", ass. xxxiv; the second canon of a synod of forty bishops held in 410 at Seleucia in Mesopotamia (cf. Lamy, "Concilium Seleuciæ et Ctesiphontæ habitum a. 410", Louvain, 1869; Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte", II, 102 sqq.); the Arabic version of the Canons of St. Hippolytus (Haneberg, "Canones Sti. Hippolyti", Munster, 1870, 40, 76); the Nestorian explanation of the Symbol (cf. Badger, "The Nestorians", London, 1852, II, 79; Cureton, "Ancient Syriac Documents Relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity in Edessa", London, 1864, 43; "The Doctrine of Addai, the Apostle", ed. Phillips, London, 1876). The only Scriptural difficulty deserving our attention is based on the words of Christ as recorded in John, xv, 26, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, without mention being made of the Son. But in the first place, it cannot be shown that this omission amounts to a denial; in the second place, the omission is only apparent, as in the earlier part of the verse the Son promises to "send" the Spirit. The Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son is not mentioned in the Creed of Constantinople, because this Creed was directed against the Macedonian error against which it sufficed to declare the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father. The ambiguous expressions found in some of the early writers of authority are explained by the principles which apply to the language of the early Fathers generally.

II. HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE FILIOQUE.—It has been seen that the Creed of Constantinople at first declared only the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father; it was directed against the followers of Macedonius who denied the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. In the East, the omission of Filioque did not lead to any serious misunderstanding. But conditions were different in Spain after the Goths had renounced Arianism and professed the Catholic faith in the Third Synod of Toledo, 589. It cannot be ascertained who first added the Filioque to the Creed; but it appears to be certain that the Creed, with the addition of the Filioque, was first sung in the Spanish Church after the conversion of the Goths. In 796 the Patriarch Paulinus of Aquileia justified and adopted the same addition at the Synod of Friaul, and

in 809 the Council of Aachen appears to have approved of it. The decrees of this last council were examined by Pope Leo III, who approved of the doctrine conveyed by the Filioque, but gave the advice to omit the expression in the Creed. The practice of adding the Filioque was retained in spite of the papal advice, and about the middle of the eleventh century it had gained a firm foothold in Rome itself. Scholars do not agree as to the exact time of its introduction into Rome, but most assign it to the reign of Benedict VIII (1014-15). The Catholic doctrine was accepted by the Greek deputies who were present at the Second Council of Lyons, in 1274, and at the Council of Florence, in 1439, when the Creed was sung both in Greek and Latin, with the addition of the word *Filioque*. On each occasion it was hoped that the Patriarch of Constantinople and his subjects had abandoned the state of heresy and schism in which they had been living since the time of Photius, who about 870 found in the Filioque an excuse for throwing off all dependence on Rome. But however sincere the individual Greek bishops may have been, they failed to carry their people with them, and the breach between East and West continues to this day. It is a matter for surprise that so abstract a subject as the doctrine of the double Procession of the Holy Ghost should have appealed to the imagination of the multitude. But their national feelings had been aroused by the desire of liberation from the rule of the ancient rival of Constantinople; the occasion of lawfully obtaining their desire appeared to present itself in the addition of Filioque to the Creed of Constantinople. Had not Rome overstepped her rights by disobeying the injunction of the Third Council, of Ephesus (431), and of the Fourth, of Chalcedon (451)? It is true that these councils had forbidden to introduce another faith or another Creed, and had imposed the penalty of deposition on bishops and clerics, and of excommunication on monks and laymen for transgressing this law; but the councils had not forbidden to explain the same faith or to propose the same Creed in a clearer way. Besides, the conciliar decrees affected individual transgressors, as is plain from the sanction added; they did not bind the Church as a body. Finally, the Councils of Lyons and Florence did not require the Greeks to insert the Filioque into the Creed, but only to accept the Catholic doctrine of the double Procession of the Holy Ghost. (See HOLY GHOST and CREED.)

HUNTER, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology* (New York, 1896), II, 193 sqq.; HURTER, *Theologia Dogmatica Compendium* (Innsbruck, 1833), II, 145 sqq.; BECKER in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v.; PETAVIUS, *De Trinitate*, Lib. VII; VAN DER MOEREN, *Dissertatio theologica de processione Spiritus Sancti ex Patre Filioque* (Louvain, 1864); VINCENTI, *De processione Spiritus Sancti* (Rome, 1878). See also literature under HOLY GHOST.

A. J. MAAS.

**Filippini.** See ORATORIAN.

**Fillastre** (PHILASTRIUS), GUILLAUME, French cardinal, canonist, humanist, and geographer, b. 1348 at La Suze, Maine, France; d. at Rome, 6 November, 1428. After graduating as *doctor juris utriusque*, Fillastre taught jurisprudence at Reims, and in 1392 was appointed dean of its metropolitan chapter. During the Western Schism he showed at first much sympathy for Benedict XIII (Peter de Luna). In 1409, however, he took part in the attempt to reconcile the factions at the Council of Pisa. John XXIII conferred on him and his friend d'Ailly the dignity of cardinal (1411), and in 1413 he was made Archbishop of Aix. Fillastre took a very important part in the Council of Constance, where he and Cardinal d'Ailly were the first to agitate the question of the abdication of the rival claimants (February, 1415). He won special distinction through the many legal questions on which he gave decisions. Martin V, in whose election he had been an important factor, appointed him *legatus a latere* to France (1418), where he was to pro-

mote the cause of Church unity. In recognition of his successful efforts in this capacity, he was made Archbishop of the Lateran Basilica. In 1421 he resigned the See of Aix, and in 1422 was assigned to the See of Saint-Pons-de-Thomières. He died at Rome in his eightieth year, as Cardinal-Priest of San Marco.

During the Council of Constance Fillastre kept a diary discovered by Heinrich Finke, first reviewed by him in the "Romische Quartalschrift" (1887), and there partly edited by him. It is the most important historical source for the Council of Constance, and was edited by Finke in its entirety in 1889 (in his "Forschungen und Quellen", see below, 163-242). Fillastre's notes throw new light on the principal participants in the council, as well as on the two popes who were deposed and their trial, on the college of cardinals as a body, and in particular on Cardinals d'Ailly, Fillastre, Zabarella, etc. Fillastre is our only authority concerning the preliminary motions on the method of voting and the extremely difficult position of the college of Cardinals; he gives us our first clear conception of the quarrels that arose among the "nations" over the matter of precedence, and the place which the Spanish "nation" held at the council; he also furnishes the long-sought explanation of the confirmation of Sigismund as Holy Roman Emperor by Martin V. Fillastre's diary derives its highest value, however, from the exposition of the relations between the king and the council and the description of the conclave.

While Fillastre was in Constance (where, it may be remarked, he translated several of Plato's works into Latin), he rendered important services to the history of geography and cartography, as well as to the history of the council. Thus he had copied the Latin translation of Ptolemy's geography (without maps), which had been completed by Jacobus Angelus in 1409, a manuscript he had great difficulty in securing from Florence. Together with this precious Ptolemy codex, he sent in 1418 to the chapter-library of Reims, which he had founded and already endowed with many valuable manuscripts, a large map of the world traced on walrus skin, and a codex of Pomponius Mela. The two geographical codices are still preserved as precious "cimelia" in the municipal library of Reims, but the map of the world unfortunately disappeared during the eighteenth century.

About 1425 Fillastre wrote one of his most important canonical works on interest and usury; it has been handed down in numerous manuscripts. In 1427, though now an old man, he was as indefatigable as ever, and had the maps of Ptolemy drawn from a Greek original, but on a diminished scale, and arranged with Latin terminology, to go with his Latin Ptolemy. Since Ptolemy had no knowledge of the Scandinavian Peninsula, much less of Greenland, Fillastre completed his codex by adding to Ptolemy's ten maps of Europe an eleventh. This "eleventh map of Europe", with the subjoined detailed description of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Greenland, is the only existing copy of the "first map" of Claudius Clavus, "the first cartographer of America". This precious cartographic treasure is still preserved in the municipal library of Nancy.

MARLOT, *Metropolis remensis historia* (Reims, 1679), II, 693 sqq.; ALBANES, *Gallia Christ. (novissima)* (1899), I, 96 sqq.; FINKE, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils* (Paderborn, 1889), 73 sqq.; STORM, *Den danske geogr. Claudius Clavus* (Stockholm, 1891), 129 sqq.; FISCHER, *Discoveries of the Norsemen* (London, 1903), 58 sqq., 83 sqq.; BJÖRNBO AND PETERSEN, *Claudius Clavus* (Innsbruck, 1908).

JOSEPH FISCHER.

**Filliucci**, VINCENZO, Jesuit moralist; b. at Sienna, Italy, 1566; d. at Rome, 5 April, 1622. Having entered the Society of Jesus at the age of eighteen and made the usual course in classics, science, philosophy, and theology, he professed philosophy and mathematics for some years, and later became rector of

the Jesuit college in his native city. Being summoned to Rome to fill the chair of moral theology in the Roman College, he taught there for ten years with great distinction. Paul V appointed him penitentiary of St. Peter's, a post he filled until his death in the following pontificate. Filliucci's greatest work, "*Moralium Quæstionum de Christianis Officiis et Casibus Conscientiæ Tomi Duo*", appeared in 1622, and together with a posthumous "*Appendix, de Statu Clericorum*", forming a third volume, has frequently been reprinted in several countries of Europe. A "*Synopsis Theologiæ Moralis*", which likewise appeared posthumously in 1626, went through numerous editions. Filliucci is also known for his excellent "*Brevis Instructio pro Confessionibus Excipiendis*" (Ravensburg, 1626); this work is generally published as an appendix in all subsequent editions of his "*Synopsis*". Besides these published works, there is a manuscript, "*Tractatus de Censuris*", preserved in the archives of the Roman College. As an authority in moral theology, Father Filliucci has ever been accorded high rank, though this did not save him from the attacks of the Jansenists. The "*Provincial Letters*" of Pascal and "*Les Extraits des Assertions*" make much capital out of their garbled quotations from his writings; while, in the anti-Jesuit tumult of 1762, the "*parlement*" of Bordeaux forbade his works and the "*parlement*" of Rouen burnt them, together with twenty-eight other works by Jesuit authors.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, III, 735; IX, 340; DE BACKER, *Bibl. des Écrivains de la Comp. de Jésus*, I, 308; HERTER, *Nomenclator Literarius*, I, 364.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Filliucius**, FELIX (or, as his name is more often found, in its Italian form, FIGLIUCCI), an Italian humanist, a philosopher, and theologian of note, was b. at Siena about the year 1525; supposed to have d. at Florence c. 1590. He completed his studies in philosophy at Padua and was for a time in the service of Cardinal Del Monte, afterwards Julius III. In spite of the fact that he gained a great reputation as an orator and poet, and had a wide knowledge of Greek, no mention of his name is found in such standard works on the Renaissance as Burchardt, Voigt (*Die Wiederbelebung des class. Alterthums*), and Belloni (*Il Seicento*). After having enjoyed the pleasures of the worldly life at the court in 1551 he entered the Dominican convent at Florence, where he assumed the name Alexis. His works are both original in Italian and translations into that language from the Greek. Worthy of mention are: "*Il Fedro, ovvero del bello*" (Rome, 1544); "*Delle divine lettere del gran Marsilio Ficino*" (Venice, 1548); "*Le undici Filippiche di Demostene dichiarate*" (Rome, 1550); "*Della Filosofia morale d'Aristotile*" (Rome, 1551); "*Della Politica, ovvero Scienza civile secondo la dottrina d'Aristotile, libri VIII scritti in modo di dialogo*" (Venice, 1583). Filliucius attended the Council of Trent, where he delivered a remarkable Latin oration and, at the order of St. Pius V, translated into Italian, under his cloister name of Alexis, the Latin Catechism of the Council of Trent (Catechismo, cioè istruzione secondo il decreto del concilio di Trento, Rome, 1567), often reprinted.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Scriptores Ord. Pred.*, II, 263 sqq., on which all the other biographies are based.

JOSEPH DUNN.

**Finality.** See CAUSE; TELEOLOGY.

**Final Perseverance.** See PERSEVERANCE.

**Finan**, SAINT, second Bishop of Lindisfarne; d. 9 February, 661. He was an Irish monk who had been trained in Iona, and who was specially chosen by the Columban Monks to succeed the great St. Aidan (635-51). St. Bede describes him as an able ruler, and tells of his labours in the conversion of Northumbria. He built a cathedral "in the Irish fashion", employing



"hewn oak, with an outer covering of reeds", dedicated to St. Peter. His apostolic zeal resulted in the foundation of St. Mary's at the mouth of the River Tyne; Gilling, a monastery on the spot where King Oswin had been murdered, founded by Queen Eanfled, and the great Abbey of Streanaeshalch, or Whitby. St. Finan (Finn-in—little Finn) converted Peada, son of Penda, King of the Middle Angles, "with all his Nobles and Thanes", and gave him four priests, including Diurma, whom he consecrated Bishop of Middle Angles and Mercia, under King Oswy. The Breviary of Aberdeen styles him "a man of venerable life, a bishop of great sanctity, an eloquent teacher of unbelieving races, remarkable for his training in virtue and his liberal education, surpassing all his equals in every manner of knowledge as well as in circumspection and prudence, but chiefly devoting himself to good works and presenting in his life, a most apt example of virtue".

In the mysterious ways of Providence, the Abbey of Whitby, his chief foundation, was the scene of the famous Paschal controversy, which resulted in the withdrawal of the Irish monks from Lindisfarne. The inconvenience of the two systems—Irish and Roman—of keeping Easter was specially felt when on one occasion King Oswy and his Court were celebrating Easter Sunday with St. Finan, while on the same day Queen Eanfled and her attendants were still fasting and celebrating Palm Sunday. Saint Finan was spared being present at the Synod of Whitby. His feast is celebrated on the 9th of February.

BEDE, ed. SELLAR, *Eccles. Hist. of England* (London, 1907); MORIN, *Irish Saints in Great Britain*, new ed. (Callan, 1903); HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1902).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Finbarr** (LOCHAN. BARR). SAINT, Bishop and patron of Cork. b. near Bandon, about 550, d. at Cloyne, 25 Sept., 623, was son of Amergin. He evangelized Gworan, Coolcashion, and Aghaboe, and founded a school at Eirce. For some years he dwelt in a hermitage at Gougane Barra, where a beautiful replica of Cormac's chapel has recently been erected in his honour. Finbarr was buried in the cathedral he built where Cork city now stands. He was specially honoured also at Dornoch and Barra, in Scotland. There are five Irish saints of this name. (See CORK.)

Life by WALSH (New York, 1864); *Banba* (Dublin), 207.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Finch, JOHN**, VENERABLE, martyr, b. about 1548; d. 20 April, 1584. He was a yeoman of Eccleston, Lancashire, and a member of a well-known old Catholic family, but he appears to have been brought up in schism. When he was twenty years old he went to London where he spent nearly a year with some cousins at the Inner Temple. While there he was forcibly struck by the contrast between Protestantism and Catholicism in practice and determined to lead a Catholic life. Failing to find advancement in London he returned to Lancashire where he was reconciled to the Catholic Church. He then married and settled down, his house becoming a centre of missionary work, he himself harbouring priests and aiding them in every way, besides acting as catechist. His zeal drew on him the hostility of the authorities, and at Christmas, 1581, he was entrapped into bringing a priest, George Ostliffe, to a place where both were apprehended. It was given out that Finch, having betrayed the priest and other Catholics, had taken refuge with the Earl of Derby, but in fact, he was kept in the earl's house as a prisoner, sometimes tortured and sometimes bribed in order to pervert him and induce him to give information. This failing, he was removed to the Fleet prison at Manchester and afterwards to the House of Correction. When he refused to go to the Protestant church he was dragged there by the feet, his head

beating on the stones. For many months he lay in a damp dungeon, ill-fed and ill-treated, desiring always that he might be brought to trial and martyrdom. After three years' imprisonment, he was sent to be tried at Lancaster. There he was brought to trial with three priests on 18 April, 1584. He was found guilty and, on 20 April, having spent the night in converting some condemned felons, he suffered with Ven. James Bell at Lancaster. The cause of his beatification with those of the other English Martyrs was introduced by decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 4 Dec., 1886.

BRIDGEWATER, *Concertatio*, 164 sqq., s. v. *Martyrium Domini Joannis Finchii*, the first and fullest account of the martyr (Trier, 1588); CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* (London, 1741), I, 162 sqq.; SIMPSON in *The Rambler*, new series, VIII, 414; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II; POLLEN, *Unpublished Documents relating to the English Martyrs*, especially 44-46 and 78-88; *Catholic Record Society* (London, 1908), V.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Finding of the Cross.** See CROSS.

**Finflow, JOHN**, VENERABLE, English martyr; b. at Barnby, near Howden, Yorkshire; executed at York, 8 August, 1586. He was ordained priest at the English College, Reims, 25 March, 1581, whence the following month he was sent on the English mission. After labouring for some time in the north of England, he was seized and confined in Ousebridge Kidcote, York, where for a time he endured serious discomforts, alleviated slightly by a fellow-prisoner. He was finally tried for being a Catholic priest and reconciling English subjects to the ancient Faith, and condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered.

COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; *Douay Diaries*, ed. KNOX (London, 1878); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*

F. M. RUDGE.

**Finland**, GRAND DUCHY OF, a department or province of the Russian Empire; bounded on the north by Norway, on the west by Sweden and the Gulf of Bothnia, on the south by the Gulf of Finland. Its limits extend from about 60° to 70° N. lat., and from about 19° to 33° E. long.; the area is 141,617 sq. miles. Finland abounds in lakes and forests, but the proportion of arable soil is small. The population numbers 2,900,000 souls, chiefly Finns; the coasts are inhabited by the descendants of Swedish settlers.

Up to the beginning of the twelfth century the people were pagans; about this date efforts for the conversion of the Finns were made from two sides. The Grand Duke of Novgorod, Vassievodovich, sent Russian missionaries to the Karelians, Finns living on the Lake of Ladoga in East Finland, while in 1157 King Erik of Sweden undertook a crusade to Finland. Erik established himself firmly on the south-western coast and from this base extended his power. Henrik, Bishop of Upsala, who had accompanied Erik on this expedition, devoted himself to preaching the Gospel and suffered the death of a martyr in 1158. His successor, Rodulfus, met the same fate about 1178, while the next following bishop, Folkvin, died a natural death. Finland attained an independent church organization under Bishop Thomas (1220; d. 1248), whose see was Rântemäkäi; at a later date the episcopal residence was transferred to Åbo. The successors of Thomas were: Bero I (d. 1258); Ragvald I (1258-66); Kettil (1266-86); Joannes I (1286-90); Magnus I (1290-1308), who was the first Finn to become bishop; he transferred the see to Åbo; Ragvald II (1309-21); Bengt (1321-38); Hemming (1338-66), who made wise laws, built numerous churches, began the collection of a library, and died in the odour of sanctity; in 1514 his bones were taken up, the relics now being in the museum of the city of Åbo, but he was not canonized; Henricus Hartmanni (1366-68); Joannes II Petri (1368-70); Joannes II Westfal (1370-85), a bishop of German descent; Bero II (1385-1412); Mag-

nus II Olai Tavast (1412-50), the most important prince of the Church of Finland, who, when eighty-eight years old, undertook arduous visitations; he also went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land whence he brought back objects of art and manuscripts; Olaus Magni (1450-60), who in earlier years was twice rector of the Sorbonne, a college of the University of Paris, and was also procurator and hursar of the "English nation" at the university. As representative of these he settled the disagreement between Charles VII and the university arising from the part the latter had taken in the burning of Joan of Arc; Conrad I Bitz (1460-89), who in 1488 had the "Missale ecclesie Åboensis" printed; Magnus III Stjernkors (1489-1500); Laurentius Suurpaa (1500-06); Joannes IV Olavi (1506-10); Arvid Kurek (1510-20), who was drowned in the Baltic; Ericus Svenonis (1523), the chancellor of King Gustavus Vasa; this prelate resigned the see as his election was not confirmed by Rome. He was the last Catholic Bishop of Finland. The king now, on his own authority, appointed his favourite, the Dominican Martin Skytte, as bishop; Skytte did all in his power to promote the violent introduction of Lutheranism. The people were deceived by the retention of Catholic ceremonies; clerics and monks were given the choice of apostasy, expulsion, or death. The only moderation shown was that exhibited towards the Brigittine nunnery of Nådendal. But on the other hand, the Dominicans at Åbo and Viborg, and the Franciscans at Kokars were rudely driven out and apparently the inmates of the monastery of Raumo were hung. Then, as later, the Church of Finland did not lack martyrs, among them being Jóns Jussoila, Peter Ericius, and others.

By the end of the sixteenth century the Catholic Church of Finland may be said to have ceased to exist. In its place appeared an inflexible and inquisitorial Lutheranism. When in 1617 Karelia (East Finland) fell to Sweden, an effort was made to win the native population, which belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church, for the "pure Gospel". As this did not succeed, the war of 1566-68 was used for the massacre and expulsion of the people. In consequence of the victories of Peter the Great matters after a while took another course; in 1809 Russia became the ruler of Finland and the Orthodox Greek Church has of late grown in strength. It numbers now 50,000 members under an archbishop; it has fine church buildings, especially in Helsingfors, wealthy monasteries (Valaam and Konevets), a church paper published at Viborg, and numerous schools. Under Russian sovereignty the long repressed Catholic Church received again (1869 and 1889) the right to exist, but it is still very weak, and numbers only about 1000 souls; there are Catholic churches at Åbo and Helsingfors. The great majority of the inhabitants belong now, as before, to the various sects of Protestantism. The State Church of former times, now the "National" Church, to which the larger part of the population adhere, is divided into four dioceses: Åbo, Kuopio, Borgå, and Nyslott; these contain altogether 45 provostships and 512 parishes. The finest of its church buildings are the domed church of St. Nicholas at Helsingfors and the church at Åbo, formerly the Catholic cathedral. Education is provided for by a university and technical high school at Helsingfors, by lycæums of the rank of gymnasia, modern scientific schools, and primary schools. Finland has a rich literature both in Swedish and Finnish. Besides the followers of Christianity there are both Jews and Mohammedans in Finland, but they have no civil rights. Since the middle of the nineteenth century about 200,000 Finns have emigrated to the United States, settling largely in Minnesota and Michigan. The town of Hancock, Michigan, is the centre of their religious and educational work.

WINTZ, *Finland as It Is* (New York, 1902); *Nordiskt Familjebok*, VIII, Pts. III-IV; *Sveriges historia* (Stockholm, 1877-81), VI;

PHIPPS, *The Grand Duchy of Finland* (London, 1906); SCHUBMANN, *Finlands historia* (1903, II); SAYRE, *Scandinavia under union with Denmark* (1880); LINDBERG, *Det svenska Finlands kyrko-historia* (Helsingfors, 1894); *Finland, its Finns, its Churches and History* (Helsingfors, 1890); *Finland, Skönlitteratur, invandring, historia* (Jyväskylä, 1893); *Finland, Skönlitteratur och historia under det förste tusenåret* (Helsingfors, 1896); *Finland, Om Finlands skolor* (Jyväskylä, 1890); *Finland, Rättsskildring* (Helsingfors, 1890); *Finland, Nordiska Mått och Stånd* (Stockholm, 1881); *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte* (1765), XXIX; KOSKINEN, *Finlands historia från den fruktbara tiden till vår egen tid* (Leipzig, 1873); SCHWEITZER, *Geschichte der skandinavischen Literaturen* (Leipzig, 1885), III; NEHER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Finland*; *Konversationslex.*, s. v. *Finland*; BÜCKERT, *Nordische Fiktion*, II; LAVISSE and RAMBAUD, *Histoire générale* (Paris, 1893-1901), XII; GALTZING, *La Finlande* (Paris, 1872), II; BROCKHAUS and EFRON, *Konversationslexikon*; *Stateman's Year Book* (London, 1908), 1462-66.

P. WITMANN.

**Finnian of Moville**, SAINT, b. about 495; d. 589. Though not so celebrated as his namesake of Clonard, he was the founder of a famous school about the year 540. He studied under St. Colman of Dromore and St. Mochæ of Noendrum (Mahee Island), and subsequently at Candida Casa (Whithorn), whence he proceeded to Rome, returning to Ireland in 540 with an integral copy of St. Jerome's Vulgate. St. Finnian's most distinguished pupil at Moville (County Down) was St. Columba, whose surreptitious copying of the Psalter led to a very remarkable sequel. What remains of the copy, together with the casket that contains it, is now in the National Museum, Dublin. It is known as the *Cathach* or *Battler*, and was wont to be carried by the O'Donnells in battle. The inner case was made by Cathar O'Donnell in 1084, but the outer is fourteenth-century work. So prized was it that the family of MacRoarty were hereditary custodians of this *Cathach*, and it finally passed, in 1802, to Sir Neal O'Donnell, County Mayo. St. Finnian of Moville wrote a rule for his monks, also a penitential code, the canons of which were published by Wasser-schleben, in 1851. His festival is observed on 10 September.

COLGAN, *Acta Sanct. Hib.* (Louvain, 1645); O'LAVERTY, *Down and Connor* (Dublin, 1880), II; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.); HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1902); HYDE, *Lit. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1901).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Finotti**, JOSEPH M., b. at Ferrara, Italy, 21 September, 1817; d. at Central City, Colorado, 10 January, 1879. In 1833 young Finotti was received into the Society of Jesus in Rome, and for several years taught and studied in the colleges of the order in Italy. He was one of the recruits whom Father Ryder, in 1845, brought from Europe to labour in the Maryland Province. After his ordination at Georgetown, D. C., Father Finotti was appointed pastor of St. Mary's Church, Alexandria, Virginia, and given charge of outlying missions in Maryland and Virginia. In 1852 he left the Society of Jesus and went to Boston. For many years he held the position of literary editor of "The Pilot", while acting as pastor of Brookline and later of Arlington, Mass. The last few years of his life he spent in the West, becoming, in 1877, pastor of Central City, Colorado, and retaining charge of that parish up to the time of his death. Father Finotti was a great book-lover, giving much time to literary pursuits and displaying special interest in the Catholic literary history of America. Among his productions are: "Month of Mary", 1853, which reached a sale of 50,000 copies; "Life of Blessed Paul of the Cross", 1860; "Diary of a Soldier", 1861; "The Spirit of St. Francis de Sales", 1866; "The French Zouave", 1863; "Herman the Pianist", 1863; "Works of the Rev. Arthur O'Leary"; "Life of Blessed Peter Claver", etc. Most of these publications were translated or edited by him. His best-known work, never completed, is his "Bibliographia Catholica Americana", which took years of study and care. It was intended to be a catalogue of all the Catholic books

published in the United States, with notices of their authors and an epitome of their contents. The first part, which brings the list down to 1820 inclusive, was published in 1872; the second volume, which was to include the works of Catholic writers from 1821 to 1875, was never finished, though much of the material for it had been industriously gathered from all available sources. His last literary effort, which he did not live to see published, entitled "The Mystery of Wizard Clip" (Baltimore, 1879), is a story of preternatural occurrences at Smithfield, W. Virginia, which is partly told in the life of Father Gallitzin.

*Illustrated Catholic Family Almanac*, 1880; *Biographical sketch in M.S.*, Georgetown College Archives; *McGee's Weekly*, Feb. 15, 1879; *Ale Maria*, Feb., 1879; *SOMMERVOGEL*, III, 747. EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

**Fintan, Saints.**—FINTAN OF CLONENAGH, SAINT, a Leinster saint, b. about 524; d. 17 February, probably 594, or at least before 597. He studied under St. Columba of Terryglass, and in 550 settled in the solitude of the Slieve Bloom Mountains, near what is now Maryborough, Queen's County. His oratory soon attracted numerous disciples, for whom he wrote a rule, and his austerities and miracles recalled the apostolic ages. Among his pupils was the great St. Comgall of Bangor. When he attained his seventieth year he chose Fintan Maeldubh as his successor in the Abbey of Clonenagh. He has been compared by the Irish annalists to St. Benedict, and is styled "Father of the Irish Monks".

FINTAN (MUNNU) OF TAGHMON, SAINT, son of Tulchan, an Ulster saint, d. at Taghmon, 636. He founded his celebrated abbey at Taghmon (Teach Munnu) in what is now County Wexford, in 599. He is principally known as the defender of the Irish method of keeping Easter, and, in 630, he attended the Synod of Magh Lene, at which he dissented from the decision to adopt the Roman paschal method. Another synod was held somewhat later at Magh Ailbe, when St. Fintan again upheld his views in opposition to St. Lasairian (Mo Laisre). But the views of the Universal Church prevailed. His feast is observed on 21 October. The beautiful stone cross of "St. Munn" still stands in the churchyard of the village.

COUGAN, *Acta Sancti. Hib.* (Louvain, 1645); *Acta SS.* (1853), Oct., VIII, 896-98; (1855), IX, 325-33; ZIMMER, *Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland* (London, 1902); O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.); REEVES, *Life of St. Columba* (Dublin, 1857); BEDE, *Ecc. Hist. of England*, ed. SELLER (London, 1907); *Annals of Ulster* (Dublin, 1901), IV; STOKES, *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, ed. LAWLER (London, 1907). W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Fioretti di S. Francesco d'Assisi** (LITTLE FLOWERS OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI), the name given to a classic collection of popular legends about the life of St. Francis of Assisi and his early companions as they appeared to the Italian people at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Such a work, as Ozanam observes, can hardly be said to have one author; it is the product rather of gradual growth and must, as Sabatier remarks, remain in a certain sense anonymous, because it is national. There has been some doubt as to whether the "Fioretti" were written in Italian in the first instance, as Sbaralea thought, or were translated from a Latin original, as Wadding maintained. The latter seems altogether more probable, and modern critics generally believe that a larger Latin collection of legends, which has come down to us under the name of the "Actus B. Francisci et Sociorum Ejus", represents an approximation to the text now lost of the original "Floretum", of which the "Fioretti" is a translation. A striking difference is noticeable between the earlier chapters of the "Fioretti", which refer to St. Francis and his companions, and the later ones which deal with the friars in the province of the March of Ancona. The first half of the collection

is, no doubt, merely a new form given to traditions that go back to the early days of the order; the other is believed to be substantially the work of a certain Fra Ugolino da Monte Giorgio of the noble family of Brunforte (see BRUNFORTE, UGOLOGINO), who, at the time of his death in 1348, was provincial of the Friars Minor in the March. Living as he did a century after the death of St. Francis, Ugolino was dependent on hearsay for much of his information; part of it he is said to have learned from Fra Giacomo da Massa who had been well known and esteemed by the companions of the saint, and who had lived on terms of intimacy with Fra Leone, his confessor and secretary. Whatever may have been the sources from which Ugolino derived his materials, the fifty-three chapters which constitute the Latin work in question seem to have been written before 1328. The four appendices on the Stigmata of St. Francis, the life of Fra Ginepro, and the life and sayings of Fra Egidio, which occupy nearly one half of the printed text of the "Fioretti", as we now have it, form no part of the original collection and were probably added by later compilers. Unfortunately the name of the fourteenth-century Franciscan friar who translated into Italian fifty-three of the seventy-six chapters found in the "Actus B. Francisci" and in translating immortalized them as the "Fioretti", remains unknown. The attribution of this work to Giovanni di San Lorenzo rests wholly upon conjecture. It has been surmised that the translator was a Florentine. However this may be, the vernacular version is written in the most limpid Tuscan and is reckoned among the masterpieces of Italian literature.

The "Fioretti" have been described as "the most exquisite expression of the religious life of the Middle Ages". That perhaps which gives these legends such a peculiar charm, is what may be called their atmosphere; they breathe all the delicious fragrance of the early Franciscan spirit. Nowhere can there be found a more childlike faith, a livelier sense of the supernatural, or a simpler literalness in the following of Christ than in the pages of the "Fioretti", which more than any other work transport us to the scenes amid which St. Francis and his first followers lived, and enable us to see them as they saw themselves.

These legends, moreover, bear precious witness to the vitality and enthusiasm with which the memory of the life and teaching of the Poverello was preserved, and they contain much more history, as distinct from mere poetry, than it was customary to recognize when Suyskens and Papini wrote. In Italy the "Fioretti" have always enjoyed an extraordinary popularity; indeed, this *liber aureus* is said to have been more widely read there than any other book, not excepting even the Bible or the Divine Comedy. Certain it is that the "Fioretti" have exercised an immense influence in forming the popular conception of St. Francis and his companions. The earliest known MS. of the "Fioretti", now preserved at Berlin, is dated 1390; the work was first printed at Vicenza in 1476. Manzoni has collected many interesting details about the well-nigh innumerable codices and editions of the "Fioretti". The best edition for the general reader is unquestionably that of Father Antonio Cesari (Verona, 1822) which is based on the epoch-making edition of Filippo Buonarroti (Florence, 1718). The Crusca quote from this edition which has been often reprinted. The "Fioretti" have been translated into nearly every European language and in our own day are being much read and studied in Northern countries. There are several well-known English versions.

OZANAM, *Les poètes Franciscains en Italie au treizième siècle* (6th ed., Paris, 1882), vii; BONAV. DA SORRENTO, *Il libro de' Fioretti di San Francesco* (Naples, 1885); MANZONI, *Studi sui Fioretti in Misc. Francescana*, III (Foligno, 1888-89); ALVISI, *Fioretti di S. Francesco: Studi sulla loro composizione storica in Arch. Stor. Ital.*, ser. 4, IV (1879), 488 sqq.; STADERINI, *Sulle fonti dei Fioretti in Boll. d. Soc. Umbra di St. Patria* (1896), II, fasc. II-III; GARAYANI, *La questione storica dei Fioretti e il loro*

posto nella storia del ordine in *Rivista Storico Critica delle Scienze teologiche*, XI (1906), 269 sqq., 578 sqq.; WADDINGTON-SBARALI, *Scriptores ordinis Minorum*, ed. NARDECCHIA (Rome, 1906-08), s. v.; HEGOLINUS, bibliography under *Brunforte* in *THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA*.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

**Fire, BAPTISM BY.** See BAPTISM.

**Fire, LITURGICAL USE OF.**—Fire is one of the most expressive and most ancient of liturgical symbols. All the creeds of antiquity accorded a prominent place to this element whose mysterious nature and irresistible power frequently caused it to be adored as a god. The sun, as the principle of heat and light for the earth, was regarded as an igneous mass and had its share in this worship. Christianity adapted this usual belief, but denied the divine title to heat and light, and made them the symbols of the divinity, which enlightens and warms humanity. The symbolism led quite naturally to the liturgical rite by which the Church on the Eve of Easter celebrates the mystery of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, of which the extinguished and rekindled fire furnishes the expressive image. The beginning of the office also reflects ancient beliefs. The new fire is struck from a flint and is blessed with this prayer: "Lord God, Almighty Father, inextinguishable light, Who hast created all light, bless this light sanctified and blessed by Thee, Who hast enlightened the whole world: make us enlightened by that light and inflamed with the fire of Thy brightness; and as Thou didst enlighten Moses when he went out of Egypt, so illuminate our hearts and senses that we may attain life and light everlasting through Christ our Lord. Amen." When the fire has been struck from the flint the three-branched candle is lighted and the deacon chants the "Exultet" (q. v.), a liturgical poem whose style is as lively and charming as the melody which accompanies it. It is yet preserved in the Roman Liturgy. In the East the ceremony of the new fire occupies a place of considerable importance in the paschal ritual of the Greek Church at Jerusalem. This ceremony is the occasion for scandalous demonstrations of a piety which frequently degenerates into orgies worthy of pagan rites. The Journal of the Marquis de Nointel, in the seventeenth century, relates scenes which cannot be transcribed and which take place periodically. This ceremony is peculiar to the Holy City and does not figure in the ordinary Byzantine ritual.

In the West we see the Irish, as early as the sixth century, lighting large fires at nightfall on the Eve of Easter. The correspondence of St. Boniface with Pope Zachary furnishes a curious detail on this subject. These fires were kindled, not with brands from other fires, but with lenses; they were therefore new fires. There is no trace of this custom in Gaul, where the Merovingian liturgical books are silent on the point. It is difficult to say what took place in Spain, for although the Mozarabic Missal contains a blessing of fire at the beginning of the vigil of Easter, it can hardly be admitted that this ceremony was primitive. It may have been inserted in this missal at a later date as it was in the Roman Missal, in the case of which fire is obtained from a flint and steel. It is possible that the custom, of Breton or Celtic origin, was imposed upon the Anglo-Saxons, and the missionaries of that nation brought it to the continent in the eighth century. An altogether different rite, though of similar meaning, was followed at Rome. On Holy Thursday, at the consecration of the holy chrism, there was collected in all the lamps of the Lateran basilica a quantity of oil sufficient to fill three large vases deposited in the corner of the church. Wicks burned in this oil until the night of Holy Saturday, when there were lighted from these lamps the candles and other luminaries by which, during the Eve of Easter, light was thrown on the ceremonies of the administration of baptism. This rite must have been attended with a

certain solemnity since the letter of Pope Zachary to St. Boniface prescribes that a priest, perhaps even a bishop, should officiate on this occasion. Unhappily we are reduced to this somewhat vague information, for neither the Roman "Ordines", nor the Sacramentaries tell us anything concerning this ceremony. This blessing of the paschal candle and the fire at the beginning of Easter Eve is foreign to Rome. The large lamps prepared on Holy Thursday provided fire on the Friday and Saturday without necessitating the solemn production of a new fire. The feast of the Purification or Candlemas (2 February) has a celebrated rite with ancient prayers concerning the emission of liturgical fire and light. One of them invokes Christ as "the true light which enlightenest every man that cometh into this world". The canticle of Simeon, "Nunc Dimittis", is chanted with the anthem "A light (which my eyes have seen) for the revelation of the Gentiles and for the glory of thy people Israel."

SCHANZ, *Apologie* (tr.), II, 96, 101; DE LA SALLE, *Comparative Religion*, II, 183; DUCHESNE, *Origins of Christian Worship* (London, 1904); KELLNER, *Heortology* (London, 1908); HAMPSON, *Medii Aevi Kalendarium*; HONE's *Every Day Book*.  
H. LECLERCQ.

**Fire, PILLAR OF.** See PILLAR OF FIRE.

**Fire Worshippers.** See PARSEES.

**Firmament** (Heb. רָקִיעַ; Sept. στερέωμα; Vulgate, *firmamentum*).—The notion that the sky was a vast solid dome seems to have been common among the ancient peoples whose ideas of cosmology have come down to us. Thus the Egyptians conceived the heavens to be an arched iron ceiling from which the stars were suspended by means of cables (Chabas, *L'Antiquité historique*, Paris, 1873, pp. 64-67). Likewise to the mind of the Babylonians the sky was an immense dome, forged out of the hardest metal by the hand of Merodach (Marduk) and resting on a wall surrounding the earth (Jensen, *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier*, Strasburg, 1890, pp. 253, 260). According to the notion prevalent among the Greeks and Romans, the sky was a great vault of crystal to which the fixed stars were attached, though by some it was held to be of iron or brass. That the Hebrews entertained similar ideas appears from numerous biblical passages. In the first account of the creation (Gen., i) we read that God created a firmament to divide the upper or celestial from the lower or terrestrial waters. The Hebrew word רָקִיעַ means something beaten or hammered out, and thus extended; the Vulgate rendering, "firmamentum", corresponds more closely with the Greek στερέωμα (Septuagint, Aquila, and Symmachus), "something made firm or solid". The notion of the solidity of the firmament is moreover expressed in such passages as Job, xxxvii, 18, where reference is made incidentally to the heavens, "which are most strong, as if they were of molten brass". The same is implied in the purpose attributed to God in creating the firmament, viz. to serve as a wall of separation between the upper and lower bodies of water, it being conceived as supporting a vast celestial reservoir; and also in the account of the deluge (Gen., vii), where we read that the "flood gates of heaven were opened", and "shut up" (viii, 2). (Cf. also IV Kings, vii, 19; Is., xxiv, 18; Mal., iii, 10; Prov., viii, 28 sqq.) Other passages, e. g. Is., xlii, 5, emphasize rather the idea of something extended: "Thus saith the Lord God that created the heavens and stretched them out" (Cf. Is., xlii, 24, and xl, 22). In conformity with these ideas, the writer of Gen., i, 14-17, 20, represents God as setting the stars in the firmament of heaven, and the fowls are located beneath it, i. e. in the air as distinct from the firmament. On this point, as on many others, the Bible simply reflects the current cosmological ideas and language of the time.

LESÈTRE in *Vig., Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; WHITEHOUSE in *HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Cosmogony*, I, 502.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.



**Firmicus Maternus**, Christian author of the fourth century, wrote a work "De errore profanarum religionum". Nothing is known about him except what can be gleaned from this work, which is found in only one MS. (Codex Vaticanus-Palatinus, Sæc. X). Some references to the Persian Wars, and the fact that the work was addressed to the two emperors, Constantius II and Constans I, have led to the conclusion that it was composed during their joint reign (337-350). The work is valuable because it gives a picture of the character which the paganism of the later Roman Empire had taken, under the stress of the new spiritual needs aroused by contact with the religions of Egypt and the East. It aims, if one may judge from the mutilated introduction, at presenting from a philosophical and historical standpoint, reasons showing the superiority of Christianity over the superstitions and licentiousness of heathenism. In a general survey of pagan creeds and beliefs the author holds up to scorn the origin and practices of the Gentile cults. All its parts are not of equal merit or importance, from the purely historical standpoint. The first portion, in which the religions of Greece and the East are described, is merely a compilation from earlier sources, but in the latter section of the work, in which the mysteries of Eleusis, Isis, and especially Mithra are set forth in detail, with their system of curious passwords, formulae, and ceremonies, the author seems to speak from personal experience, and thus reveals many interesting facts which are not found elsewhere. The emperors are exhorted to stamp out this network of superstition and immorality, as a sacred duty for which they will receive a reward from God Himself, and ultimately the praise and thanks of those whom they rescue from error and corruption. The theory that the author of the Christian work was identical with Julius Firmicus Maternus Siculus, who wrote a work on astrology (*De Nativitatibus sive Matheosibus*), assigned by Mommsen to the year 337 ["Hermes", XXIX (1894), 468 sq.], is favourably received by some, as well because of the identity of names and dates, as because of similarities in style which they are satisfied the two documents exhibit. This theory of course supposes that the author wrote one work before, the other after, his conversion. Critical edition by Halm (Vienna, 1867) in "*Corpus Scrip. Eccles. Lat.*" II.

ZIEGLER, *Firmicus Maternus, De Errore Prof. Relig.* (Leipzig, 1908); MÜLLER, *Zur Ueberlieferung der Apologie des Firmicus Maternus* (Tübingen, 1908); additional literature, BARDEY-HEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br., St. Louis, 1908), 402. PATRICK J. HEALY.

**Firmilian**, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, died c. 269. He had among his contemporaries a reputation comparable to that of Dionysius or Cyprian. St. Gregory of Nyssa tells us that St. Gregory the Wonder-Worker, then a pagan, having completed his secular studies, "fell in with Firmilian, a Cappadocian of noble family, similar to himself in character and talent, as he showed in his subsequent life when he adorned the Church of Cæsarea." The two young men agreed in their desire to know more of God, and came to Origen, whose disciples they became, and by whom Gregory, at least, was baptized. Firmilian was more probably brought up as a Christian. Later, when bishop, Eusebius tells us, he had such a love for Origen that he invited him to his own country for the benefit of the Churches, at the time (232-5) when the great teacher was staying in Cæsarea of Palestine, on account of his bishop's displeasure at his having been ordained priest in that city. Firmilian also went to him subsequently and stayed with him some time that he might advance in theology (*Hist. Eccl.*, VII, xxviii, 1). He was an opponent of the antipope Novatian, for Dionysius in 252-3 writes that Helenus of Tarsus, Firmilian, and Theoctistus of Cæsarea in Palestine (that is, the Metropolitan of Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Palestine) had invited him to a synod at Antioch, where some

were trying to support the heresy of Novatian (*Euseb., Hist. Eccl.*, VI, xli, 3). Dionysius counts Firmilian as one of "the more eminent bishops" in a letter to Pope Stephen (*ibid.*, VII, v, 1), where his expression "Firmilian and all Cappadocia" again implies that Cæsarea was already a metropolitan see. This explains why Firmilian could invite Origen to Cappadocia "for the benefit of the Churches".

In a letter to Pope Sixtus II (257-8), Dionysius mentions that Pope St. Stephen in the baptismal controversy had refused to communicate with Helenus of Tarsus, Firmilian, and all Cilicia and Cappadocia, and the neighbouring lands (*Euseb.*, VII, v, 3-4). We learn the cause of this from the only writing of St. Firmilian's which remains to us. When the baptismal controversy arose, St. Cyprian wished to gain support from the Churches of the East against Pope Stephen for his own decision to rebaptize all heretics who returned to the Church. At the end of the summer of 256, he sent the deacon Rogatian to Firmilian with a letter, together with the documents on the subject—letters of the pope, of his own, and of his council at Carthage in the spring, and the treatise "*De Eccl. Cath. Unitate*". Firmilian's reply was received at Carthage about the middle of November. It is a long letter, even more bitter and violent than that of Cyprian to Pompeius. It has come down to us in a translation made, no doubt, under St. Cyprian's direction, and apparently very literal, as it abounds in Græcisms (*Ep. lxxv* among St. Cyprian's letters). St. Cyprian's arguments against St. Stephen are reiterated and reinforced, and the treatise on Unity is laid under contribution. It is particularly interesting to note that the famous fourth chapter of that treatise must have been before the writer of the letter in its original form, and not in the alternative "Roman" form (c. xvi). It is the literal truth when Firmilian says: "We have received your writings as our own, and have committed them to memory by repeated reading" (c. iv).

The reasoning against the validity of heretical baptism is mainly that of St. Cyprian, that those who are outside the Church and have not the Holy Spirit cannot admit others to the Church or give what they do not possess. Firmilian is fond of dilemmas: for instance, either the heretics do not give the Holy Ghost, in which case rebaptism is necessary, or else they do give it, in which case Stephen should not enjoin the laying on of hands. It is important that Firmilian enables us to gather much of the drift of St. Stephen's letter. It is "ridiculous" that Stephen demanded nothing but the use of the Trinitarian formula. He had appealed to tradition from St. Peter and St. Paul: this is an insult to the Apostles, cries Firmilian, for they execrated heretics. Besides (this is from Cyprian, *Ep. lxxiv*, 2), "no one could be so silly as to believe this" for the heretics are all later than the Apostles! And Rome has not preserved the Apostolic traditions unchanged, for it differs from Jerusalem as to the observances at Easter and as to other mysteries. "I am justly indignant with Stephen's obvious and manifest silliness, that he so boasts of his position, and claims that he is the successor of St. Peter on whom were laid the foundations of the Church; yet he brings in many other rocks, and erects new buildings of many Churches when he defends with his authority the baptism conferred by heretics; for those who are baptized are without doubt numbered in the Church, and he who approves their baptism affirms that there is among them a Church of the baptized. . . . Stephen, who declares that he has the Chair of Peter by succession, is excited by no zeal against heretics" (c. xvii). "You have cut yourself off—do not mistake—since he is the true schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For in thinking that all can be excommunicated by you, you have cut off yourself alone from the communion of all" (c. xxiv).

We thus learn the claims of the pope to impose on the whole Church by his authority as successor of Peter, a custom derived by the Roman Church from Apostolic tradition. Firmilian tells the Africans that with them the custom of rebaptizing may be new, but in Cappadocia it is not, and he can answer Stephen by opposing tradition to tradition, for it was their practice from the beginning (c. xix); and some time since, he had joined in a council at Iconium with the bishops of Galatia and Cilicia and other provinces, and had decided to rebaptize the Montanists (c. vii and xix). Dionysius, in a letter to the Roman priest Philemon, also mentions the Council of Iconium with one at Synnada "among many". It was presumably held in the last years of Alexander Severus, c. 231-5. Firmilian also took part in the two councils of 264-5 at Antioch which deposed Paul of Samosata. He may even have presided. The letter of the third council says he was too easily persuaded that Paul would amend; hence the necessity of another council (Euseb. Hist. Eccl., VII, iii-v). He was on his way to this assembly when death overtook him at Tarsus. This was in 268 (Harnack) or 269. Though he was cut off from communion by Pope Stephen, it is certain that the following popes did not adhere to this severe policy. He is commemorated in the Greek *Menæa* on 28 Oct., but is unknown to the Western martyrologies. His great successor, St. Basil, mentions his view on heretical baptism without accepting it (Ep. clxxxviii), and says, when speaking of the expression "with the Holy Ghost" in the Doxology: "That our own Firmilian held this faith is testified by the books [*λόγοι*] which he has left" (De Spir. Sanc., xxix, 74). We hear nothing else of such writings, which were probably letters.

BOSSUE, in *Acta SS.*, 28 Oct., gives an elaborate dissertation on this saint; BENSON in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*; the genuineness of the letter was arbitrarily contested by MISSORIUS, in *Epist. ad Pomp. inter Cypr.* (Venice, 1733), and by MÖLKENBUCH, *Binné diss. de S. Firm.* (Münster, 1790, and in P. L., III, 1357); RITSCHL, *Cyprian v. Karth* (Göttingen, 1893), argued that the letter had been interpolated at Carthage in the interests of Cyprian's party; so also HARNACK in *Gesch. der altchr. Lit.* (Leipzig, 1893), I, 407, and SODEN, *Die cyprianische Briefsammlung* (Berlin, 1904); this was disproved by ERNST, *Die Echtheit des Briefes Firmilians in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.* (1894), XVIII, 209, and *Zur Frage über die Echtheit des Briefes F.'s an Cyprian* (*ibid.*, XX, 384), also by BENSON, *Cyprian* (London, 1897), p. 377, and Harnack later expressed himself convinced (*Gesch.*, II, ii, p. 359, 1904). MOSES of CHORENE, *Hist. Arm.*, II, lxxxv, attributed to Firmilian "many books, among them a history of the persecutions of the Church in the days of Maximus, Decius and later of Diocletian". This is a mistake. It seems there were letters from Firmilian in the published correspondence of Origen, according to St. Jerome's version of the list of Origen's works by Pamphilus and Eusebius: "Origenis, Firmiani [sic] et Gregorii" [ed. by KLOSTERMANN, *Sitzungsberichte der Real-Akad.* (Berlin, 1897); see HARNACK, *op. cit.*, II, ii, p. 47]; the letter to Gregory Thaum. is extant. A fragment of a letter from Origen to Firmilian, cited by VICTOR of CAPUA, was published by FITZ, *Spic. Solesm.*, I, 268. St. Augustine seems not to have known the letter to Cyprian, but CRESCONIUS seems to have referred to it, *C. Cresc.*, iii, 1 and 3. The letter is not quoted by any ancient writer, and is found in at most 23 out of the 431 MSS. of St. Cyprian enumerated by von Soden, *op. cit.* See also BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.*, II, 269; BATIFFOL, *Litt. grecque* (Paris, 1898); IDEM, *L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme* (Paris, 1909); see also references under CYPRIAN of CARTHAGE, SAINT.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

**First-Born.**—The word, though casually taken in Holy Writ in a metaphorical sense, is most generally used by the sacred writers to designate the first male child in a family. The first-cast male animal is, in the English Bibles, termed "firstling". The firstlings, both human and animal, being considered as the best representatives of the race, because its blood flows purest and strongest in them, were commonly believed, among the early nomad Semitic tribes, to belong to God in a special way. Hence, very likely, the custom of sacrificing the first-cast animals; hence also the prerogatives of the first-born son; hence, possibly, even some of the superstitious practices which mar a few pages of the history of Israel.

Among the Hebrews, as well as among other na-

tions, the first-born enjoyed special privileges. Besides having a greater share in the paternal affection, he had everywhere the first place after his father (Gen., xliii, 33) and a kind of directive authority over his younger brothers (Gen., xxxvii, 21-22, 30, etc.); a special blessing was reserved to him at his father's death, and he succeeded him as the head of the family, receiving a double portion among his brothers (Deut., xxi, 17). Moreover, the first-birthright, up to the time of the promulgation of the Law, included a right to the priesthood. Of course this latter privilege, as also the headship of the family, to which it was attached, continued in force only when brothers dwelt together in the same house; for, as soon as they made a family apart and separated, each one became the head and the priest of his own house.

When God chose unto Himself the tribe of Levi to discharge the office of priesthood in Israel. He wished that His rights over the first-born should not thereby be forfeited. He enacted therefore that every first-born should be redeemed, one month after his birth, for five sicles (Num., iii, 47; xviii, 15-16). This redemption tax, calculated also to remind the Israelites of the death inflicted upon the first-born of the Egyptians in punishment of Pharaoh's stubbornness (Ex., xiii, 15-16), went to the endowment-fund of the clergy. No law, however, stated that the first-born should be presented to the Temple. It seems, however, that after the Restoration parents usually took advantage of the mother's visit to the sanctuary to bring the child thither. This circumstance is recorded in St. Luke's Gospel, in reference to Christ (ii, 22-38). It might be noted here that St. Paul refers the title *primogenitus* to Christ (Heb., i, 6), the "first-born" of the Father. The Messianic sacrifice was the first-fruits of the Atonement offered to God for man's redemption. It must be remembered, however, contrary to what is too often asserted and seems, indeed, intimated by the liturgical texts, that the "pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons" mentioned in this connexion, were offered for the purification of the mother, and not for the child. Nothing was especially prescribed with regard to the latter.

As polygamy was, at least in early times, in vogue among the Israelites, precise regulations were enacted to define who, among the children, should enjoy the legal right of primogeniture, and who were to be redeemed. The right of primogeniture belonged to the first male child born in the family, either of wife or concubine; the first child of any woman having a legal status in the family (wife or concubine) was to be redeemed, provided that child were a boy.

As the first-born, so were the firstlings of the Egyptians smitten by the sword of the destroying angel, whereas those of the Hebrews were spared. As a token of recognition, God declared that all firstlings belonged to Him (Ex., xiii, 2; Num., iii, 13). They accordingly should be immolated. In case of clean animals, as a calf, a lamb, or a kid (Num., xviii, 15-18), they were, when one year old, brought to the sanctuary and offered in sacrifice; the blood was sprinkled at the foot of the altar, the fat burned, and the flesh belonged to the priests. Unclean animals, however, which could not be immolated to the Lord, were redeemed with money. Exception was made in the case of the firstling of the ass, which was to be redeemed with a sheep (Ex., xxxiv, 20) or its own price (Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*, IV, iv, 4), or else to be slain (Ex., xiii, 13; xxxiv, 20) and buried in the ground. Firstlings sacrificed in the temple should be without blemish; such as were "lame or blind, or in any part disfigured or feeble", were to be eaten unconditionally within the gates of the owner's home-city.

W. R. SMITH, *The Religion of the Semites* (2d ed., London, 1907); TALMUD, *Bekhoroth*; PHILO, *De promissis sacerdotum*; RELAND, *Antiquitates sacre* (Utrecht, 1741); SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes im Zeit. J. C.* (Leipzig, 1898), II, 253-54.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.



**First-Fruits.**—The practice of consecrating first-fruits to the Deity is not a distinctly Jewish one (cf. *Iliad*, IX, 529; Aristophanes, "Ran.", 1272; Ovid, "Metam.", VIII, 273; X, 431; Pliny, "Hist. Nat.", IV, 26; etc.). It seems to have sprung up naturally among agricultural peoples from the belief that the first—hence the best—yield of the earth is due to God as an acknowledgment of His gifts. "God served first", then the whole crop becomes lawful food. The offering of the first-fruits was, in Israel, regulated by laws enshrined in different parts of the Mosaic books. These laws were, in the course of ages, supplemented by customs preserved later on in the Talmud. Three entire treatises of the latter, "Bikkûrim", "Terûmôth", and "Hallah", besides numerous other passages of both the Mishna and Gemarah, are devoted to the explanation of these customs.

First-fruit offerings are designated in the Law by a threefold name: Bikkûrim, Rêshith, and Terûmôth. There remains much uncertainty about the exact import of these words, as they seem to have been taken indiscriminately at different epochs. If, however, one considers the texts attentively, he may gather from them a fairly adequate idea of the subject. There was a first-fruit offering connected with the beginning of the harvest. Leviticus, xxiii, 10-14, enacted that a sheaf of ears should be brought to the priest, who, the next day after the Sabbath, was to lift it up before the Lord. A holocaust, a meal-offering, and a libation accompanied the ceremony; and until it was performed no "bread, or parched corn, or frumenty of the harvest" should be eaten. Seven weeks later two loaves, made from the new harvest, were to be brought to the sanctuary for a new offering. The Bikkûrim consisted, it seems, of the first ripened raw fruits; they were taken from wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, and honey. The fruits offered were supposed to be the choicest, and were to be fresh, except in the case of grapes and figs, which might be offered dried by Israelites living far from Jerusalem. No indication is given in Scripture as to how much should be thus brought to the sanctuary. But the custom was gradually introduced of consecrating no less than one-sixtieth and no more than one-fortieth of the crop (Bikk., ii, 2, 3, 4). Occasionally, of course, there were extraordinary offerings, like that of the fruit of a tree the fourth year after it had been planted (Lev., xix, 23-25); one might also, for instance, set apart as a free offering the harvest of a whole field.

No time was, at first, specially set apart for the offering; in later ages, however, the feast of Dedication (25 Casleu) was assigned as the limit (Bikk., i, 6; Hallah, iv, 10). In the Book of Deuteronomy, xxvi, 1-11, directions are laid down as to the manner in which these offerings should be made. The first-fruits were brought in a basket to the sanctuary and presented to the priest, with an expression of thanksgiving for the deliverance of Israel from Egypt and the possession of the fertile land of Palestine. A feast, shared by the Levite and the stranger, followed. Whether the fruits offered were consumed in that meal is not certain; Numbers, xviii, 13, seems to intimate that they henceforth belonged to the priest, and Philo and Josephus suppose the same.

Other offerings were made of the prepared fruits, especially oil, wine, and dough (Deut., xviii, 4; Num., xv, 20-21; Lev., ii, 12, 14-16; cf. Ex., xxii, 29, in the Greek), and "the first of the fleece". As in the case of the raw fruits, no quantity was determined; Ezechiel affirms that it was one-sixtieth of the harvest for wheat and barley and one-one hundredth for oil. They were presented to the sanctuary with ceremonies analogous to those alluded to above, although, unlike the Bikkûrim, they were not offered at the altar, but brought into the store-rooms of the temple. They may be looked upon, therefore, not so much as sacrificial

matter as a tax for the support of the priests. (See ANNATES.)

SMITH, *The Religion of the Semites* (2d ed., London, 1907); WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, tr. BLACK AND MENZIES (Edinburgh, 1885), 157-58; PHILO, *De festo cophini*; Id., *De proemius sacerdotum*; JOSEPHUS, *Ant. Jud.*, IV, viii, 22; RELAND, *Antiquitates sacre*; SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jud. Volkes im Zeit. J. C.* (Leipzig, 1898), II, 237-50.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

**First Request.** See RIGHT OF PRESENTATION.

**Fiscal Procurator** (Lat. PROCURATOR FISCALIS).—The duties of the fiscal procurator consist in preventing crime and safeguarding ecclesiastical law. In case of notification or denunciation it is his duty to institute proceedings and to represent the law. His office is comparable to that of the state attorney in criminal cases. The institution of the *procuratores regii* or *procurateurs du roi* (king's procurators) was established in France during the thirteenth century, and has developed from that time onward; though canon law, previous to that time, had imposed on the bishops the duty of investigating the commission of crimes and instituting the proper judicial proceedings. It is to be noted that formerly canon law admitted the validity of private as well as of public accusation or denunciation. At present custom has brought it about that all criminal proceedings in ecclesiastical courts are initiated exclusively by the fiscal procurator.

The Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, 11 June, 1880, called attention to the absolute necessity of the fiscal procurator in every episcopal curia, as a safeguard for law and justice. The fiscal procurator may be named by the bishop, either permanently, or his term of office may be limited to individual cases (see Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1884, no. 299; App., p. 289). This official appears not only in criminal proceedings but also in other ecclesiastical matters. In matrimonial cases, canon law provides for a defender of the matrimonial tie whose duty it is to uphold the validity of the marriage, as long as its invalidity has not been proven in two lower ecclesiastical courts. This defender of the matrimonial tie represents both ecclesiastical law and public morality, whose ultimate objects would not be attained if the validity or invalidity of a marriage were decided in a too easy or informal way. A similar office is that of the defender of the validity of sacred orders and solemn vows. When the validity of either of these acts, and their pertinent obligations, is attacked, it becomes the duty of this official to bring forward whatever arguments may go to establish their binding force. In all these cases the defender, like the fiscal procurator in criminal processes, represents the public interests; the institution of this office was all the more necessary, as it takes cognizance of causes in which both parties frequently display a desire to have the contract nullified. In the processes of beatification and canonization it devolves on the *promotor fidei* to investigate strictly the reasons urged in favour of canonization, and to find out and emphasize all objections which can possibly be urged against it. He is therefore popularly known as the *advocatus diaboli*, i. e. "devil's lawyer". It is the duty of the *promotor fidei*, therefore, to take up the negative side in the discussion which has a place amongst the preliminaries to beatification and canonization, and to endeavour, by every legitimate means, to prevent the completion of the process.


FERIÈS, *Le Procureur Fiscal ou promoteur* (Paris, 1897); LEGA, *De Judiciis Ecclesiasticis*, Bk. I, vol. I, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1905).

**FISCAL OF THE HOLY OFFICE.**—The Holy Office, i. e. the supreme court in the Catholic Church for all matters that affect its faith or are closely connected with its teaching, has an *officialis fiscalis*, whose duties are similar to those of the fiscal procurator in episcopal courts. The officialis fiscalis is present at all sessions of the Holy Office, when criminal cases are *sub judice*, and

as adviser to the ordinary when the process is referred to the episcopal court. By the reorganization of the Roman Curia, 29 June, 1908, the Holy Office continues to retain its exclusive competency in all cases of heresy and kindred crimes. The office of fiscalis to this Congregation therefore remains unchanged.

JOSEPH LAURENTIUS.

**Fish, SYMBOLISM OF THE.**—Among the symbols employed by the primitive Christians that of the fish ranks probably first in importance. While the use of the fish in pagan art as a purely decorative sign is ancient and constant, the earliest literary reference to the symbolic fish is made by Clement of Alexandria, born about 150, who recommends his readers (Pædagogus, III, xi) to have their seals engraved with a dove or a fish. Clement did not consider it necessary to give any reason for this recommendation, from which it may safely be inferred that the meaning of both symbols was so well known to Christians that explanation was unnecessary. Indeed, from monumental sources we know that the symbolic fish was familiar to Christians long before the famous Alexandrian was



LOAVES AND FISH  
Crypt of Lucina, Catacomb of St. Callistus

born; in such Roman monuments as the Capella Greca and the Sacrament Chapels of the catacomb of St. Callistus, the fish was depicted as a symbol in the first decades of the second century. The symbol itself may have been suggested by the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes or the repast of the seven Disciples, after the Resurrection, on the shore of the Sea of Galilee (John, xxi, 9), but its popularity among Christians was due principally, it would seem, to the famous acrostic consisting of the initial letters of five Greek words forming the word for fish (ΙΧΘΥΣ), which words briefly but clearly described the character of Christ and His claim to the worship of believers: *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός Σωτὴρ*, i. e. Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour. (See the discourse of Emperor Constantine, "Ad cœtum Sanctorum" c. xviii.) It is not improbable that this Christian formula originated in Alexandria, and was intended as a protest against the pagan apotheosis of the emperors; on a coin from Alexandria of the reign of Domitian (81-96) this emperor is styled Θεοῦ Υἱός (son of God).

The word *Ιχθύς*, then, as well as the representation of a fish, held for Christians a meaning of the highest significance; it was a brief profession of faith in the divinity of Christ, the Redeemer of mankind. Believers in this mystic *Ιχθύς* were themselves "little fishes", according to the well-known passage of Tertullian (*De baptismo*, c. 1): "we, little fishes, after the image of our *Ιχθύς*, Jesus Christ, are born in the water". The association of the *Ιχθύς* with the Eucharist is strongly emphasized in the epitaph of Abercius, the second-century Bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia (see ABERCIUS, INSCRIPTION OF), and in the

somewhat later epitaph of Pectorius of Autun. Abercius tells us on the aforesaid monument that in his journey from his Asiatic home to Rome, everywhere on the way he received as food "the Fish from the spring, the great, the pure", as well as "wine mixed with water, together with bread". Pectorius also speaks of the Fish as a delicious spiritual nurture supplied by the "Saviour of the Saints". In the Eucharistic monuments this idea is expressed repeatedly in pictorial form; the food before the banqueters is invariably bread and fish on two separate dishes. The peculiar significance attached to the fish in this relation is well brought out in such early frescoes as the *Fractio Panis* scene in the cemetery of St. Priscilla, and the fishes on the grass, in closest proximity to the baskets containing bread and wine, in the crypt of Lucina. (See EUCHARIST, SYMBOLISM OF THE.) The fish symbol was not, however, represented exclusively with symbols of the Eucharist; quite frequently it is found associated with such other symbols as the dove, the anchor, and the monogram of Christ. The monuments, too, on which it appears, from the first to the fourth century, include frescoes, sculptured representations, rings, seals, gilded glasses, as well as enkolpia of various materials. The type of fish depicted calls for no special observation, save that, from the second century, the form of the dolphin was frequently employed. The reason for this particular selection is presumed to be the fact that, in popular esteem, the dolphin was regarded as friendly to man. Besides the Eucharistic frescoes of the catacombs a considerable number of objects containing the fish-symbol are preserved in various European museums, one of the most interesting, because of the grouping of the fish with several other symbols, being a carved gem in the Kircherian Museum in Rome. On the left is a T-form anchor, with two fishes beneath the cross-bar, while next in order are a T-form cross with a dove on the crossbar and a sheep at the foot, another T-cross as the mast of a ship, and the Good Shepherd carrying on His shoulders the strayed sheep. In addition to these symbols the five letters of the word *ΙΧΘΥΣ* are distributed round the border. Another ancient carved gem represents a ship supported by a fish, with doves perched on the mast and stern, and Christ on the waters rescuing St. Peter. After the fourth century the symbolism of the fish gradually disappeared; representations of fishes on baptismal fonts and on bronze baptismal cups like those found at Rome and Trier, now in the Kircherian Museum, are merely of an ornamental character, suggested, probably by the water used in baptism.

HEUSER in KRAUS, *Real-Encyk. der christlichen Alterthümer* (Freiburg, 1882); WILPERT, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane* (Rome, 1903), for accurate representations; IDEM, *Principumfragen* (Freiburg, 1889); TYRWHITT and CHEETHAM in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. Important archaeologico-literary studies on the subject are the dissertations of G. B. DE ROSSI, *De christianis monumentis Ιχθύς exhibentibus in Spicileg. Solesm.* (1855), III, 548-84, and PITRÀ, *De pisce allegorico et symbolico*, *ibid.*, 499-543, 637-29. See also LECTERQ, *Manuel d'archéol. chrét.* (Paris, 1907), II, 379-81; particularly R. MOWAT in *Société nat. des antiquaires de France* (Paris, 1898), 21 and *Atti del II. Congr. Internazionale* (Rome, 1902), 1-8.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

**Fisher, JOHN.** See JOHN FISHER, BLESSED.

**Fisher, PHILIP** (an *alias*, real name THOMAS Copley), missionary, b. in Madrid, 1595-6; d. in Maryland, U. S., 1652. He was the eldest son of William Copley of Gatton, England, of a Catholic family of distinction who suffered exile in the reign of Elizabeth. He arrived in Maryland in 1637, and, being a man of great executive ability, took over the care of the mission, "a charge which at that time required rather business men than missionaries". In 1645, Father Fisher was wantonly seized and carried in chains to England, with Father Andrew White, the founder of

the English mission in America. After enduring many hardships he was released, when he boldly returned to Maryland (Feb., 1648), where, after an absence of three years, he found his flock in a more flourishing state than those who had oppressed and plundered them. That he made an effort to enter the missionary field of Virginia, appears from a letter written 1 March, 1648, to the Jesuit General Caraffa in Rome, in which he says: "A road has lately been opened through the forest to Virginia; this will make it but a two days' journey, and both places can now be united in one mission. After Easter I shall wait upon the Governor of Virginia upon business of great importance." Unfortunately there is no further record bearing on the projected visit. Neill, in his "Terra Marica" (p. 70), and Smith, in his "Religion under the Barons of Baltimore" (p. VII), strangely confound this Father Thomas Copley of Maryland with an apostate John Copley, who was never a Jesuit. Father Fisher is mentioned with honourable distinction in the missionary annals of Maryland, and, according to Hughes, was "the most distinguished man among the fourteen Jesuits who had worked in Maryland".

HUGHES, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America* (London and New York, 1907). Text, I, passim; Documents, I, part I; SHRA, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886), 38, 46-47, 53; FOLEY, *Records of English Province S. J.* (London, 1882), VII, 255; DORSEY, *Life of Father Thomas Copley*, published in *Woodstock Letters*, XIV, 223; *Woodstock Letters*, XI, 18-24; XIII, 104-105; XV, 44, 47; OLIVEN, *Collections*, *Scottish, English and Irish Members of S. J.* (London, 1845), 91, 92; RUSSELL, *Maryland: the Land of the Sanctuary* (Baltimore, 1907), 83, 125, 127, 156-159, 171-173; *Dict. of National Biography* (New York, 1908), IV, 1114.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

#### Fisherman's Ring. See RING.

FITTER, DANIEL, b. in Worcestershire, England, 1628; d. at St. Thomas' Priory, near Stafford, 6 Feb., 1700. He entered Lisbon College at the age of nineteen, went through his studies with some distinction, and was raised to the priesthood in 1651. A year or two later, he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain to William Fowler, Esq., of St. Thomas' Priory, near Stafford, where he remained until his death. During the reign of James II, he opened a school at Stafford, which was suppressed at the revolution in 1688. At the period of excitement ensuing upon the Titus Oates plot (1678), he, with a few others, upheld the lawfulness of taking the oath then tendered to every well-known Catholic. He himself subscribed it, and defended his action on the ground of a common and legal use of the term "spiritual". In consequence of this, when the chapter chose him as Vicar-General of the Counties of Stafford, Derby, Cheshire and Salop, they required that he should "sign a Declaration made by our Brethren in Paris against the Oath of Supremacy".

In a letter to the clergy of England and Scotland (1684), Cardinal Philip Howard recommended warmly the "Institutum clericorum in communi viventium", founded in 1641 by the German priest Bartolomäus Holzhauser, and approved by Innocent XI in 1680 and 1684. The institute met with eager acceptance in England, and Fitter was appointed its first provincial president and procurator for the Midland district. The association was, however, dissolved shortly after his death by Bishop Giffard in 1702, on account of a misunderstanding between its members and the rest of the secular clergy. Fitter had bequeathed property to "The Common Purse" of the institute, with a life-interest in favour of his elder brother Francis; but when the institute ceased to exist, Francis, by a deed of assignment, established a new trust (1703), called "The Common Fund" for the benefit of the clergy of the district. This fund became subsequently known as "The Johnson Fund" and still exists. Daniel Fitter also left a fund for the maintenance of a priest, whose duty it should be to reside in the county of

Stafford and take spiritual charge of the poor Catholics of the locality.

KIRK, *Bio. of Eng. Cath.* (London, 1909); IDEM, *Address to the Secular Clergy of the Midland District* (1810); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; IDEM, *St Thomas' Priory, Stafford* (London, s. d.); *Reports of the Nottingham Johnson Fund* (1892, 1895); *Archives of the Birmingham Johnson Fund*.

HENRY PARKINSON.

FITTON, JAMES, missionary, b. at Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A., 10 April, 1805; d. there, 15 Sept., 1881. His father, Abraham Fitton, went to Boston from Preston, England; his mother was of Welsh origin and a convert to the Faith. His primary education was received in the schools of his native city, and his classical course was made at Claremont, New Hampshire, at an academy conducted by Virgil Horace Barber, an early New England convert to the Faith. His theology he learned from the lips of Bishop Fenwick, by whom he was ordained priest, 23 Dec., 1827. Thenceforth for nearly a quarter of a century the whole of New England became the theatre of his zealous missionary labours. Carrying a valise containing vestments, chalice, and all necessities for offering the Holy Sacrifice, his breviary under his arm, he travelled, often on foot, from Eastport and the New Brunswick line on the northeast, to Burlington and Lake Champlain on the northwest; from Boston in the east, to Great Barrington and the Berkshire Hills in the west; from Providence and Newport in the southeast, to Bridgeport and the New York State line in the southwest. In the course of his ministry he was often exposed to insult and hardship, but he considered these as trifles when souls were to be saved. During his missionary career he was pastor of the first Catholic church at Hartford, Connecticut, and at Worcester, Massachusetts. He erected the church of Our Lady of the Isle at Newport, Rhode Island. In 1840, while pastor of the church at Worcester, he purchased the present site of Holy Cross College, and erected a building for the advanced education of Catholic young men. In 1842 he deeded the grounds and building to Bishop Fenwick, who placed it under the care of the Jesuits. In 1855 he was appointed by Bishop Fenwick pastor of the church of the Most Holy Redeemer in East Boston. Here he laboured for the remaining twenty-six years of his life, and built four more churches. In 1877 he celebrated the golden jubilee of his priesthood.

LEAHY, *History of the Catholic Church in the New England States* (Boston, 1899); FITTON, *Sketches of the Establishment of the Church in New England* (Boston, 1872); SHRA, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1904); McCAFFERY, *Sketch of Life and Missionary Labors of Rev. James Fitton* (N. E. Cath. Hist. Soc., Boston, 1908).

ARTHUR T. CONNOLLY.

FITZALAN, HENRY, twelfth Earl of Arundel, b. about 1511; d. in London, 24 Feb., 1580 (O. S. 1579). Son of William, eleventh earl, and Lady Anne Percy, he was godson to Henry VIII, in whose palace he was educated. From 1540 he was governor of Calais till 1543, when he succeeded to the earldom. In 1544 he besieged and took Boulogne, being made lord-chamberlain as a reward. In the reign of Edward VI he opposed Protector Somerset and supported Warwick, who eventually unjustly accused him of peculation and removed him from the council. On the death of Edward he abandoned the cause of Lady Jane Grey and proclaimed Mary as queen. Throughout her reign he was in favour as lord-steward and was employed in much diplomatic business. Even under Elizabeth he at first retained his offices and power though distrusted by her ministers. Yet he was too powerful to attack, and, being a widower, was considered as a possible consort for the queen. But in 1564 he fell into disgrace, and Elizabeth did not again employ him till 1568. Being the leader of the Catholic party, he desired a marriage between Mary, Queen of Scots, and his son-in-law, the Duke of Norfolk, but

was too cautious to commit himself, so that even after the futile northern rebellion of 1569 he was recalled to the council. But the discovery of the Ridolfi conspiracy,



HENRY FITZALAN, EARL OF ARUNDELL

again led to his confinement, and he spent the rest of his life in retirement.

*Life of Henry Fitzalan last Earle of Arundell of that name, written shortly after his death by his chaplain, a MS. in British Museum (Kings MSS. XVII, A. ix), printed in Gentleman's Magazine, 1833; The Boke of Henrie, Earle of Arundel (Harl. MS. 4107), printed in Jeffery's Antiquarian Repertory, II (London, 1807); Calendar of State Papers, 1547-1569, TIERNEY, History of the Castle and Town of Arundel, I (London, 1834), 310-350; GOODWIN in*

*Diet. Nat. Biog., s. v., Father Persons' Memoirs in Catholic Record Society: Miscellanea, II (London, 1806).*

EDWIN BURTON.

**Fitzherbert, MARIA ANNE**, wife of King George IV; b. 26 July, 1756 (place uncertain); d. at Brighton, England, 29 March, 1837; eldest child of Walter Smythe, of Brambridge, Hampshire, younger son of Sir John Smythe, of Eshe Hall, Durham and Acton Burnell Park, Salop, a Catholic baronet. In 1775 she married Edward Weld, of Lulworth, Dorset (uncle of Cardinal Weld), who died before the year was out. Her next husband was Thomas Fitzherbert, of Swynerton, Staffordshire, whom she married in 1778 and who died in 1781. A young and beautiful widow with a jointure of £2000 a year, she took up her abode in 1782 at Richmond, Surrey, having at the same time a house in town. In or about 1784 happened her first meeting with George, Prince of Wales, then about twenty-two years of age, she about six years older. He straightway fell in love with her. Marriage with her princely suitor being legally impossible, Mrs. Fitzherbert turned a deaf ear to the prince's solicitations, to get rid of which she withdrew to the Continent.

However, on receipt of an honourable offer from the prince, she returned after a while to England, and they were privily married in her own London drawing-room and before two witnesses, 15 Dec., 1785, the officiating minister being an Anglican curate.

Thenceforth, though in separate houses, they lived together as man and wife, she being treated on almost every hand with



MARIA ANNE FITZHERBERT

unbounded respect and deference, until 1787, when, upon the prince's application to Parliament for payment of his debts, Fox authoritatively declared in the House of Commons that no marriage between the prince and Mrs. Fitzherbert had ever

taken place. However, upon the prince's solemn and oft-repeated assurance that Fox had no authority for this degrading denial, the breach between the offended wife and her husband was healed. So they continued to live together on a matrimonial footing until 1794, when, being about to contract a forced legal marriage with his cousin, Caroline of Brunswick, the prince very reluctantly cast Mrs. Fitzherbert off, at the same time continuing the pension of £3000 a year, which he had allowed her ever since their marriage. Shortly after the birth of Princess Charlotte in 1796, the prince, who hated the Princess of Wales, separated from her and besought the forsaken Mrs. Fitzherbert to return to him. This, after consultation with Rome, she at length did in 1800, and remained with him some nine years more, when they virtually parted. At last, in 1811, because of a crowning affront put upon her on occasion of a magnificent fête given at Carlton House by the prince, lately made regent, at which entertainment no fixed place at the royal table had been assigned her, she broke off connexion with the prince for ever, withdrawing into private life upon an annuity of £8000. Her husband, as King George IV, died in 1830, with a locket containing her miniature round his neck, and was so buried. Mrs. Fitzherbert survived him seven years, dying at the age of eighty, at Brighton, where she was buried in the Catholic church of St. John the Baptist, to the erection of which she had largely contributed, and wherein a mural monument to her memory is still to be seen.

KEBBEL in *Diet. Nat. Biog., s. v.*; GILLOW, *Bibl. Diet. Eng. Cath., s. v.*; *Annual Register for 1837* (London); LANGDALE, *Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert* (London, 1856); WILKINS, *Mrs. Fitzherbert and George IV* (London, 1905).

C. T. BOOTHMAN.

**Fitzherbert, SIR ANTHONY**, judge, b. in 1470; d. 27 May, 1538. He was the sixth son of Ralph Fitzherbert of Norbury, Derbyshire, and Elizabeth Marshall. His brothers dying young, he succeeded his father as lord of the manor of Norbury, an estate granted to the family in 1125 and still in their hands. Wood states that he was educated at Oxford, but no evidence of this exists; nor is it known at which of the inns of court he received his legal training, though he is included in a list of Gray's Inn readers (Douthwaite, *Gray's Inn*, p. 46.). He was called to the degree of serjeant-at-law, 18 Nov., 1510, and six years later he was appointed king's serjeant. He had already published (in 1514) his great digest of the year-books which was the first systematic attempt to provide a summary of English law. It was known as "La Graunde Abridgement" and has often been reprinted, both entire and in epitomes, besides forming the foundation of all subsequent abridgments. He also brought out an edition of "Magna Charta cum diversis aliis statutis" (1519). In 1522 he was made a judge of common pleas and was knighted; but his new honours did not check his literary activity and in the following year (1523) he published three works: one on law, "Diversité de courtz et leur jurisdictions" (tr. by Hughes in 1646); one on agriculture, "The Boke of Husbandrie"; and one of law and agriculture combined, "The Boke of Surveyinge and Improvements". All three were frequently reprinted and though Sir Anthony's authorship of the "Boke of Husbandrie" was formerly questioned it is now regarded as established. Meanwhile his integrity and ability caused much business to be entrusted to him.

In 1524 Fitzherbert was sent on a royal commission to Ireland, Archbishop Warham appointed him by will sole arbitrator in the administration of his estate; and in 1529 when Wolsey fell, he was made a commissioner to hear chancery causes in place of the chancellor, and he subsequently signed the articles of impeachment against him. As one of the judges he unwillingly took part in the trials of the martyrs Fisher, More, and Haile, but he strongly disapproved

of the king's ecclesiastical polity, particularly the suppression of the monasteries and he bound his children under oath never to accept or purchase any abbey lands. In 1534 he brought out "that exact work, exquisitely penned" (Coke, Reports X, Pref.), "*La Nouvelle Natura Brevium*", which remained one of the classical English law books until the end of the eighteenth century. His last works were the constantly reprinted "*L'Office et Auctoryté des justices de peas*" (1538), the first complete treatise on the subject, and "*L'Office de Viconts Bailiffes, Escheators, Constables, Coroners*". Sir Anthony was twice married, first to Dorothy Willoughby who died without issue, and secondly to Matilda Cotton by whom he had a large family. His descendants have always kept the Faith and still own his estate of Norbury as well as the family seat at Swynnerton.

*State Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of Henry VIII*, III, ii, 889; IV, iii, 272; VI, 263; VII, 545, 581; *Præterea, De Illust. Anglie Scripturibus* (Paris, 1623), 707; Dodd, *Ch. Hist.* (Brussels, 1737), I; BURKE, *History of the Commoners of Great Britain* (London, 1834), I, 78 sqq.; Foss, *The Judges of England* (London, 1848-1864); IDEM, *A Biog. Dict. of the Judges of England* (London, 1870); BURKE, *Landed Gentry* (London, 1882); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), s. v.; RICE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), s. v.—For Sir Anthony's descendants see pedigree in FOLEY, *Records of the Eng. Prov. S. J.* (London, 1878), III, 792.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Fitzherbert, THOMAS**, b. 1552, at Swynnerton, Staffs, England; d. 17 Aug., 1640, at Rome. His father having died whilst Thomas was an infant, he was, even as a child, the head of an important family and the first heir born at Swynnerton, where his descendants have since flourished and still remain Catholics. He was trained to piety and firmness in his religion by his mother, and when sent to Oxford in his sixteenth year he confessed his faith with a courage that grew with the various trials, of which he has left us an interesting memoir (Foley, "*Records of English Province S. J.*", II, 210). At last he was forced to keep in hiding, and in 1572 he suffered imprisonment. In 1580 he married and had issue, but he did not give up his works of zeal. When Campion and Persons commenced their memorable mission, Fitzherbert put himself at their service, and helped Campion in the preparation of his "*Decem Rationes*" by verifying quotations and copying passages from the Fathers in various libraries, to which it would have been impossible for the Jesuit to obtain admission. Unable at last to maintain his position in face of the ever-growing persecution, he left England in 1582, and took up his residence in the north of France. Here, as a lay Catholic of birth, means, and unexceptionable character, he was much trusted by the Catholic leaders, and as sedulously watched by Walsingham's emissaries, whose letters contain frequent insinuations against his intentions and ulterior objects (see Foley, "*Records of English Province S. J.*", II, 220-228). His wife died in 1588, and he soon afterwards took a vow of celibacy. He is next found in the household of the young Duke of Feria, whose mother was Lady Anne Dormer. With him or in his service he lived in Flanders, Spain, Milan, Naples, and Rome for some twenty years, until the duke died in 1607, on the point of setting out for a diplomatic mission to Germany, on which Fitzherbert was to have accompanied him. It was during this period that he was charged in 1598 by Squire with having tempted him to murder Queen Elizabeth; in 1595 a charge of contradictory implication had been preferred against him to the Spanish Government, viz. that he was an agent of Elizabeth. Both charges led to the enhancement of his reputation. An interesting series of 200 letters from the duke to him is preserved in the archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster. In 1601, while in Spain, he felt moved to take a vow to offer himself for the priesthood, and he was ordained in Rome 24 March, 1602. After this he acted as Roman agent for the archpriest Harrison

until he was succeeded, in 1609, by the future bishop, Richard Smith. But in 1606 he had made a third vow, namely, to enter the Society of Jesus, which he did about the year 1613. He was soon given the important post of superior in Flanders, 1616 to 1618, afterwards recalled and made rector of the English College, Rome, from 1618 to 1639. He died there, closing, at the age of eighty-eight years, a life that had been filled with an unusual variety of important duties. His principal works are: "*A Defence of the Catholycke Cause*, By T. F., with an Apology of his innocence in a fayned conspiracy of Edward Squire" (St-Omer, 1602); "*A Treatise concerning Policy and Religion*" (Douai, 1606-10, 1615), translated into Latin in 1630. This work was highly valued for its sound and broad-minded criticism of the lax political principles professed in those days. He also wrote books in the controversy that grew out of King James's Oath of Allegiance. "*A Supplement to [Father Persons's] the Discussion of M. D. Barlow*" (St-Omer, 1613); "*A Confutation of certain Absurdities uttered by M. D. Andrews*" (St-Omer, 1613); "*Of the Oath of Fidelity*" (St-Omer, 1614); "*The Obmutesce of F. T. to the Epiphata of D. Collins*" (St-Omer, 1621). We have also from his pen a translation of Turcellini's "*Life of St. Francis Xavier*" (Paris, 1632).

FOLEY, *Records of English Province S. J.*, II, 198-230, VII, 258; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. J. H. POLLEN.

**Fitz Maurice, JOHN**. See ERIE, DIOCESE OF.

**Fitzpatrick, JOHN BERNARD**. See BOSTON, DIOCESE OF.

**Fitzpatrick, WILLIAM JOHN**, historian, b. in Dublin, Ireland, 31 Aug., 1830; d. there 24 Dec., 1895. The son of a rich merchant, he had ample means to indulge his peculiar tastes, and these were for biography, and especially for seeking out what was hitherto unknown and not always desirable to publish about great men. Educated partly at a Protestant school, partly at Clongowes Wood College, he early took to writing and in 1855 published his first work—"The Life, Times and Correspondence of Lord Cloncurry". The same year he wrote a series of letters to "Notes and Queries" charging Sir Walter Scott with plagiarism in his Waverley novels, and attributing the chief credit of having written these novels to Sir Walter's brother Thomas. The latter was dead, but his daughters repudiated Fitzpatrick's advocacy and their father's supposed claims, and the matter ended there. In 1859 Fitzpatrick published "*The Friends, Foes and Adventures of Lady Morgan*". From that date to his death, his pen was never idle. His research was great, his industry a marvel, his patience and care immense, nor is he ever consciously unjust. For these reasons, though his style is unattractive, his works are valuable, especially to the Irish historical student. Notable examples are "*The Sham Squire*" (1866), "*Ireland before the Union*" (1867), "*The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell*" (1888), "*Secret Service under Pitt*" (1892). Fitzpatrick also wrote works dealing with Archbishop Whately, Charles Lever, Rev. Dr. Lanigan, Father Tom Burke, O.P., and Father James Healy of Bray. In 1876 he was appointed professor of history by the Hibernian Academy of Arts. Fitzpatrick's painstaking research as well as his spirit of fair play are specially to be commended and have earned words of praise from two men differing in many other things—Lecky and Gladstone.

FAULKNER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, supplement, II, s. v.; *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin, 26 Dec., 1895).

E. A. D'ALTON.

**Fitzralph, RICHARD**, Archbishop of Armagh, b. at Dundalk, Ireland, about 1295; d. at Avignon, 16 Dec., 1360. He studied in Oxford, where we first find mention of him in 1325 as an ex-fellow and teacher of Balliol College. He was made doctor of theology before 1331, and was chancellor of Oxford University in 1333. In 1334



he was made chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral, and in Jan., 1335, canon and prebendary of Lichfield, "notwithstanding that he has canonries and prebends of Crediton and Bosham, and has had provision made for him of the Chancellorship of Lincoln and the canonries and prebends of Armagh and Exeter, all of which he is to resign" (Bliss, *Calendar of Entries in Papal Registers*, II, 524). He was archdeacon of Chester when made dean of Lichfield in 1337. On 31 July, 1346, he was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh.

Fitzralph was a man who pre-eminently joined the speculative temperament with the practical. One of the great Scholastic luminaries of his day, and a close friend of the scholarly Richard of Bury, he fostered learning among his priests by sending many of them to take higher studies in Oxford. He was zealous too in visiting the various church provinces, and in bettering financial as well as spiritual conditions in his own see. He contended for his primatial rights against the immunity claimed by the See of Dublin; and on various occasions acted as peacemaker between the English and the Irish. He was in great demand as a preacher, and many of his sermons are still extant in manuscript. Whilst at Avignon in 1350, Fitzralph presented a memorial from the English clergy reciting certain complaints against the mendicant orders. After serving on a commission appointed by Clement VI to inquire into the points at issue, he embodied his own views in the treatise "*De Pauperie Salvatoris*", which deals with the subject of evangelical poverty, as well as the questions then agitated concerning dominion, possession, and use, and the relation of these to the state of grace in man. Part of this work is printed by Poole in his edition of Wyclif's "*De Dominio Divino*" (London, 1890). It was probably during this visit that Fitzralph also took part in the negotiations going on between the Armenian delegates and the pope. He composed an elaborate apologetico-polemic work, entitled "*Summa in Questionibus Armenorum*" (Paris, 1511), in which he displayed his profound knowledge of Scripture with telling effect in refuting the Greek and Armenian heresies.

Fitzralph's controversy with the friars came to a crisis when he was cited to Avignon in 1357. Avowing his entire submission to the authority of the Holy See, he defended his attitude towards the friars in the plea entitled "*Defensorium Curatorum*" (printed in Goldast's "*Monarchia*" and elsewhere). He maintained as probable that voluntary mendicancy is contrary to the teachings of Christ. His main plea, however, was for the withdrawal of the privileges of the friars in regard to confessions, preaching, burying, etc. He urged a return to the purity of their original institution, claiming that these privileges undermined the authority of the parochial clergy. The friars were not molested, but by gradual legislation harmony was restored between them and the parish clergy. Fitzralph's position, however, was not directly condemned, and he died in peace at Avignon. In 1370 his remains were transferred to St. Nicholas' church, Dundalk; miracles were reported from his tomb and for several centuries his memory was held in saintly veneration. His printed works are mentioned above. His "*Opus in P. Lombardi Sententias*" and several other works (list in the "*Catholic University Bulletin*", XI, 243) are still in manuscript.

POOLE in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; GREANEY in *Cath. Univ. Bull.* (Washington), XI, 68, 195; FELTEN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

JOHN J. GREANEY.

**Fitzsimon** (FITZ SIMON), HENRY, Jesuit, b. 1566 (or 1569), in Dublin, Ireland; d. 29 Nov., 1643 (or 1645), probably at Kilkenny. He was educated a Protestant at Oxford (Hart Hall, and perhaps Christ Church), 1583-1587. Going thence to the University of Paris, he became a zealous protagonist of Protestantism, "with the firm intention to have died for it", if need

had been. But having engaged in controversy with "an owld English Jesuit, Father Thomas Darbishire, to my happiness I was overcome". Having embraced Catholicism he visited Rome and Flanders, where, in 1592, he "elected to militate under the Jesuits' standard, because they do most impugn the impiety of heretics". In 1595 there was a call for Jesuit labourers for Ireland, which had been deprived of them for ten years. He at once offered himself for the post of danger, and he shares with Father Archer the honour of having refounded that mission on a basis that proved permanent amid innumerable dangers and trials. Keeping chiefly to Dublin and Drogheda he was wonderfully successful in reconciling Protestants, and he loudly and persistently challenged the chief Anglican divines to disputation. With the same fighting spirit he laughed at his capture in 1600. "Now", said he, "my adversaries cannot say that they know not where to find me"; and he would shout his challenges from his prison window at every passing parson. But his opponents, James Ussher, Meredith Hanmer, and John Rider, in spite of their professions, carefully avoided coming to close quarters with their redoubtable adversary.

Banished in 1604, he visited Spain, Rome, and Flanders, 1611-1620, everywhere earnest and active with voice and pen in the cause of Ireland. After the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, in July, 1620, he served as chaplain to the Irish soldiers in the imperial army, and published a diary, full of life and interest, of his adventurous experiences. He probably returned to Flanders in 1621 and in 1630 went back to Ireland, where he continued to work with energy and success until the outbreak of the Civil War (1640). In the ensuing tumult and confusion, we are unable to follow his later movements with certainty. At one time we hear that he was under sentence of death, from which he escaped in the winter of 1641 to the Wicklow Mountains, and after many sufferings died in peace, probably at Kilkenny. "Not many, if any Irishmen", says his biographer, while reflecting on the many universities, towns, courts and armies which Father Fitzsimon had visited, "have known, or been known to, so many men of mark". Besides one controversial work in MS., not known to previous biographers, now at Oscott College, Birmingham, which is entitled "*A revelation of contradictions in reformed articles of religion*", dated 1633, he wrote two MS. treatises, now lost, against Rider; and afterwards printed against him "*A Catholic Confutation*" (Rouen, 1608); "*Britannomachia Ministrorum*" (1614); "*Pugna Pragensis*" (1620) and "*Buquonii Quadrimestreiter, Auctore Constantio Peregrino*" (Brünn, 1621, several editions, also Italian and English versions); "*Catalogus Præcipuorum Sanctorum Hiberniæ*" (1611, several editions), important as drawing attention to Irish hagiography at a time of great depression. His "*Words of Comfort to Persecuted Catholics*", "*Letters from a Cell in Dublin Castle*", and "*Diary of the Bohemian War of 1620*", together with a sketch of his life, were published by Father Edmund Hogan, S.J. (Dublin, 1881).

HOGAN, *Distinguished Irishmen of the Sixteenth Century* (Dublin, 1894), 198-310; FOLEY, *Records S.J.*, VII, 260; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, III, 766-768; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. J. H. POLLEN.

**Fitz-Simons**, THOMAS, American merchant, b. in Ireland, 1741; d. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 26 Aug., 1811. There is no positive date of his arrival in America, but church records in Philadelphia show he was there in 1758. In 1763 he was married to Catherine, sister of George Meade, and he was Meade's partner as a merchant until 1784. In the events that led up to the revolt of the colonists against England he took a prominent part. He was one of the deputies who met in conference in Carpenter's Hall, Philadelphia, out of which conference grew the Continental Congress that



of the king's ecclesiastical polity, particularly the suppression of the monasteries and he bound his children under oath never to accept or purchase any abbey lands. In 1534 he brought out "that exact work, exquisitely penned" (Coke, Reports X, Pref.), "La Nouvelle Natura Brevium", which remained one of the classical English law books until the end of the eighteenth century. His last works were the constantly reprinted "L'Office et Auctoryté des justices de peas" (1538), the first complete treatise on the subject, and "L'Office de Viconts Bailiffes, Escheators, Constables, Coroners". Sir Anthony was twice married, first to Dorothy Willoughby who died without issue, and secondly to Matilda Cotton by whom he had a large family. His descendants have always kept the Faith and still own his estate of Norbury as well as the family seat at Swynnerton.

*State Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of Henry VIII*, III, ii, 889; IV, ii, 272; VI, 263; VII, 545, 581; *Pitts, De Illust. Angliæ Scriptis* (Paris, 1623), 707; *Dodd, Ch. Hist.* (Brussels, 1737), I; *BURKE, History of the Commoners of Great Britain* (London, 1834), I, 78 seq.; *Foss, The Judges of England* (London, 1848-1864); *IDEM, A Biog. Dict. of the Judges of England* (London, 1870); *BURKE, Landed Gentry* (London, 1882); *GILLOW, Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), s. v; *Rigg in Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), s. v.—For Sir Anthony's descendants see pedigree in *FOLEY, Records of the Eng. Prov. S. J.* (London, 1878), III, 792.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Fitzherbert, THOMAS**, b. 1552, at Swynnerton, Staffs, England; d. 17 Aug., 1640, at Rome. His father having died whilst Thomas was an infant, he was, even as a child, the head of an important family and the first heir born at Swynnerton, where his descendants have since flourished and still remain Catholics. He was trained to piety and firmness in his religion by his mother, and when sent to Oxford in his sixteenth year he confessed his faith with a courage that grew with the various trials, of which he has left us an interesting memoir (Foley, "Records of English Province S. J.", II, 210). At last he was forced to keep in hiding, and in 1572 he suffered imprisonment. In 1580 he married and had issue, but he did not give up his works of zeal. When Campion and Persons commenced their memorable mission, Fitzherbert put himself at their service, and helped Campion in the preparation of his "Decem Rationes" by verifying quotations and copying passages from the Fathers in various libraries, to which it would have been impossible for the Jesuit to obtain admission. Unable at last to maintain his position in face of the ever-growing persecution, he left England in 1582, and took up his residence in the north of France. Here, as a lay Catholic of birth, means, and unexceptionable character, he was much trusted by the Catholic leaders, and as sedulously watched by Walsingham's emissaries, whose letters contain frequent insinuations against his intentions and ulterior objects (see Foley, "Records of English Province S. J.", II, 220-228). His wife died in 1588, and he soon afterwards took a vow of celibacy. He is next found in the household of the young Duke of Feria, whose mother was Lady Anne Dormer. With him or in his service he lived in Flanders, Spain, Milan, Naples, and Rome for some twenty years, until the duke died in 1607, on the point of setting out for a diplomatic mission to Germany, on which Fitzherbert was to have accompanied him. It was during this period that he was charged in 1598 by Squire with having tempted him to murder Queen Elizabeth; in 1595 a charge of contradictory implication had been preferred against him to the Spanish Government, viz. that he was an agent of Elizabeth. Both charges led to the enhancement of his reputation. An interesting series of 200 letters from the duke to him is preserved in the archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster. In 1601, while in Spain, he felt moved to take a vow to offer himself for the priesthood, and he was ordained in Rome 24 March, 1602. After this he acted as Roman agent for the archpriest Harrison

until he was succeeded, in 1609, by the future bishop, Richard Smith. But in 1606 he had made a third vow, namely, to enter the Society of Jesus, which he did about the year 1613. He was soon given the important post of superior in Flanders, 1616 to 1618, afterwards recalled and made rector of the English College, Rome, from 1618 to 1639. He died there, closing, at the age of eighty-eight years, a life that had been filled with an unusual variety of important duties. His principal works are: "A Defence of the Catholycke Cause, By T. F., with an Apology of his innocence in a fayned conspiracy of Edward Squire" (St-Omer, 1602); "A Treatise concerning Policy and Religion" (Douai, 1606-10, 1615), translated into Latin in 1630. This work was highly valued for its sound and broad-minded criticism of the lax political principles professed in those days. He also wrote books in the controversy that grew out of King James's Oath of Allegiance. "A Supplement to [Father Persons's] the Discussion of M. D. Barlow" (St-Omer, 1613); "A Confutation of certain Absurdities uttered by M. D. Andrews" (St-Omer, 1613); "Of the Oath of Fidelity" (St-Omer, 1614); "The Obmutescence of F. T. to the Epiphata of D. Collins" (St-Omer, 1621). We have also from his pen a translation of Turcellini's "Life of St. Francis Xavier" (Paris, 1632).

*FOLEY, Records of English Province S. J.*, II, 198-230, VII, 258; *COOPER in Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. J. H. POLLEN.

**Fitz Maurice, JOHN**. See *ERIE, DIOCESE OF*.

**Fitzpatrick, JOHN BERNARD**. See *BOSTON, DIOCESE OF*.

**Fitzpatrick, WILLIAM JOHN**, historian, b. in Dublin, Ireland, 31 Aug., 1830; d. there 24 Dec., 1895. The son of a rich merchant, he had ample means to indulge his peculiar tastes, and these were for biography, and especially for seeking out what was hitherto unknown and not always desirable to publish about great men. Educated partly at a Protestant school, partly at Clongowes Wood College, he early took to writing and in 1855 published his first work—"The Life, Times and Correspondence of Lord Cloncurry". The same year he wrote a series of letters to "Notes and Queries" charging Sir Walter Scott with plagiarism in his Waverley novels, and attributing the chief credit of having written these novels to Sir Walter's brother Thomas. The latter was dead, but his daughters repudiated Fitzpatrick's advocacy and their father's supposed claims, and the matter ended there. In 1859 Fitzpatrick published "The Friends, Foes and Adventures of Lady Morgan". From that date to his death, his pen was never idle. His research was great, his industry a marvel, his patience and care immense, nor is he ever consciously unjust. For these reasons, though his style is unattractive, his works are valuable, especially to the Irish historical student. Notable examples are "The Sham Squire" (1866), "Ireland before the Union" (1867), "The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell" (1888), "Secret Service under Pitt" (1892). Fitzpatrick also wrote works dealing with Archbishop Whately, Charles Lever, Rev. Dr. Lanigan, Father Tom Burke, O.P., and Father James Healy of Bray. In 1876 he was appointed professor of history by the Hibernian Academy of Arts. Fitzpatrick's painstaking research as well as his spirit of fair play are specially to be commended and have earned words of praise from two men differing in many other things—Lecky and Gladstone.

*FALKNER in Dict. Nat. Biog.*, supplement, II, s. v.; *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin, 26 Dec., 1895).

E. A. D'ALTON.

**Fitzralph, RICHARD**, Archbishop of Armagh, b. at Dundalk, Ireland, about 1295; d. at Avignon, 16 Dec., 1360. He studied in Oxford, where we first find mention of him in 1325 as an ex-fellow and teacher of Balliol College. He was made doctor of theology before 1331, and was chancellor of Oxford University in 1333. In 1334

he was made chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral, and in Jan., 1335, canon and prebendary of Lichfield, "notwithstanding that he has canonries and prebends of Crediton and Bosham, and has had provision made for him of the Chancellorship of Lincoln and the canonries and prebends of Armagh and Exeter, all of which he is to resign" (Bliss, *Calendar of Entries in Papal Registers*, II, 524). He was archdeacon of Chester when made dean of Lichfield in 1337. On 31 July, 1346, he was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh.

Fitzralph was a man who pre-eminently joined the speculative temperament with the practical. One of the great Scholastic luminaries of his day, and a close friend of the scholarly Richard of Bury, he fostered learning among his priests by sending many of them to take higher studies in Oxford. He was zealous too in visiting the various church provinces, and in bettering financial as well as spiritual conditions in his own see. He contended for his primatial rights against the immunity claimed by the See of Dublin; and on various occasions acted as peacemaker between the English and the Irish. He was in great demand as a preacher, and many of his sermons are still extant in manuscript. Whilst at Avignon in 1350, Fitzralph presented a memorial from the English clergy reciting certain complaints against the mendicant orders. After serving on a commission appointed by Clement VI to inquire into the points at issue, he embodied his own views in the treatise "*De Pauperie Salvatoris*", which deals with the subject of evangelical poverty, as well as the questions then agitated concerning dominion, possession, and use, and the relation of these to the state of grace in man. Part of this work is printed by Poole in his edition of Wyclif's "*De Dominio Divino*" (London, 1890). It was probably during this visit that Fitzralph also took part in the negotiations going on between the Armenian delegates and the pope. He composed an elaborate apologetico-polemic work, entitled "*Summa in Questionibus Armenorum*" (Paris, 1511), in which he displayed his profound knowledge of Scripture with telling effect in refuting the Greek and Armenian heresies.

Fitzralph's controversy with the friars came to a crisis when he was cited to Avignon in 1357. Avowing his entire submission to the authority of the Holy See, he defended his attitude towards the friars in the plea entitled "*Defensorium Curatorum*" (printed in Goldast's "*Monarchia*" and elsewhere). He maintained as probable that voluntary mendicancy is contrary to the teachings of Christ. His main plea, however, was for the withdrawal of the privileges of the friars in regard to confessions, preaching, burying, etc. He urged a return to the purity of their original institution, claiming that these privileges undermined the authority of the parochial clergy. The friars were not molested, but by gradual legislation harmony was restored between them and the parish clergy. Fitzralph's position, however, was not directly condemned, and he died in peace at Avignon. In 1370 his remains were transferred to St. Nicholas' church, Dundalk; miracles were reported from his tomb and for several centuries his memory was held in saintly veneration. His printed works are mentioned above. His "*Opus in P. Lombardi Sententias*" and several other works (list in the "*Catholic University Bulletin*", XI, 243) are still in manuscript.

POOLE in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; GREANEY in *Cath. Univ. Bull.* (Washington), XI, 68, 195; FEITZEN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

JOHN J. GREANEY.

**Fitzsimon** (FITZ SIMON), HENRY, Jesuit, b. 1566 (or 1569), in Dublin, Ireland; d. 29 Nov., 1643 (or 1645), probably at Kilkenny. He was educated a Protestant at Oxford (Hart Hall, and perhaps Christ Church), 1583-1587. Going thence to the University of Paris, he became a zealous protagonist of Protestantism, "with the firm intention to have died for it", if need

had been. But having engaged in controversy with "an owld English Jesuit, Father Thomas Darbishire, to my happiness I was overcome". Having embraced Catholicism he visited Rome and Flanders, where, in 1592, he "elected to militate under the Jesuits' standard, because they do most impugn the impiety of heretics". In 1595 there was a call for Jesuit labourers for Ireland, which had been deprived of them for ten years. He at once offered himself for the post of danger, and he shares with Father Archer the honour of having refounded that mission on a basis that proved permanent amid innumerable dangers and trials. Keeping chiefly to Dublin and Drogheda he was wonderfully successful in reconciling Protestants, and he loudly and persistently challenged the chief Anglican divines to disputation. With the same fighting spirit he laughed at his capture in 1600. "Now", said he, "my adversaries cannot say that they know not where to find me"; and he would shout his challenges from his prison window at every passing parson. But his opponents, James Ussher, Meredith Hamner, and John Rider, in spite of their professions, carefully avoided coming to close quarters with their redoubtable adversary.

Banished in 1604, he visited Spain, Rome, and Flanders, 1611-1620, everywhere earnest and active with voice and pen in the cause of Ireland. After the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, in July, 1620, he served as chaplain to the Irish soldiers in the imperial army, and published a diary, full of life and interest, of his adventurous experiences. He probably returned to Flanders in 1621 and in 1630 went back to Ireland, where he continued to work with energy and success until the outbreak of the Civil War (1640). In the ensuing tumult and confusion, we are unable to follow his later movements with certainty. At one time we hear that he was under sentence of death, from which he escaped in the winter of 1641 to the Wicklow Mountains, and after many sufferings died in peace, probably at Kilkenny. "Not many, if any Irishmen", says his biographer, while reflecting on the many universities, towns, courts and armies which Father Fitzsimon had visited, "have known, or been known to, so many men of mark". Besides one controversial work in MS., not known to previous biographers, now at Oscott College, Birmingham, which is entitled "*A revelation of contradictions in reformed articles of religion*", dated 1633, he wrote two MS. treatises, now lost, against Rider; and afterwards printed against him "*A Catholic Confutation*" (Rouen, 1608); "*Britannomachia Ministrorum*" (1614); "*Pugna Pragensis*" (1620) and "*Buquoii Quadrimestreiter, Auctore Constantio Peregrino*" (Brunn, 1621, several editions, also Italian and English versions); "*Catalogus Præcipuorum Sanctorum Hiberniæ*" (1611, several editions), important as drawing attention to Irish hagiography at a time of great depression. His "*Words of Comfort to Persecuted Catholics*", "*Letters from a Cell in Dublin Castle*", and "*Diary of the Bohemian War of 1620*", together with a sketch of his life, were published by Father Edmund Hogan, S.J. (Dublin, 1881).

HOGAN, *Distinguished Irishmen of the Sixteenth Century* (Dublin, 1894), 198-310; FOLEY, *Records S.J.*, VII, 260; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, III, 766-768; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. J. H. POLLEN.

**Fitz-Simons**, THOMAS, American merchant, b. in Ireland, 1741; d. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 26 Aug., 1811. There is no positive date of his arrival in America, but church records in Philadelphia show he was there in 1758. In 1763 he was married to Catherine, sister of George Meade, and he was Meade's partner as a merchant until 1784. In the events that led up to the revolt of the colonists against England he took a prominent part. He was one of the deputies who met in conference in Carpenter's Hall, Philadelphia, out of which conference grew the Continental Congress that

assembled 4 Sept., 1774, and of which he was a member. His election as one of the Provincial Deputies in July, 1774, is the first instance of a Catholic being named for a public office in Pennsylvania. At the breaking-out of hostilities he organized a company of militia and took part in the Trenton campaign in New Jersey. After this service in the field he returned to Philadelphia and was active with other merchants in providing for the needs of the army.

On 12 Nov., 1782, he was elected a member of the Congress of the old Confederacy and was among the leaders in its deliberations. He was a member of the Convention that met in Philadelphia 25 May, 1787, and framed the Constitution of the United States. Daniel Carroll of Maryland being the only other Catholic member. In this convention Fitz-Simons voted against universal suffrage and in favour of limiting it to free-holders. Under this constitution he was elected a member of the first Congress of the United States and in it served on the Committee on Ways and Means. In politics he was an ardent Federalist. He was re-elected to the second and the third Congresses, but was defeated for the fourth, in 1794, and this closed his political career. Madison wrote to Jefferson, on 16 Nov., 1794, that the failure of Fitz-Simons to be selected was a "stinging blow for the aristocracy". The records of Congress show that he was among the very first, if not the first, to advocate the fundamental principles of a protective tariff system to help American industries. When Washington was inaugurated the first president, Fitz-Simons was one of the four laymen, Charles and Daniel Carroll of Maryland, and Dominic Lynch of New York being the others, to sign the address of congratulation presented to him by the Catholics of the country. He was among the founders of Georgetown College, and was considered during his long life one of the most enlightened merchants in the United States. On all questions connected with commerce and finance his advice was always sought and regarded with respect in the operations that laid the foundation of the commercial prosperity of the new republic.

GREFFIN, *Thomas Fitz-Simons* (Philadelphia, 1887); *Am. Cath. Hist. Researches* (Philadelphia, 1908), 162-63; SHEA, *Life and Times of Most Rev. John Carroll* (New York, 1888).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

#### Five Mile Act. See NONCONFORMISTS.

**Fixlmillner**, PLACIDUS, astronomer, b. at Achleuthen near Kremsmünster, Austria, in 1721; d. at Kremsmünster, 27 August, 1791. He received his early education at Salzburg, where he displayed a talent for mathematics. He joined the Benedictines at the age of sixteen and became distinguished for his broad scholarship. In 1756 he published a small treatise entitled "*Reipublicæ sacræ origines divinæ*". He intended to continue this work but the transit of Venus in 1761 again aroused his interest in mathematics. Though already forty years of age he resumed his old studies with ardour, and an opportunity soon presented itself for work in astronomy. He was appointed director of the observatory of Kremsmünster, which had been established by his uncle in 1748 while abbot. His first task was to improve the equipment and have new instruments constructed, and as soon as possible he determined the latitude and longitude of the observatory. He continued in charge of the observatory until his death and by his industry accumulated a number of observations of great variety and value. He did not, however, devote all his time to astronomy. For many years he was in charge of the college connected with the abbey and at the same time acted as professor of canon law. As such he was honoured with the dignity of notary Apostolic of the Roman Court. Fixlmillner is best known for his work in astronomy. He was one of the first to compute the orbit of Uranus after its discovery by Herschel. His numerous observations of Mercury were of much ser-

vice to Lalande in constructing tables of that planet. Besides the treatise already mentioned he was the author of "*Meridianum speculæ astronomicæ cremifanensis*" (Steyer, 1765), which treats of his observations in connexion with the latitude and longitude of his observatory, and "*Decennium astronomicum*" (Steyer, 1776). After his death his successor P. Derflinger published the "*Acta cremifanensia a Placido Fixlmillner*" (Steyer, 1791), which contain his observations from 1776 to 1791.

SCHLICHTEGROLL, *Nekrolog der Deutschen* (Gotha, 1791-1806), supplement; ZACH, *Ephémérides géographiques* (1799); NICOLLET in *Biog. Universelle*, XIV.

H. M. BROCK.

**Fizeau**, ARMAND-HIPPOLYTE-LOUIS, physicist, b. at Paris, 23 Sept., 1819; d. at Nanteuil, Seine-et-Marne, 18 Sept., 1896. His father, a distinguished physician and professor of medicine in Paris during the Restoration, left him an independent fortune, so that he was able to devote himself to scientific research. He attended Stanislas College and then began to study medicine, but had to abandon it on account of ill-health and travelled for awhile. Then followed Arago's lessons at the Observatory, Regnault on optics at the College of France, and a thorough study of his brother's notebooks of the courses at the Ecole Polytechnique. In 1839 he became interested in the new photography and succeeded in getting permanent pictures by the daguerreotype. Foucault came to consult him about this work and became associated with him in their epoch-making experiments in optics, showing the identity of radiant heat and light, the regularity of the light vibrations, and the validity of the undulatory theory. Just as they were ready to develop the *experimentum crucis* (see FOUCAULT) overthrowing the emission theory, they parted company and worked independently.

Fizeau was the first to determine experimentally the velocity of light (1849). He used a rotating cog-wheel and a fixed mirror several miles distant; light passed between two teeth of the wheel to the distant mirror and then returned. If the wheel turned fast enough to obscure the reflection, then the reflected beam struck a cog. The time it took the wheel to move the width of one tooth was then equal to the time it took the light to travel twice the distance between the wheel and the mirror. He also experimented successfully to show that the ether is carried along by moving substances, since light travels faster through a stream of water in the direction of its motion than in the opposite direction. In his measurements of vanishingly small distances, such as the expansion of crystals, he made use of the extremely small and very regular wave-length of light. His addition of a condenser in the primary circuit of the induction coil increased the effectiveness of this device considerably. On the recommendation of the Academy of Sciences he was awarded the Grand Prix (10,000 francs) of the Institute in 1856. He was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences in 1860, and a member of the Bureau des Longitudes in 1878. He received the decoration of the Legion of Honour in 1849 and became officer in 1875. In 1866 the Royal Society of London awarded him the Rumford Medal. Cornu says of him: "He was a practical and convinced Christian and did not hide that fact." In the presidential address before the academy (Comptes Rendus, 1879), Fizeau calls attention to "the dignity and independence of natural science as well as to its limits of action, preventing it from interfering in philosophic or social questions, and not permitting it to put itself in opposition to the noble emotions of the heart nor to the pure voice of conscience". Most of his published works appeared in the "*Comptes Rendus*" and in the "*Annales de physique et de chimie*". A few of the titles are: "*Sur la daguerréotypie*"; "*Sur l'interférence entre deux rayons dans le cas de grandes dif-*



LEO XII (1823-29) CARRIED IN PROCESSION IN ST. PETER'S  
FROM VERNET'S PAINTING, SHOWING THE FLABELLA AS USED ON OCCASIONS OF STATE  
WITH THE "SEDIA GESTATORIA", OR PROCESSIONAL CHAIR




férences de marche"; "Vitesse de la lumière; "Interférence des rayons calorifiques"; "Réfraction différentielle"; "Vitesse de l'électricité"; "Dilatation des cristaux".

GRAY, *Nature* (London, 1896); CORNU, *Annuaire pour l'an 1898 of the Bureau des Longitudes* (Paris).

WILLIAM FOX.

**Flabellum**, in liturgical use a fan made of leather, silk, parchment, or feathers intended to keep away insects from the Sacred Species and from the priest. It was in use in the sacrifices of the heathens and in the Christian Church from very early days, for in the Apostolic Constitutions, a work of the fourth century, we read (VIII, 12): "Let two of the deacons, on each side of the altar, hold a fan, made up of thin membranes, or of the feathers of the peacock, or of fine cloth, and let them silently drive away the small animals that fly about, that they may not come near to the cups". Its use was continued in the Latin Church to about the fourteenth century. In the Greek Church to the present day, the deacon, at his ordination, receives the *hagion ripidion*, or sacred fan, which is generally made to the likeness of a cherub's six-winged face, and in the sacrifice of the Mass he waves it gently over the species from the time of the Offertory to the Communion—in the Liturgy of St. Basil only during the Consecration. Among the ornaments found belonging to the church of St. Riquier, in Ponthieu (813), there is a silver flabellum (Migne, P. L., CLXXIV, 1257), and for the chapel of Cisoin, near Lisle, another flabellum of silver is noted in the will of Everard (d. 937), the founder of that abbey. When, in 1777, Martène wrote his "Voyage Littéraire", the Abbey of Tournus, on the Saône in France, possessed an old flabellum, which had an ivory handle two feet long, and was beautifully carved; the two sides of the ivory circular disc were engraved with fourteen figures of saints. Pieces of this fan, dating from the eighth century, are in the Musée Cluny at Paris, and in the Collection Carrand. The circular disc is also found in the Slavic flabellum of the thirteenth century, preserved at Moscow, and in the one shown in the Megaspoleon monastery in Greece. On this latter disc are carved the Madonna and Child and it is encircled by eight medallions containing the images of cherubim and of the Four Evangelists. The inventory, taken in 1222, of the treasury of Salisbury, enumerates a silver fan and two of parchment. The richest and most beautiful specimen is the flabellum of the thirteenth century in the Abbey of Kremsmünster in Upper Austria. It has the shape of a Greek cross and is ornamented with fretwork and the representation of the Resurrection of Our Lord. A kind of fan with a hoop of little bells is used by the Maronites and other Orientals and is generally made of silver or brass.

Apart from the foregoing liturgical uses, a flabellum, in the shape of a fan, later of an umbrella or canopy, was used as a mark of honour for bishops and princes. Two fans of this kind are used at the Vatican whenever the pope is carried in state on the *sedes gestatoria* to or from the altar or audience-chamber. Through the influence of Count Ditalmo di Brozza, the fans formerly used at the Vatican were, in 1902, presented to Mrs. Joseph Drexel of Philadelphia, U. S. A., by Leo XIII, and in return she gave a new pair to the Vatican. The old ones are exhibited in the museum of the University of Pennsylvania. They are splendid creations. The spread is formed of great ostrich plumes tipped with peacock feathers; on the sticks are the papal arms, worked in a crimson field in heavy gold, the crown studded with rubies and emeralds.



PAPAL FLABELLUM  
Museum of University of Pennsylvania

St. Paul's Cathedral, London, had a fan made of peacock feathers, and York Cathedral's inventory mentions a silver handle of a fan, which was gilded and had upon it the enamelled picture of the bishop. Haymo, Bishop of Rochester (d. 1352), gave to his church a fan of silver with an ivory handle.

ROCK, *Church of our Fathers* (London, 1904), II, 209; DU CANGE, *Glossarium* (Niot, 1885); STREBER in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v.; KRAUS, *Gesch. der kirchl. Kunst* (Freiburg, 1896), I, 552. FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Flaccilla** (Πλακίλλα), ÆLIA, empress, wife of Theodosius the Great, died c. A. D. 385 or 386. Like Theodosius himself, his first wife, Ælia Flaccilla, was of Spanish descent. She may have been the daughter of Claudius Antonius, Prefect of Gaul, who was consul in 382. Her marriage with Theodosius probably took place in the year 376, when his father, the *comes* Theodosius, fell into disfavour and he himself withdrew to Cauca in Gallæcia, for her eldest son, afterwards Emperor Arcadius, was born towards the end of the following year. In the succeeding years she presented two more children to her husband,

Honorius (384), who later became emperor, and Pulcheria, who died in early childhood, shortly before her mother. Gregory of Nyssa states expressly that she had three children; consequently the Gratian mentioned by St. Ambrose, together with Pulcheria, was probably not her son. Flaccilla was, like her husband, a zealous supporter of the Nicene Creed and prevented the conference between the emperor and the Arian Eunomius (Sozomen, Hist. eccl., VII, vi). On the throne she was a shining example of Christian virtue and ardent charity. St. Ambrose describes her as "a soul true to God" (*Fidelis anima Deo*.—"De obitu Theodosii", n. 40, in P. L., XVI, 1462). In his panegyric St. Gregory of Nyssa bestowed the highest praise on her virtuous life and pictured her as the helpmate of the emperor in all good works, an ornament of the empire, a leader of justice, an image of beneficence. He praises her as filled with zeal for the Faith, as a pillar of the Church, as a mother of the indigent. Theodoret in particular exalts her charity and benevolence (Hist. eccl., V, xix, ed. Valesius, III, 192 sq.). He tells us how she personally tended cripples, and quotes a saying of hers: "To distribute money belongs to the imperial dignity, but I offer up for the imperial dignity itself personal service to the Giver." Her humility also attracts a special meed of praise from the church historian. Flaccilla was buried in Constantinople, St. Gregory of Nyssa delivering her funeral oration. She

is venerated in the Greek Church as a saint, and her feast is kept on 14 September. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.*, Sept., IV, 142) are of the opinion that she is not regarded as a saint but only as venerable, but her name stands in the Greek *Menæa* and *Synaxaria* followed by words of eulogy, as is the case with the other saints (cf. e.g. *Synaxarium eccl. Constantinopolitanæ*, ed. Delehaye, Brussels, 1902, col. 46, under 14 Sept.).

GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Oratio funebris de Placilla* in P. G., XLVI, 877-92; THEMISTIVS, *Oratio*, ed. DINDORF, 637 sqq.; TILLEMONT, *Histoire des empereurs*, V (Brussels, 1732), 62, 109 sq., notes 33, 40 sq.; ARGLES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Flaccilla* (1); GULDENPENNING AND IFLAND, *Der Kaiser Theodosius der Grosse* (Halle, 1878), 56, 132.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Flagellants**, a fanatical and heretical sect that flourished in the thirteenth and succeeding centuries. Their origin was at one time attributed to the missionary efforts of St. Anthony of Padua, in the cities of Northern Italy, early in the thirteenth century; but



Lempp (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XII, 435) has shown this to be unwarranted. Every important movement, however, has its forerunners, both in the idea out of which it grows and in specific acts of which it is a culmination. And, undoubtedly, the practice of self-flagellation, familiar to the folk as the ascetic custom of the more severe orders (such as the Camaldolese, the Cluniacs, the Dominicans), had but to be connected in idea with the equally familiar penitential processions popularized by the Mendicants about 1233, to prepare the way for the great outburst of the latter half of the thirteenth century. It is in 1260 that we first hear of the Flagellants at Perugia. The terrible plague of 1259, the long-continued tyranny and anarchy throughout the Italian States, the prophecies concerning Antichrist and the end of the world by Joachim of Flora and his like, had created a mingled state of despair and expectation among the devout lay-folk of the middle and lower classes. Then there appeared a famous hermit of Umbria, Raniero Fasani, who organized a brotherhood of "Disciplinati di Gesù Cristo", which spread rapidly throughout Central and Northern Italy. The brotherhoods were known by various names in various localities (Battuti, Scopatori, Verberatori, etc.), but their practices were very similar everywhere. All ages and conditions were alike subject to this mental epidemic. Clergy and laity, men and women, even children of tender years, scourged themselves in reparation for the sins of the whole world. Great processions, amounting sometimes to 10,000 souls, passed through the cities, beating themselves, and calling the faithful to repentance. With crosses and banners borne before them by the clergy, they marched slowly through the towns. Stripped to the waist and with covered faces, they scourged themselves with leathern thongs till the blood ran, chanting hymns and canticles of the Passion of Christ, entering the churches and prostrating themselves before the altars. For thirty-three days and a half this penance was continued by all who undertook it, in honour of the years of Christ's life on earth. Neither mud nor snow, cold nor heat, was any obstacle. The processions continued in Italy throughout 1260, and by the end of that year had spread beyond the Alps to Alsace, Bavaria, Bohemia, and Poland. In 1261, however, the ecclesiastical and civil authorities awoke to the danger of such an epidemic, although its undesirable tendencies, on this occasion, were rather political than theological. In January the pope forbade the processions, and the laity realized suddenly that behind the movement was no sort of ecclesiastical sanction. It ceased almost as quickly as it had started, and for some time seemed to have died out. Wandering flagellants are heard of in Germany in 1296. In Northern Italy, Venturino of Bergamo, a Dominican, afterwards beatified, attempted to revive the processions of flagellants in 1334, and led about 10,000 men, styled the "Doves", as far as Rome. But he was received with laughter by the Romans, and his followers deserted him. He went to Avignon to see the pope, by whom he was promptly relegated to his monastery, and the movement collapsed.

In 1347 the Black Death swept across Europe and devastated the Continent for the next two years. In 1348 terrible earthquakes occurred in Italy. The scandals prevalent in Church and State intensified in the popular mind the feeling that the end of all things was come. With extraordinary suddenness the companies of Flagellants appeared again, and rapidly spread across the Alps, through Hungary and Switzerland. In 1349 they had reached Flanders, Holland, Bohemia, Poland, and Denmark. By September of that year they had arrived in England, where, however, they met with but little success. The English people watched the fanatics with quiet interest, even expressing pity and sometimes admiration for their devotion; but no one could be induced to join them,

and the attempt at proselytism failed utterly. Meanwhile in Italy the movement, in accordance with the temperament of the people, so thorough, so ecstatic, yet so matter-of-fact and practical in religious matters, spread rapidly through all classes of the community. Its diffusion was marked and aided by the popular *laudi*, folk-songs of the Passion of Christ and the Sorrows of Our Lady, while in its wake there sprang up numberless brotherhoods devoted to penance and the corporal works of mercy. Thus the "Battuti" of Siena, Bologna, Gubbio, all founded *Casa di Dio*, which were at once centres at which they could meet for devotional and penitential exercises, and hospices in which the sick and destitute were relieved. Though tendencies towards heresy soon became apparent, the same Italian faith was unfavourable to its growth. The confraternities adapted themselves to the permanent ecclesiastical organization, and not a few of them have continued, at least as charitable associations, until the present day. It is noticeable that the songs of the *Laudesi* during their processions tended more and more to take on a dramatic character. From them developed in time the popular mystery-play, whence came the beginnings of the Italian drama.

As soon, however, as the Flagellant movement crossed the Alps into Teutonic countries, its whole nature changed. The idea was welcomed with enthusiasm; a ceremonial was rapidly developed, and almost as rapidly a specialized doctrine, that soon degenerated into heresy. The Flagellants became an organized sect, with severe discipline and extravagant claims. They wore a white habit and mantle, on each of which was a red cross, whence in some parts they were called the "Brotherhood of the Cross". Whosoever desired to join this brotherhood was bound to remain in it for thirty-three and a half days, to swear obedience to the "Masters" of the organization, to possess at least four pence a day for his support, to be reconciled to all men, and, if married, to have the sanction of his wife. The ceremonial of the Flagellants seems to have been much the same in all the northern cities. Twice a day, proceeding slowly to the public square or to the principal church, they put off their shoes, stripped themselves to the waist and prostrated themselves in a large circle. By their posture they indicated the nature of the sins they intended to expiate, the murderer lying on his back, the adulterer on his face, the perjurer on one side holding up three fingers, etc. First they were beaten by the "Master", then, bidden solemnly in a prescribed form to rise, they stood in a circle and scourged themselves severely, crying out that their blood was mingled with the Blood of Christ and that their penance was preserving the whole world from perishing. At the end the "Master" read a letter which was supposed to have been brought by an angel from heaven to the church of St. Peter in Rome. This stated that Christ, angry at the grievous sins of mankind, had threatened to destroy the world, yet, at the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, had ordained that all who should join the brotherhood for thirty-three and a half days should be saved. The reading of this "letter", following the shock to the emotions caused by the public penance of the Flagellants, aroused much excitement among the populace. In spite of the protests and criticism of the educated, thousands enrolled themselves in the brotherhood. Great processions marched from town to town, with crosses, lights, and banners borne before them. They walked slowly, three or four abreast, bearing their knotted scourges and chanting their melancholy hymns. As the number grew, the pretences of the leaders developed. They professed a ridiculous horror of even accidental contact with women, and insisted that it was of obligation to fast rigidly on Fridays. They cast doubts on the necessity or even desirability of the sacraments, and even pretended to

absolve one another, to cast out evil spirits, and to work miracles. They asserted that the ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction was suspended and that their pilgrimages would be continued for thirty-three and a half years. Doubtless not a few of them hoped to establish a lasting rival to the Catholic Church, but very soon the authorities took action and endeavoured to suppress the whole movement. For, while it was thus growing in Germany and the Netherlands, it had also entered France.

At first this *jatus novus ritus* was well received. As early as 1348, Pope Clement VI had permitted a similar procession in Avignon in entreaty against the plague. Soon, however, the rapid spread and heretical tendencies of the Flagellants, especially among the turbulent peoples of Southern France, alarmed the authorities. At the entreaty of the University of

fourteenth century, too, the great Dominican, St. Vincent Ferrer, spread this penitential devotion throughout the north of Spain, and crowds of devotees followed him on his missionary pilgrimages through France, Spain, and Northern Italy.

In fact, the great outburst of 1349, while, perhaps, more widespread and more formidable than similar fanaticisms, was but one of a series of popular upheavals at irregular intervals from 1260 until the end of the fifteenth century. The generating cause of these movements was always an obscure amalgam of horror of corruption, of desire to imitate the heroic expiations of the great penitents, of apocalyptic vision, of despair at the prevailing corruption in Church and State. All these things are smouldering in the minds of the much-tried populace of Central Europe. It needed but a sufficient occasion, such as the accumulated



PROCESSION OF FLAGELLANTS AT TOURNAI, 1349  
Miniature in the Chronicle of Gilles de Muisis (1353), Library of Brussels

Paris, the pope, after careful inquiry, condemned the movement and prohibited the processions, by letters dated 20 Oct., 1349, which were sent to all the bishops of France, Germany, Poland, Sweden, and England. This condemnation coincided with a natural reaction of public opinion, and the Flagellants, from being a powerful menace to all settled public order, found themselves a hunted and rapidly dwindling sect. But, though severely stricken, the Flagellant tendency was by no means eradicated. Throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there were recrudescences of this and similar heresies. In Germany, about 1360, there appeared one Konrad Schmid, who called himself Enoch, and pretended that all ecclesiastical authority was abrogated, or rather, transferred to himself. Thousands of young men joined him, and he was able to continue his propaganda till 1369, when the vigorous measures of the Inquisition resulted in his suppression. Yet we still hear of trials and condemnations of Flagellants in 1414 at Erfurt, in 1446 at Nordhausen, in 1453 at Sangerhausen, even so late as 1481 at Halberstadt. Again the "Albati" or "Bianchi" are heard of in Provence about 1399, with their processions of nine days, during which they beat themselves and chanted the "Stabat Mater". At the end of the

tyranny of some petty ruler, the horror of a great plague, or the ardent preaching of some saintly ascetic, to set the whole of Christendom in a blaze. Like fire the impulse ran through the people, and like fire it died down, only to break out here and there anew. At the beginning of each outbreak, the effects were generally good. Enemies were reconciled, debts were paid, prisoners were released, ill-gotten goods were restored. But it was the merest revivalism, and, as always, the reaction was worse than the former stagnation. Sometimes the movement was more than suspected of being abused for political ends, more often it exemplified the fatal tendency of emotional pietism to degenerate into heresy. The Flagellant movement was but one of the manias that afflicted the end of the Middle Ages; others were the dancing-mania, the Jew-baiting rages, which the Flagellant processions encouraged in 1349, the child-crusades, and the like. And, according to the temperament of the peoples among whom it spread, the movement became a revolt and a fantastic heresy, a rush of devotion settling soon into pious practices and good works, or a mere spectacle that aroused the curiosity or the pity of the onlookers.

Although as a dangerous heresy the Flagellants are not heard of after the fifteenth century, their practices

were revived again and again as a means of quite orthodox public penance. In France, during the sixteenth century, we hear of White, Black, Grey, and Blue Brotherhoods. At Avignon, in 1574, Catherine de' Medici herself led a procession of Black Penitents. In Paris, in 1583, King Henry III became patron of the "Blancs Batus de l'Annonciation". On Holy Thursday of that year he organized a great procession from the Augustinians to Notre-Dame, in which all the great dignitaries of the realm were obliged to take part in company with himself. The laughter of the Parisians, however, who treated the whole thing as a jest, obliged the king to withdraw his patronage. Early in the seventeenth century, the scandals arising among these brotherhoods caused the Parliament of Paris to suppress them, and under the combined assaults of the law, the Gallicans, and the sceptics, the practice soon died out. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Flagellant processions and self-flagellation were encouraged by the Jesuits in Austria and the Netherlands, as well as in the far countries which they evangelized. India, Persia, Japan, the Philippines, Mexico, and the States of South America, all had their Flagellant processions; in Central and South America they continue even to the present day, and were regulated and restrained by Pope Leo XIII. In Italy generally and in the Tyrol similar processions survived until the early years of the nineteenth century; in Rome itself they took place in the Jesuit churches as late as 1870, while even later they occurred in parts of Tuscany and Sicily. Always, however, these later Flagellant processions have taken place under the control of ecclesiastical authority, and must by no means be connected with the heretical epidemic of the later Middle Ages.

One of the best modern accounts of flagellation and the Flagellants is an article by HAUPT, *Geisselung, kirchliche, und Geisselbruderschaften, in Realencykl. fur prot. Theol.* It contains full and excellent bibliographies. Some of the original authorities for the outbreak in 1260 will be found in PERZ, *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, XVII, 102-3, 105, 191, 402, 531, 714; XIX, 179. For the heresy of 1348 may be consulted: *Chroniken der deutschen Stadte*, VII, 204 sqq.; IX, 105 sqq.; *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, XXI (1881), 21 sqq.; *Recueil des chroniques de Flandre*, II (Bruges, 1841), 111 sqq.; FREDERICQ, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis hereticæ pravilatis neerlandicæ*, I (Ghent, 1889), 190 sqq.; BERLIÈRE, *Trois traités inédits sur les Flagellants de 1349, in Revue Bénédictine*, July, 1908. Good accounts are to be found in MURATORI, *Antiquit. Ital. med. ævi*, VI (Milan, 1738-42), diss. lxxv; GRETSER, *Opera*, IV (Ratisbon, 1734), 43-5; ZOCKLER, *Askesis und Monchthum*, II (Frankfort, 1897), 518, 530-7.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKIE.

**Flagellation.**—The history of the whip, rod, and stick, as instruments of punishment and of voluntary penance, is a long and interesting one. The Heb. שֵׁשֶׁבֶט, "whip", and שֵׁשֶׁבֶט, "rod", are in etymology closely related (Gesenius). Horace (Sat., I, iii) tells us not to use the *horribile flagellum*, made of thongs of ox-hide, when the offender deserves only the *scutica* of twisted parchment; the schoolmaster's *ferula*—Eng. ferule (Juvenal, Sat., I, i, 15)—was a strap or rod for the hand (see *ferule* in Skeat). The earliest Scriptural mention of the whip is in Ex., v, 14, 16 (*flagellati sunt; flagellis cedimur*), where the Heb. word meaning "to strike" is interpreted in the Greek and the Latin texts, "were scourged"—"beaten with whips". Roboam said (III Kings, xii, 11, 14; II Par., x, 11, 14): "My father beat you with whips, but I will beat you with scorpions", i. e. with scourges armed with knots, points, etc. Even in Latin *scorpio* is so interpreted by St. Isidore (Etym., v, 27), "virga nodosa vel aculeata". Old-Testament references to the rod might be multiplied indefinitely (Deut., xxv, 2, 3; II Kings, vii, 14; Job, ix, 34; Prov., xxvi, 3, etc.). In the New Testament we are told that Christ used the scourge on the money-changers (John, ii, 15); He predicted that He and His disciples would be scourged (Mat., x, 17; xx, 19); and St. Paul says: "Five times did I receive forty stripes, save one. Thrice was I beaten with

rods" (II Cor., xi, 24, 25; Deut., xxv, 3; Acts, xvi, 22). The offender was to be beaten in the presence of the judges (Deut., xxv, 2, 3), but was never to receive more than forty stripes. To keep within the law, it was the practice to give only thirty-nine. The culprit was so attached to a low pillar that he had to lean forward—"they shall lay him down", says the law, to receive the strokes. Verses of thirteen words in Hebrew were recited, the last always being: "But he is merciful, and will forgive their sins: and will not destroy them" [Ps. lxxvii (Heb. lxxviii) 38]; but the words served merely to count the blows. Moses allowed masters to use the rod on slaves; not, however, so as to cause death (Ex., xxi, 20). The flagellation of Christ was not a Jewish, but a Roman punishment, and was therefore administered all the more cruelly. It was suggested by Pilate's desire to save Him from crucifixion, and this was inflicted only when the scourging had failed to satisfy the Jews. In Pilate's plan flagellation was not a preparation, but rather a substitute, for crucifixion.

As the earliest monuments of Egypt make the scourge or whip very conspicuous, the children of Israel cannot have been the first on whom the Egyptians used it. In Assyria the slaves dragged their burdens under the taskmaster's lash. In Sparta even youths of high social standing were proud of their stoical indifference to the scourge; while at Rome the various names for slaves (*flagriones*, *verberones*, etc.) and the significant term *lorari*, used by Plautus, give us ample assurance that the scourge was not spared. However, from passages in Cicero and texts in the New Testament, we gather that Roman citizens were exempt from this punishment. The bamboo is used on all classes in China, but in Japan heavier penalties, and frequently death itself, are imposed upon offenders. The European country most conspicuous at the present day for the whipping of culprits is Russia, where the knout is more than a match for the worst scourge of the Romans. Even in what may be called our own times, the use of the whip on soldiers under the English flag was not unknown; and the State of Delaware yet believes in it as a corrective and deterrent for the criminal class. If we refer to the past, by Statute 39 Eliz., ch. iv, evil-doers were whipped and sent back to the place of their nativity; moreover, Star-chamber whippings were frequent. "In Partridge's Almanack for 1692, it is stated that Oates was whipt with a whip of six thongs, and received 2256 lashes, amounting to 13536 stripes" (A Hist. of the Rod, p. 158). He survived, however, and lived for years. The pedagogue made free use of the birch. Orbilius, who flogged Horace, was only one of the learned line who did not believe in moral suasion, while Juvenal's words: "Et nos ergo manum ferulæ subdiximus" (Sat., I, i, 15) show clearly the system of school discipline existing in his day. The priests of Cybele scourged themselves and others, and such stripes were considered sacred. Although these and similar acts of penance, to propitiate heaven, were practised even before the coming of Christ, it was only in the religion established by Him that they found wise direction and real merit. It is held by some interpreters that St. Paul in the words: "I chastise my body" refers to self-inflicted bodily scourging (I Cor., ix, 27). The Greek word *ὑποτάσσω* (see Liddell and Scott) means "to strike under the eye", and metaphorically "to mortify"; consequently, it can scarcely mean "to scourge", and indeed in Luke, xviii, 5, such an interpretation is quite inadmissible. Furthermore, where St. Paul certainly refers to scourging, he uses a different word. We may therefore safely conclude that he speaks here of mortification in general, as Piconio holds (Triplex Expositio).

Scourging was soon adopted as a sanction in the monastic discipline of the fifth and following centuries. Early in the fifth century it is mentioned by Palladius

in the "Historia Lausiaca" (c. vi), and Socrates (Hist. Eccl., IV, xxiii) tells us that, instead of being excommunicated, offending young monks were scourged. See the sixth-century rules of St. Casarius of Arles for nuns (P. L., LXVII, 1111), and of St. Aurelian of Arles (ibid., LXVIII, 392, 401-02). Thenceforth scourging is frequently mentioned in monastic rules and councils as a preservative of discipline (Hefele, "Concilieng.", II, 594, 656). Its use as a punishment was general in the seventh century in all monasteries of the severe Columban rule (St. Columbanus, in "Regula Cœnobialis", c. x, in P. L., LXXX, 215 sqq.); for later centuries of the early Middle Ages see Thomassin, "Vet. ac nova ecc. disciplina, II (3), 107; Du Cange, "Glossar. med. et infim. latinit.", s. v. "Disciplina"; Gretser, "De spontanea disciplinarum seu flagellorum cruce libri tres" (Ingolstadt, 1603); Kober, "Die körperliche Zuchtigung als kirchliches Strafmittel gegen Cleriker und Mönche" in Tub. "Quartalschrift" (1875). The canon law (Decree of Gratian, Decretals of Gregory IX) recognized it as a punishment for ecclesiastics; even as late as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it appears in ecclesiastical legislation as a punishment for blasphemy, concubinage, and simony. Though doubtless at an early date a private means of penance and mortification, such use is publicly exemplified in the tenth and eleventh centuries by the lives of St. Dominic Loricatus (P. L., CXLIV, 1017) and St. Peter Damian (d. 1072). The latter wrote a special treatise in praise of self-flagellation; though blamed by some contemporaries for excess of zeal, his example and the high esteem in which he was held did much to popularize the voluntary use of the scourge or "discipline" as a means of mortification and penance. Thenceforth it is met with in most medieval religious orders and associations. The practice was, of course, capable of abuse, and so arose in the thirteenth century the fanatical sect of the Flagellants (q. v.), though in the same period we meet with the private use of the "discipline" by such saintly persons as King Louis IX and Elizabeth of Thuringia.

UNGER, *Die Flagellanten* (1902); COOPER (pseudonym), *Flagellation and the Flagellants. A History of the Rod, etc.* (new ed., London, 1896), an anti-Catholic and biased work; BARNES, *Circumcision and Flagellation among the Filipinos* (Carlisle, Pa., 1903); CALMET'S *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Scourging*; KITTO, *Cyclop. of Biblical Lit.*, s. v. *Punishment*.

JOHN J. TIERNEY.

**Flaget**, BENEDICT JOSEPH, first Bishop of Bardstown (subsequently of Louisville), Kentucky, U. S. A., b. at Contournat, near Billom, Auvergne, France, 7 November, 1763; d. 11 February, 1850, at Louisville, Kentucky. He was a posthumous child and was only two years old when his mother died, leaving him and two brothers to the care of an aunt; they were welcomed at the home of Canon Benoit Flaget, their uncle, at Billom. In his seventeenth year, he went to the Sulpician seminary of Clermont to study philosophy and theology, and joining the Society of St. Sulpice, 1 November, 1783, he was ordained priest in 1787, at Issy, where Father Gabriel Richard, the future apostle of Michigan, was then superior. Flaget taught dogmatic theology at Nantes for two years, and filled the same chair at the seminary of Angers when that house was closed by the Revolution. He returned to Billom in 1791 and on the advice of the Sulpician superior, Father Emery, determined to devote himself to the American mission. He sailed in January, 1792, with Father J. B. M. David, his future coadjutor, and the subdeacon Stephen Badin (q. v.), landing in Baltimore, 29 March, 1792. He was studying English with his Sulpician brethren, when Bishop Carroll tested his self-sacrifice by sending him to Fort Vincennes, as missionary to the Indians and pastor of the Fort. Crossing the mountains he reached Pittsburg, where he had to tarry for six months owing to

low water in the Ohio, doing such good work that he gained the lasting esteem of General Anthony Wayne. The latter recommended him to the military commander Colonel Clark at the Falls of the Ohio, who deemed it an honour to escort him to Fort Vincennes, where he arrived 21 December, 1792. Father Flaget stayed here two years and then, recalled by his superiors, he became professor at the Georgetown College under the presidency of Father Dubourg. In November, 1798, he was sent to Havana, whence he returned in 1801 with twenty-three students to Baltimore.

On 8 April, 1808, Bardstown, Kentucky, was created a see and Flaget was named its first bishop. He refused the honour and his colleagues of St. Sulpice approved his action, but when in 1809 he went to Paris, his superior, Father Emery, received him with the greeting: "My Lord, you should be in your diocese! The pope commands you to accept." Leaving France with Father Simon William Bruté, the future Bishop of Vincennes, and the subdeacon, Guy Ignatius Chabrat, his future coadjutor in Kentucky, Flaget landed in Baltimore and was consecrated 4 November, 1810, by Archbishop Carroll. The Diocese of Bardstown comprised the whole North-West, bounded East and West by Louisiana and the Mississippi. Bishop Flaget, handicapped by poverty, did not leave Baltimore until 11 May, 1811, and reached Louisville, 4 June, whence the Rev. C. Nerinckx escorted him to Bardstown. He arrived there 9 June. On Christmas of that year he ordained priest the Rev. Guy Ignatius Chabrat, the first priest ordained in the West. Before Easter, 1813, he had established priestly conferences, a seminary at St. Stephen's (removed to St. Thomas', November, 1811), and made two pastoral visits in Kentucky. That summer he visited the outlying districts of Indiana, Illinois, and Eastern Missouri, confirming 1275 people during the trip.

Bishop Flaget's great experience, absolute self-denial, and holy life gave him great influence in the councils of the Church and at Rome. Most of the bishops appointed within the next twenty years were selected with his advice. In October, 1817, he went to St. Louis to prepare the way for Bishop Dubourg. He recommended Bishop Fenwick for Ohio, then left on a trip through that State, Indiana, and Michigan in 1818. In the latter State he did great missionary work at Detroit and Monroe, attending also a rally of 10,000 Indians at St. Mary's. Upon his return to Kentucky in 1819 he consecrated his new cathedral in Bardstown, 8 August, and consecrated therein his first coadjutor bishop, Rev. J. B. M. David, on the 15th. In 1821 he started on a visitation of Tennessee, and bought property in Nashville for the first Catholic church. The years 1819 to 1821 were devoted to missionary work among the Indians. He celebrated the first Synod of Bardstown, 8 August, 1823, and continued his labours until 1828, when he was called to Baltimore to consecrate Archbishop Whitfield; there he attended the first Council of Baltimore in 1829. In 1830 he consecrated one of his own priests, Rev. Richard Kenrick, as Bishop of Philadelphia. A great friend of education, he invited the Jesuits to take charge of St. Mary's College, Bardstown, in 1832. In the meantime he had resigned his see in favour of Bishop David with Bishop Chabrat as coadjutor. Both priests and people rebelled, and their representations were so instant and continued that Rome recalled its appointment and reinstated Bishop Flaget, who during all this time was, regardless of age and infirmities, attending the cholera-stricken in Louisville, Bardstown, and surrounding country during 1832 and 1833. Bishop Chabrat became his second coadjutor and was consecrated 20 July, 1834. Only Kentucky and Tennessee were now left under Flaget's jurisdiction, and in the former he founded various religious institutions, including four colleges, two convents, one foundation of brothers, and

two religious institutions of priests. Tennessee became a diocese with see at Nashville in 1838.

His only visit to Europe and Rome was not undertaken until 1835. He spent four years in France and Italy in the interests of his diocese and of the propagation of the Faith, visiting forty-six dioceses. Everywhere he edified the people by the sanctity of his life, and well authenticated miracles are ascribed to his intercession. He returned to America in 1839, transferred his see to Louisville, and crowned his fruitful life by consecrating, 10 September, 1848, a young Kentucky priest, Martin John Spalding, as his third coadjutor and successor in the See of Louisville. The corner-stone of the cathedral of Louisville was laid 15 August, 1849. He died peacefully at Louisville, sincerely mourned and remembered to this day. His only writings are his journal and a report of his diocese to the Holy See.

SPALDING, *Life, Times and Character of Benedict Joseph Flaget* (Louisville, 1852); SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1904); WEBB, *The Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884).

CAMILLUS P. MAES.

**Flanagan, THOMAS CANON**, b. in England in 1814, though Irish by descent; d. at Kidderminster, 21 July, 1865. He was educated at Sedgley Park School. At the age of eighteen he proceeded to Oscott—that is “Old Oscott”, now known as Maryvale—to study for the priesthood. The president at that time was Dr. Weedall, under whose supervision the present imposing college buildings were about to be erected. The students and professors migrated there in 1838, after the summer vacation, Flanagan being thus one of the original students at the new college. There he was ordained in 1842, Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman being then president. At this time Oscott was the centre of much intellectual activity, many of the Oxford converts during the following years visiting the college, where some made their first acquaintance with Catholic life. Flanagan, who throughout his course had been an industrious and persevering student, was asked by Wiseman to remain as a professor, and as such he came into contact with the new converts, his own bent towards historical studies creating a strong bond of sympathy between him and those who had become convinced of the truth of Catholicism on historical grounds.

In 1847 Flanagan brought out his first book, a small manual of British and Irish history, containing numerous statistical tables the preparation of which was congenial to his methodical mind. The same year he became prefect of studies and acted successfully in that capacity until 1850, when he was appointed vice-president and then president of Sedgley Park School, and he became one of the first canons of the newly formed Birmingham Diocese in 1851. The active life of administration was, however, not congenial to his tastes, and he was glad to resume his former position at Oscott in 1853. It was at this time that he began writing his chief work, a “History of the Church in England”. In order to allow him more leisure for this, he was appointed chaplain to the Hornyold family at Blackmore Park, and his history appeared in two volumes, during his residence there, in 1857. It was at that time the only complete work on the Church in England continued down to present times, and, though marred by some inaccuracies, on the whole it bore witness to much patient work and research on the part of the author. His style, however, was somewhat concise, and Bishop Ullathorne’s remark, that Canon Flanagan was a compiler of history rather than a vivid historian, has often been quoted. The year after the appearance of his Church history, we find Flanagan once more installed in his old position as prefect of studies at Oscott, where he remained for eighteen months, when his health gave way. The last years of his life were spent as assistant priest at St. Chad’s

Cathedral, Birmingham. He died at Kidderminster, whither he had gone for his health.

FLANAGAN, *Manual of British and Irish Hist.* (1847); IDEM, *Catechism of Eng. Hist.* (1851); IDEM, *History of Church in Eng.* (1857); COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s. v.; GILLLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; HUSENBETH, *Hist. of Sedgley Park, Oscottan Jubilee* No. (1888); Obituary notices in *The Tablet and Weekly Register*.

BERNARD WARD.

**Flanders** (Flem. VLAENDEREN; Ger. FLANDEREN; Fr. FLANDRE) designated in the eighth century a small territory around Bruges; it became later the name of the country bounded by the North Sea, the Scheldt, and the Canche; in the fifteenth century it was even used by the Italians and the Spaniards as the synonym for the Low Countries; to-day Flanders belongs for the most part to Belgium, comprising the provinces of East Flanders and West Flanders. A part of it, known as French Flanders, has gone to France, and another small portion to Holland. Flanders is an unpicturesque lowland, whose level is scarcely above that of the sea, which accounts for the fact that a great part of it was for a long time flooded at high water. The country took its present aspect only after a line of downs had been raised by the sea along its shore. The soil of Flanders, which for the most part was unproductive, owes its present fertility to intelligent cultivation; its products are various, but the most important are flax and hemp; dairying, market-gardening, and the manufacture of linens are the main Flemish industries. At the time of its conquest by the Romans, Flanders was inhabited by the Morini, the Menapii, and the Nervii. Most probably these tribes were of partly Teutonic and partly Celtic descent, but, owing to the almost total absence of Roman colonies and the constant influx of barbarians, the Germanic element soon became predominant. The Flemings of to-day may be considered as a German people whose language, a Low-German dialect, has been very slightly, if at all, influenced by Latin.

It is likely that Christianity was first introduced into Flanders by Roman soldiers and merchants, but its progress must have been very slow, for Saint Eloi (Eligius, c. 590–660) tells us that in his days almost the whole population was still heathen, and the conversion of the Flemings was not completed until the beginning of the eighth century. Towards the middle of the ninth century, the country around Bruges was governed by a marquess or “forester” named Baldwin, whose bravery in fighting the Northmen had won him the surname of Iron Arm. Baldwin married Judith, daughter of the Emperor Charles the Bald, and received from his father-in-law, with the title of count, the country bounded by the North Sea, the Scheldt, and the Canche. Thus was founded, in 864, the County of Flanders. Baldwin I was a warm protector of the clergy, and made large grants of land to churches and abbeys. He died in 878. His successors were Baldwin II, the Bald (878–919), Arnold I (919–964), Baldwin III (958–961), and Arnold II (964–989), who could not prevent Hugh Capet from annexing the County of Boulogne to the royal domain of France. The son of Arnold II, Baldwin IV, the Bearded (989–1036), was a brave and pious prince. He received from the Emperor Henry II the imperial castle of Ghent and its territory. From that time there were two Flanders: Flanders under the Crown, a French fief; and imperial Flanders, under the suzerainty of Germany. Baldwin V, of Lille (1036–67), added to his domains the County of Eenhan or Alost. He was regent of France during the minority of Philip I. Baldwin VI, of Mons (1067–70), was also Count of Hainaut in consequence of his marriage to Richilde, heiress of that county. He reigned only three years, and was succeeded in Flanders by his brother Robert the Friesman (1070–1093). Robert II, of Jerusalem (1093–1111), took a leading part in the First Crusade. He annexed Tournai to Flanders and died fighting for



his suzerain. His son Baldwin VII, Hapkin (1111-1119), enforced strict justice among the nobility. Like his father, he died while supporting the cause of his suzerain. His successor was Charles, son of Saint Canute of Denmark (1119-27). The new count was a saintly prince and a great lover of peace. His stern justice, however, angered a few greedy nobles, who murdered him while he was praying in the church of Saint-Donat in Bruges. Louis VI, King of France, then gave the County of Flanders to William of Normandy, a grandson of the Conqueror, but William's high-handed way of governing the country soon made him unpopular and the Flemings turned to Thierry of Alsace, a descendant of Robert I. William died in the war which ensued, and Thierry's candidacy received the royal sanction. Thierry (1123-68) granted privileges to the Flemish communes, whose origin dates from this period, and took part in the Second Crusade. His son Philip (1168-91) granted new privileges to the communes, did much to foster commerce and industry, and was a generous protector of poets. He made a political blunder when he gave up Artois to France as the dowry of his niece, as this dismemberment of the county led to many wars with the latter country. Philip died in the Holy Land during the Third Crusade. His successor was his brother-in-law, Baldwin VIII, the Bold, of Hainault (1191-95). Baldwin IX (1195-1205) is famous in history as the first Latin Emperor of Constantinople. He died in 1205 in a war against the Bulgarians, and the Counties of Flanders and Hainault passed to his daughter Jeanne, who had married Ferdinand of Portugal. This prince was involved in the war of King John of England against Philip II of France, and was made a prisoner at the battle of Bouvines (1214). He was released in 1228, only to die shortly afterwards. Jeanne (1205-1244) administered the counties wisely during her husband's captivity, and after his death she increased the liberties of the communes to counteract the influence of the nobility—a policy which was followed by her sister Margaret, who succeeded her in 1244. Upon Margaret's death, in 1279, her children by her first husband (Bouchard d'Avesnes) inherited Hainault, while Flanders went to the Dampierres, her children by her second husband.

The battle of Bouvines was the beginning of a new era in the history of Flanders. Up to that time the counts had occupied the foreground; their place was henceforth taken by the communes, whose power reaches its acme in the course of the thirteenth century. Bruges, the Venice of the North, had then a population of more than 200,000 inhabitants; its fairs were the meeting place of the merchants of all Europe; Ghent and Ypres had each more than 50,000 men engaged in the cloth industry. This commercial and industrial activity, in which the rural classes had their share, brought to Flanders a wealth which manifested itself everywhere—in the buildings, in the fare of the inhabitants, in their dress. "I thought I was the only queen here," said the wife of Philip the Fair on a visit to Bruges, "but I see hundreds of queens around me." The intellectual and artistic activity of the time was no less remarkable. Then flourished Henry of Ghent, the Solemn Doctor; Van Maerlant, the great Flemish poet, and his continuator, Louis van Velthem; Philip Mussche, the chronicler, who became Bishop of Tournai; and the mystic Jan van Ruysbroeck. Then, too, were built the beautiful guild-halls, city-halls, and churches, which bear witness at once to the popular love for the fine arts and Flemish religious zeal—the guild-halls of Bruges and Ypres, the churches of the Holy Saviour and of Our Lady at Bruges, those of Saint-Bavon, Saint-Jacques and Saint-Nicolas at Ghent, and of Saint-Martin at Ypres. Still more worthy of admiration was the internal organization of the communes, which, owing to the beneficent influence of the Church, had become so powerful a factor in the moral welfare

of the masses. Guy of Dampierre (1279-1305) succeeded his mother Margaret, and inaugurated a new policy in the administration of the county. His predecessors had on the whole been friendly to the wealthy classes in the Flemish cities, in whose hands were the most important offices of the communes. Guy, who aimed at absolute rule, sought the support of the guilds in his conflict with the rich. The latter appealed from his decisions to the King of France, the wily Philip the Fair, who readily seized upon this opportunity of weakening the power of his most important vassal. Philip constantly ruled against the count, who finally appealed to arms, but was defeated. Flanders then received a French governor, but the tyranny of the French soon brought about an insurrection, in the course of which some 3000 French were slaughtered in Bruges, and at the call of the two patriots, de Coninck and Breydel, the whole country rose in arms. Philip sent into Flanders a powerful army, which met with a crushing defeat at Courtrai (1302); after another battle, which remained undecided, the King of France resorted to diplomacy, but in vain, and peace was restored only in 1320, after Pope John XXII had induced the Flemings to accept it. Guy of Dampierre, who died in prison in 1305, was succeeded by his son Robert of Béthune, who had an uneventful reign of seventeen years. The successor of the latter was his grandson, Louis of Nevers (1322-1346), who was unfit for the government of Flanders on account of the French education he had received. Shortly after his accession, the whole country was involved in a civil war, which ended only after the Flemings had been defeated at Cassel by the King of France (1328).

At the breaking out of the Hundred Years War, the Flemish communes, whose prosperity depended on English wool, followed the advice of Ghent's great citizen, Jacques van Artevelde, and remained neutral; the count and nobility took the part of the French king. When the policy of neutrality could no longer be adhered to, the Flemings sided with the English and helped them to win the battle of Sluis (1340). By that time Van Artevelde had become practically master of the country, which was very prosperous under his rule. He was murdered in 1345, and Louis of Nevers was killed the next year at the battle of Crécy. His son Louis of Male (1346-1384) was a spendthrift. The communes paid his debts several times, but they finally refused to give him any more money. He managed, however, to get some from Bruges by granting to that city a licence to build a canal, which Ghent considered a menace to her commerce. A new civil war broke out between the two cities, and peace was not restored until Charles VI of France had defeated the insurgents at Roosebeke (1382). Louis of Male's successor was his son-in-law, Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy (1384-1404). This prince and his son, John the Fearless (1404-1419), being mostly interested in the affairs of France, paid little attention to those of Flanders.

The situation changed after Philip the Good, third Duke of Burgundy (1419-1467), had united under his rule the whole of the Low Countries. Philip wanted to weaken the power of the communes for the benefit of the central government, and soon picked a quarrel with Bruges, which was compelled to surrender some of its privileges. Ghent's turn came next. A contention had arisen between that city and the duke over a question of taxes. War broke out, and the army of Ghent was utterly defeated at Gavre (1452), which city had to pay a heavy fine and to surrender her privileges. In 1446, Philip created the Great Council of Flanders, which, under Charles the Bold, became the Great Council of Mechlin. Appeals from the judgments of local courts were henceforth to be made to this council, not to the Parliament of Paris as before. Thus were severed the bonds of vassalage which for



six centuries had connected Flanders to France. Philip was succeeded by Charles the Bold (1467-1477), the marriage of whose daughter to Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, brought Flanders with the rest of the Low Countries under the rule of the House of Hapsburg in 1477. In 1488, the communes tried to recover their independence. The attempt was unsuccessful, and the war was disastrous for Bruges, because it hastened her approaching decline. The main causes of this decline were: the silting up of her harbour, which became inaccessible to large vessels; the discovery of America, which opened new fields for European enterprise; the dissolution of the Flemish Hanse, whose seat was in Bruges; the unintelligent policy of the dukes towards England; and the civil wars of the preceding fifty years. The prosperity of Bruges passed to Antwerp. The reign of the House of Burgundy, in many respects so harmful to Flanders, was a period of artistic splendour. To that time belong Memling and the Van Eycks, the first representatives of the Flemish school of painters. Flemish literature on the whole declined, but a Fleming, Philippe de Comines, was the leading French writer of the fifteenth century. Another Fleming of that time, Thierry Maertens of Alost, was the Gutenberg of the Low Countries. Flanders can also claim two of the greatest scientists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Simon Stevin, mathematician and engineer, and the Jesuit Father Grégoire de Saint-Vincent, whom Leibniz considered the equal of Descartes.

Although the material condition of Flanders is today very satisfactory, the country has not recovered its former prosperity. And it is not likely that it ever will, not because of any decrease in the energy of the Flemish race, but because economic conditions have changed. Intellectually the Flemings of the twentieth century are still the true sons of the glorious generations which produced Van Maerlant, Van Artevelde, Rubens, and Van Dyck; perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that they have taken the lead in promoting the prosperity of Belgium. The Flemish tongue, which during the eighteenth century had fallen so low that in 1830 it was little more than a patois, has risen again to the rank of a literary language and can claim the larger portion of the literary production of Belgium in the last seventy-five years; nay, the Flemings have even made important contributions to French literature. In the fine arts, in the sciences, in politics, their activity is no less remarkable. They have given the Belgian Parliament some of its best orators and its ablest statesmen: Malou, Jacobs, Woeste, Beernaert, Schollaert. Above all they have retained, as the most precious inheritance of the past ages, the simple, fervent, vigorous faith of the crusaders and their filial attitude towards the Church. No country sends out a larger proportion of secular and regular missionaries, some of whom (like Father P. J. De Smet, the apostle of the American Indians) have attained a world-wide celebrity. Flanders may, indeed, be considered the bulwark of Catholicism in Belgium. The Socialists are well aware of this fact, but the Catholics realize it just as clearly, and their defence is equal to the enemy's attack. Every Flemish community has its parochial schools; the Catholic press is equal to its task; and the "Volk" of Ghent has been organized to counteract the evil influence of the Socialist "Voruit".

KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE, *Hist. de Flandre* (Brussels, 1848-50); MOKE and HUBERT, *Hist. de Belgique* (Brussels, 1895); KURTZ, *Origines de la Civilisation Moderne* (Brussels, 1886); HYMANS, *Histoire parlementaire de la Belgique* (Brussels, 1877-1906).

P. J. MARIQUE.

**Flandrin, JEAN-HIPPOLYTE**, French painter, b. at Lyons, 23 March, 1809; d. at Rome, 21 March, 1864. He came of a family of poor artisans and was a pupil of the sculptor Legendre and of Revoil. In his education, however, two elements must above all

be taken into account. The first is the Lyonnaise genius. Various causes, physical and historical, have combined to give the city of Lyons a character all its own. This is twofold—religious and democratic—and the labouring classes have always been an active centre of idealism. This is especially noticeable in its poets, from Maurice Scève to Lamartine. Lyons has also always been the great entrepôt for Italy, and the province was a permanent centre of Roman culture. The second factor in Flandrin's development was the influence of Ingres, without which it is doubtful whether Flandrin would have achieved any fame. In 1829 Flandrin, with his brother Jean-Paul (the landscape painter), went to Paris, where he became a pupil of Ingres, who conceived a paternal affection for him. In Paris the young man experienced the bitterest trials. He was often without a fire, sometimes without bread, but he was sustained by a quiet but unshakable faith, and finally (1832) carried off the Grand Prix de Rome through "The Recognition of Theseus by his Father". At Rome, where, after 1834, Ingres was director of the French Academy, his talents expanded and blossomed under the influence of natural beauty, a mild climate, and the noble spectacle of the works of classic and Christian antiquities. He sent thence to the French salons: "Dante and Virgil" (Lyons Museum, 1835); "Euripides" (Lyons Museum, 1835); "St. Clare Healing the Blind" (Cathedral of Nantes, 1836); "Christ Blessing the Children" (Lisieux Museum, 1837). The serenity of his nature, his chaste sense of form and beauty, his taste for effective disposition of details, his moral elevation, and profound piety, found expression in these early efforts. On his return to Paris, in 1838, he was all intent upon producing great religious works.

At this time there sprang up throughout the French School a powerful reaction against "useless pictures", against the conventional canvases exhibited since the end of the eighteenth century (Quatremère de Quincy, "Notices historiques", Paris, 1834, 311). There was a return to an art more expressive of life, less arbitrary, more mural and decorative. Delacroix, Chassériau, and the aged Ingres were engaged on mural paintings. It was above all, however, the walls of the churches which offered an infinite field to the decorators, to Chassériau, Victor Mottez, Couture, and Amaury Duval. Within fifteen or twenty years this great pictorial movement, all too obscure, left on the walls of the public buildings and churches of Paris pictorial treasures such as had not been seen since the age of Giotto. It is possible, and even probable that the first impulse towards this movement (especially so far as religious paintings are concerned) was due to the Nazarene School. Ingres had known Overbeck and Steinle at Rome; Flandrin may well have known them. In any case it is these artists whom he resembles above all in purity of sentiment and profound conviction, though he possessed a better artistic education. From 1840 his work is scarcely more than a painstaking revival of religious painting. The artist made it his mission in France to serve art more brilliantly than ever, for the glory of God, and to make beauty, as of old, a source of instruction and an instrument of edification to the great body of the faithful. He found a sort of apostolate before him. He was one of the *petits prédicateurs de l'Évangile*. Artistic productions in the mid-nineteenth century, as in the Middle Ages, became the Biblia Pauperum.

Henceforth Flandrin's life was passed almost entirely in churches, hovering between heaven and earth on his ladders and scaffolds. His first work in Paris was in the chapel of St-Jean in the church of St-Séverin. He next decorated the sanctuary and choir of the church of St-Germain-des-Prés (1842-48). On either side of the sanctuary he painted "Christ's Entry into Jerusalem" and "The Journey to Calvary", besides the figures of the Apostles and the symbols of

the Evangelists. All these are on a gold background with beautiful arabesques which recall the mosaic of Torriti at Santa Maria Maggiore. At St. Paul, Nîmes (1847-49), he painted a lovely garland of virgin martyrs, a prelude to his masterpiece, the frieze in the nave of the church of St-Vincent-de-Paul in Paris. The last is a double procession, developing symmetrically between the two superimposed arches, without any exaggeration, a Christian Panathenaea, as it was called by Théophile Gautier. It might be shown how the ancient Greek theme is subjected, in the work of the modern painter, to a more flexible, less uniform, and more complex rhythm, how the melodic procession, without losing any of its grandeur or its continuity, is strengthened by silences, pauses, cadences. But it is more important to note the originality in the return to the most authentic sources of Christian iconography. Hitherto painters of this class hardly went back beyond the fourteenth or fifteenth century. But Flandrin turned to the first centuries of the Church, and drew his inspiration from the very fathers of religious thought. In the frieze of St-Vincent-de-Paul fifteen centuries of Christian tradition are unrolled. In 1855 the artist executed a new work in the apse of the church of Ainay near Lyons. On his return he undertook his crowning work, the decoration of the nave of St-Germain-des-Prés. He determined to illustrate the life of Christ, not from an historical, but from a theological, point of view, the point of view of eternity. He dealt less with facts than with ideas. His tendency to parallelism, to symmetry, found its element in the symbolism of the Middle Ages. He took pleasure in considering, according to this system of harmony and relations, the Old Testament as the prototype of the New, the burning bush as representing the Annunciation, and the baptism of Christ as prefiguring the crossing of the Red Sea.

It was, perhaps, the first time since the frescoes of Perugino and Botticelli in the Sistine Chapel, that Christian art returned to its ancient genius. The interrupted tradition was renewed after three centuries of the Renaissance. Unhappily the form, despite its sustained beauty, possesses little originality. It is lacking in personality. The whole series, though exhibiting a high degree of learning and poise, of grace, and even of strength, lacks charm and life. The colouring is flat, crude, and dull, the design neutral, unaccented, and commonplace. It is a miracle of spiritual power that the seriousness of thought, the truth of sentiment, more harsh in the Old Testament, and more tender in the Christian, scenes, glow through this pedantic and poor style. Certain scenes, such as "The Nativity", which strongly recalls that of Giotto at Padua, possess a sweetness which is quite human in their conventional reserve. Others, such as "Adam and Eve after the Fall", and "The Confusion of Tongues", are marked by real grandeur. This was Flandrin's last work. He was preparing a "Last Judgment" for the cathedral of Strasburg, when he went to Rome, where he died.

Apart from his religious work, Flandrin is the author of some very charming portraits. In this branch of painting he is far from possessing the acute and powerful sense of life of which Ingres possessed the secret. Nevertheless, pictures such as the "Young Girl with a Pink", and the "Young Girl Reading", of the Louvre, will always be admired. Nothing could be more maidenly and yet profound. His portraits of men are at times magnificent. Thus in the "Napoleon III" of the Versailles Museum the pale massive countenance of Caesar and his dream-troubled eyes reveal the impress of destiny. An admirable "Study of a Man" in the Museum of the Louvre, is quite "Ingresque" in its perfection, being almost equal to that master's Oedipus. What was lacking to the pupil in order that the artistic side of his work should equal its merits from the religious and philosophic side was the

power of always painting in the style displayed in this portrait.

DELABORDE, *Lettres et pensées d'Hippolyte Flandrin* (Paris, 1865); BLANC, *Artistes de mon temps* (Paris, 18—), 263; *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, XVII (1864), 105, 243; XVIII (1865), 66, 187; XXIV (1868), 20; GAUTIER, *Les Beaux-Arts en Europe*, 1853, I, 283; MAURICE HAMEL in *Musée d'art*, Paris, no date, II, 86.

LOUIS GILLET.

**Flathead Indians**, a name used in both Americas, without special ethnologic significance, to designate tribes practising the custom of compressing the skull in infancy by artificial means. Curiously enough the tribe best known under this name, the Salish or Flathead proper of Western Montana, never practised the custom, the confusion arising from the fact that the early traders felt compelled to adopt the local Indian classification, which considered the prevailing compressed skull of the neighbouring tribes as pointed and the naturally shaped Salish skull by contrast as flat. The Salish or Flathead Indians of the mountain region of north-western Montana are the easternmost tribe of the great Salishan stock which occupied much of the Columbia and Fraser River region westward to the Pacific. Although never a large tribe, they have always maintained an exceptional reputation for bravery, honesty, and general high character and for their friendly disposition towards the whites. When first known, about the beginning of the last century, they subsisted chiefly by hunting and the gathering of wild roots, particularly camas, dwelt in skin tipis or mat-covered lodges, and were at peace with all tribes excepting their hereditary enemies, the powerful Blackfeet. Their religion was the ordinary animism of the Indians and they had a number of ceremonial dances, apparently including the Sun Dance. Having learned through the Catholic Iroquois of the Hudson Bay Company something of the Catholic religion, they voluntarily adopted its simpler forms and prayers, and in 1831 sent a delegation all the long and dangerous way to St. Louis to ask of the resident government Indian superintendent that missionaries be sent to them. This was not then possible and other delegations were sent, until in 1840 the noted Jesuit Father Pierre De Smet (q. v.) responded and was welcomed on his arrival in their country by a great gathering of some 1600 Indians of the allied mountain tribes. In 1841 he founded on Bitter Root River the mission of St. Mary, which was abandoned in 1850, in consequence of the inroads of the Blackfeet, for the new mission of St. Ignatius on Flathead Lake. This still exists in successful operation, practically all the confederated Indians of the reservation—Flathead, Pend d'Oreille, Kutenai, and Spokane—having been consistent Catholics for half a century.

In 1855 the Flatheads made a treaty ceding most of their territory, but retaining a considerable reservation south of Flathead Lake and including the mission. They number now about 620, the confederated body together numbering 2200 souls, being one of the few Indian communities actually increasing in population. They are prosperous and industrious farmers and stockmen, moral, devoted Catholics, and in every way a testimony to the zeal and ability of their religious teachers, among whom, besides De Smet, may be named such distinguished Jesuit priests and scholars as Canestrelli, Giorda, Mengarini, Point, and Ravalli, several of whom have made important contributions to Salishan philology. The mission is (1908) in charge of Rev. L. Tallman, assisted by several Jesuits, together with a number of Christian Brothers, Sisters of Providence, and Ursulines.

*Director's Report of the Bureau of Catholic Ind. Missions* (Washington, 1906); CLARK, *The Indian Sign Language* (Philadelphia, 1885); RONAN, *Sketch of the Flathead Nation* (Helena, Mont., 1890); SHEA, *Hist. of the Catholic Missions*, etc. (New York, 1854); DE SMET, *Oregon Missions* (New York, 1847); IDEM, *Western Missions and Missionaries* (New York, 1863); STEVENS in *Rept. of Com. of Ind. Affairs* (Washington, 1854);

O'CONNOR, *The Flathead Indians in Records of The Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.* (Philadelphia, 1888), III, 85-110; Post, *Worship Among the Flatheads and Kahpels in The Messenger* (New York, 1894), 528-29.

JAMES MOONEY.

**Flathers** (alias MAJOR), MATTHEW, VENERABLE, English priest and martyr; b. probably c. 1580 at Weston, Yorkshire, England; d. at York, 21 March, 1607. He was educated at Douai, and ordained at Arras, 25 March, 1606. Three months later he was sent to the English mission, but was discovered almost immediately by the emissaries of the Government, who, after the Gunpowder Plot, had redoubled their vigilance in hunting down the priests of the proscribed religion. He was brought to trial, under the statute of 27 Elizabeth, on the charge of receiving orders abroad, and condemned to death. By an act of unusual clemency, this sentence was commuted to banishment for life; but after a brief exile, the undaunted priest returned to England in order to fulfil his mission, and, after ministering for a short time to his oppressed coreligionists in Yorkshire, was again apprehended. Brought to trial at York on the charge of being ordained abroad and exercising priestly functions in England, Flathers was offered his life on condition that he take the recently enacted Oath of Allegiance. On his refusal, he was condemned to death and taken to the common place of execution outside Micklegate Bar, York. The usual punishment of hanging, drawing, and quartering seems to have been carried out in a peculiarly brutal manner, and eyewitnesses relate how the tragic spectacle excited the commiseration of the crowds of Protestant spectators.

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; CHALLONER, *Memoirs*, II; MORRIS, *Troubles*, third series; *Douay Diaries*.

H. G. WINTERSGILL.

**Flavia Domitilla**, a Christian Roman matron of the imperial family who lived towards the close of the first century. She was the third of three persons (mother, daughter, and grand-daughter) who bore the same name. The first of these was the wife of the Emperor Vespasian; the second was his daughter and sister to the Emperors Titus and Domitian; her daughter, the third Domitilla, married her mother's first cousin, Titus Flavius Clemens, a nephew of the Emperor Vespasian and first cousin to Titus and Domitian. From this union there were born two sons who, while children, were adopted as his successors by Domitian and commanded to assume the names Vespasianus and Domitianus. It is quite probable that these two lads had been brought up as Christians by their pious mother, and the possibility thus presents itself that two Christian boys at the end of the first century were designated for the imperial purple in Rome. Their later fate is not known, as the Flavian line ended with Domitian. Clement, their father, was the emperor's colleague in the consular dignity, but had no sooner laid down his office than he was tried on charges of the most trivial character (*ex tenuissimâ suspitione*—Suetonius, *Vita Domit.*). Dio Cassius (lxvii, 14) says that husband and wife alike were guilty of atheism and the practice of Jewish rites and customs. Such accusations, as is clear from the works of the Christian apologists, could have meant nothing else than that both had become Christians. Though doubts have been expressed, because of the silence of Christian tradition on the subject, as to whether Clement was a Christian, the affirmative view is considerably strengthened by the further accusation of Suetonius that he was a man of the most contemptible inactivity (*contemptissimæ inertie*). Such a charge is easily explained on the ground that Clement found most of the duties of his office as consul so incompatible with Christian faith and practice as to render total abstention from public life almost an absolute necessity. In the case of Domitilla no doubt can re-

main, since De Rossi showed that the "Cœmeterium Domitillæ" (see CEMETERIES, EARLY CHRISTIAN) was situated on ground belonging to the Flavia Domitilla who was banished for her faith, and that it was used as a Christian burial place as early as the first century. As a result of the accusations made against them Clement was put to death, and Flavia Domitilla was banished to the island of Pandataria in the Tyrrhenian Sea. Eusebius (H. E., III, 18; Chron. ad an. Abrahami 2110), the spurious acts of Nereus and Achilles, and St. Jerome (Ep., CVIII, 7) represent Flavia Domitilla as the niece, not the wife, of the consul Flavius Clemens, and say that her place of exile was Pontia, an island also situated in the Tyrrhenian Sea. These statements have given rise to the opinion that there were two Domitillas (aunt and niece) who were Christians, the latter generally referred to as Flavia Domitilla the Younger. Lightfoot has shown that this opinion, adopted by Tillemont and De Rossi and still maintained by many writers (among them Allard and Duchesne), is derived entirely from Eusebius, who was led into this error by mistakes in transcription, or ambiguity of expression, in the sources which he used.

LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Pt. I; ST. CLEMENT OF ROME, I, the best discussion of all subjects connected with the name Domitilla; ALLARD, *Hist. des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles*, p. 96 sq.; NEUMANN, *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian* (Leipzig, 1890), I; RAMSAY, *The Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170* (New York, 1893); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'église* (Paris, 1906).

P. J. HEALY.

**Flavian**, SAINT, Bishop of Constantinople, date of birth unknown; d. at Hypæpa in Lydia, August, 449. Nothing is known of him before his elevation to the episcopate save that he was a presbyter and *σκευοφύλαξ*, or sacristan, of the Church of Constantinople, and noted for the holiness of his life. His succession to St. Proclus as bishop was in opposition to the wishes of the eunuch Chrysaphius, minister of Emperor Theodosius, who sought to bring him into imperial disfavour. He persuaded the emperor to require of the new bishop certain *eulogia* on the occasion of his appointment, but scornfully rejected the proffered blessed bread on the plea that the emperor desired gifts of gold. Flavian's intrepid refusal, on the ground of the impropriety of thus disposing of church treasures, roused considerable enmity against him. Pulcheria, the emperor's sister, being Flavian's staunch advocate, Chrysaphius secured the support of the Empress Eudocia. Although their first efforts to involve St. Flavian in disgrace miscarried, an opportunity soon presented itself. At a council of bishops convened at Constantinople by Flavian, 8 Nov., 448, to settle a dispute which had arisen among his clergy, the archimandrite Eutyches, who was a relation of Chrysaphius, was accused of heresy by Eusebius of Dorylæum. (For the proceedings of the council see EUSEBIUS OF DORYLÆUM; EUTYCHES.) Flavian exercised clemency and urged moderation, but in the end the refusal of Eutyches to make an orthodox declaration on the two natures of Christ forced Flavian to pronounce the sentence of degradation and excommunication. He forwarded a full report of the council to Pope Leo I, who in turn gave his approval to Flavian's decision (21 May, 449), and the following month (13 June) sent him his famous "Dogmatic Letter". Eutyches' complaint that justice had been violated in the council and that the Acts had been tampered with resulted in an imperial order for the revision of the Acts, executed (8 and 27 April, 449). No material error could be established, and Flavian was justified.

The long-standing rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople now became a strong factor in the discussions. It had been none the less keen since the See of Constantinople had been officially declared next in dignity to Rome, and Dioscurus, Bishop of Alexandria, was quite ready to join forces with Eutyches

against Flavian. Even before the revision of the Acts of Flavian's council, Chrysaphius had persuaded the emperor of the necessity for an oecumenical council to adjust matters, and the decree went forth that one should convene at Ephesus under the presidency of Dioscurus, who also controlled the attendance of bishops. Flavian and six bishops who had assisted at the previous synod were allowed no voice, being, as it were, on trial. (For a full account of the proceedings see *EPHESUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF*.) Eutyches was absolved of heresy, and despite the protest of the papal legate Hilary (later pope), who by his *Contradictur* annulled the decisions of the council, Flavian was condemned and deposed. In the violent scenes which ensued he was so ill-used that three days later he died in his place of exile. Anatolius, a partisan of Dioscurus, was appointed to succeed him.

St. Flavian was repeatedly vindicated by Pope Leo, whose epistle of commendation failed to reach him before his death. The pope also wrote in his favour to Theodosius, Pulcheria, and the clergy of Constantinople, besides convening a council at Rome, wherein he designated the Council of Ephesus *Ephesinum non iudicium sed latrocinium*. At the Council of Chalcedon (451) the Acts of the Robber Council were annulled and Flavian eulogized as a martyr for the Faith. Pope Hilary had Flavian's death represented pictorially in a Roman church erected by him. On Pulcheria's accession to power, after the death of Theodosius, she brought the remains of her friend to Constantinople, when they were received in triumph and interred with those of his predecessors in the see. In the Greek Menology and the Roman Martyrology his feast is entered 18 February, the anniversary of the translation of his body. Relics of St. Flavian are honoured in Italy.

St. Flavian's appeal to Pope Leo against the Robber Council has been published by Amelli in his work "S. Leone Magno e l'Oriente" (Monte Cassino, 1890), also by Lacey (Cambridge, 1903). Two other (Greek and Latin) letters to Leo are preserved in Migne, P. L. (LIV, 723-32, 743-51), and one to Emperor Theodosius also in Migne, P. G. (LXV, 889-92).

BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br., 1908); HERGENROTHER-KIRSCH, *Kirchengesch.* (Freiburg, 1904); HAUSWIRTH in *Kirchenlex.*; *Acta SS.*, Feb., III, 71-9; TILLEMONT, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. eccl.* (Paris, 1704); BARONIUS, *Annales eccl.* ad an. 449, nn. 4, 5, 14.

F. M. RUDGE.

**Flavias**, a titular see of Cilicia Secunda. Nothing is known of its ancient name and history, except that it is said to be identical with Sis. Lequien (II, 899) gives the names of several of its bishops: Alexander, later Bishop of Jerusalem and founder of the famous library of the Holy Sepulchre in the third century; Nicetas, present at the Council of Nicæa (325); John, who lived in 451; Andrew in the sixth century; George (681); and Eustratus, Patriarch of Antioch about 868. If the identification of Flavias with Sis, which is probable, be admitted, it will be found that it is first mentioned in Theodoret's life of St. Simeon Stylites.

In 704 the Arabs laid siege to the stronghold of Sis. From 1186 till 1375 the city was the capital of the Kings of Lesser Armenia. In 1266 it was captured and burned by the Egyptians. Definitely conquered by the latter in 1375, it passed later into the power of the Ottomans. In the Middle Ages it was the religious centre of Christian Armenians, at least until the catholicoi established himself at Etschmiadzin. Sis is still the residence of an Armenian catholicos, who has under his jurisdiction several bishops, numerous villages and convents. It is the chief town of the caza of the same name in the vilayet of Adana and numbers 4000 inhabitants, most of whom are Armenians. The great heats compel the inhabitants to desert it during the summer months. It is surrounded by vineyards and groves of cypress and sycamore trees.

more trees. Ruins of churches, convents, castles, and palaces may be seen on all sides.

ALISHAN, *Sissouan ou l'Arméno-Chirce* (Venice, 1899), 241-272; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II, 90-92.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Flavigny**, ABBEY OF, a Benedictine abbey in the Diocese of Dijon, the department of Côte-d'Or, and the arrondissement of Semur. This monastery was founded in 721, the first year of the reign of Thierry IV, by Widerad, who richly endowed it. According to the authors of the "Gallia Christiana", the new abbey, placed under the patronage of St. Prix, Bishop of Clermont, and martyr, was erected on the site of an ancient monastic foundation, dating, it is said, from the time of Clovis, and formerly under the patronage of St. Peter. This titular eventually overshadowed and superseded St. Prix. Pope John VIII dedicated the new church about the year 877, from which time the first patronage, that of St. Peter, appears to have prevailed definitively. The fame of Flavigny was due partly to the relics which it preserved, and partly to the piety of its religious. The monastery was at the height of its reputation in the eighth century, in the time of the Abbot Manasses, whom Charlemagne authorized to found the monastery of Corbigny. The same Manasses transferred from Volvic to Flavigny the relics of St. Prix. There were also preserved here the relics of St. Regina, whom her acts represent as having been beheaded for the faith in the borough of Alise (since called Alise-Sainte-Reine). The history of the translation of St. Regina (21-22 March, 864) was the subject of a contemporary account. Unfortunately the "Chronicle", the "Martyrology", and the "Necrology" of the Abbot Hugues, and the "Livre contenant les choses notables" have either perished or contain few facts of real interest. The liturgical books, notably the "Lectionary", have disappeared. The abbatial list contains few names worthy to be preserved, with the exception of that of Hugues of Flavigny. The monastery was rebuilt in the seventeenth century and occupied by Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur, who were actively employed in research concerning the historical documents of the abbey, but it disappeared during the French Revolution. Hitherto it had formed a part of the Diocese of Autun; but after the concordat of 1802 the new partition of the diocese placed Flavigny in the Diocese of Dijon. Lacordaire rebuilt and restored all that remained of the monastery surrounded by a portion of its ancient estate, and established there a convent of the order of St. Dominic.

GRIGNARD, *Notitia chronologica de exordiis cum veteris abbatis Sancti Petri Flaviniacensis, O.S.B. duocensis Eduensis, tum eius priorum et de anno collationis unius cujusque ecclesie illi subjecti in Die wissenschaftliche Studien aus dem Benedictiner-Orden* (1881), II, 252-272; *L'abbaye bénédictine de Flavigny en Bourgogne, ses historiens et ses histoires in Mémoires de la Société Eduenne* (1885), second series, XIV, 25-95; *Annales Flaviniacenses* (382-853) in PERTZ, *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Scriptores* (1839), III, 150-152; *Cartulaire du monastère de Flavigny (analyse de Rossignol)*, published by COLLETON in *Bulletin de la Société scientifique de Semur* (1886-1887), second series, III, 33-109; *Catalogue des principales reliques qui sont gardées dans l'église et le trésor de l'abbaye de Saint-Pierre de Flavigny-Sainte-Reine* (Auxerre, 1702); *Catalogue abbatum Flaviniacensium* in PERTZ, *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Scriptores* (1848), VIII, 502-503; DELISLE, *Deux manuscrits de l'abbaye de Flavigny au X<sup>e</sup> siècle in Mémoires comm. des Antiq. de la Côte d'Or*, XI; *Gallia Christiana* (1656), IV, 383-387; (1728), IV, 454-465; LABBE, *Analecta Monumentorum Cenobii Flaviniacensis in Nova bibl. MSS.* (1657), I, 269-272; MOLINIER, *Obituaires français* (1890), 224-225.

H. LECLERCQ.

**Flaviopolis**, a titular see in the province of Honorias. The city, formerly called Cratia, originally belonged to Bithynia (Ptolemy, V, i, 14), but was later attached to Honorias by Justinian (Novella xxix). Under Constantine the Great it received the name of Flaviopolis. No less than ten of its bishops are known from 343 to 869 (Lequien, I, 575-78). One of them, Paul, was the friend and defender of St. John

Chrysostom. The most noted was St. Abraham, bishop in the sixth century, whose life has recently been published (Vailhé, "Saint Abraham de Cratia," in "Echos d'Orient", VIII, 290-94). The diocese was still in existence in the twelfth century. Flaviopolis, now known as Guerdedé, is a caza situated in the sanjak of Bolou, and the vilayet of Castamouni. Its 4000 inhabitants, are nearly all Mussulmans; there are only 200 Christians, 40 of whom are Armenian Catholics. A small river, the Oulou Sou, irrigates the very fertile country. Fruit trees (peach, apricot, and cherry) grow there in great abundance.

TEXIER, *L'Asie Mineure*, 149-151; CUNET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, IV, 524-526; for the coinage of Cratia or Flaviopolis, see MIONNET, II, 420, and *Supplément*, II, 266.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Flavius, JOSEPHUS.** See JOSEPHUS.

**Fléchier, ESPRIT**, bishop; b. at Pernes, France, 1632; died at Montpellier, 1710; member of the Academy, and together with Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Fénelon, and Mascaron, one of the greatest sacred orators of his century; his earliest studies were made at Tarascon, under the guidance of his uncle, who was superior of a religious congregation. He himself entered this congregation, where he received holy orders, but soon left it and went to Paris in 1660. It was not long before he acquired a reputation as a wit and spiritual writer. A Latin poem in honour of Louis XIV first won for him the favour of the Court. He devoted to literature and history the leisure which remained after the fulfilment of his duties as tutor in the household of Caumartin, Councillor of State, and it was then he wrote his chief historical work, "Mémoires sur les grands jours tenus à Clermont en 1665". He was tutor to the Dauphin when his preaching began to make him famous. His funeral eulogies in particular won for him more than one comparison with Bossuet. It happened that on a number of occasions he had to treat the same subjects as the Bishop of Meaux, for instance the funeral oration of Maria Theresa, and to arouse almost the same sentiments of admiration.

He was received a member of the French Academy in 1673, on the same day as Racine. Having been consecrated bishop in 1685, he left the See of Lavaur for that of Nîmes in 1687. During his administration he was remarkable for his great charity and his zeal in converting Protestants, but this did not prevent him from devoting himself to letters and to making the Academy of Nîmes, of which he was the director, shine with particular brilliancy. He was less a preacher of the Gospel than a remarkable panegyrist. His sermons are as different from those of Bourdaloue as his funeral orations resemble Bossuet's. He was much more an elegant man of letters and fashionable orator than a severe moralist and humble preacher. He delighted in ingenious turns of phrase, sonorous words and pretentious periods which have the appearance of seeking applause and which are hardly in accord with the spirit of the Gospel. His funeral oration for Turanne is in every classical handbook. His oratorical works have been collected under the title of "Oraisons Funèbres" (Paris, 1878), "Sermons", and "Panégyriques". In history he has left an "Histoire du Cardinal Ximénès" (Paris, 1693), the "Vie de Théodose le Grand" and "Lettres choisies sur divers sujets". The last edition of the "Œuvres" of Fléchier is in two volumes (Paris, 1886).

DELA-CROIX, *Vie de Fléchier* (Paris, 1865); *Mémoires de Fléchier* (Paris, 1844, 1886); FOLIOLET in *Histoire de la littérature française au 17<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Tours, 1883); SAINTE-BEUVE, Introduction to the edition of the *Mémoires*; FABRE, *Fléchier orateur* (Paris, 1886); ALZOG, *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise* (Tournai, 1851).

LOUIS LALANDE.

**Flemael, BERTHOLET** (the name was also spelled FLEMAILLE and FLAMAEL), painter, b. at Liège, Flanders, in 1614; d. there in 1675. The son of a glass painter, he was instructed in his art by Tripez and

Douffet successively. He visited Rome in 1638, was invited by the Duke of Tuscany to Florence and employed in decorating one of his galleries; thence he passed to Paris where he carried out some elaborate decorative work at Versailles and painted for the sacristy of the church of the Augustinians his picture of the "Adoration of the Magi". He returned to Liège in 1647 and executed many paintings for the churches of his native town. In 1670 he was invited to return to Paris, and painted the ceiling of the audience room in the Tuileries. Louis XIV made him a professor of the Royal Academy of Paris. Towards the close of his life he returned to Liège and was elected a lay canon of the church of St. Paul, and painted several works for the prince-bishop of the city. A few years before he died he fell into a state of profound melancholy and had to be placed under the care of a medical man, in whose house he died. He was a painter of the "grand style", full of inventive genius, but his colouring is pale and weak and his figures somewhat artificial. He is believed to have painted a portrait of Colbert and by some writers is stated to have been a pupil at one time of Jordaens, but this has never been verified.

EYNDEN and VAN DER WILLIGEN, *Vaderlandsche Schilderkunst* (Haarlem, 1816); JAMES, *Dutch School of Painting* (London, 1832); DESCAMPS, *La Vie des Peintres Flamands* (Paris, 1753); NAGLER, *Kunstler Lexikon* (Munich, 1838); RATHEBER, *Annalen der niederländischen Malerei* (Gotha, 1844); MICHELIS, *Histoire de la Peinture Flamande* (Brussels, 1845); KUGLER, *Handbook of Painting* (London, 1846).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Fleming, PATRICK**, Franciscan friar, b. at Lagan, County Louth, Ireland, 17 April, 1599; d. 7 November, 1631. His father was great-grandson of Lord Slane; his mother was daughter of Robert Cusack, a baron of the exchequer and a near relative of Lord Delvin. In 1612, at a time when religious persecution raged in Ireland, young Fleming went to Flanders, and became a student, first at Douai, and then at the College of St. Anthony of Padua at Louvain. In 1617 he took the Franciscan habit and a year later made his solemn profession. He then assumed in religion the name of Patrick, Christopher being the name he received at baptism. Five years after his solemn profession he went to Rome with Hugh MacCaghwell, the definitor general of the order, and when he had completed his studies at the College of St. Isidore, was ordained priest. From Rome he was sent by his superiors to Louvain and for some years lectured there on philosophy. During that time he established a reputation for scholarship and administrative capacity; and when the Franciscans of the Strict Observance opened a college at Prague in Bohemia, Fleming was appointed its first superior. He was also lecturer in theology. The Thirty Years War was raging at this time, and in 1631 the Elector of Saxony invaded Bohemia and threatened Prague. Fleming, accompanied by a fellow-countryman named Matthew Hoar, fled from the city. On 7 November the fugitives encountered a party of armed Calvinist peasants; and the latter, animated with the fierce fanaticism of the times, fell upon the friars and murdered them. Fleming's body was carried to the monastery of Votivum, four miles distant from the scene of the murder and there buried.

Eminent both in philosophy and theology, he was specially devoted to ecclesiastical history, his tastes in this direction being still further developed by his friendship for his learned countryman Father Hugh Ward. The latter, desirous of writing on early Christian Ireland, asked for Fleming's assistance, which was readily given. Even before Fleming left Louvain for Prague he had amassed considerable materials, and had written a "Life of St. Columba". It was not, however, published in his lifetime. That and other MSS. fell into the hands of Thomas O'Sheerin, lecturer in theology at the College of St. Anthony of Padua, who edited and published them at Louvain in 1667.



Fleming also wrote a life of Hugh MacCaghwell (q.v.), Primate of Armagh, a chronicle of St. Peter's monastery at Ratisbon (an ancient Irish foundation), and letters to Hugh Ward on the lives and works of the Irish saints. The letters have been published in "The Irish Ecclesiastical Record" (see below). The work published at Louvain in 1667 is now rare and costly; one copy in recent years was sold for seventy pounds.

WARE-HARRIS, *Writers of Ireland* (Dublin, 1764); *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, II; *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, VII; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

E. A. D'ALTON.

**Fleming** (FLEMMING, FLEMMYNGE), RICHARD, Bishop of Lincoln and founder of Lincoln College, Oxford; b. of a good Yorkshire family about 1360, Cros-ton being sometimes mentioned, though without clear authority, as his birthplace; d. at Sleaford, 25 Jan., 1431. He studied at University College, Oxford, and became junior proctor in 1407. In 1409 he was chosen by convocation as one of the twelve commissioners appointed to examine the writings of Wyclif, though at this time he was suspected of sympathy with the new movement and is mentioned by name in a mandate which Archbishop Arundel addressed to the chancellor in 1409 in order to suppress this tendency in the university. If the archbishop's description is correct the date usually assigned for Fleming's birth must be far too early, for a man close on fifty could not be mentioned as one of a company of beardless boys who had scarcely put away the playthings of youth (Wilkins, *Conc. Magn. Brit.*, III, 322). If he ever had any sympathy with Wyclif it did not extend to Wyclif's heretical doctrines, for his own orthodoxy was beyond suspicion and it subsequently became his duty as bishop to burn the exhumed body of Wyclif in 1428. He held successively the prebends of South Newbald (22 Aug., 1406) and Langtoft (21 Aug., 1415), both in York Diocese, and subsequently was rector of Boston. He became bachelor in divinity some time before 1413. Finally he was elected Bishop of Lincoln, 20 Nov., 1419, in succession to Philip Repyngdon, and was consecrated at Florence, 28 April, 1420. In 1422 he was in Germany at the head of an embassy, and in June, 1423, he acted as president of the English representatives at the Council of Pavia, which was transferred to Siena and finally developed into the Council of Basle. More than once he preached before the council, but as he supported the rights of the pope against the assembled Fathers his views were disapproved of. The pope, however, showed him favour by appointing him as his chamberlain and naming him Archbishop of York in 1424. Difficulties, however, arose with the king's ministers, and the appointment was set aside. On returning to Lincoln, the bishop began the foundation of Lincoln College, which he intended to be a *collegium* of theologians connected with the three parish churches of St. Mildred, St. Michael, and All-hallows, Oxford. The preface which he wrote to the statutes is printed in the "Statutes of Lincoln College" (Oxford, 1853). He proved a vigorous administrator of his diocese, and added to his cathedral a chantry in which he was subsequently buried. One work now lost, "Super Angliæ Etymologia", is attributed to him by Bale.

FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Mediae Aetatis* (1746); TANNER, *Bibl. Brit.-Hub.* (London, 1748); WOOD, *Hist. and Antiq. of the University of Oxford* (Oxford, 1786), I, 551; *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1816), XV; *Statutes of Lincoln College*, Oxford (Oxford, 1853); LE NEVE, *Fash Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, ed. HARDY (Oxford, 1854), III, 205; STUBBS, *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum* (Oxford, 1858), 65; *Munimenta Academica Oxon.* in R. S. (1868), I, XIV; *Hist. MSS. Comm.* (London, 1871), 2d Report, 131; POOLE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Fleming**, THOMAS, Archbishop of Dublin, son of the Baron of Slane, b. in 1593; d. in 1655. He studied at the Franciscan College of Louvain, became a priest of the Franciscan Order, and after finishing his studies

continued at Louvain for a number of years as professor. In October, 1623, he was appointed by Urban VIII to Dublin as successor of Archbishop Matthews. His appointment gave great offence to the opponents of the religious orders, and a bitter onslaught was begun against the new archbishop by the priest Paul Harris, in his "Olfactorium" and other brochures. Archbishop Fleming convened and presided at a provincial synod of the province of Dublin in 1640. When the Confederate War broke out (1641-1642) the archbishop, though rather a man of peace, felt constrained to take sides with the Confederates and despatched a procurator to represent him at the synod of the clergy held in Kilkenny (May, 1642). Later on, when the general assembly was convoked at Kilkenny for October, the archbishop resolved to attend personally and take part in the deliberations. As might be expected from his antecedents, and especially from his connexion with the Anglo-Irish nobility of the Pale, he was opposed to the "thorough" policy of the Old Irish, and wished for peace at all costs. In 1643 he was one of the prelates who signed the commission empowering representatives of the Confederates to treat with Ormond for a cessation of hostilities. He also opposed Scarampa and Rinuccini, the latter of whom was strongly identified with the Old-Irish party. In 1649, when all was lost, and the defeated Irish were confronted with Cromwell, a reconciliation was effected with Ormond at a synod of bishops, a step which Archbishop Fleming favoured. But even then King Charles could not recognize his real friends, and the alliance was broken off. The remainder of the archbishop's life was much disturbed by religious persecution carried on by the government of Cromwell. He died in 1655, and the severity of the persecution may be judged from the fact that until 1669 no successor could be appointed. The diocese was administered by vicars until the nomination of Peter Talbot in 1669.

MORAN, *History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin* (Dublin, 1864); D'ALTON, *Archbishops of Dublin* (Dublin, 1838); MORAN, *Spicilegium Ossoriense* (Dublin, 1874); DE BURGO, *Hibernia Dominicana* (Kilkenny, 1762); GILBERT, *History of Irish Confederation* (Dublin, 1882, 1891).

JAMES MACCAFFREY.

**Fletcher**, JOHN, missionary and theologian, b. at Ormskirk, England, of an old Catholic family; educated at Douai and afterwards at St. Gregory's, Paris; d. about 1848. After ordination to the priesthood he became a professor at the College at St-Omer, of which his great-uncle, Rev. William Wilkinson, had been president. When the French Revolution broke out he was taken prisoner with the other collegians and spent many months in captivity at Arras and Dourlens. After they were released in 1795 he returned to England and acted as priest first at Hexham, then at Blackburn, and finally at Weston Underwood (1827), the seat of the Throckmortons. Having acted for a time as chaplain to the dowager Lady Throckmorton he took charge of Leamington Mission (1839-1844). He removed thence to Northampton in 1844 and resigned, owing to his great age, in 1848, after which his name does not appear in the "Catholic Directory", though his death is not therein recorded. Dr. Fletcher's works are: "Sermons on various Religious and Moral Subjects for all the Sundays after Pentecost" (2 vols., 1812, 1821); the introduction is "An Essay on the Spirit of Controversy", also published separately; "The Catholic's Manual", translated from Bossuet with a commentary and notes (1817, 1829); "Thoughts on the Rights and Prerogatives of Church and State, with some observations upon the question of Catholic Securities" (1823); "A Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches" (1826); "The Catholic's Prayerbook", compiled from a MS. drawn up in 1813 by Rev. Joseph Berington (q. v.); "The Prudent Christian; or Con-



siderations on the Importance and Happiness of Attending to the Care of Our Salvation" (1834); "The Guide to the True Religion" (1836); "Transubstantiation: a Letter to Lord —" (1836); "On the Use of the Bible"; "The Letters of Fénelon, with illustrations" (1837); "A Short Historical View of the Rise, Progress and Establishment of the Anglican Church" (1843). He translated Blessed Edmund Campion's "Decem Rationes" (1827); de Maistre's "Letters on the Spanish Inquisition" (1838); and Fénelon's "Reflections for Every Day of the Month" (1844). He also brought out an edition of "My Motives for Renouncing the Protestant Religion" by Antonio de Dominis (1828).

*Catholic Magazine* (1833), III, 112; BUTLER, *Historical Memoirs of Eng. Catholics* (London, 1819), II, 321; (1822), IV, 441; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), s. v.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Flete**, WILLIAM, an Augustinian hermit friar, a contemporary and great friend of St. Catherine of Siena; the exact place and date of his birth are unknown and those of his death are disputed. He was an English mystic, and lived in the latter half of the fourteenth century; educated at Cambridge, he afterwards joined the Austin Friars in England, but desiring a stricter life than they were living, and hearing that there were two monasteries of his order which had returned to the primitive discipline near Siena, he set out for Italy. On reaching the forest of Lecceto near Siena, in which one of these monasteries stood, he found the place, which abounded in caves, so suited to the contemplative life, that with the consent of his superiors he joined this community. Henceforth he spent his days in study and contemplation in one of these caves, and returned to the monastery at night to sleep. He was called the "Bachelor of the Wood"; here he became acquainted with St. Catherine, who occasionally visited him at Lecceto and went to confession to him. He had so great a love for solitude, that he declined to leave it when invited by Pope Urban VI to go to Rome, to assist him with his counsel at the time of the papal schism, then disturbing the Church.

He wrote a long panegyric on St. Catherine at her death, which, with another of his works, is preserved in the public library at Siena. For at least nineteen years he led a most holy and austere life in this wood, and is said by Torellus to have returned to England immediately after St. Catherine's death in 1383, and after introducing the reform of Lecceto, to have died the same year. Others say he died in 1383, but there is no mention of his death in the book of the dead at Lecceto, and the exact date of it is uncertain. He was considered a saint by his contemporaries.

None of his works have been printed: they consist of six MSS.; (1) an epistle to the provincial of his order; (2) a letter to the doctors of the province; (3) an epistle to the brethren in general; (4) predictions to the English of calamities coming upon England (in this he prophesied that England would lose the Catholic faith); (5) divers epistles; (6) a treatise on remedies against temptations. A fifteenth century MS. of this last is now in the University Library at Cambridge, to which it was presented by George I.

OSSENGER, *Bibliotheca Augustiniana* (1768), 343-5; DRANE, *The History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions* (London, 1887).

FRANCESCA M. STEELE.

**Fleuriot**, ZÉNAÏDE-MARIE-ANNE, a French novelist, b. at Saint-Brieuc, 12 September, 1829; d. at Paris, 18 December, 1890. She published her first novel, "Les souvenirs d'une douairière", in 1859, and its success led her to adopt the literary profession. Either under her real name or the pseudonym of "Anna Ediane de Saint-B.", she published a large number of novels, most of which were intended for women and girls. She was a constant contributor to

"Le Journal de la jeunesse" and "La Bibliothèque rose", whose aim is to provide young people with unobjectionable reading. Her novels are written in a simple, easy style which leaves the reader's whole attention free to occupy itself with the interest of the story; they are Catholic in the true sense of the word, for they not only contain no unorthodox opinion, but present none of those evil suggestions with which so many writers have won popularity and lucre. The following deserve to be specially mentioned: "La vie en Famille" (Paris, 1862); "La clef d'or" (Paris, 1870); "Le théâtre chez soi" (Paris, 1873); "Mon-sieur Nostradamus" (Paris, 1875); "Sans beauté" (Paris, 1889).

LAROUSSE, *Supplément au Dictionnaire universel du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*.

PIERRE MARIQUE.

**Fleury** (more completely FLEURY-SAINT-BENOÎT), ABBEY OF, one of the oldest and most celebrated Benedictine abbeys of Western Europe. Its modern name is Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, applicable both to the monastery and the township with which the abbey has always been associated. Situated, as its name implies, on the banks of the Loire, the little town is of easy access from Orléans. Its railway station, St-Benoît—St-Aignan (Loiret) is a little over a mile from the old Floriacum. Long before reaching the station, the traveller is struck by the imposing mass of a monastic church looming up solitary in the plain of the Loire. The church of Floriacum has survived the stately habitation of abbot and monks. The list of the abbots of Fleury contains eighty-nine names, a noble record for one single abbey. From Merovingian names like St. Mommolus, and Carolingian names like St. Abbo, we come upon names that arouse different feelings, like Odet de Coligny (Cardinal de Châtillon), Armand du Plessis (Cardinal de Richelieu). The last twenty-two abbots held the abbey in *commendam*. The list closes with Georges-Louis Phélypeaux, Archbishop of Bourges, in 1789. Tradition, accepted by Mabillon, attributes the foundation of Fleury to Leodebaldus, Abbot of St-Aignan (Orléans) about 640. Before the days of the monks there was a Gallo-Roman villa called Floriacum, in the Vallis aurea. This was the spot selected by the Abbot of St-Aignan for his foundation, and from the very first Fleury seems to have known the Benedictine rule. Rigomarus was its first abbot.

Church building must have made busy men of many abbots of Fleury. From the very start the abbey boasted of two churches, one in honour of St. Peter and the other in honour of the Blessed Virgin. This latter became the great basilica that survived every storm. In 1022 Abbot Gauzlin started the erection of a gigantic feudal tower, intending it to be one day the west front of the abbey church. His bold plan became a reality, and in 1213 the edifice was completed. It is a fine specimen of the romanesque style, and the tower of Abbot Gauzlin, resting on fifty columns, forms a unique porch. The church is about three hundred feet long and one hundred and forty feet wide at the transepts. The crypt alone would repay an artist's journey. The choir of the church contains the tomb of a French monarch, Philip I, buried there in 1108. But the boast of Fleury is the relics of St. Benedict, the father of Western monasticism. Mommolus, the second Abbot of Fleury, is said to have effected their transfer from Monte Cassino when that abbey fell into decay after the ravages of the Lombards. Nothing is more certain than the belief of western Europe in the presence of these precious relics at Fleury. To them more than to its flourishing schools Fleury owed wealth and fame, and to-day French piety surrounds them with no less honour than when kings came thither to pray. The monks of Monte Cassino impugn the claims of Fleury, but without ever showing any relics to make good their contention that they possess

the body of the founder. No doubt there is much fabulous matter in the Fleury accounts of the famous transfer, but we must remember they were written at the time when even good causes were more effectually defended by introducing the supernatural than by the most obvious natural explanations.

*Miracula Sancti Benedicti*, ed. DE CERTAIN (Paris, 1858); MARCHAND, *Souvenirs historiques sur l'ancienne Abbaye de Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire* (Orléans, 1838); ROCHER, *Histoire de l'abbaye Royale de S. Benoît-sur-Loire* (Orléans, 1869); MABILLON, *Annales O.S.B.*, I; CHAMARD, *Les reliques de S. Benoît* (Paris, 1882); TOSTI, tr. WOODS, *Saint Benedict* (London, 1896).

ANSCAR VONIER.

**Fleury**, ANDRÉ-HERCULE DE, b. at Lodève, 26 June, 1653; d. at Paris, 29 January, 1743. He was a

protégé of Cardinal de Bonzi and became chaplain to Maria Theresa in 1679, and to Louis XIV in 1683. He was appointed Bishop of Fréjus in 1698, but resigned the see in 1715, when he received the Abbey of Tournus and was appointed tutor to the young Louis XV. Naturally cold and imperturbable, he remained in the background during the regency. When Louis XV attained his majority in 1723, it was at the instance of Fleury that the Duc de Bourbon was made prime minister, and quarrelling with the duke, Fleury pretended to retire to Issy. Louis XV, however, who admired and loved his tutor, sent the duke into exile, and entrusted the government to Fleury. True to his habits of discretion, and accustomed, as Duclos says, "to bridle the envious", he never assumed the title of prime minister. He was made cardinal in September, 1726, and until his death remained the guiding spirit in French politics.

Comparing the three cardinals, d'Argenson said: "Richelieu bled France, Mazarin purged it, and Fleury put it on a diet". He alluded in this bantering way to the cardinal's policy of economy which, among other drawbacks, retarded the development of the French military marine at the very period when the mercantile marine, thanks to private enterprise, was making considerable progress. In spite of this, however, Fleury had the qualities of a great minister. He was the first to foresee that France would not always be at enmity with the Hapsburgs. In connexion with the Polish succession and the Duchy of Lorraine, he availed himself of the able advice of the diplomat Chauvelin, when it became necessary to play a cautious game with Austria. But, as Vandal says, the policy of Chauvelin was that of the past. Fleury, in redoubling his efforts to bring about as quickly as possible pleasant relations between the King of France and the emperor, was the precursor of Choiseul, Vergennes, and Talleyrand. He was accused of

timidity when at the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession he wrote a letter to General Königseck, in which he seemed to apologize for this war. But, in truth, Fleury was simply anticipating the policy of the *renversement des alliances* (breaking up of the alliances), which began in 1756, and which by uniting France and Austria was to be more in conformity with the Catholic traditions of both countries. The opinion of historians like Vandal and Masson with regard to this *renversement des alliances*, so long the object of criticism, tends to justify Cardinal Fleury.

During the period of Fleury's power Jansenism was gaining ground among the masses as a superstitious sect, as is evidenced by the miracles of the deacon Pâris,

while among the upper classes it took shape as a political faction. Fleury was the minister who had to contend with a Jansenist opposition in the Parliament of Paris. He reserved to royal authority all matters relating to the Jansenists, one consequence of which was a "strike" on the part of the magistrates and lawyers, which Fleury repressed by certain measures of severity. He became a member of the Academy in 1717 and was the first to propose sending a scientific expedition to the far north and to Peru to measure the degrees of the meridian.

MARIS, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1863-68); BARBIER, *Journal historique* (Paris, 1857); D'ARGENSON *Journal* (Paris, 1859-67); DUCLOS, *Mémoires secrets* (Paris, 1791); LACRETTE, *Histoire de France pendant le 18<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1830); JOBEZ, *La France sous Louis XV* (Paris, 1861-73); DUC DE BROGLIE, *Le Cardinal de Fleury et la Pragmatique impériale* in *Revue historique* (1882)

GEORGES GOYAU.



ANDRÉ-HERCULE CARDINAL DE FLEURY

Painted by Jacques Autreau—Engraved by H. S. Thomassin

**Fleury**, CLAUDE, Church historian and educator; b. at Paris, 6 December, 1640; d. 14 July, 1725. The son of a lawyer from Normandy, he received a thorough education at the renowned Jesuit College of Clermont, devoted himself subsequently to legal studies, and in 1658 was called to the bar at the very early age of eighteen. For nine years he applied himself earnestly to his calling and continued his studies in jurisprudence, but interested himself also in history, literature, and archaeology. Signally gifted, industrious, and of a gentle disposition, he soon won for himself the patronage of the great. He frequented the house of M. de Montmor and the salon of Guillaume de Lamoignon, first president of the Parlement of Paris, where he met the intellectual celebrities of France, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Boileau, etc. His deeply religious spirit and his leaning towards a life of quiet retirement led him to form the resolution to abandon the law, to study theology, and to embrace the priestly calling. The date of his ordination is unknown, but it certainly took place before 1672, when, at Bossuet's suggestion, he was appointed tutor (*sous-précepteur*)

to the Princes de Conti, whom Louis XIV wished to be educated with the Dauphin. During the succeeding period, he published his first important works. Later appeared two books, containing the fruits of his legal studies: "Histoire du droit français" (Paris, 1674) and "Institution au droit ecclésiastique" (Paris, 1677). The latter of these works was at first issued anonymously, but subsequently (1687) appeared under the author's name. In these writings Fleury shows himself to be an outspoken Gallican. That he was a pronounced follower of Bossuet in this regard appears also from his "Discours sur les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane", written in 1690. His position as teacher led him to the study of pedagogics, and as early as 1675 he wrote at Bossuet's suggestion his "Traité du choix et de la méthode des études", which was published at Paris in 1686. For the instruction of his pupil and as a practical application of the principles expounded in his treatise, he wrote a series of three works: "Les mœurs des israélites" (Paris, 1681), "Les mœurs des chrétiens" (1682), and the "Grand catéchisme historique" (1683). Meanwhile he maintained his close relations with Bossuet, who was ever a zealous patron of the able and industrious teacher, and translated into Latin (1678) his "Exposition de la foi catholique".

Upon completing the education of the Princes de Conti, Fleury was (1680) appointed tutor to the Comte de Vermandois, the legitimized son of Louis XIV and Louise de La Vallière. On the death of the young count in 1684, Louis XIV, in token of his appreciation of Fleury's tutorial services, appointed him Abbot of Loc-Dieu in the Diocese of Rhodéz, and Fleury devoted himself zealously to the duties of his pastoral charge. He preached frequently in the Diocese of Meaux, and accompanied the Abbé Fénelon on his missionary journeys in Saintonge and Poitou, after the abrogation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), both labouring diligently and with great success for the conversion of the Huguenots. At the same time Fleury continued his literary pursuits, and in 1685 he published a "Life of Marguerite d'Arbouze, Abbess and reformer of the Abbey of Val-de-Grâce, and in 1688 the treatise entitled "Devoirs des maîtres et des domestiques". Shortly afterwards he was recalled to the court, and in 1689, on Fénelon's recommendation, was appointed tutor (sous-précepteur) to the grandsons of Louis XIV, the young Dukes of Burgundy, of Anjou, and of Berry. He continued at this post for sixteen years, and lived at the brilliant court the same modest, retired life, devoted to his duties as teacher and to his studies. During this period his leisure hours were given mainly to the composition of his "Histoire ecclésiastique", the first volume of which appeared in 1691. In this great work, the principal literary fruit of the remaining years of his life, the author discloses once more his leanings toward Gallicanism.

In recognition of his literary services Fleury was chosen in 1696 to fill La Bruyère's seat in the Academy, was offered the Bishopric of Montpellier, which however, he refused. When in 1697, on the appearance of the "Maximes des saints", a Quietistic controversy broke out between Bossuet and Fénelon, Fleury, as the protégé of Fénelon, was in danger of sharing his patron's disfavour at court. Bossuet, however, proved a true protector, and Fleury was rescued from Fénelon's fate, and allowed to retain his place as tutor to the princes. In 1706, as a reward for his services, the king appointed Fleury prior of Notre-Dame d'Argenteuil, near Paris. On receiving this appointment, Fleury resigned forthwith his Abbacy of Loc-Dieu, as he was opposed to the cumulation of ecclesiastical benefices, and devoted himself to the continuation of his "Histoire ecclésiastique". On a subsequent occasion, he was again summoned to court to fill an important and responsible position. On the death of Louis XIV, the regent, wishing to secure a


trustworthy and learned cleric who held neither Jansenistic nor Molinistic views, and who might be trusted to represent Gallican principles, appointed Fleury as confessor to the young King Louis XV. Fleury continued to fill this office until 1722, but then resigned on the plea of old age, and until his death lived a life of the closest retirement in Paris.

Fleury was a righteous, pious, universally respected pastor, a conscientious, devoted teacher, a talented and profound scholar and author. Most of his works have been recently reprinted; some have been translated into other languages and have secured a wide circle of readers. His comprehensive "Histoire ecclésiastique", of which he himself issued twenty volumes (Paris, 1691-1720), is the most important of his works and extends from the Ascension of Christ to the year 1414. This work is at once instructive and edifying; its material is carefully and fully treated, but all critical examination is avoided. The facts are recorded in elegant and well-chosen language without rhetorical exaggerations, and although his judgments are tinged with Gallicanism (especially as regards the papacy), they are expressed moderately and with restraint. Consequently Fleury's work offers a marked contrast to the histories of Noël Alexandre and Tillemont. His "Histoire" was received enthusiastically in educated circles, ran through several editions, and was translated into German (Leipzig, 1752) and Latin (Augsburg, 1758). The Gallican views expressed in the work have been attacked by several historians, of whom the most notable are Honoratus a S. Maria (Mechlin, 1729), Baldwin de Houta (Mechlin, 1733), N. Lanteaume (Avignon, 1736), Rossignol (Paris, 1802), Marchetti (Venice, 1794). The ex-Oratorian, John Claude Fabre, an extreme Gallican, issued a continuation of Fleury's work in sixteen volumes (Paris, 1722-36), bringing the history to the year 1595. This continuation, however, is neither in its narration nor its workmanship comparable with Fleury's achievement. Rondet added a further volume (XXXVII) which contains a table of contents (Paris, 1754); Alexander of St. John of the Cross, who, with the assistance of a brother Carmelite, had already translated Fleury's work into Latin, continued the history to the year 1765, in thirty-five volumes, and after Alexander's death another volume (extending to 1768) was added by Benno, a member of the same order. Father Alexander also translated Calmet's "Histoire de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament" into Latin, and published it in five volumes as an introduction to Fleury's work, so that the complete edition in Latin (Augsburg, 1768-98) consists of ninety-one volumes, with two index-volumes.


Amongst Fleury's papers was found a sketch in manuscript of the ecclesiastical history from 1414 to 1517, and this sketch was inserted in the edition issued in 1840 at Paris. Several collections of Fleury's sermons and treatises have been issued since his death, e. g. his "Discours" (2 vols., Paris, 1752); "Traité du Droit public en France" (4 vols., Paris, 1769); "Opusculs de l'abbé Fleury", published by Rondet (5 vols., Nîmes, 1780); "Œuvres de l'abbé Fleury", published by A. Martin (Paris, 1837). In conclusion, it should be noted that the "Abrégé de l'histoire ecclésiastique de Fleury", published at Berne in 1766, with an introduction by Frederick II of Prussia, has no connexion with Claude Fleury's "Histoire ecclésiastique"; it is a work undertaken at the suggestion of the above-mentioned monarch and is dominated throughout by a spirit hostile to Christianity.

RONDET, *Notice sur l'abbé Fleury in Opusculs* (Nîmes, 1780), I; MARTIN, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Fleury in Œuvres* (Paris, 1837); DU PIN, *Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1686, sqq.), XIX, 110 sqq.; HEFELÉ, *Der Kirchenhistoriker Fleury in Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte, Archäologie und Liturgik*, II (Tubingen, 1864), 89 sqq.



J. P. KIRSCH.



FAÇADE OF SANTA MARIA NOVELLA  
PIAZZA DELLA SIGNORIA



SANTA CROCE AND STATUE OF DANTE  
PITTI PALACE



FLORENCE



**Floodoard** (or **FRODOARD**), French historian and chronicler, b. at Epernay in 894; d. in 966. He was educated at Reims, where he became canon of the cathedral and keeper of the episcopal archives. He visited Rome during the pontificate of Leo VII (936-939) and was shown much favour by the pope. In gratitude he wrote a long poem in Latin hexameters, celebrating the deeds of Christ and of the first saints in Palestine and Antioch, adding a versified narration of the history of the popes. The whole work, which is legendary rather than historical, was dedicated to Archbishop Rotbert of Trier. When his patron and protector, Archbishop Artold of Reims, was deposed through the intrigues of the powerful Héribert, Count of Vermandois, Floodoard remained loyal to him, and after Artold's re-establishment became his trusted counsellor. In 952 he retired to a monastery, probably that of St. Basol, and became abbot. This dignity he laid down when seventy years of age.

At the instance of Archbishop Rotbert Floodoard undertook to write a history of the Church of Reims, "*Historia Remensis ecclesiae*", for which he used the episcopal archives as well as the writings of Bishop Hincmar. This work is of the greatest value on account of the completeness of the material as well as the truthfulness of the narration. Floodoard's other great work is the "*Annales*", which covers the period from 919 to 966. With the most painstaking exactness he narrates in plain, simple language all the events that happened during these years, and thus the work is of the utmost importance for a knowledge of the history of France, Lorraine, and the East Franconian realm. With this chronicle he was occupied almost to the day of his death. An addition was made subsequently to cover the period from 976-978. The "*Historia Remensis ecclesiae*" was first edited by Sirmond (Paris, 1611); the best edition is that of Heller and Waitz in the "*Monumenta Germaniae historica: Scriptores*", XIII, 405-599 (Hanover, 1881). The "*Annales*" were edited by Pertz in the same work, III, 363-408 (Hanover, 1839). The poem was published in Mabilon's "*Acta Sanctorum*", vol. III (Paris, 1668-1701). Floodoard's complete works were published with a French translation by the Academy of Reims (Reims, 1854-55, 3 vols.) and in Migne's Latin Patrology, CXXXV, 1-886.

WATTENBACH, *Deutschl. Geschichtsquellen*, ed. DÜMMLER (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1904), I, 457-460; EBERT, *Allg. Gesch. der Litt. des M. A. im Abendlande* (Leipzig, 1874-87), III, 409-414; *Hist. litt. de la France* (1733-1763, 1814-1856), VI, 319-329.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

**Flood.** See DELUGE.

**Floreffe**, ABBEY OF, pleasantly situated on the right bank of the Sambre, about seven miles southwest of Namur, Belgium, owes its foundation to Godfrey, Count of Namur, and his wife Ermensendis. When St. Norbert, in the year after the foundation of his order, returned from Cologne with a rich treasure of relics for his new church at Prémontré, Godfrey and Ermensendis went to meet him and received him in their castle at Namur. So edified were they with what they had seen and heard, that they besought the saint to found a house at Floreffe. The charter by which they made over a church and house to Norbert and his order bears the date of 27 November, 1121, so that Floreffe is chronologically speaking, the second abbey of the order. Norbert laid the foundations of the church which was called *Salve*, and the abbey received the sweet name of *Flos Mariæ*, the Flower of Mary. The chronicles of Floreffe record the following event: While celebrating Mass at Floreffe, the saint saw a drop of Blood issuing from the Sacred Host on the paten. Distrusting his own eyes, he said to the deacon who assisted him: "Brother, do you see what I see?" "Yes, Father", answered the deacon, "I see a drop of Blood which gives out a brilliant light." The

altar stone on which St. Norbert celebrated Mass is still preserved at Floreffe. St. Norbert placed Richard, one of his first disciples, at the head of the young community. The second abbot, Almaric, was commissioned by Pope Innocent II to preach the Gospel in Palestine. Accompanied by a band of chosen religious of Floreffe, he journeyed to the Holy Land and founded the abbey of St. Habauc (1137). Philip, Count of Namur, gave to Weric, the sixth abbot, a large piece of the Holy Cross which he had received from his brother Baldwin, Emperor of Constantinople. The chronicles record that twice, namely in 1204 and 1254, Blood flowed from this relic on the Feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross, the miracle being witnessed by the religious and by a large concourse of people. At the suppression of the Abbey of Floreffe, the relic was removed to a place of safety. When a few years ago, the Norbertine canons, who had been expelled from France, bought an old Augustinian Monastery at Bois-Seigneur-Isaac, this precious relic was restored to them, so that it is again in the custody of the sons of St. Norbert. All the abbeys and convents founded by the Abbey of Floreffe have ceased to exist with the exception of Postel and Leffe. Louis de Fromantau, elected in 1791, was the fifty-fifth and last abbot of Floreffe. When the French Republican army overran Belgium, the religious were expelled, and the abbey with all its possessions was confiscated. Put up for sale in 1797, it was bought back for the abbot and his community. After the Concordat the abbot and a few of his religious returned to the abbey, but so great were the difficulties that after the death of the last religious the abbey became the property of the Bishop of Namur and is now the seat of a flourishing seminary.

F. M. GEUDENS.

**Florence** (Lat. *Florentia*; It. *Firenze*), ARCHDIOCESE OF (FLORENTINA), in the province of Tuscany (Central Italy). The city is situated on the Arno in a fertile plain at the foot of the Fiesole hills, whence came its first inhabitants (about 200 B. C.). In 82 B. C. Sulla destroyed it because it supported the democratic party at Rome. In 59 B. C. it was rebuilt by Cæsar at a short distance from its original site. It served then as a military post and commanded the ford of the Arno. Soon afterwards it became a flourishing *municipium*.

**EARLY MEDIEVAL HISTORY.**—Besieged and probably captured by Totila (541), it was retaken (552) by the Byzantine general Narses. The most famous of its few antiquities dating from Roman times is the amphitheatre known as the *Parlagio*. In ancient times it was a town of small importance; its prosperity did not begin until the eleventh century. During the Lombard period Florence belonged to the Duchy of Chiusi; after the absorption of the Lombard kingdom by Charlemagne, who spent at Florence the Christmas of 786, it was the residence of a count whose overlord was margrave of Tuscany. In the two centuries of conflict between the popes and the emperors over the feudal legacy of Countess Matilda (d. 1115) the city played a prominent part; it was precisely to this conflict that the republic owed its wonderful development. During this period Florence stood always for the papacy, knowing well that it was thus ensuring its own liberty. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Florentines fought successfully against Fiesole, which was destroyed in 1125, and against several neighbouring feudal lords who had harassed the trade of the town, the Alberti, Guido Guerra, the Buondelmonti (whose castle of Montebuoni was destroyed in 1135), the Uberti, the Cadolinghi, the Ubaldini, and others. These nobles were all obliged to take up their residence in the town, and spend there at least three months of every year. In 1113 the Florentines, never partial to the German Emperors, rose against the imperial vicar in Florence. The first public meeting of



the townsfolk which paved the way for the establishment of the "Commune" was convened by Bishop Ranieri in 1105. About the same time they helped the Pisans in the conquest of the Balearic Isles (1114) asking no other reward than two porphyry columns for the great central doorway of the Baptistery (San Giovanni). By 1155 they had grown so powerful that they dared to close their gates against Frederick Barbarossa. The nobles (magnates, *grandi*), forced to become citizens, were not slow in creating disturbances in the town by their rival factions, and in hindering the work of the consuls who chanced to be displeasing to them. In this way there was endless friction and strife, and thus was laid the foundation of the two great parties that for centuries divided the city, Guelphs and Ghibellines. The former was democratic, republican, favourable to the papacy; the latter was the party of the old Florentine aristocracy and the emperor. In 1197 the Tuscan League (in imitation of the successful Lombard League) was formed at San Ginesio between the cities of Florence, Lucca, Siena, Prato, San Miniato, and the Bishop of Volterra, in presence of papal legates. These cities bound themselves on that occasion not to acknowledge the authority of emperor, king, duke, or marquis without the express order of the Roman Church. At that time, in the interest of better administration, Florence abolished its old-time government by two consuls, and substituted a *podestà*, or chief magistrate (1193), with a council of twelve consuls. In 1207 a law was passed which made it obligatory for the *podestà* to be an outsider. The legislative power originally resided in the *Statuto*, a commission nominated by the consuls. After the introduction of a *podestà* it was exercised by the priors of the chief guilds (the *artes majores*), seven in number (carpenters, wool-weavers, skimmers, tanners, tailors, shoemakers, and farriers), to which were afterwards added the fourteen lesser guilds (the judges, the notaries-public, doctors, money-changers, and others). To hold any public office it was necessary to belong to one or other of these guilds (*arti*); the nobles were therefore wont to enter their names on the books of the wool-weavers' guild. The management of all political affairs rested with the *Signoria*, and there was a kind of public parliament which met four times a year. Public business was attended to by the *podestà*, assisted in their turns by two of the consuls.

**GUELPHS AND Ghibellines.**—A broken engagement between one of the Buondelmonti and a daughter of the house of Amidei, and the killing of the young man, were the causes of a fierce civil strife in 1215 and long after. Some sided with the Buondelmonti and the Donati, who were Guelphs; others sympathized with the Amidei and the Uberti, who were Ghibellines. Up to 1249 the two factions fought on sight; in that year Emperor Frederick II, who wished to have Florence on his side in his struggle with the papacy, sent the Uberti reinforcements of German mercenaries with whose aid they drove out the Buondelmonti and so many of their followers that the Guelph party was completely routed. The Ghibellines straightway established an aristocratic government but retained the *podestà*. The people were deprived of their rights, but they assembled on 20 October, 1250, in the church of Santa Croce and deposed the *podestà* and his Ghibelline administration. The government was then entrusted to two men, one a *podestà*, the other a *Capitano del Popolo* (captain of the people), both of them outsiders; besides these the six precincts of the town nominated each two *anziani*, or elders. For military purposes the town was divided into twenty *gonfaloni*, or banner-wards, the country around about into sixty-six, the whole force being under the command of the *gonfaloniere*. The advantage of the new arrangement was quickly shown in the wars against neighbouring towns, once their allies, but which had fallen under Ghibelline control. In 1253 Pistoia was taken, and

was forced to recall the exiled Guelphs. The year 1254 has been called the year of victories. Siena, Volterra, and Pisa were then constrained to accept peace on severe terms, and to expel the Ghibellines. In 1255 it was the turn of Arezzo; Pisa was once more defeated at Ponte Serchio, and forced to cede to Florence the Castello di Mutrone, overlooking the sea. Henceforward war was continuous between Pisa and Florence until the once powerful Pisa passed completely into the power of the Florentines. In 1260, however, Farinata degli Uberti, leader of the outlawed Ghibellines, with the help of Siena and of the German bands in King Manfred's pay, but mostly by deceiving the Florentines into believing that he would betray Siena into their hands, defeated (4 Sept.) the Florentine army of 30,000 foot and 3,000 horse in the battle of Montaperti. The Guelphs thereupon chose exile for themselves and their families. The people's government was again overturned; the citizens had to swear allegiance to King Manfred, and German troops were called on to support the new order of things. The *podestà*, Guido Novello, was appointed by Manfred. After the latter's death the Guelphs again took courage, and Guido Novello was forced to make concessions. Finally, in 1266, the people rose, and barricaded the streets with locked chains; Guido lost courage and on 4 November, accompanied by his cavalry, fled from the city. The popular government of the guild-masters or priors (*Capi delle arti*) was restored; Charles of Anjou, brother of St. Louis of France and King of Naples, was called in as peace-maker (*paciere*) in 1267, and was appointed *podestà*. Florence took again the lead in the Tuscan League, soon began hostilities against the few remaining Ghibelline towns, and with the help of Pope Nicholas III succeeded in ridding itself of the embarrassing protection of King Charles (1278). Nicholas also attempted to reconcile the two factions, and with some success. Peace was concluded (Cardinal Latini's peace) in 1280 and the exiles returned.


The government was then carried on by the *podestà* and the *capitano del popolo*, aided by fourteen *buoni uomini*, i. e. reputable citizens (eight Guelphs and six Ghibellines), afterwards replaced by three (later six) guild-masters, elected for two months, during which time they lived together in the palace of the Signoria. Nor could they be re-elected till after two years. There were, moreover, two councils, in which also the guild-masters took part. As a result of the assistance Florence gave Genoa in the war against Pisa (1284 and 1285) its territory was greatly extended. The victory at Campaldino (1289) over Ghibelline Arezzo established firmly the hegemony of Florence in Tuscany. In 1293 Pisa was obliged to grant Florence the right to trade within its walls. Fresh troubles, however, were in store for Florence. In 1293 the burghesses, exulting in their success, and acting under the influence of Giano della Bella, excluded the nobles from election to the office of guild-master. On the other hand, even the lesser guilds were allowed to retain a share in the government. To crown the insult a new magistrate, styled *gonfaloniere di giustizia*, was appointed to repress all abuses on the part of the nobles. The latter chose as their leader and defender Corso Donati; the burghesses gathered about the Cerchi family, whose members had grown rich in trade. The common people or artisan class sided with the Donati. In 1295 Giano della Bella was found guilty of violating his own ordinances, and was forced to leave Florence. The opposing factions united now with similar factions in Pistoia; that of the Cerchi with the *Bianchi* or Whites, that of the Donati with the *Neri* or Blacks. To restore peace the guild-masters in 1300 exiled the leaders of both factions; among them went Dante Alighieri. The leaders of the *Bianchi* were, however, soon recalled. Thereupon the *Neri* appealed to Boniface VIII, who persuaded Charles of Valois, brother of

Philip the Fair of France, to visit Florence as peace-maker. He at once recalled the Donati, or Neri, and set aside the remonstrances of the Bianchi, who were once more expelled, Dante among them. The exiles negotiated successively with Pisa, Bologna, and the chiefs of the Ghibelline party for assistance against the Neri; for a while they seemed to infuse new life into the Ghibelline cause. Before long, however, both parties split up into petty factions. In 1304 Benedict XI essayed in vain to restore peace by causing the recall of the exiles. The city then became the wretched scene of incendiary attempts, murders, and robberies. In 1306 the Ghibellines were once more driven out, thanks to Corso Donati (*Il Barone*), who aimed at tyrannical power and was soon hated by rich and poor alike. Aided by his father-in-law, Uguccione della Faggiuola, leader of the Ghibellines in Romagna, he attempted to overthrow the Signoria, accusing it of corruption and venality. The people assembled and the guild-masters condemned him as a traitor; he shut himself up in his fortress-like house, but soon afterwards fell from his horse and was killed (13 Sept., 1308).

In 1310 Emperor Henry VII invaded Italy, and obliged successively the cities of Lombardy to recognize his imperial authority. The Florentine exiles (particularly Dante in his Latin work "*De Monarchia*"), also the Pisans, ardently denounced Florence to the emperor as the hotbed of rebellion in Italy. Great was, therefore, the terror in Florence. All the exiles, save Dante, were recalled; but in order to have an ally against the emperor, whose overlordship they refused to acknowledge, they did homage to Robert, King of Naples. On his way to Rome (1312) Henry found the gates of Florence closed against him. He besieged it in vain, while Florentine money fanned the flames of further revolt in all the cities of Lombardy. On his return journey in October he was again obliged to abandon his siege of Florence. At Pisa he laid Florence under the ban of the empire, deprived it of all rights and privileges, and permitted the counterfeiting of its coinage, the famous "florins of San Giovanni". Pisa and Genoa were now eager for revenge on their commercial rival, when suddenly Henry died. The Pisans then elected as podestà the aforesaid exiled Florentine, Uguccione della Faggiuola, who became master of several other towns of which Lucca was the most important (1314). In 1315 he defeated the Florentines near Montecatini, and already beheld Florence in his power and himself master of Tuscany. Unfortunately, at this juncture Lucca, under Castruccio Castracane, rebelled against him and drove him out, nor was he ever able to return. Castruccio, himself a Ghibelline, was a menace to the liberty of the Tuscan League, always Guelph in character. After a guerrilla warfare of three years, the army of the League under Raimondo Cardona was defeated at Altopascio (1325), though the Florentines succeeded in making good their retreat. To ensure the safety of the city, Florence offered Charles, Duke of Calabria, son of King Robert of Naples, the Signoria for ten years. He came, and greatly curtailed the privileges of the citizens. Happily for Florence he died in 1329. Thereupon, Florence, having regained its freedom, remodelled its government, and created five magistracies: (1) guild-masters (*priori*) or supreme administrative power; (2) the Gonfalonieri charged with the military operations; (3) the *capitani di parte* (Guelphs, common people); (4) a board of trade (*Grudici di commercio*); (5) consuls for the guilds (*Consoli delle arti*). Moreover, two councils or assemblies were established, one composed of three hundred Guelphs and the humbler citizens, the other of various groups of rich and poor under the presidency of the podestà. These councils were renewed every four months.

LATER MEDIEVAL HISTORY.—It has always been a cause for wonder that amid so many political, econom-

ical, and military vicissitudes the prosperity of Florence never ceased to grow. Majestic churches arose amid the din of arms, and splendid palaces were built on all sides, though their owners must have been at all times uncertain of peaceful possession. At the date we have now reached forty-six towns and walled *castelli*, among them Fiesole and Empoli, acknowledged the authority of Florence, and every year its mint turned out between 350,000 and 400,000 gold florins. Its coinage was the choicest and most reliable in Europe. The receipts of its exchequer were greater than those of the Kings of Sicily and Aragon. Merchants from Florence thronged the markets of the known world, and established banks wherever they went. In the city itself there were 110 churches. It openly




FACADE OF THE CATHEDRAL (S. MARIA DEL FIORE), FLORENCE  
Designed by Brunellesco

aimed at sovereignty over all Tuscany. Arms and money won for it Pistoia (1329) and Arezzo (1336). It aided Venice (1338) against Mastino della Scala, a peril to Florence since he became master of Lucca. Knowing well the commercial greed of the Florentines, Mastino, to free himself from their opposition, offered to sell them Lucca. But the Pisans could not allow their ancient enemy to come so near; they took up arms, captured Lucca, and defeated the Florentines at La Ghiaia (1341). Seeing now that their militia needed a skilful leader, the Florentines offered the command and a limited dictatorship, first to Jacopo Gabrielli d'Agabio, and when he proved unfit, to a French freebooter, Gauthier de Brienne (1342), who styled himself Duke of Athens on the strength of his descent from the dukes of Achaia. He played his part so skilfully that he was proclaimed Signore for life. In this way Florence imitated most other Italian cities, which in their weariness of popular government had by this time chosen princes to rule over them. Gauthier de Brienne, however, became despotic, favoured the nobility and the populace (always allies in Florence), and harassed the rich middle-class families (Altoviti, Medici, Rucellai, Ricci). The populace soon tired of him, and joined by the peasants (*genti del contado*), they raised the cry of "liberty" on 26 July, 1343. Gauthier's soldiers were slain, and he was forced to leave the city. But the newly recovered liberty of Florence was dearly bought. Its subject

towns (Arezzo, Colle di Val d'Elsa, and San Gemini-ano) declared themselves independent; Pistoia joined with Pisa; Ottaviano de' Belforti was lord of Volterra. There was now an interval of peace, during which the greater guilds (known as the *popolo grasso*) strove gradually to restrict the rights of the lesser guilds, which in the end found themselves shut out from all public offices. Aided by the populace they threatened rebellion, and secured thus the abolition of the more onerous laws.

It was now the turn of the humblest classes, hitherto without political rights. Clearly they had reaped no advantage from their support of the small bourgeoisie, and so they resolved to resort to arms in their own behalf. Thus came about the revolution of the *Ciompi* (1378), so called from the wool carders (*ciompi*), who under Michele di Lando seized the palace of the Signoria, and proclaimed their leader *gonfaloniere di giustizia*.



BAPTISTERY OF S. GIOVANNI, FLORENCE

They instituted three new guilds in which all artisans were to be inscribed, and which had equal civil rights with the other guilds. Michele, fearing that the popular tumult would end in a restoration of the Signoria, went over to the burgesses; after a sanguinary conflict the *Ciompi* were put to flight. The rich burgesses were now more firmly established than before, which

did not remove the discontent of the lesser guilds and the populace. This deep discontent was the source of the brilliant fortune of Giovanni de' Medici, son of Bicci, the richest of the Florentine bankers.

Apropos of this world-famous name it may be said here that the scope of this article permits only a brief reference to the great influence of medieval Florence as an industrial, commercial, and financial centre. In the woollen industry it was easily foremost, particularly in the dyeing and final preparation of the manufactured goods. Its banking houses were famous through all Europe, and had for clients not only a multitude of private individuals, but also kings and popes. As financial agents of the latter, the *mercatores papæ*, the Florentines were to be found in all the chief national centres, and exercised no little influence. (See H. de B. Gibbins, "History of Commerce in Europe", London, 1892; Peruzzi, "Storia del commercio e dei banchieri di Firenze in tutto il mondo da 1200 fino a 1345", Florence, 1868; Toniolo, "Dei rimoti fattori della potenza economica di Firenze nel medio ev", Milan, 1882; G. Buonazia, "L'arte della lana" in "Nuova Antologia", 1870, XIII, 327-425.)

To take up the thread of our narrative, several events of interest had meanwhile occurred. In 1355 Emperor Charles III appeared before Florence. The city had become more cautious as it grew in wealth and did not, therefore, venture to resist him; it seemed wiser to purchase, with gold and a nominal submission, entailing as few obligations as possible, present security and actual independence. The citizens swore allegiance on the understanding that the emperor would ratify the laws made or to be made in Florence; that the members of the Signoria (elected by the citizens) should be, *ipso facto*, vicars imperial; that neither the emperor himself nor any envoy of his should enter the town; that he should be content with

the payment of 100,000 florins, in lieu of all past claims (*regalia*), and a promise of 4000 florins annually during his life. The Florentines could hardly ask more complete autonomy. The populace, it is true, opposed even this nominal submission, but it was explained to them that their liberties were untouched. In 1360 Volterra returned again to Florence, and war with Pisa followed. Pisa sought the help of Bernabò Visconti; after a prolonged conflict the Florentines won the decisive battle of San Savino (1364), and peace was declared. In 1375 the inquisitor, Fra Pietro d'Aquila, having exceeded his powers, the Signoria restricted his authority and conferred on the ordinary civil courts jurisdiction in all criminal cases of ecclesiastics. This displeased the pope; and in consequence Guillaume de Noelle, papal legate at Bologna, directed against Tuscany the band of mercenaries known as the "White Company" (*Compagnia Bianca*). Florence had hitherto been undeviatingly faithful to the Holy See; it now began to rouse against the pope, not only the cities of Romagna and the Marches, but even Rome itself. Eighty cities joined in the movement. Gregory XI thereupon placed Florence under interdict (1376), and allowed anyone to lay hands on the goods and persons of the Florentines. Nor was this a mere threat; the Florentine merchants in England were obliged to return to Florence, leaving their property behind them. Not even the intercession of St. Catharine of Siena, who went to Avignon for the purpose, could win pardon for the city. It was only in 1378, after the Western Schism had begun, that Urban VI absolved the Florentines. Even then the people compelled the offending magistrates to give ample satisfaction to the pope (Gherardi, *La guerra de' Fiorentini con papa Gregorio XI, detta guerra degli otto santi*, Florence, 1869). Florence now beheld with no little concern the political progress of Gian Galeazzo Visconti, Lord of Milan. By the acquisition of Pisa he had gained a coveted foothold in Tuscany. The Florentines sided with his numerous enemies, all of whom were anxious to prevent the formation of an Italian sole monarchy. Visconti was victorious, but he died in 1402, whereupon Florence at once laid siege to Pisa. In 1405 Giovanni Maria Visconti sold the town to the Florentines for 200,000 florins; but the Pisans continued to defend their city, and it was not till 1406 that Gino Capponi captured it. A revolt that broke out soon after the surrender was repressed with great severity. The purchase (1421) of the port of Leghorn from Genoa for 100,000 gold florins gave Florence at last a free passage to the sea, nor did the citizens long delay to compete with Venice and Genoa for the trade of the African and Levantine coasts (1421). In 1415 the new constitutions of the republic were promulgated. They were drawn up by the famous jurists Paolo di Castro and Bartolommeo Volpi of the University of Florence.


THE MEDICI.—Naturally enough, these numerous wars were very costly. Consequently early in the fifteenth century the taxes increased greatly and with them the popular discontent, despite the strongly democratic character of the city government. Certain families now began to assume a certain prominence. Maso degli Albizzi was captain of the people for thirty years; after his death other families sought the leadership. Giovanni di Bicci de' Medici, to bring about a more equal distribution of taxation, proposed the *catasto*, i. e. an income-tax. This made him very popular and he was proclaimed *Gonfaloniere* for life (1421). His son Cosimo (d. 1464) inherited his immense riches and popularity, but his generosity brought him under suspicion. The chief men of the greater guilds, and especially the Albizzi family, charged him with a desire to overthrow the government and he was exiled to Padua (1433). In 1434 the new Signoria, favourable to Cosimo, recalled him and gave him the proud title of *Pater Patriæ*, i. e. father

of his country. In 1440 the Albizzi were outlawed, and Cosimo found his path clear. He scrupulously retained the old form of government, and refrained from all arbitrary measures. He was open-handed, built palaces and villas, also churches (San Marco, San Lorenzo); his costly and rare library was open to all; he patronized scholars and encouraged the arts. With him began the golden age of the Medici. The republic now annexed the district of Casentino, taken from the Visconti at the Peace of Gavriana (1441). Cosimo's son Piero was by no means equal to his father; nevertheless the happy ending of the war against Venice, the former ally of Florence, shed glory on the Medici name. Piero died in 1469, whereupon his sons Lorenzo and Giuliano were created "princes of the State" (*principi dello Stato*). In 1478 occurred the conspiracy of the Pazzi, to whose ambitious plans Lorenzo was an obstacle. A plot was formed to kill the two Medici brothers in the cathedral on Easter Sunday; Giuliano fell, but Lorenzo escaped. The authors of the plot, among them Francesco Salviati, Archbishop of Pisa, perished at the hands of the angry populace. Sixtus IV, whose nephew Girolamo Riario was also an accomplice, laid the town under an interdict because of the murder of Salviati and the Pazzi, and supported by the King of Naples threatened to go to war. Hostilities had actually begun, when Lorenzo set out for Naples and by his diplomatic tact induced King Alfonso to make peace (1480); this obliged the pope also to come to terms. Meanwhile, despite his almost unlimited influence, Lorenzo refused to be anything else than the foremost citizen of Florence. With the exception of Siena, all Tuscany now acknowledged the rule of Florence and offered the spectacle of an extensive principality governed by a republic of free and equal citizens. Lorenzo died in 1492. (See the life of Lorenzo by Roscoe, Liverpool, 1795, and often reprinted; also the German life by A. von Reumont, Leipzig, 1874, and Eng. tr. by R. Harrison, London, 1876.)

Lorenzo was succeeded by his son, Piero, but he did not long retain popularity, especially after he had ceded the fortresses of Pietra Santa and Pontremoli to Charles VIII of France, who entered Italy with the avowed purpose of overthrowing the Aragonese dominion in Naples. The popular displeasure reached its acme when Piero pawned the towns of Pisa and Leghorn to the French king. He was driven out and the former republican government restored. Charles VIII entered Florence and endeavoured to have Piero's promises honoured; but the firmness of Piero Capponi and a threatened uprising of the people forced the French king to quit Tuscany (1494). There were at that time three parties in Florence: the Medicean party, known as the Paleschi (from the *palle* or little balls in the Medici coat of arms), the oligarchic republicans, called the Arrabiati (enraged), and the democrats or Piagnoni (weepers). The last had for chief the Dominican friar, Girolamo Savonarola of Ferrara, who hoped by their aid to restore in Florence piety and a Christian discipline of life, i. e. to establish in the city the Kingdom of Christ. In fact, Christ was publicly proclaimed Lord or *Signore* of Florence (*Rex populi Florentini*). (For the irreligious and rationalistic elements in the city at this period see GUICCIARDINI and MACHIAVELLI). Savonarola's intemperate speeches were the occasion of his excommunication, and in 1498 he was publicly burned. The Arrabiati were then in power. In 1512 Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici purchased at a great price the support of the Spanish captain Cardona and sent him to Florence to demand the return of the Medici. Fearing worse evils the people consented, and Lorenzo II, son of Piero, was recalled as prince. Cardinal Giovanni, however, kept the reins of power in his own hands. As Leo X he sent thither Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (the natural son of Giuliano), afterwards Clement VII. The family

had now reached the acme of its power and prestige. The sack of Rome (1527) and the misfortunes of Clement VII caused a third exile of the Medici. Ippolito and Alessandro, cousins of the pope, were driven out.

In the peace concluded between Emperor Charles V and Clement VII it was agreed that the Medici rule should be restored in Florence. The citizens, however, would not listen to this, and prepared for resistance. Their army was defeated at Gavinana (1530) through the treachery of their general, Malatesta Baglioni. A treaty was then made with the emperor, Florence paid a heavy war-indemnity and recalled the exiles, and the pope granted a free amnesty. On 5 July, 1531, Alessandro de' Medici returned and took the title of Duke, promising allegiance to the emperor. Clement VII dictated a new constitution, in which among other things the distinction between the greater and the lesser guilds was removed. Alessandro was a man of dissolute habits, and was stabbed to death by a distant relative, Lorenzino (1536), no better, but more clever, than Alessandro. The murderer fled at once from Florence. The party of Alessandro now offered the ducal office to Cosimo de' Medici, son of Giovanni delle Bande Nere. He avenged the death of Alessan-



SPEDALE DEGLI INNOCENTI, FLORENCE  
Designed by Brunellesco

dro and finally transformed the government into an absolute principality. This he did by gradually equalizing the political status of the inhabitants of Florence and of the subject cities and districts. This is the last stage in the political history of Florence as a distinct state; henceforth the political history of the city is that of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany. When the new Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed in 1861 Florence was chosen as the seat of government and remained such till 1871.

Few cities have affected more profoundly the course of civilization. In many ways mankind has drawn from Florence its highest inspiration. Among the great poets Dante was a Florentine, while Petrarch and Boccaccio were sons of Florentines. Among the great painters Giotto found in Florence patronage and a proper field for his genius. Fra Angelico (Giovanni da Fiesole) was a Florentine, likewise Masaccio and Donatello. Unrivalled sculptors, like Lorenzo Ghiberti and Michelangelo, architects like Brunelleschi, universal savants like Leone Battista Alberti, shine like brilliant gems in the city's diadem of fame, and mark in some respects the highest attainments of humanity. Florence was long the chief centre of the Renaissance, the leaders of which were either citizens or welcome guests of that city, e. g. Michael Chrysoloras, Giovanni Argirpulo, Leonardo Bruni, Cristoforo Landolfo, Niccolò Niccoli, Pico della Mirandola, and others scarcely less distinguished for their devotion to Greek and Latin literature, philosophy, art, and antiquities. It was capable at the same time of an incredible enthusiasm for Plato, whom men like Marsilio Ficino wished to

see canonized (Sieveking, *Gesch. der platon. Akademie zu Florenz*, Göttingen, 1812), and of an equally passionate zeal for the restoration of all things in Christ (see SAVONAROLA). For its rôle in the restoration and development of classical literary taste, both Greek and Latin, see HUMANISM, and for its share in the growth of the fine arts see RENAISSANCE.

INSTITUTIONS AND BUILDINGS.—Florence is the seat of a university, and possesses also an institute of social science, conservatory of music, a botanical garden, and an observatory (astronomical, meteorological, and seismological). Various scientific societies have their centres there, e. g. the Accademia della Crusca, whose famous Italian dictionary is one of the glories of the city. The city has four libraries containing many rare manuscripts. The Biblioteca Nazionale, one of the largest and most important in Europe, founded in 1861 by merger of the famous Magliabecchiana and the former (Pitti) Bibliotheca Palatina; the Laurentiana, founded in 1444 by Cosimo de' Medici; the Marucelliana, containing a collection of brasses; the Riccardiana. The State archives are the most important in Italy. Various art collections are: the Uffizi Gallery; the Pitti, in the old palace of the grand dukes; the archaeological museum with its fine collection of coins and tapestries; the Museum of the Duomo or cathedral; the Accademia delle belle arti (Academy of the Fine Arts); and the Casa Buonarroti (house of Michelangelo). The charitable institutions include: the Great Hospital (*Arcispedale*) of Santa Maria Nuova (1800 beds), founded in 1285 by Falco Portinari, the father of Dante's Beatrice; the Hospital of the Innocents, or Foundling Hospital (1421); a home for the blind; an insane asylum, and many private charities.

Among the numerous charitable works of Florence the most popularly known is that of the "Confraternità della Misericordia", founded in 1244, and attached to the oratory of that name close by the cathedral. Its members belong to all classes of Florentine society, the highest as well as the lowest, and are bound to quit all work or occupation at the sound of the oratory bell, and hasten to any scene of accident, violent illness, sudden death, and the like. The costume of the brotherhood is a rough black robe and girdle, with a hood that completely covers the head except two loopholes for the eyes. Thus attired, a little group may frequently be seen hastening through the streets of Florence, bearing on their shoulders the sick or the dead to the specific institution that is to care for them (Bakouine, "La miséricorde à Florence" in "Le Correspondant", 1884, 805-26).

The chief industries are the manufacture of majolica ware, the copying of art works and their sale, also the manufacture of felt and straw hats.

The more noted of the public squares of Florence are the Piazza della Signoria (Palazzo Vecchio, Loggia de' Lanzi, and the historic fountain by Ammannati); the Piazza del Duomo; the Piazza di Santa Croce, with its monument to Dante; the Piazza di Santa Maria Novella, adorned by two obelisks. Among the famous churches of Florence are the following: Santa Maria del Fiore, otherwise the Duomo or cathedral, begun in 1296 by Arnolfo del Cambio, consecrated in 1436 by Eugene IV, and called *del Fiore* (of the flower), either in reference to the name of the city or to the municipal arms, a red lily on a white ground. It is about 140 yards long, and badly proportioned. The admirable Campanile was begun by Giotto, but finished by Taddeo Gaddi (1334-36). The majestic dome is by Brunelleschi (1420) and furnished inspiration to Michelangelo for the dome of St. Peter's. The façade was not completed until 1887; the bronze doors are also a work of recent date. The Baptistery of San Giovanni dates from the seventh century; it was remodelled in 1190, again in the fifteenth century, and is octagonal in form. San Giovanni was the old cathed-

dral of Florence, around which in Lombard times (seventh and eighth centuries) the city grew up. Some have maintained that it rises on the site of an ancient temple of Mars. Dante mentions it twice with veneration in the *Paradiso* (xv, 136-37; xvi, 25-27). The three massive bronze doors of the Baptistery are unparalleled in the world; one of them is the work of Andrea Pisano (1330), the remaining two are the masterpieces of Lorenzo Ghiberti (1403-47), and were declared by Michelangelo fit to serve as the gates of paradise. Santa Croce (Franciscans) is a Gothic church (1294-1442), with frescoes by Giotto and his school. It is a kind of national Pantheon, and contains monuments to many illustrious Italians. In the cloister stands the chapel of the Pazzi family, the work of Brunelleschi, with many rich friezes by the della Robbia. (Ozanam, "Sainte Croix de Florence" in "Poètes franciscains ital.", Paris, 1852, 273-80). Santa Maria Novella, the Dominican counterpart of Santa Croce, begun in 1278 by Fra Jacopo Talenti da Nipozzano, is also a Gothic edifice. The façade is by Leone Battista Alberti. The church contains frescoes by Orcagna, Ghirlandaio, and Fra Lippo Lippi. In its Ruccellai chapel is the famous Madonna of Cimabue. Or San Michele, a unique artistic monument, was meant originally, it is said, for a corn-market, but was remodelled in 1336. On the exterior walls are to be seen admirable statues of the patron saints of the various Florentine guilds, the work of Verrocchio, Donatello, Ghiberti, and others. San Lorenzo, dedicated in 393 under the holy bishop Zanobius by St. Ambrose, with a sermon yet preserved (P. L., XIV, 107), was altered to its present shape (1421-61) by Brunelleschi and Manetti at the instance of Cosimo de' Medici. It contains in its sacristies (*Nuova, Vecchia*) tombs of the Medici by Verrocchio, and more famous ones by Michelangelo. San Marco (1290), with its adjacent convent decorated in fresco by Fra Angelico was the home also of Fra Bartolommeo della Porta, and of Savonarola. Santissima Trinità contains frescoes by Ghirlandaio. Santa Maria del Carmine, contains the Brancacci Chapel, with frescoes by Masaccio, Masolino, and Filippino Lippi. Other monumental or historic churches are the Santissima Annunziata (mother-house of the Servites) and the Renaissance church of Ognissanti (Franciscan).

Several Benedictine abbeys have had much to do with the ecclesiastical history of Florence. Among them are San Miniato, on the Arno, about twenty-one miles from Florence, restored in the eleventh century, since the seventeenth century an episcopal see (Capelletti, "Chiese d'Italia", Venice, 1862, XVII, 305-47; Rondoni, "Memorie storiche di San Miniato", Venice, 1877, p. 1148); La Badia di Santa Maria, founded in 977 (Galletti, *Ragionamenti dell'origine e de' primi tempi della Badia Fiorentina*, Rome, 1773); San Salvatore a Settimo, founded in 988; Vallombrosa founded in 1039 by St. John Gualbert. All of these being within easy reach of the city, exercised strong religious influence, particularly in the long conflict between the Church and the Empire. Besides the public buildings already mentioned, we may note the Loggia del Bigallo, the Palazzo del Podestà (1255) now used as a museum, the Palazzo Strozzi, Palazzo Riccardi, Palazzo Rucellai, and several other private edifices of architectural and historic interest.

EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION.—St. Frontinus is said by local tradition to have been the first bishop and a disciple of St. Peter. In the Decian persecution St. Miniatius (San Miniato) is said to have suffered martyrdom. It is to him that is dedicated the famous church of the same name on the hill overlooking the city. It has been suggested that Miniatius is but a form of Minias (Mena), the name of a saint who suffered at Alexandria. In 313 we find Bishop Felix mentioned as present that year at a Roman synod. About 400 we meet with the above-mentioned St. Zanobius. In the



following centuries Florence sank into obscurity, and little is known of its civil or ecclesiastical life. With St. Reparatus (fl. 679), the patron of the Duomo, begins the unbroken line of episcopal succession. Among the best known of its medieval bishops are Gerardo, later Pope Nicholas II and author (1059) of the famous decree on papal elections; Pietro of Pavia, whom another Florentine, San Pietro Aldobrandini (Petrus Igneus), convicted of simony (1062); Ranieri (1101), who preached that Antichrist had already come (Mansi, Suppl. Conc., II, 217); Ardengho, under whom was fought (1245) a pitched battle with the Patarini or Catharist heretics; Antonio Orso (1309), who roused all Florence, and even his clergy, against the German Emperor Henry VII; Angelo Acciaiuoli (1383), a zealous worker for the extinction of the Western Schism; Francesco Zabarella (1410), cardinal, canonist, and philosopher, prominent at the Council of Constance. When in 1434 the see became vacant, Pope Eugene IV did it the honour to rule it in person. Other archbishops of Florence were Cardinal Giovanni Vitelleschi, captain of Eugene IV's army; the Dominican St. Antoninus Forcellioni, d. 1459; Cosimo de' Pazzi (1508), a learned humanist and philosopher; Antonio Martini, translator of the Bible into Italian (1781). In 1809 Napoleon, to the great dissatisfaction of the diocese, imposed on Florence as its archbishop Monsignor d'Osmond, Bishop of Nancy. To Eugenio Ceccoli (1874-88) we owe an (unfinished) "Storia del concilio ecumenico Vaticano" (Rome, 1872-79). Archbishop Alfonso Maria Mistrangelo, of the Society of the Pious Schools (*Scuole Pie*), was born at Savona, in 1852, and transferred (19 June, 1899) from Pontremoli to Florence.

*Saints and Popes.*—Florence is the mother of many saints. Besides those already mentioned, there are Bl. Uberto degli Uberti, Bl. Luca Mongoli, Bl. Domenico Bianchi, Bl. Antonio Balducci, St. Catherine de' Ricci, St. Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi, and St. Philip Neri. The Florentine popes are: Leo X (1513-21), Clement VII (1523-34), Clement VIII (1592-1605), Leo XI (1605), Urban VIII (1623-44), and Clement XII (1730-40).

Since 1420 Florence has been an archdiocese; its suffragan sees are: Borgo San Sepolcro, Colle di Val d'Elsa, Fiesole, San Miniato, Modigliana, and the united Dioceses of Pistoia and Prato. The Archdiocese of Florence has 800 secular and 336 regular clergy; 479 parishes and 1900 churches, chapels, and oratories; 200 theological students; 44 monasteries (men) and 80 convents (women). In 1907 the population of the archdiocese, almost exclusively Catholic, was 500,000.

The literature of this subject is so extensive that only a few titles can be here given. General bibliographies will be found in CHEVALIER *Topo-bibl.* (Paris, 1894-), s. v., and P. BIGAZZI, *Firenze e dintorni, manuale bibliografico-biografico* (Florence, 1893), 360. ECCLESIASTICAL:—CAPPELLI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1861), XVI, 407-12; CERRACHINI, *Cronologia sacra dei vescovi ed arcivescovi di Firenze* (Florence, 1716); LAMIO, *Sacra Ecc. Florentina Monumenta* (Florence, 1738); GORI, *Hagiologium Ecc. Florent.* (Florence, 1787); RICHA, *Notizie storiche delle chiese fiorentine* (Florence, 1754-62); COCCHI, *Le chiese di Firenze dal secolo IV fino al secolo XX* (Florence, 1903). The reader may also consult the seventeenth-century documentary work of UGHELLI, *Italia Sacra*, III, 14 sqq., and F. M. FIORENTINI, *Hetrusca pietatis origines* (Lucca, 1701); also CIANFAGNI (ed. MORENI), *Memorie storiche della Ambrosiana basilica di San Lorenzo* (Florence, 1804, 1816, 17); LUMACHI, *Memorie storiche dell' antica basilica di San Giovanni di Firenze* (Florence, 1782) and G. BERNI, *Memorie storiche dell' antica basilica di San Giovanni di Firenze* (Florence, 1886); GODKIN, *The Monastery of San Marco in Florence* (London, 1887). For the hospitals and other charitable works of Florence, see PASSERINI, *Storia degli stabilimenti di beneficenza della città di Firenze* (Florence, 1853).—For the ecclesiastical sciences in Florence see CERRACHINI, *Catalogo generale de' teologi della eccelsa univ. Fiorentina* (Florence, 1725); IDEM, *Fasti teologici* (Florence, 1738); SCHIFF, *L'Università degli studi in Firenze* (Bologna, 1887).

CIVIL:—Florentine historiography is very rich, and may best be studied in special introductory works like BALZANI, *Le Cronache d'Italia* (Milan, 1884), also in Eng. tr., S. P. C. K.; cf. HEGEL, *Ueber die Anfänge der florentinischen Geschichtsschreibung* in SYBEL, *Hist. Zeitschrift* (1876), XXXV, 32-63; also the

pertinent writings of SCHEFFER-BOICHOEST, e. g. *Florentiner Studien* (Leipzig, 1873). For the *Historie Florentine*, or *Chronica* of GIOVANNI VILLANI (d. 1348), see the Turin edition (1879), and for the still more celebrated *Historie Fiorentine, libri VIII* of MACHIAVELLI see the PASSERINI edition (Florence, 1873), and the Eng. tr. in Bohn's Standard Library (1847). Among the modern comprehensive histories of Florence may be mentioned: CAPPONI, *Storia della repubblica fiorentina* (3d ed., Florence, 1886); VILLARI, *Storia di Firenze* (Milan, 1890); IDEM, *I due primi secoli della storia di Firenze* (Florence, 1893-98); PERRENS, *Histoire de Florence depuis ses origines jusqu'à la domination des Médici* (9 vols., Paris, 1877-90); HARTWIG, *Quellen und Forschungen zur älteren Geschichte der Stadt Florenz* (Marburg, 1878). Much important material, both ecclesiastical and civil, for the medieval history of Florence, is found in MURATORI's famous collection of medieval Italian annals and chronicles: *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, 28 folio volumes (Milan, 1723-1751; new ed. small quarto, 1900 sqq.).

MISCELLANEOUS:—YRIARTE, *Florence, l'histoire, les Médicis, les humanistes, les lettres, les arts* (Paris, 1880), tr. (London, 1882); KLEINPAUL, *Florenz in Wort und Bild* (Leipzig, 1888); MORENI, *Notizie storiche dei contorni di Firenze* (Florence, 1790-96); OLIPHANT, *The Makers of Florence, Dante, Giotto, Savonarola and their City* (London, 1880); E. M. CLERKE, *Florence in the Time of Dante in Dublin Review* (1879), LXXXV, 279. The writings of RUSKIN (1819-1900) on Italian art abound with studies and impressions of the Florentine artists. SYMONDS, *The Age of the Renaissance* (London, 1882-) deals at great length with the literary and political figures of Florentine history in the fifteenth century; in ecclesiastical matters he is not unfrequently prejudiced, insular, and unduly harsh. The German writings of VON REUMONT have also done much to make better known the medieval influence and prestige of the great city by the Arno.

U. BENIGNI.

COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, the Seventeenth Ecumenical Council, was, correctly speaking, the continuation of the Council of Ferrara, transferred to the Tuscan capital because of the pest, or, indeed, a continuation of the Council of Basle, which was convoked in 1431 by Martin V. In the end the last-named assembly became a revolutionary *conciliabulum*, and is to be judged variously, according as we consider the manner of its convocation, its membership, or its results. Generally, however, it is ranked as an oecumenical council until the decree of dissolution in 1437. After its transfer to Ferrara, the first session of the council was held 10 Jan., 1438. Eugene IV proclaimed it the regular continuation of the Council of Basle, and hence its oecumenical character is admitted by all.

The Council of Constance (1414-18) had seen the growth of a fatal theory, based on the writings of William Durandus (Guillaume Durant), John of Paris, Marsiglio of Padua, and William of Occam, i. e. the conciliar theory that proclaimed the superiority of the council over the pope. It was the outcome of much previous conflict and embitterment; was hastily voted in a time of angry confusion by an incompetent body; and, besides leading eventually to the deplorable articles of the "Declaratio Cleri Gallicani" (see GALLICANISM), almost provoked at the time new schisms. Influenced by this theory, the members of the Council of Constance promulgated in the thirty-fifth general session (9 Oct., 1417) five decrees, the first being the famous decree known as "Frequens", according to which an oecumenical council should be held every ten years. In other words, the council was henceforth to be a permanent, indispensable institution, that is, a kind of religious parliament meeting at regular intervals, and including amongst its members the ambassadors of Catholic sovereigns; hence the ancient papal monarchy, elective but absolute, was to give way to a constitutional oligarchy.

While Martin V, naturally enough, refused to recognize these decrees, he was unable to make headway openly against a movement which he considered fatal. In accordance, therefore, with the decree "Frequens" he convoked an oecumenical council at Pavia for 1423, and later, yielding to popular opinion, which even many cardinals countenanced, summoned a new council at Basle to settle the difficulties raised by the anti-Hussite wars. A Bull of 1 Feb., 1431, named as president of the council Giuliano Cesarini, Cardinal of Sant' Angelo, whom the pope had sent to Germany to



preach a crusade against the Hussites. Martin V died suddenly (20 Feb., 1431), before the Bull of convocation and the legate faculties reached Cesarini. However, the new pope, Eugene IV (Gabriele Condolmieri), confirmed the acts of his predecessor with the reservation that further events might cause him to revoke his decision. He referred probably to the reunion of the Greek Church with Rome, discussed between Martin V and the Byzantine emperor (John Palæologus), but put off by reason of the pope's death. Eugene IV laboured most earnestly for reunion, which he was destined to see accomplished in the Council of Ferrara-Florence. The Council of Basle had begun in a rather burlesque way. Canon Beaupère of Besançon, who had been sent from Basle to Rome, gave the pope an unfavourable and exaggerated account of the temper of the people of Basle and its environs. Eugene IV thereupon dissolved the council before the close of 1431, and convoked it anew at Bologna for the summer of 1433, providing at the same time for the participation of the Greeks. Cesarini, however, had already opened the council at Basle, and now insisted vigorously that the aforesaid papal act should be withdrawn. Yielding to the aggressive attitude of the Basle assembly, whose members proclaimed anew the conciliar theory, Eugene IV gradually modified his attitude towards them, and exhibited in general, throughout these painful dissensions, a very conciliatory temper.

Many reform-decrees were promulgated by the council, and, though never executed, contributed towards the final rupture. Ultimately, the unskilful negotiations of the council with the Greeks on the question of reunion moved Eugene IV to transfer it to Ferrara. The embassy sent from Basle to Constantinople (1435), Giovanni di Ragusa, Heinrich Henger, and Simon Fréron, insisted obstinately on holding at Basle the council which was to promote the union of the two Churches, but in this matter the Byzantine Emperor refused to give way. With all the Greeks he wished the council to take place in some Italian city near the sea, preferably in Southern Italy. At Basle the majority insisted, despite the Greeks, that the council of reunion should be convoked at Avignon, but a minority sided with the Greeks and was by them recognized as the true council. Hereupon Eugene IV approved the action of the minority (29 May, 1437), and for this was summoned to appear before the council. He replied by dissolving it on 18 September. Wearing of the obstinacy of the majority at Basle, Cardinal Cesarini and his adherents then quitted the city and went to Ferrara, whither Eugene IV, as stated above, had transferred the council by decree of 30 December, 1437, or 1 January, 1438.


The Ferrara Council opened on 8 January, 1438, under the presidency of Cardinal Niccolò Albergati, whom the pope had commissioned to represent him until he could appear in person. It had, of course, no other objects than those of Basle, i. e. reunion of the Churches, reforms, and the restoration of peace between Christian peoples. The first session of the council took place 10 January, 1438. It declared the Council of Basle transferred to Ferrara, and annulled in advance any and all future decrees of the Basle assembly. When Eugene IV heard that the Greeks were nearing the coast of Italy, he set off (24 January) for Ferrara and three days later made his solemn entry into the city. The manner of voting was first discussed by the members of the council. Should it be, as at Constance, by nations (*nationes*), or by committees (*commissiones*)? It was finally decided to divide the members into three estates: (1) the cardinals, archbishops, and bishops; (2) the abbots and prelates; (3) the doctors and other members. In order that the vote of any estate might count, it was resolved that a majority of two-thirds should be required, and it was hoped that this provision would remove all pos-

sibility of the recurrence of the regrettable dissensions at Constance. At the second public session (15 February) these decrees were promulgated, and the pope excommunicated the members of the Basle assembly, which still continued to sit. The Greeks soon appeared at Ferrara, headed by Emperor John Palæologus and Joasaph, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and numbered about seven hundred. The solemn sessions of the council began on 9 April, 1438, and were held in the cathedral of Ferrara under the presidency of the pope. On the Gospel side of the altar rose the (unoccupied) throne of the Western Emperor (Sigismund of Luxemburg), who had died only a month previously; on the Epistle side was placed the throne of the Greek Emperor. Besides the emperor and his brother Demetrius, there were present, on the part of the Greeks, Joasaph, the Patriarch of Constantinople; Antonius, the Metropolitan of Heraclea; Gregory Hamma, the Protosyncellus of Constantinople (the last two representing the Patriarch of Alexandria); Marcus Eugenius of Ephesus; Isidore of Kiev (representing the Patriarch of Antioch); Dionysius, Bishop of Sardes (representing the Patriarch of Jerusalem); Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicæa; Balsamon, the chief chartophylax; Syropoulos, the chief ecclesiarch, and the Bishops of Monembasia, Lacedæmon, and Anchielo. In the discussions the Latins were represented principally by Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini and Cardinal Niccolò Albergati; Andrew, Archbishop of Rhodes; the Bishop of Forlì; the Dominican John of Turrecremata; and Giovanni di Ragusa, provincial of Lombardy.

Preliminary discussions brought out the main points of difference between the Greeks and the Latins, viz. the Procession of the Holy Spirit, the azymes, purgatory, and the primacy. During these preliminaries the zeal and good intentions of the Greek Emperor were evident. Serious discussion began apropos of the doctrine of purgatory. Cesarini and Turrecremata were the chief Latin speakers, the latter in particular engaging in a violent discussion with Marcus Eugenius. Bessarion, speaking for the Greeks, made clear the divergency of opinion existing among the Greeks themselves on the question of purgatory. This stage of the discussion closed on 17 July, whereupon the council rested for a time, and the Greek Emperor took advantage of the respite to join eagerly in the pleasures of the chase with the Duke of Ferrara.

When the council met again (8 Oct., 1438), the chief (indeed, thenceforth the only) subject of discussion was the *Filioque*. The Greeks were represented by Bessarion, Marcus Eugenius, Isidore of Kiev, Gemistus Plethon, Balsamon, and Xantopulos; on the Latin side were Cardinals Cesarini and Niccolò Albergati, the Archbishop of Rhodes, the Bishop of Forlì, and Giovanni di Ragusa. In this and the following fourteen sessions, the *Filioque* was the sole subject of discussion. In the fifteenth session it became clear that the Greeks were unwilling to consent to the insertion of this expression in the Creed, although it was imperative for the good of the church and as a safeguard against future heresies. Many Greeks began to despair of realizing the projected union and spoke of returning to Constantinople. To this the emperor would not listen; he still hoped for a reconciliation, and in the end succeeded in appeasing the heated spirits of his partisans. Eugene IV now announced his intention of transferring the council to Florence, in consequence of pecuniary straits and the outbreak of the pest at Ferrara. Many Latins had already died, and of the Greeks the Metropolitan of Sardis and the entire household of Isidore of Kiev were attacked by the disease. The Greeks finally consented to the transfer, and in the sixteenth and last session at Ferrara the papal Bull was read, in both Latin and Greek, by which the council was transferred to Florence (January, 1439).

The seventeenth session of the council (the first



THE CATHEDRAL OF FLORENCE



at Florence) took place in the papal palace on 26 February. In nine consecutive sessions, the Filioque was the chief matter of discussion. In the last session but one (twenty-fourth of Ferrara, eighth of Florence) Giovanni di Ragusa set forth clearly the Latin doctrine in the following terms: "The Latin Church recognizes but one principle, one cause of the Holy Spirit, namely, the Father. It is from the Father that the Son holds his place in the 'Procession' of the Holy Ghost. It is in this sense that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, but He proceeds also from the Son." In the last session, the same theologian again expounded the doctrine, after which the public sessions were closed at the request of the Greeks, as it seemed useless to prolong further the theological discussions. At this juncture began the active efforts of Isidore of Kiev, and, as the result of further parleys, Eugene IV submitted four propositions summing up the result of the previous discussion and exposing the weakness of the attitude of the Greeks. As the latter were loath to admit defeat, Cardinal Bessarion, in a special meeting of the Greeks, on 13 and 14 April, 1439, delivered his famous discourse in favour of reunion, and was supported by Georgius Scholarius. Both parties now met again, after which, to put an end to all equivocation, the Latins drew up and read a declaration of their faith in which they stated that they did not admit two "principia" in the Trinity, but only one, the productive power of the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost proceeds also from the Son. They admitted, therefore, two hypostases, one action, one productive power, and one product due to the substance and the hypostases of the Father and the Son. The Greeks met this statement with an equivocal counter-formula, whereupon Bessarion, Isidore of Kiev, and Dorotheus of Mitylene, encouraged by the emperor, came out strongly in favour of the *ex filio*.

The reunion of the Churches was at last really in sight. When, therefore, at the request of the emperor, Eugene IV promised the Greeks the military and financial help of the Holy See as a consequence of the projected reconciliation, the Greeks declared (3 June, 1439) that they recognized the procession of the Holy Ghost, from the Father and the Son as from one "principium" (ἀρχή) and from one cause (αἰτία). On 8 June, a final agreement was reached concerning this doctrine. The Latin teaching respecting the azymes and purgatory was also accepted by the Greeks. As to the primacy, they declared that they would grant the pope all the privileges he had before the schism. An amicable agreement was also reached regarding the form of consecration in the Mass (see ΕΠΙΚΛΕΣΙΣ). Almost simultaneously with these measures the Patriarch of Constantinople died, 10 June; not, however, before he had drawn up and signed a declaration in which he admitted the Filioque, purgatory, and the papal primacy. Nevertheless the reunion of the Churches was not yet an accomplished fact. The Greek representatives insisted that their aforesaid declarations were only their personal opinions; and as they stated that it was still necessary to obtain the assent of the Greek Church in synod assembled, seemingly insuperable difficulties threatened to annihilate all that had so far been achieved. On 6 July, however, the famous decree of union (Lætentur Cœli), the original of which is still preserved in the Laurentian Library at Florence, was formally announced in the cathedral of that city. The council was over, as far as the Greeks were concerned, and they departed at once. The Latin members remained to promote the reunion with the other Eastern Churches—the Armenians (1439), the Jacobites of Syria (1442), the Mesopotamians, between the Tigris and the Euphrates (1444), the Chaldeans or Nestorians, and the Maronites of Cyprus (1445). This last was the concluding public act of the Council of Florence, the proceedings of

which from 1443 onwards took place in the Lateran palace at Rome.

The erudition of Bessarion and the energy of Isidore of Kiev were chiefly responsible for the reunion of the Churches as accomplished at Florence. The question now was to secure its adoption in the East. For this purpose Isidore of Kiev was sent to Russia as papal legate and cardinal, but the Muscovite princes, jealous of their religious independence, refused to abide by the decrees of the Council of Florence. Isidore was thrown into prison, but afterwards escaped and took refuge in Italy. Nor was any better headway made in the Greek Empire. The emperor remained faithful, but some of the Greek deputies, intimidated by the discontent prevailing amongst their own people, deserted their position and soon fell back into the surrounding mass of schism. The new emperor, Constantine, brother of John Palæologus, vainly endeavoured to overcome the opposition of the Byzantine clergy and people. Isidore of Kiev was sent to Constantinople to bring about the desired acceptance of the Florentine "Decretum Unionis" (Lætentur Cœli), but, before he could succeed in his mission, the city fell (1453) before the advancing hordes of Mohammed II.

One advantage, at least, resulted from the Council of Florence: it proclaimed before both Latins and Greeks that the Roman pontiff was the foremost ecclesiastical authority in Christendom; and Eugene IV was able to arrest the schism which had been threatening the Western Church anew (see BASLE, COUNCIL OF). This council was, therefore, witness to the prompt rehabilitation of papal supremacy, and facilitated the return of men like Eneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who in his youth had taken part in the Council of Basle, but ended by recognizing its erroneous attitude, and finally became pope under the name of Pius II.

SOURCES:—DOROTHEUS OF MITYLENE, *Historia concilii Florentini* in HARPOIN, *Collectio Conciliorum*, IX, 397, 669 sqq., and in MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum collectio* (new ed., Paris, 1901), XXI: "H' αἰτία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ ἐν ἀποστόλῃ, συνόδῳ (Rome, 1507); Acta sacri oecumenici concilii Florentini collecta, disposita, illustrata per Justinianum (Rome, 1638); CRETIGNON, ed., *Vera historia unionis non vera inter Græcos et Latinos, sive concilii Florentini exactissima narratio, græce scripte per Sylvestrum Syropoulos* (La Haye, 1690). For a criticism of these sources see FROMMANN, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kirchenvereinigung*, 46–82; FEA, *Pius II vindicatus* (Rome, 1823); PÉROUSE, *Documents inédits relatifs au concile de Bâle in Bulletin historique et philologique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (Paris, 1905), 364–399.

SPECIAL WORKS:—CREIGHTON (Anglican), *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome* (new ed., London, 1900); I, von WESSEMBERG (antipapal), *Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Constance, 1840); ZHISMAN, *Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen der orientalischen und römischen Kirche seit dem Anfange des 15. Jahrhunderts bis zum Concil von Ferrara* (Vienna, 1858); CHRISTOPHE, *Histoire de la papauté pendant le quinzième siècle* (Lyons, 1863); CECCONI, *Studi storici sul concilio di Firenze* (Florence, 1869), an important work; FROMMANN, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kirchenvereinigung* (Halle, 1872); VAST, *Le cardinal Bessarion (1405–1472). Étude sur la chrétienté et la renaissance vers le milieu du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1878); HEFELÉ, *Conciliengeschichte* (Freiburg im Br., 1879), VII, 426–821; GUIRAUD, *L'Etat pontifical après le grand schisme* (Paris, 1897); FERRAUD-DABOT, *Le duc de Bourgogne Philippe le Bon et le concile de Florence* (Dijon, 1900); CHRISTEN, *Le pape Eugène IV (1431–1447) in Revue internationale de Théologie* (1901), 150–170, 352–367; LANGER, *Die Wahl Amedeos von Savoyen zum Papste durch das Baseler Konzil* (Marburg, 1901); PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgange des Mittelalters, I: Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance bis zur Wahl Pius II* (Freiburg im Br., 1901); FRIEDLING, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège. Études diplomatiques, I: Les Russes au concile de Florence* (Paris, 1902); A. PAPADOPOULOS, *Μάκρος ὁ Εὐγενικός ὡς πατρις ἄγιος τῆς ὀρθόδοξης καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας in Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1902), XI, 50–69; PREISWERT, *Der Einfluss Aragons auf den Prozess des Baseler Konzils gegen Papst Eugen IV.* (Basle, 1902); SCERRINA, *Literaturgeschichte der russischen Erklärungen über die Florentiner Union, in Jahrbuch der hist. phil. Gesellschaft bei der kaisert. neurrussischen Universität zu Odessa* (1902), IX, sect. 7, 139–186; *Die Immakulata-Bulle der Väter des Baseler Konzils, 1439, in Katholik* (1903), third ser., XXVIII, 518–520; ROCHOLL, *Bessarion, Studie zur Geschichte der Renaissance* (Leipzig, 1904); A. L., *Le concile général et le grand schisme d'Occident, in Revue des Sciences ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1904), XC, 342–349; AUNER, *La Moldavie au concile de Florence* (Paris, 1904); PÉROUSE, *Le cardinal Louis Aleman, président du concile de Bâle, et la fin du grand schisme* (Paris, 1904); CHRYSA, *PAPADO-*

ΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Χρονολογικὸν σημεῖωμα περί τῆς ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ Διοτικῆς συνόδου in *Νέα Σιών* (1905), II, 414-19; *Nicholas of Cusa, Cardinal and Reformer in Catholic Quarterly Review* (Philadelphia, 1906), LXII, 120-147; KONTIG, *Kardinal Giordano Orsini, Ein Lebensbild aus der Zeit der grossen Konzilien und des Humanismus* (Freiburg im Br., 1906); ZLACIST, *Die Gesandtschaft des Baseler Konzils nach Avignon und Konstantinopel, 1437-1438* (Halle, 1908).

L. VAN DER ESSEN.

**Florence of Worcester**, English chronicler. All that is known of his personal history is that he was a monk of Worcester and that he died in 1118. His "Chronicon ex Chronicis" is the first attempt made in England to write a universal chronicle from the creation onwards, but the universal part is based entirely on the work of Marianus Scotus an Irish monk who died at Mainz about 1082. To this Florence added a number of references to English history taken from Bede, the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle", and various biographies. The portions borrowed from the "Chronicle" are of value because he used a version which has not been preserved. Florence begins to be an independent authority in 1030, and his "Chronicle" goes down to 1117; it is annalistic in form, but a very useful record of events. John, another monk of Worcester, continued the "Chronicon" to 1141, and other writers took it down to 1295. It has been edited for the English Historical Society by Benj. Thorpe (London, 1848-9, 2 vols.), and translated by Stevenson (Church Historians of England, Vol. II, pt. I, London, 1853); there is also an English version in Bohn's Antiquarian Library (London, 1854).

*Die. Nat. Biog.*, XIX, 335-6; Gross, *Sources and Literature of English History* etc. (London, 1900), No. 1866.

F. F. URQUHART.

**Florentina**, SAINT, Virgin; b. towards the middle of the sixth century; d. about 612. The family of St. Florentina furnishes us with a rare example of lives genuinely religious, and actively engaged in furthering the best interests of Christianity. Sister of three Spanish bishops in the time of the Visigothic dominion (Leander, Isidore and Fulgentius), she consecrated her virginity to God, and all four have been canonized by the Church. Florentina was born about the middle of the sixth century, being younger than her brother Leander, later Archbishop of Seville, but older than Isidore, who succeeded Leander as archbishop of the same see. Before his elevation to the episcopal dignity, Leander had been a monk, and it was through his influence that Florentina embraced the ascetic life. She associated with herself a number of virgins, who also desired to forsake the world, and formed them into a religious community. Later sources declare their residence to have been the convent of S. Maria de Valle near Ecija (Astigis), of which city her brother Fulgentius was bishop. In any case, it is certain that she had consecrated herself to God before the year 600, as her brother Leander, who died either in the year 600 or 601, wrote for her guidance an extant work dealing with a nun's rule of life and with contempt for the world ("Regula sive Libellus de institutione virginum et de contemptu mundi ad Florentinam sororem", P. L. LXXII, 873 sqq.). In it the author lays down the rules according to which cloistered virgins consecrated to God should regulate their lives. He strongly advises them to avoid intercourse with women living in the world, and with men, especially youths; recommends strict temperance in eating and drinking, gives advice concerning the reading of and meditation on Holy Scripture, enjoins equal love and friendship for all those living together in community, and exhorts his sister earnestly to remain true to her holy state. Florentina regulated her life according to the advice of her brother, entered with fervour into the spirit of the religious life, and was honoured as a saint after her death. Her younger brother Isidore also dedicated to her his work "De fide catholica contra Judæos", which he wrote at her

request. Florentina died early in the seventh century and is venerated as the patroness of the diocese of Plasencia. Her feast falls on 20 June. The name is written Florentina in the Roman martyrology, but Florentina is without doubt the correct form.

*Acta SS.*, June, IV, 18-20; cf. January, I, 972 sqq., and April, I, 331 sqq.; YEPES, *Hist. de la gloriosa virgen S. Florentina* (Madrid, 1884); WRIGHT in *Dul. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; LÉCLERCQ, *L'Espagne chrétienne* (Paris, 1906), 275 sqq.; GAMS, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien* (Ratisbon, 1862), I.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Florentini**. See THEODOSIUS.

**Flórez**, ENRIQUE, Spanish theologian, archæologist, and historian; b. at Valladolid, 14 February, 1701; d. at Madrid, 20 August, 1773. While still very young (1715) he joined the Order of St. Augustine, and thereafter he devoted his entire life to great works on history and antiquities, which are valuable contributions to the civil and ecclesiastical history of Spain. He was one of the most learned men produced by Spain, and on account of his learning enjoyed the respect and friendship of the most eminent men of his time. His best-known and most important work is "La España Sagrada, ó teatro geográfico-histórico de la Iglesia de España" (51 vols., Madrid, 1747-), a work following the same plan as the "Gallia christiana" of Sainte-Marthe and the "Italia sacra" of Ughelli. It is a history of the Church in Spain, with biographies of bishops, and its value is enhanced by the insertion of ancient documents which are not to be found elsewhere. But the work was of such large scope that he did not live to finish his task, so that, of the fifty-one volumes of which the history consists, Flórez wrote and published only a little more than half (twenty-nine volumes), the rest being written and published after his death by two other Augustinians, Fathers Risco and Fernández. This and other works of Father Flórez are enriched by carefully made illustrations which serve still further to increase their value. In 1743 he published his historical work, the curious "Llave historial", a work similar to the French "Art de vérifier les dates", but having the advantage of priority over the latter, which did not appear until 1750. This book passed through several later editions in 1774, 1786, and 1790. It did not, however, add much to the literary fame of its author. Father Flórez had pursued studies in numismatics and published "España carpetana; medallas de las colonias, municipios, y pueblos antiguos de España" (3 vols., Madrid, 1757), dealing with the history of Spain when that country was occupied by the Romans. Other works of Flórez were "Cursus Theologiæ" (5 vols., Madrid, 1732-38), one of his earlier works, and "Memorias de las reynas Católicas" (2 vols., Madrid, 1761, 1770, and 1779), a genealogical history of the royal house of Leon and Castile.

MÉNDEZ, *Noticia de la Vida y Escritos de Enrique Flórez* (Madrid, 1780).

VENTURA FUENTES.

**Florian**, JEAN-PIERRE CLARIS, CHEVALIER DE, a French poet and novelist, b. at the château of Florian (Gard), 6 March, 1756; d. at Sceaux, 13 Sept., 1794. An orphan at an early age, he was brought up by his grandfather and studied at St-Hippolyte. At ten years of age he was taken by one of his uncles who was related to Voltaire, to the château of Ferney. The influence of the philosopher was already beginning to be felt by the child when he was sent in 1768 to the Duke of Penthièvre, to act as a page. His sojourn at the château of Anet was very beneficial to him. Not only did the duke interest himself in his studies, and direct his readings, but he gave him good advice and made him promise that he would never write except with reserve and decency. Upon leaving the service of the Duke of Penthièvre, he entered the military school at Bapaume, obtained a commission in the dragoons of Penthièvre, but soon abandoned the army for literature and began to write comedies. He was elected to the



Académie Française in 1788. Arrested at Sceaux in 1793, he owed his life to the death of Robespierre, but he outlived the terrors of his imprisonment only a short time. To modern readers, Florian is chiefly known as the author of pretty fables well suited as reading for the young, but his contemporaries praised him also for his poetical and pastoral novels. He was the Boucher and the Watteau of the literature of the eighteenth century and it is remarkable that some of his graceful and delicate works were written in the midst of the Revolution. The list of his works is long. Worthy of mention are: two pastoral novels, "Galatée" and "Estelle"; two poetical novels, "Numa Pompilius" and "Gonzalve de Cordoue"; three volumes of comedies, the principal being "Les Deux Billets", "Le Bon Ménage", "Le Bon Père", "Jeannot et Colin"; two volumes of short stories, a few religious poems, like "Ruth" and "Tobie", etc. Florian was very fond of Spain and its literature, doubtless owing to the influence of his mother, Gillette de Salgue, who was a Castilian. He was loved by his contemporaries as well for his character as for his writings, and he was much praised for his charity.

Standard editions of FLORIAN'S works by DUFOUR (Paris, 1805); JOUSSAUT (Paris, 1887); LACRETTE and JAUFFRET, *Eloges de Florian* (Paris, 1812); SAINTE-BEUVE, *Causeries du Lundi* (Paris, 1851-63), VII, XIII; CLARETIE, *Florian* (1894).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

**Florianopolis.** See SANTA CATHARINA, DIOCESE OF.

**Florians (FLORIANENSES), THE,** an altogether independent order, and not, as some consider, a branch of the Cistercians; it was founded in 1189 by the Abbot Joachim of Flora (q. v.), by whom its constitutions were drawn up. Besides preserving a number of Cistercian observances, the founder added to the austerities of Cîteaux. The Florians went barefoot; their habits were white and very coarse. Their Breviary differed in the distribution of Offices from that of Cîteaux. The constitutions were approved by Pope Celestine III in 1196. The order spread rapidly, soon numbering as many as thirty-five monasteries, but it seems not to have extended beyond Italy. In 1470 the regular abbots were replaced by commendatory abbots, but the abuses of this regime hastened the decline of the order. In 1505 the Abbey of Flora and its affiliated monasteries were united to the Order of Cîteaux. In 1515 other Florian monasteries united themselves to the Grande Chartreuse or to the Dominicans, and in 1570, after a century under the regime of commendatory abbots, not a single independent monastery remained, and the Order of Flora had ceased to exist. Under the Abbot of Flora were also four monasteries of religious women, who followed the Florian rule.

MANRIQUE, *Annales Cistercienses* (Lyons, 1642); UGHELLI, *Italia Sacra* (Venice, 1721); ZIEGELBAUER, *Historia Rei Litterariae O. S. B.* (Augsburg, 1754); *Acta SS.*, 29 May; HÉLYOT, *Histoire des ordres monastiques religieux et militaires* (Paris, 1719); BUCCOLINI, *Menologium Benedictinum* (Augsburg, 1656); GREGORIUS DE LANDE, *Beati Joachim Abbatis S. O. Cist., etc. Apologetica* (Naples, 1659).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

**Florida.**—The Peninsular or Everglade State, the most southern in the American Union and second largest east of the Mississippi, lies between parallels 24° 38' and 31° N. latitude and meridians 79° 48' and 87° 38' W. longitude. Its name, commemorative of its discovery by Ponce de Leon at Eastertide (Sp. *Pascua florida*), 1513, or less probably descriptive of the verdant aspect of the country, was originally applied to territory extending northward to Virginia and westward indefinitely from the Atlantic. Florida is bounded north by Alabama and Georgia, east by the Atlantic, south by the Straits of Florida and Gulf of Mexico, and west by the Gulf and the Perdido River. It contains 58,680 sq. miles, 4440 being lake and river area. Politically, the State is divided into forty-six

counties, geographically into the peninsular section, stretching 450 miles north and south, average width 95 miles, and the continental or northern portion, measuring 400 miles from Alabama to the Atlantic, mean width 65 miles. Its eastern coast-line, comparatively regular, is 470 miles long; it is paralleled almost its entire length by sand reefs which enclose an inland waterway, and its outline is prolonged in the chain of coral and sandy islets known as the Florida Keys, which extend 200 miles in a south-westerly direction, terminating in the Tortugas. Over the Keys an extension of the Florida East Coast Railroad from the mainland to Key West is in course of construction. The deep-water ports are Fernandina, Jacksonville, and Key West. The Gulf coast-line, sinuous in conformation, measures 675 miles; the chief ports are Tampa, Apalachicola, and Pensacola.

**PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.**—The Everglades, often erroneously described as swamp-lands, form the characteristic feature of Southern Florida. They consist mainly of submerged saw-grass plains extending 130 by 70 miles, studded with numerous islands which produce a semi-tropical jungle-growth. The surface water, ordinarily about knee-deep, pure, potable, and abounding in fish, has a perceptible southbound current. A limestone substratum occasionally appears through a bed-bottom of vegetable mould. While subterranean sources of supply are contributory, the inundation chiefly results from the overflow of Lake Okeechobee (1200 sq. miles), whose rock-rimmed shores, 18 feet above sea-level, exceed by 10 feet the general elevation of the Everglades. North of the lake, extending through the counties of De Soto, Manatee, Osceola, and Brevard, lie vast tracts of prairie or savanna land with large swamp areas. This is the cattle region of Florida. Farther north, and embracing the counties of Polk, Lake, Orange, Sumter, Marion, and Alachua, is the fertile and picturesque rolling country of the central ridge with a general altitude of 200, and elevations approaching 300 feet above sea-level. This is the lake region; Lakes Kissimmee, Tohopekaliga, Apopka, Harris, and George are chief amongst thousands. The extensive coastal plains, comprising the entire area of the Gulf and Atlantic seaboard counties, are low-lying sandy tracts, monotonously level and frequently marshy. These constitute the pine region of Florida. The northern portion of middle Florida, between the Suwannee and Apalachicola Rivers, while corresponding in general altitude and topography to the central ridge, differs widely from all other parts of the State. Red clay and loam of surpassing fertility replace the elsewhere prevalent thin sandy soils, while the featureless aspect of boundless pine plains and the recurrent sameness of undulating landscape are replaced by a rare exuberance and diversity of highland, plain, lake, and woodland scenery. Florida is an exceedingly well-wooded and well-watered State. Pine, cypress, cedar, oak, magnolia, hickory, and sweet gum everywhere abound, while there are good supplies of rarer hardwoods and semi-tropical varieties. There are, including the East Coast Canal nearing completion, nearly 2000 miles of navigable waterways. The chief rivers flowing into the Atlantic are: St. Mary's, form-



SEAL OF FLORIDA

ing part of the northern boundary; St. John's, 300 miles long, navigable for 200 miles; Indian River, properly a salt-water lagoon or sound, forming part of the East Coast Canal. The Caloosahatchee, Peace, Manatee, Withlacoochee, Suwannee, Ocala, Ocklockonee, Apalachicola, Choctawhatchee, Yellow River, Escambia, and Perdido empty into the Gulf. The Kissimmee enters Lake Okeechobee. Characteristic of the State are its immense mineral springs: Silver, Wakulla, Chipola, Green Cove, and White Springs are the principal. The remarkably mild and agreeable climate of Florida makes it a favourite winter resort. The average annual temperature ranges from 68° at Pensacola to 70° at Key West; extremes of heat or cold are rarely experienced; the annual rainfall is about 60 inches.

**RESOURCES.**—*Agriculture.*—Diversity of product, rather than abundance of yield, is noticeable. Besides semi-tropical productions, all varieties common in higher latitudes, except a few cereals, may be profitably cultivated in Florida. The soil, exclusive of the impartially distributed fertile hammock lands, i. e. limited areas enriched by decomposed vegetable deposit, is excessively sandy and rather poor in quality, yet surprisingly responsive to cultivation. Even where the soil is not especially prolific the warm, humid climate stimulates a rapid and vigorous plant growth. In 1905 31,233 farms were operated by whites, 14,231 by negroes, 20 by others; farm acreage, 4,758,874; 1,621,362 acres being improved. Value of farms, \$51,464,124; operating expenses, \$3,914,296; products, \$40,131,814; field crops, \$13,632,641; fruit crops, \$5,423,390; live stock, \$14,731,521. Crops in order of value: cotton, 282,078 acres, 80,485 bales, value \$4,749,351; corn, 455,274 acres, 4,888,958 bushels, value \$3,315,965; peanuts, sweet potatoes, tomatoes, beans, white potatoes, tobacco, celery, hay, watermelons, oats, lettuce, cabbage, cucumbers. The most valuable fruit crop was the orange: 1,768,944 bearing trees, producing 2,961,195 boxes, value \$3,353,609; followed in order of value by pineapples, grapefruit, strawberries, and peaches. Live stock included 36,131 horses, 19,331 mules, 69 asses, 1,010,454 cattle, 604,742 swine, 115,324 sheep, 33,150 goats.

*Commerce and Industries.*—The report for the last statistical year shows a remarkable increase in commercial and industrial activities; 1906 manufacturing establishments, capital \$42,157,080, paid \$18,048,599 to 52,345 wage-earners; value of manufactured products, \$53,506,154. The leading industries and value of annual output are: cigarmaking, about \$15,000,000 (returns incomplete); lumber, \$15,210,916; naval stores, \$10,196,327; phosphate, \$6,601,000. The value of exports (overland being about as much more, not included) was \$62,655,559 for 1906, cigars comprising one-third this amount, the remainder being almost equally divided between lumber, naval stores, and phosphate; the value of imports was \$6,654,546. The fisheries of the west coast and sponge industry of the Keys are important, giving employment to 6000 men and yielding an annual product valued at \$1,500,000. The total assessed valuation of taxable property in the State was (1904) \$111,333,735; State debt, \$601,567. On 1 March, 1908, eighteen railroads, with a total mileage of 4104, main track 2948, miles, were in operation.

**HISTORY.**—The landing of Ponce de Leon on the shores of Florida probably on the Sunday after Easter, 3 April, 1513, is the first positively authenticated instance of the presence of Europeans on the mainland of the United States. This expedition, which popular narrative invests with romantic glamour, was undertaken according to the royal patent of authorization "to discover and people the island of Bimini". Ponce named the land Florida in honour of the Easter festival, set up a stone cross with an inscription, and impressed with the hostile character of the natives,

returned after six months' exploration to Porto Rico. His attempt to establish a colony in 1521 was doomed to speedy failure. The voyages of Miruelo (1516), Cordova (1517), Pineda (1519), Ayllón (1520), and Gomez (1524) accomplished little beyond establishing the fact that Florida was not an island but part of a vast continent. The disastrous outcome of the expeditions of Pánfilo Narvaez (1527–28), of Hernando de Soto (1538–43), and of Tristan de Luna (1559–61) are well-known episodes in the early history of America. On the failure of Ribault's French colony, founded at Port Royal (1562), René de Laudonnière planted the new settlement of Fort Caroline at the mouth of St. John's River (1564). Pedro Menendez de Avilés, the foremost naval commander of his day, learning that Ribault had left France with reinforcements and supplies for the new colony, set out to intercept him and banish for ever French Huguenots from the land that belonged by right of discovery to Catholic Spain. Menendez never undertook an enterprise and failed. He reached the harbour of St. Augustine 28 August, 1565, naming it for the saint of the day. The founding of the oldest city in the United States merits a brief description. After devoting a week to reconnoitring, Menendez entered the harbour on 6 September. Three companies of soldiers were sent ashore under two captains, to select a site and begin a fort. On 8 September Menendez landed, and amid the booming of artillery and the blast of trumpets the standard of Castile and Leon was unfurled. The chaplain, Father Lopez de Mendoza, carrying a cross and followed by the troops, proceeded to meet the general who advanced to the cross, which he kissed on bended knee as did those of his staff. The solemn Mass of Our Lady's Nativity was then offered on a spot which was ever afterward called Nombre de Dios. On 20 Sept. Fort Caroline was taken by surprise, only women and children being spared. The merciless slaughter of Ribault and his shipwrecked companions by Menendez a few days subsequently is an indelible stain on a singularly noble record. The story, so assiduously copied by successive historiographers, that Avilés hanged some of his prisoners on trees and attached the inscription *No por franceses sino por Luteranos*, is an apocryphal embellishment (see Spanish Settlements, II, 178). Two years later De Gourgues retaliated by slaughtering the Spanish garrison at Fort Caroline.

The history of Florida during the first Spanish administration (1565–1763) centres round St. Augustine, and is rather of religious than political importance. English buccaneers under Drake in 1586 and again under Davis in 1665 plundered and sacked the town. Distrust and hostility usually prevailed between the Spanish colonies and their northern English neighbours. Governor Moore of South Carolina made an unsuccessful attempt in 1702 to capture St. Augustine, and in 1704 laid waste the country of the civilized Apalachee. Governor Oglethorpe of Georgia invaded Florida in 1740, besieging St. Augustine with a large force but was repulsed by the Spanish Governor Monteano and forced to retreat. Spain ceded Florida to England in 1763. During the English period great efforts were made to populate the country and develop its resources, but religion suffered irreparably. During the second Spanish occupation (1783–1821) some unimportant military operations took place in West Florida under General Andrew Jackson in 1814 and 1818. In consequence of the treaty of 1819, the Americans took possession of Florida in 1821. In 1822 Florida became a territory of the United States, William P. Duval being appointed first governor. The following year Tallahassee was selected as the new capital. The refusal of the warlike Seminoles to repair to reservations resulted in the long, costly, and discreditable Indian War (1835–42), which came to an end in the capture by treachery of Osceola.

Florida was admitted to Statehood in 1845. The State seceded from the Union 10 January, 1861. In 1862 minor engagements between the Federal and Confederate forces took place; the Federal troops occupied Jacksonville, St. Augustine, and Fernandina, but the Confederates, under General Finegan, gained a decisive victory over the Union forces commanded by General Seymour at Olustee in 1864. In proportion to population Florida furnished more troops than any other Confederate State; they took an honourable part in the campaigns of Tennessee and Virginia, and bore a distinguished reputation for steadfast endurance on the march and conspicuous gallantry on the battlefield. Florida gave to the higher ranks of the Confederate service three major-generals, Loring, Anderson, and Smith, and the Brigadier-Generals Brevard, Bullock, Finegan, Miller, Davis, Finley, Perry, and Shoup. The State was represented in the Confederate Cabinet by Stephen H. Mallory, Secretary of the Navy. If the war proved disastrous to Florida, the subsequent reconstruction added despair to disaster when citizens witnessed the control of public affairs pass into the hands of unscrupulous adventurers. The ordinance of secession was repealed in October, 1865, and a State government organized in 1866. In 1868 a new constitution having been adopted and the Fourteenth Amendment ratified, Florida was readmitted into the Union, but it was not till 1877, when Floridians obtained political ascendancy, that a healthy industrial growth as well as social and educational progress began to appear. The present constitution was adopted in 1886. The discovery of rich phosphate deposits in 1889 greatly improved economic conditions, and the constantly growing popularity of Eastern Florida—the American Riviera—as a winter resort contributes to the general prosperity.

**POPULATION.**—The colony of 600 Spaniards founded by Menendez at St. Augustine in 1565 was the earliest permanent white settlement within the present limits of the United States. Relinquishing fruitless attempts to establish extensive settlements, Florida's Spanish conquerors early subordinated purposes of colonization to motives of military expediency, so that during an occupation of two hundred years the white population remained limited to a few stations of strategic importance. In 1648 the civilian population of St. Augustine was represented by 300 families, and in 1740, nearly a hundred years later, it numbered 2143. The various Spanish garrisons usually aggregated about 2000 men. In 1763, when Florida passed under English rule, the entire Spanish population of 5700 moved away. During the twenty years of English occupancy there was a steady influx of settlers, including numbers of loyalists from the revolted colonies. At this period the so-called Minorcan colony was founded at New Smyrna. During the second Spanish regime (1783–1821) immigration continued and, when Florida came under the United States flag in 1821, increased rapidly. The first U. S. census of 1830 gives the population at 34,730. For the thirty years following a decennial increase of 60 per cent appears, the population in 1860 being 140,424. Since 1860 the increase per decade has averaged 40 per cent. In 1900 the population was 528,542, and in 1905, 614,845, nearly 18 times that of 1830, showing in five years an increase of 86,303, or 16 per cent. In 1900 whites numbered 297,812, coloured 230,730, average number of inhabitants per square mile 9.7. Following are detailed statistics of 1908 (State census): white, 348,923; coloured, 265,737; other races, 185; average per square mile, 11.3. Foreign born white, 22,409, comprising 5867 Cubans, 3120 Italians, 2589 West Indians, 2051 English, 1945 Spanish, 1699 Germans, 1059 Canadians, 610 Irish, and 3469 of other nationalities. The Cuban population is concentrated mainly at Tampa and Key West, Spanish and Italian at Tampa, West Indian of both races at Key West; the other

nationalities are scattered broadly over the State. Nine counties exhibit a slightly decreased population attributed to a shifting of negroes from the farms. In twelve counties negroes outnumber whites. Leon county has the largest percentage of coloured people, 14,880 out of 18,883 total, or 78.8 per cent; Lee county the smallest, 399 out of 3961 total, or 10 per cent. Leon has 25.8 inhabitants per square mile, Lee only 0.8; these figures are typical of racial distribution of population throughout the State. Cities over 10,000: Jacksonville 35,301, Tampa (estimated) 28,000, Pensacola 21,505, and Key West 20,498.

**EDUCATION.**—The organization of the Florida Educational Society in 1831 was apparently the first attempt made to inaugurate a public school system. It resulted in the establishment of a free school at St. Augustine in 1832. During the *ante-bellum* period, owing to general lack of interest, inefficiency of educational legislation, and the prejudice that regarded public schools as "pauper" schools, but little was accomplished for the cause of popular education. In 1860 a few counties had organized public school systems, but the advent of war, and particularly the subsequent dismal process of reconstruction proved a serious blow to educational progress. The constitutional convention of 1865 gave the subject scant recognition, but that of 1868 adopted in its constitution liberal provisions, which were greatly amplified by the constitution of 1885. This constitution established a permanent State school fund, consisting mainly of proceeds of public land sales, State appropriations, and a one-mill property tax, the interest of which was to be applied to support public schools. This fund (1908) exceeds one million dollars. Each county constitutes a school unit (but when advisable special school districts may be formed) and is authorized to levy a school tax of from 3 to 7 mills. Poll-tax proceeds also revert to the county school fund. The governor, secretary of state, attorney-general, State treasurer, and State superintendent of public instruction form the State Board of Education. County boards consist of a county superintendent and three commissioners. There are twelve grades or years of instruction, eight months constituting a school year. The school age is six to twenty-one years. The constitution prescribes that "white and coloured children shall not be taught in the same school, but impartial provision shall be made for both". Statistics from latest biennial report (1906) of state superintendent show: total public schools, 2387; white 1720; coloured 667; enrolment: white 81,473, or 66 per cent of school population, coloured 48,992, or 52 per cent of school population; total expenditure for school year ending June, 1906, \$1,020,674.95 for white schools, \$200,752.27 for coloured schools. There are 2495 white and 794 coloured teachers. The report observes that while rapid progress has been accomplished along educational lines, a comparison with more advanced States shows that in Florida popular education of the masses is yet in its initial stage. "One of the greatest hindrances to educational progress at the present time is the scarcity, not only of professionally trained teachers, but teachers of any kind." This scarcity is ascribed to the inadequate remuneration teachers receive.

The system of higher education fostered by the State was reorganized by legislative act of 1905. Several existing institutions were abolished, and in their stead were established a State university for men, a State college for women, and a coloured normal and industrial school in which co-education prevails. These higher educational institutions receive generous support. State appropriations in 1907 amounted to \$600,000, while annual subventions from the federal treasury aggregate about \$60,000. The University of the State of Florida, Gainesville, includes a normal department, also a United States Agricultural Experiment Station, under a separate managerial staff. The

university faculty numbers 15, Experiment Station staff 14, enrolment (1908) 103. The Florida Female College, Tallahassee, also includes a normal school, and has 22 professors and instructors and 240 students. The coloured normal school, Tallahassee, reports a faculty of 24 and an enrolment of 307. Institutions of higher education under denominational auspices: The John B. Stetson University (Baptist), Deland, incorporated 1889, affiliated with Chicago University, 1898. Its productive endowment funds amount to \$225,000, while it has been the recipient of munificent gifts and legacies; enrolment (1908) 520, faculty 49. Rollins College (undenominational evangelical), Winter Park, incorporated 1885, possesses an endowment fund of \$200,000, faculty 20, enrolment 148. The Southern College (Methodist), Southerland, founded 1902, faculty 19, enrolment 216. The Columbia College (Baptist), Lake City, was established in 1907; its faculty numbers 12, enrolment 143. St. Leo College (Catholic), St. Leo, incorporated 1889, is conducted by the Benedictine Fathers, faculty 9, enrolment 75. The Presbyterian College of Florida, Eustis, opened in 1905 and has at present 9 professors and 63 students. There is a business college located at Tampa and two—Massey's and Draughon's—at Jacksonville.

Catholic institutions, beneath college grade but maintaining a high standard of instruction, are the Academies of St. Joseph at St. Augustine, Jacksonville, and Loretto—the latter a boys' preparatory school—of the Holy Names at Tampa and Key West, and of the Sisters of Mercy at Pensacola. The number of children under Catholic care is 3704. Denominational institutions of high grade for the education of negroes are the Cookman Institute (Methodist), enrolment 487; the Edward Waters College (Methodist); and the Florida Baptist College, all situated at Jacksonville. In all the non-Catholic institutions co-education obtains.

**RELIGION.—Early Missionary Efforts.**—The permanent establishment of the Christian Religion in what is now the United States dates from the founding of St. Augustine in 1565. The previous fifty years exhibit a record of heroic though fruitless attempts to plant the cross on the soil of Florida. The solicitude manifested by the Spanish Crown for the conversion of the Indians was sincere and lasting, nor was there ever wanting a plentiful supply of zealous Spanish missionaries who brought to the spiritual subjugation of the Western World the same steadfastness of purpose and unflinching courage that achieved within so short a space the mighty conquests of Spanish arms. Priests and missionaries accompanied Ponce (1521), Allyn (1526), De Soto (1538), and De Luna (1559). In 1549 the Dominican Father Luis Cancer de Barbastró, honoured as Apostle of Central America and Protomartyr of Florida, in attempting to establish a mission, was slain by hostile Indians near Tampa Bay. Having secured Spanish supremacy by ruthlessly crushing out the French and planting a permanent colony at St. Augustine in 1565, Menéndez with indomitable energy and zeal devoted himself to the evangelization of the Indians. Of the twenty-eight priests who embarked with him from Spain, four only seem to have reached Florida, of whom Martín Francisco Lopez de Mendoza Grajales became first parish priest of St. Augustine, the first established parish in the United States. Pending the arrival of regular missionaries, Menéndez appointed soldiers possessing the necessary qualifications as religious instructors to the Indians. The Jesuits were the first to enter the missionary field; three were sent by St. Francis Borgia in 1566 and ten in 1568; the few who survived the martyrdom of their brethren were recalled in 1572. In 1577 the Franciscans arrived. The good progress made by 1597 was severely checked by a general massacre of the missionaries instigated by a young chief chafing under merited reprimand. In 1609 several Indian chiefs sought baptism

at St. Augustine, and the Florida missions entered the palmy period of their existence, which lasted till well past the middle of the century. In 1634 the Franciscan province of St. Helena, with mother-house at St. Augustine, contained 44 Indian missions, 35 missionaries, and 30,000 Catholic Indians. By 1674 evidences of decline begin to appear. Bishop Calderon found his episcopal jurisdiction questioned by the friars, and although he confirmed many Indians, he complained of the universal ignorance of Christian doctrine. The arbitrary exactions of successive governors provoked resentment and rebellion amongst the Christian Indians, while the English foe on the northern border menaced their very existence. In 1704 the blow fell. Burning, plunder, carnage, and enslavement is the record of Moore's raid amongst the Apalachee missions. Efforts at re-establishment partially succeeded, there being in 1720 six towns of Catholic Indians and several missions, but owing to the ravages of persistent conflict between the Spanish and English colonies, these in 1763 had languished to four missions with 136 souls. The cession to England in 1763 resulted, not merely in the final extinction of the missions, but in the complete obliteration of Florida's ancient Catholicity.

**Formation of Dioceses.**—St. Augustine began its existence as a regularly constituted parish of the Diocese of Santiago de Cuba. Its church records, dating from 1594, are preserved in the archives of the present cathedral. The first recorded episcopal visitation was made by Bishop Cabeza de Altamirano in 1606. In 1674 Bishop Gabriel Diaz Vara Calderon visited the Floridian portion of his diocese; he conferred minor orders on seven candidates, and during an itinerary of eight months, extending to the Carolinian confines, confirmed 13,152 persons, founded many mission churches, and liberally supplied others. The permanent residence of Bishops-Auxiliary Resino (1709-10), Tejada (1735-45), and Ponce y Carasco (1751-55) at St. Augustine, shows that despite the waning condition of the colony and missions at this period, the Church in Florida was not deprived of episcopal care and vigilance. Bishop Morell of Santiago, exiled from his see during the English occupation of Havana (1662-63), remained four months at St. Augustine, confirming 639 persons. When Florida in 1763 passed under English rule, freedom of worship was guaranteed, but the illiberal interpretation of officials resulted in the general exodus of Catholics, so that by 1765, the bi-centenary year of the Church in Florida, a few defaced church buildings presented the only evidence of its former Catholicity. Five hundred survivors of the New Smyrna colony of 1400 Catholics, natives of Mediterranean lands, settled at St. Augustine in 1776 and preserved the Faith alive through a trying epoch. In 1787 Florida became subject to the newly constituted See of St. Christopher of Havana, and the following year Bishop Cyril de Barcelona found the church at St. Augustine progressing satisfactorily under the care of Fathers Hassett and O'Reilly, who had arrived on the retrocession of Florida to Spain in 1783.

In 1793 Pius VI established the Diocese of Louisiana and the Floridas, appointing the Right Rev. Luis Peñalver y Cardenas, with residence at New Orleans, as first bishop. After Bishop Peñalver's promotion to the Archbishopric of Guatemala in 1801, no successor having been appointed, Louisiana, which was annexed to the United States in 1803, came under the jurisdiction of Bishop Carroll of Baltimore in 1806, the bishops of Havana reassuming authority over Florida until the appointment of the Rev. Michael Portier in 1825 to the new Vicariate of Alabama and Florida. Bishop Portier undertook single-handed the work of his vast vicariate, not having a single priest, until at his request Bishop England of Charleston sent Father Edward Mayne to St. Augustine in 1828. In 1850 the See of Savannah was created and included that part of

Florida which lies east of the Apalachicola River; this was constituted a separate vicariate in 1857 under the Right Rev. Augustin Verot as vicar apostolic and erected into the Diocese of St. Augustine in 1870, with Bishop Verot, who had occupied the See of Savannah since 1861, as first bishop. Bishop Verot's unwearied activity and zeal in promoting religion and education soon bore fruit; schools were opened by the Christian Brothers and the Sisters of Mercy in 1858, but the outbreak of the Civil War frustrated all hopes of success. In 1866 the Sisters of St. Joseph were introduced from France, and despite the most adverse conditions, they had several flourishing schools and academies in operation before many years. The era of progress inaugurated by Bishop Verot continued under the administration of Bishop John Moore (1877-1901), whose successor, the Right Rev. William John Kenny, was consecrated by Cardinal Gibbons 18 May, 1902, in the historic cathedral of St. Augustine. The Catholic population of the State, including 1750 coloured Catholics, is (1908) about 30,000. The Diocese of St. Augustine, wholly included within the State, contains about 25,000 Catholics; there are 49 priests with 40 churches and several missions, and 2897 young people under the care of religious teaching orders. That portion of the State situated west of the Apalachicola River forms part of the Diocese of Mobile since 1829; the Catholic population is about 5000, there are five churches with resident priests and 6 Catholic schools with 807 pupils; Pensacola, founded 1696, is the Catholic centre.

*Other Religious Denominations.*—The Methodist Church South has the largest membership. The Florida Conference was set off from the Georgia Conference in 1844. The session of December, 1907, reported 341 churches and 155 ministers; estimated membership 40,000. The Baptists report 35,021 total membership, 548 churches, 370 ministers. The Episcopalian denomination, comprising the Diocese of Florida and the Missionary District of Southern Florida, organized 1892, has 7737 communicants, about 12,000 total baptized, and 66 ministers. These three denominations display considerable activity and efficiency in missionary and educational work. The Baptist State Mission board supports 40 missionaries; while the Episcopalians, with but 10 self-supporting parishes, maintain nearly 200 missions, including 14 churches for negroes and 10 parish schools with 540 pupils. In 1894 the Episcopal Church started mission work amongst the Seminole Indians of the Everglades, who number about 300, but as the chiefs who are arbiters of all individual rights have hitherto held aloof, the result has been very discouraging. Presbyterians North and South number 6500 with 95 ministers, Congregationalists 2500; other denominations represented in the State are: Adventists, Christians, Lutherans, Unitarians, Campbellites, Jews, Christian Scientists, and Mormons. Reliable religious statistics of the coloured people are difficult to obtain owing to multiplicity of organizations and mobility of religious temperament. Five distinct branches of Methodists report 635 preachers, 400 churches, and 7470 members. Baptist organizations approximate the Methodists in strength, while the coloured membership of other denominations is very small.

*Florida Indians.*—The early explorers found the Indians distributed over the entire peninsula. To the north-west the populous tribes of the Apalachee inhabited the country watered by the Suwannee and Apalachicola Rivers; the Timuquanas occupied the centre of the peninsula, with numerous settlements along the St. John's; the Calusa in the south-west ranged from Cape Sable to Tampa Bay; on Biscayne Bay the small settlement of Tegestas seems to have come originally from the Bahamas and contracted kinship with the Calusa; along the Indian River south of Cape Canaveral lived the Ays, also comparatively

few in numbers and mentioned only in connexion with early missionary labour, probably having become absorbed in the Timuquanas under the unifying influence of Christianity. Sufficient data for an approximate estimate of population are wanting; probably the entire population of the tribes mentioned exceeded 20,000 but not 40,000. These tribes pertained ethnologically and linguistically to the great Muskogean or Creek family, though some philologists consider the Timuquanan language, which "represents the acme of polysynthesis", a distinct linguistic stock.

The Timuquanas lived in great communal houses, fortified their villages, practised agriculture to some extent and a few rude industries. They are described as being of fine physique, intelligent, courageous, generally monogamous, very fond of ceremonial, and much addicted to human sacrifice and superstition. Their settlement near St. Augustine furnished the first Indian converts, in all probability prior to the advent of the Franciscan missionaries in 1577. In 1602 Governor Canço estimated the number of Christians amongst them at 1200. A catechism in the Timuquanan language by Father Francisco Pareja was printed in Mexico in 1612 and a grammar in 1614 (reprinted at Paris, 1886), besides other works. These were the first books printed in any of our Indian tongues. The baptism of twelve Timuquanan chiefs in 1609 at St. Augustine cleared the way for the conversion of the whole nation to Christianity. English and hostile Indian raids diminished their numbers (1685-1735), and by 1763 they had all but disappeared. The Apalachee Indians, closer related to the Creeks, resembled the neighbouring Timuquanas in general disposition and manner of life. It is not mentioned that they practised human sacrifice, and in other respects, especially after their conversion to Christianity, they exhibited a superiority of character over the other Floridian tribes, being docile and tractable to religious teaching and training. Towards Narvaez (1528) and De Soto (1539) they assumed a surprisingly hostile demeanour, in view of the ready response accorded subsequently to the efforts of the missionaries. In 1595 Father Pedro de Chozas penetrated to Ocuta in the Apalachee country, and his mission proved so fruitful that the Indians appealed in 1607 for additional missionaries, and by 1640 the whole tribe was Catholic. The Apalachee country was invaded and devastated by hostile Indians and English under Moore in 1704. Of thirteen flourishing towns but one escaped destruction, missionaries were tortured and slain, 1000 Christians were carried off to be sold as slaves, and of 7000 Christian Apalachee only 400 escaped. One of the last items recorded of the tribe is the testimony of the French writer Penicaut to the edifying piety with which a fugitive band that had settled near Mobile adhered to the practices of religion.

The Calusa or Carlos Indians, with whom Menendez in 1566 endeavoured to establish friendship and alliance, in order to pave the way to their conversion, showed a persistent spirit of hostility to Christian teaching. They were cruel, crafty, though recklessly brave, polygamous, and inveterately addicted to human sacrifice. The Jesuit Father Rogel laboured fruitlessly amongst them (1567-8). The Franciscans in 1697 were even less successful. In 1743 the Jesuit Fathers Monaco and Alana, who obtained some little success, described them as cruel, lewd, and rapacious. The remnant of the tribe moved to the western reservations about 1835. The Seminoles, also allied to the Creek stock, came into Florida about 1750; very few of them became Christians, as missionary activity ceased on the English occupation in 1763. Their refusal to withdraw to reservations resulted in the Indian War of 1835-42. On the conclusion of the war 2000 were conveyed to Indian Territory. About 300, defying every effort of the United States, retired to the



almost inaccessible recesses of the Everglades which their descendants occupy to this day.

**Legislation Directly Affecting Religion.**—Freedom of worship and liberty of conscience are by constitutional provision guaranteed in perpetuity to the citizens of Florida. The Declaration of Rights ordains (Sec. 5): "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed in this State, and no person shall be considered incompetent as a witness on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to justify licentiousness or practices subversive of, or inconsistent with, the peace or moral safety of the state or society." The constitution further provides (Sec. 6) that no preference be given by law to any church or religious sect, and forbids the subvention of public funds in aid of any religious denomination or sectarian institution. Wilful interruption or disturbance of "any assembly of people met for the worship of God" is, through legislative enactment (Gen. Stat. 3547), a penal offence. The religious observance of Sunday is, by various prohibitory statutes, indirectly enjoined. All business pursuits "either by manual labor or with animal or mechanical power, except the same be work of necessity" are forbidden on Sunday. Selling goods in open store, the employment of servants, except in ordinary household duty and necessary or charitable work, and the discharge of fire-arms on Sunday are punishable offences. The printing and sale of newspapers is specially exempted. Service and execution of writs on Sunday (suitable provisions obviating possible abuse of the statute being annexed) are declared null and void. By legislative act of 1905, certain games and sports, expressly baseball, football, bowling, and horse-racing, are prohibited on Sunday. All electors upon registering must testify under oath in form prescribed, that they are legally qualified to vote. All State officials, on assuming office, are required to take an oath of loyalty to the Federal and State constitutions and governments, of legal qualification for office, and of fidelity to duty. Testimony in the various courts is to be given under oath. The officials authorized to administer oaths are designated by statute. The issuance of search-warrants is forbidden, except for probable cause, with specification of names and places and supported by oath (Dec. of Rights, 22); also all offences cognizable in Criminal Courts of Record are to be prosecuted upon information under oath (Constit., V, 28). By statutory provision (1731) a declaration in judicial form may in all cases be substituted for an oath.

The days defined as legal holidays include Sunday, New Year's Day, Christmas Day, and Good Friday. The use of prayer in the Legislature is not sanctioned by legal provision, although it is customary to appoint a chaplain and begin each session with prayer.

Against open profanity and blasphemy it is enacted (Gen. Stat. 3542) that "whoever having arrived at the age of discretion profanely curses or swears in any public street shall be punished by fine not exceeding five dollars". Heavier penalties are decreed against the use of indecent or obscene language, and liberal statutory provision exists for the safeguarding of public morality.

Churches, religious communities, charitable institutions, and cemetery associations may become incorporated by complying with the provisions of the general statutes regulating non-profitable corporations. Churches, church lots, parsonages, and all burying-grounds not held for speculative purposes are declared exempt from taxation; property of literary, educational, and charitable institutions actually occupied and used solely for the specific purposes indicated is likewise exempt. Ministers of the Gospel are by statute exempt from jury duty and military service. All regularly ordained ministers in communion with

some church are authorized to solemnize the rites of the matrimonial contract under the regulations prescribed by law. Marriages of whites with negroes or persons of negro descent to the fourth generation (one-eighth negro blood) are forbidden. The prohibited degrees, besides the direct line of consanguinity, include only brother and sister, uncle and niece, nephew and aunt. Continuous absence of either spouse over sea or continual absence for three years following voluntary desertion, with presumption of demise, gives the other spouse legal right to remarry. The statutory grounds for divorce are: consanguinity within the degrees prohibited by law, natural impotence, adultery not connived at or condoned, extreme cruelty, habitual indulgence in violent and ungovernable temper, habitual intemperance, wilful, obstinate, and continued desertion for one year, divorce procured by defendant in another state or country, and bigamy. To file a bill of divorce two years' residence (the cause of adultery excepted) is conditional. Separation *a mensa et toro* is not legally recognized; every divorce is *a vinculo*. Special personal and local divorce legislation is unconstitutional.

State aid is prohibited denominational schools. The law directs every teacher "to labor faithfully and earnestly for the advancement of the pupils in their studies, deportment and morals, and to embrace every opportunity to inculcate, by precept and by example, the principles of truth, honesty and patriotism, and the practice of every christian virtue". The benevolent institutions maintained by the State include an insane asylum situated at Chattahoochee, a school for the blind, deaf, and dumb at St. Augustine, and a reform school for youthful delinquents at Marianna. A Confederate Veterans' Home at Jacksonville receives an annual appropriation. Each county cares for its indigent and needy infirm. While financial support is denied, ample provision for incorporation is afforded religious charitable institutions. The constitution orders the establishment and maintenance of a State prison, which is not at present permanently located. Convicts are leased through contractors to turpentine and phosphate operators. Over these convicts the State retains surveillance through supervisors appointed by the governor. The law provides also for the appointment and remuneration of a chaplain for state convicts. On 1 January, 1906, there were 1234 state prisoners, 90 per cent of whom were coloured, distributed through 33 convict camps.

The constitution gives to each county the privilege of local option to permit or prohibit the sale of liquor. In a majority of the counties prohibition prevails. Where permitted, the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor are regulated by State, county, and municipal licence laws. Conveyance of real and personal property by will is restricted only by conditions of soundness of mind and age requirement of twenty-one years on part of the testator. There appear to be no Supreme Court decisions referring to bequests for Masses and charitable purposes or to the seal of confession, but the attitude of both bench and bar in the State has in these matters been ever above suspicion of anti-Catholic bias or partiality.

FAIRBANKS, *History of Florida* (Jacksonville, 1901); IDEM, *History of St. Augustine* (New York, 1858); SHEA, *Catholic Missions* (New York, 1857); IDEM, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886-92); GATSCHE, *A Migration of the Creek Indians* (Philadelphia, 1884); IDEM, *The Timuqua Language in Proceedings of Am. Phil. Soc.* (Philadelphia), XVI (1877), 627; XVII (1878), 490; XVIII (1880), 465; LOWERY, *The Spanish Settlements* (New York, 1901-05); IRVING, *The Conquest of Florida* (Philadelphia, 1835); BRINTON, *Notes on the Floridian Peninsula* (Philadelphia, 1859); ROMANS, *A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida* (New York, 1775); BREVARD, *History and Government of Florida* (New York, 1904); DEWHURST, *The History of St. Augustine* (New York, 1881); CARROLL, *Historical Collections of South Carolina* (New York, 1836); STEPHENS, *History of Georgia* (New York, 1847); WALLACE, *Carpet Bag Rule in Florida* (Jacksonville, 1888); YOCUM, *Civil Government in Florida* (Deland, 1905); WILLIAMS, *Florida* (New York, 1837); FISKE, *The Discovery of*

*America* (Boston, 1892); *General Statutes of the State of Florida* (St. Augustine, 1906); WILLOUGHBY, *Across the Everglades* (Philadelphia, 1906); RUIDIAZ, *La Florida* (Madrid, 1893); GARCÍA, *Dos antiguas relaciones de la Florida* (Mexico, 1902); TERNAUX-COMANS, *Recueil de pièces sur la Floride* (Paris, 1841); SPRAGUE, *The Origin, Progress and Conclusion of the Florida War* (New York, 1848); *Extant Records of the Parish of St. Augustine from the year 1564*, preserved in the Cathedral Archives at St. Augustine. JAMES VEALE.

**Florilegia** (Lat. *florilegium*, an anthology) are systematic collections of excerpts (more or less copious) from the works of the Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers of the early period, compiled with a view to serve dogmatic or ethical purposes. These encyclopedic compilations—Patristic anthologies as they may be fitly styled—are a characteristic product of the later Byzantine theological school, and form a very considerable branch of the extensive literature of the Greek Catenæ.

Two classes of Christian florilegia may here be distinguished: the dogmatic and the ascetical, or ethical. The dogmatic florilegia are collections of Patristic citations designed to exhibit the continuous and connected teaching of the Fathers on some specific doctrine. The first impulse to compilations of this nature was given by the Christological controversies that convulsed the Eastern Church during the fifth century, when, both at the gatherings of the great church councils and in private circles, the practical need had made itself definitely felt, of having at hand, for ready reference, a convenient summary of what the Fathers and most approved theologians had held and taught concerning certain controverted doctrines. Such a summary, setting forth the views of Nestorius and the mind of the orthodox Fathers, was first laid before the Council of Ephesus, in 431, by St. Cyril of Alexandria. Summaries of dogmatic utterances were used also at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and at the Fifth General Council in 533. But it was not until the seventh century that the dogmatic florilegia assumed a fully developed and definite form. At the Sixth General Council, in 680, two of these collections played a very prominent rôle, one, constructed by Macarius, the Patriarch of Antioch, in favour of the Monothelites, and the other, a counter collection presented by the legates of Pope Agatho. During the Iconoclastic controversy similar collections were produced. Mention is made of one on the cult of relics and images which the Synod of Jerusalem sent to John, Bishop of Gothia, about 760.

The oldest extant, and at the same time most extensive and valuable, of these dogmatic compilations, is the "*Antiquorum Patrum doctrina de Verbi incarnatione*" (first completely edited from a manuscript in the Vatican Library by F. Diekamp, "*Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*", Münster, 1907). It is extraordinarily rich in fragments from writings of the Patristic period which are now lost. Of the 977 citations (mainly of a Christological character) which it contains, 751 alone are from the works of the Fathers, representing 93 ecclesiastical writers. Diekamp ascribes the work to the period between the years 685 and 726, and, though nothing can be said with certainty concerning the author, a slight probability points to Anastasius of Sinai as its compiler. A florilegium somewhat similar to the "*Doctrina*" is mentioned by Photius in his *Bibliotheca* (Migne, P. G., CLIII, 1089-92), but not a trace of it survives to-day. Another compilation of this kind, covering the whole province of theology in five books, is ascribed to the monk Doxopates, identical perhaps with the eleventh-century John Doxopates; the first two books, treating of Adam and Christ, are all that remain. A number of other dogmatic florilegia are still extant in manuscript form, but they have never been edited, nor even critically examined. The authors of most of them are unknown.

The ascetical florilegia are collections of moral sentences and excerpts drawn partly from the Scriptures and partly from the Fathers, on such topics as virtues and vices, duties and exercises of a religious life, faith, discipline, etc. They are not so numerous as the dogmatic florilegia, and apparently were all compiled before the tenth century. Their material, as a rule, is gathered indiscriminately from various authorities, though in some instances it is furnished by only a single writer, a distinct preference being then shown for the works of the more illustrious Fathers, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and St. John Chrysostom. An extensive Christian florilegium of the sixth century, entitled *τὰ ιερὰ* (Sacred Things), is probably the earliest of these anthologies. The work consisted originally of three books, the first of which treated of God, the second of man, and the third of the virtues and vices. In the course of time it underwent contraction into one book, its material was recast and arranged in alphabetical order under *τίτλοι*, or sections, its name changed to *τὰ ιερὰ παράλληλα*, "*Sacra Parallela*" (from the fact that in the third book a virtue and a vice were regularly contrasted or paralleled), and its authorship widely ascribed to St. John Damascene. That the Damascene was really the compiler of the "*Sacra Parallela*," and that he used as his principal source the "*Capita theologica*," a florilegium of Maximus Confessor, has been maintained recently with much learning and skill (against Loofs, Wendland, and Cohn) by K. Holl ("*Fragmenta Vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela*", Leipzig, 1899). Though *τὰ ιερὰ* is no longer extant in its original form, considerable portions of the first two books have come down to us in manuscript, and parts of the third are preserved in "*The Bee*" (*Melissa*) of Antonius, a Greek monk of the eleventh century (Migne, P. G., CXXXVI, 765-1124). Of the "*Sacra Parallela*" there are several recensions, one of which is given in Migne (P. G., XCV, 1040-1586; XCVI, 9-544). Other extant ascetical florilegia still remain unedited. As in the case of the dogmatic florilegia, most of them are anonymous.

The character and value of the Christian florilegia cannot be definitely or finally estimated until the various manuscripts that now lie scattered through the libraries of Europe and the East have received a more thorough and critical investigation than has hitherto been accorded to them. Questions as to date, authorship, sources, structure, relative dependence, etc., have as yet been treated only in a general way. As the characteristic production of an age of theological decadence, these collections of ancient Christian fragments have no high literary value; they are, however, of great importance to us, because they frequently embody the only remains of important Patristic writings. The difficulties connected with their use arise chiefly from the unsatisfactory condition of the text, the uncertainty concerning the names to which the fragments have been ascribed, and the want of sufficient data to determine the dates. Only a small part of the extant material has been printed.

The best general account of the florilegia will be found in KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897), 206-210, 216-218, where there is also bibliography and a full list of manuscripts.—WACHSMUTH, *Studien zu den griechischen Florilegien* (Berlin, 1882).

For the dogmatic florilegia: SHERMAN, *Die Geschichte der dogmatischen Florilegien vom 5. bis 8. Jahrh.* (Leipzig, 1904). For the *Sacra Parallela*, LOOFS, *Leontius von Byzanz* (Leipzig, 1887); IDEM, *Studien über die Johannes von Damasko zugeschriebenen Parallelen* (Halle, 1892); and the above-mentioned works by DIEKAMP and HOLL. Cf. SHAHAN in *Catholic Univ. Bulletin* (Washington), V, 94 sq.

THOMAS OESTREICH.

**Florus**, a deacon of Lyons, ecclesiastical writer in the first half of the ninth century. We have no information regarding the place of birth, the parents, or the youth of this distinguished theologian; but it is probable that he came from the neighbourhood of Lyons,

not however from Spain, as some scholars have asserted. A letter to Bishop Bartholomew of Narbonne, written between 827 and 830 and signed by Florus as well as by Archbishop Agobard and the priest Hildigisus, furnishes us with the first positive information we possess of his history ("Mon. Germ. Hist.: Epp.", V, 206 sqq.). He was then a deacon of the church of Lyons, which office he continued to hold throughout his life. From the fact that at this time he already enjoyed a reputation as a theologian, we may conclude that he was born certainly before the end of the eighth century. That he was then known (827) even outside the boundaries of the church of Lyons is testified by the poetic epistle written about the same time by the youthful Walahfrid Strabo to Archbishop Agobard, in which he speaks of Florus, with an allusion to his name, as a flower the fragrance of which had spread even to the banks of the Rhine ("Versus Strabi Walahfridi", viii, v, 17-24, ed. Dümmler, "Poetæ Carol. ævi", II, 357, in "Mon. Germ. Hist.>").

Until about the middle of the ninth century, the deacon of Lyons followed an active literary career; he was theologian, canonist, liturgist, and poet. He was considered one of the foremost authorities on theological questions among the clergy of the Frankish kingdom; and, in consequence, his opinion was often sought in important ecclesiastical matters. When, after the deposition of Archbishop Agobard of Lyons by the Synod of Diedenhofen (835), Bishop Modoin of Autun summoned before the civil power certain ecclesiastics of the church of Lyons, Florus, in his work "De iniusta vexatione ecclesiæ Lugdunensis", took issue with Modoin and defended ecclesiastical freedom. Other canonical writings of Florus are his "Capitula ex lege et canone collecta" and his treatise on the election of bishops, "De electionibus episcoporum". Another of his works, "Querela de divisione Imperii", a lament over the dissensions of the realm, was written by Florus when the kingdom was undergoing severe political disturbance occasioned by the strife between Louis the Pious and Lothair. His liturgical writings are: "De expositione Missæ", and three treatises against Amalarius ("Opuscula contra Amalarium"). In these latter works the author inveighs against the famous Amalarius of Metz, who came to Lyons, in 835, and wished to introduce changes in the liturgy which were disapproved of by Florus. Later, Florus took part in the conflict concerning predestination, which had been stirred up by the monk Gottschalk. Shortly after the Synod of Quierzy, in the year 849, he wrote on this subject, "De prædestinatione", and laid down the doctrine of a twofold predestination, to salvation and to damnation, maintaining at the same time the doctrine of the free will of man. When John Scotus Eriugena attacked this opinion, Florus, commissioned by the church of Lyons, wrote in 852 his work "Liber adversus Johannem Scotum". He is also the author of commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul. His next work was the completion of the Martyrology of Bede, to which he made additions for the various days. The chief sources on which he relied in enlarging the work are a manuscript from St-Pierre in Mâcon, and two manuscripts of Echternach and Toul, which may all be found in the National Library at Paris (MSS. lat. 5254, 10018 and 10158). In later revisions of the martyrology, these additions have been made use of. Finally, the deacon of Lyons has left a number of poems. After the year 852, no further information, definite as to time, has come down to us regarding Florus; so that his death may be said, with probable exactitude, to have occurred about the year 860.

The works of Florus are found in *P. L.*, LXI, 1081 sqq., XCIV, 799 sqq., CXIX; in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Epp.*, V, and in *Poetæ Carol. ævi*, II; DÜMMLER, *Præfatio* to den *Poetæ Carol. ævi*, II, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*; MAASEN, *Ein Kommentar des Florus von Lyon zu einer der sogen. Sirmundischen Konstitutionen in Sitzungsberichte der Akademie zu Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, XCII (1878), 301-325; BAEHR, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*

im karolingischen Zeitalter (Heidelberg, 1840); QUENTIN, *Les martyrologes historiques du moyen-âge* (Paris, 1908), 222-408. J. P. KIRSCH.

**Flower, RICHARD.** See LEIGH, RICHARD.

**Floyd, JOHN**, English missionary, wrote under the names, FLUD, DANIEL A JESU, HERMANNUS LCMELIUS, GEORGE WHITE, ANNOSUS FIDELIS VERIMENTANUS, and under the initials J. R. Some of his works have been erroneously attributed to Robert Jennison, S.J. He was b. in Cambridgeshire in 1572; d. at St-Omer, 16 Sept., 1649. He was educated at the Jesuit College at Eu, then at the English College at Reims (17 March, 1588), and finally the English College in Rome (1590), where he entered the Society of Jesus, 1 Nov., 1592. Nothing is known about his ordination, but in 1606 he was a missionary priest in England. On 6 April in that year he was arrested at Worcester while attempting to visit Ven. Edward Oldcorne who was to suffer martyrdom next day. Having been imprisoned for twelve months he, with forty-six other priests, was banished for life. He then spent four years teaching at St-Omer, though Foley (Records, IV, 238) is mistaken in supposing that he published any controversial works at that time. On 31 July, 1609, he was professed of the four vows, and soon after returned to England, where he laboured on the mission for many years, being often captured, but effecting his escape by buying off the pursuivants. In 1612 he published his first work, "The Overthrow of the Protestant Pulpit Babels", in which he replied to Crashaw's "Jesuit's Gospel". He was in turn answered by Sir Edward Hoby, in his "A Counter-snarl for Ishmael Rabshakeh a Cycropeidian Lycaonite, being an answer to a Roman Catholic who writes himself J. R." Father Floyd retorted in 1613 with "Purgatorie's Triumph over Hell, maugre the barking of Cerberus in Syr Edward Hoby's Counter Snarle". This controversy closed with Hoby's rejoinder "A Curry-comb for a Cox-combe", published in 1615. Father Floyd next turned his attention to Marc' Antonio de Dominis, formerly Archbishop of Spalatro, who had apostatized and become Protestant dean of Windsor. Against him Father Floyd wrote four works: "Synopsis Apostasiæ Marci Antonii de Dominis, olim Archiepiscopi Spalatensis, nunc Apostatæ, ex ipsiusmet libro delineata" (Antwerp, 1617). It was translated into English by Father Henry Hawkins, S.J., in 1617, and again by Dr. John Fletcher in 1828. "Hypocrisis Marci Antonii de Dominis detecta seu censura in ejus libros de Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ" (Antwerp, 1620); "Censura X Librorum de Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ Marci Antonii de Dominis" (Antwerp, 1620; Cologne, 1621); "Monarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ ex scriptis M. Antonii de Dominis Archiepiscopi Spalatensis Demonstratio, duobus libris comprehensa" (Cologne, 1622). All four works appeared under the signature *Fidelis Annosus Verimentanus*.

In 1620 Floyd published "God and the King", a translation of a work on loyalty; and in the following year a translation of St. Augustine's "Meditations". In 1623 he was living in Fleet Lane (Gee's "Foot out of the Snare") and in the same year he wrote "A Word of Comfort: or a discourse concerning the late lamentable accident of the fall of a room at a Catholic Sermon in the Blackfriars at London, wherewith about four-score persons were oppressed"; also a translation of Molina "On the Sacrifice of the Mass". In 1625 he published "An Answer to Francis White's reply to Mr. Fisher's answer to the Nine Articles offered by King James to Father John Fisher". In 1629 and the succeeding years Father Floyd played a leading part in the controversy between seculars and Jesuits as to the desirability of having a bishop resident in England. Bishop Richard Smith, whose presence was regarded by some as a source of persecution, had in fact left England for Paris and was never able to return, but

the situation gave rise to acrimonious discussion. Father Floyd's works were "An Apology of the Holy Sea Apostolic's Proceedings for the Government of the Catholicos of England during the time of persecution" (Rouen, 1630; enlarged Lat. ed., Cologne, 1631); and "Hermannii Lœmelii Antverpiensis Spongia qua diluuntur Calumniae nomine facultatis Parisiensis impositae libro qui inscribitur Apologia", etc. (St-Omer, 1631). Both these works were condemned by the Sorbonne, and in 1633 Urban VIII stopped the controversy and suppressed all writings upon the subject. His other works are: "A Paire of Spectacles for Sir Humphrey Linde to see his way withall" (1631); "The Church Conquerant over Human Wit" (1638); "The Totall Summ" (1638); "The Imposture of Puritan Piety" (1638). He left two unpublished works, "Vita Brunehildis Francorum Reginae" and a "Treatise on Holy Pictures". Father Floyd spent the last years of his life teaching philosophy and theology at St. Omer's.

DODD, *Church History* (Brussels, 1739-1742), III, 105; DE BACKER, *Bibl. des écrivains de la c. de J.* (1869), I, 1888; KNOX, *Douay Diaries* (London, 1878); FOLEY, *Records Eng. Prov. S. J.* (London, 1878, 1880, 1882), IV, 238, where he mistakes a date in Douay Diary and states that Floyd was sent to Rome in 1593 instead of 1590; VI, 185; VII, 268; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v., who repeats FOLEY's mistake.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Fogaras**, ARCHDIOCESE OF (FOGARASIENSIS), Hungary, of the Greek-Rumanian Rite. It has three suffragan sees, Grosswardein (Nagy Váradi), Lugos, and Szamos Ujvár (Armenopolis). Since 1733 the residence has been at Balászfalva (Blaj, Blasendorf). The Diocese of Fogaras was erected in 1721, suffragan to the Primate of Hungary (the Latin Archbishop of Gran). In 1853 Pius IX re-established the archbishopric of Alba Julia (Weissenburg, Karlsburg), an ancient metropolitan title, and united it with the See of Fogaras. Since that time the head of the Greek-Rumanian Church bears the title of Archbishop of Fogaras and Alba Julia. Since 1697 (Synod of Karlsburg), when these Rumanians returned to Catholic unity, there have been eleven Catholic titulars of Alba Julia or Fogaras.

The city of Fogaras (6000 inhabitants) (in German Fagreschmarkt) is built on the Aluta. Its fortress played an important part in all the wars with the Turks. In 1849 the Hungarians were defeated here by the Russians. Balászfalva, the residence of the archbishop, has also about 6000 inhabitants. Here, in 1848, the Rumanians protested against political union with Hungary. The archdiocese numbers 440,000 Rumanian Catholics. There are 720 priests, nearly all married, 705 parishes, as many churches, and several chapels. The preparatory and theological seminaries are at Blaj, also a college and a printing establishment, where the weekly journal "Unirea" has been published since 1890. The diocesan schools for boys and girls are attended by 60,000 pupils. There are 3 gymnasias for boys or girls, and several convents.

NILLES, *Symbola ad illustrandam historiam Ecclesiarum orientalium in terris Coronae S. Stephani* (Innsbruck, 1885), passim; *Semiatismul . . . de Alba Julia si Fogaras* (Balászfalva, 1900); *Missiones catholicae* (Rome, 1907), 785-86.

S. VAILLÉ.

**Fogarty**, MICHAEL. See KILLALOE, DIOCESE OF.

**Foggia**, DIOCESE OF (FODIANA), in the province of the same name in Apulia (Southern Italy). The city is in the heart of a rich agricultural centre, in a vast plain between the rivers Cervaro and Celone. It grew up about the church of the Madonna dei Sette Veli, today the cathedral, built in 1072 by Robert Guiscard. Foggia is so named from the swampy character of the territory, *foya* or *fogia* signifying "marsh". It later became the capital of the district known as the Capitanata. Frederick II built an imperial fortress there.

In 1254 Manfred defeated there Pope Innocent IV, though in the same place, in 1266, he himself submitted to Charles of Anjou, who in 1268 destroyed the city for taking part with the unfortunate Conradino. In 1781 a severe earthquake greatly damaged the city. Foggia formed part of the Diocese of Troia until 1855, when it was made a diocese by Pius IX, comprising territory of the Dioceses of Siponto and Manfredonia. The first bishop was Bernardino M. Frascolla. Situated so near the ancient city of Arpi, which had a bishop, Pardus, as early as 314, the Bishops of Troia may be considered as successors of the Bishops of Arpi. In 1907 Foggia was united *aeque principaliter* with Troia. It is immediately subject to the Holy See. The cathedral, a remarkable architectural monument, has been often restored and enlarged; it contains the mausoleum of the Princes of Durazzo. Worthy of mention is the church of the Crosses, which is approached through a series of chapels. Foggia has 9 parishes, 81,000 inhabitants, 2 male and 8 female educational institutions, 3 religious houses of men, and 9 of women.

CAFFELLETTI, *Le Chiese d' Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI; *Anuario Ecd.* (Rome, 1908).

U. BENIGNI.

**Foillan** (Irish FAELAN, FAOLAN, FOELAN, FOALAN), SAINT, represented in iconography with a crown at his feet to show that he despised the honours of the world. He was born in Ireland early in the seventh century and was the brother of Saints Ultan and Fursey, the latter a famous missionary who preached the Faith to the Irish, the Anglo-Saxons, and the Franks. Foillan, probably in company with Ultan, went with his brother Fursey when the latter, fleeing from his country then devastated by foreign invaders, retired to a lonely island. Fursey soon went among the Anglo-Saxons and built a monastery at Burgh Castle (Cnobresburg) in Suffolk, between 634 and 650.

Seized again with the desire for solitude, Fursey left the monastery in the care of Foillan, who remained at the head of the community, and had the happiness of once more seeing his brother Fursey, who, having since gone to the kingdom of the Franks, came to visit him about 650. Soon a disastrous war broke out between Penda, the Mercian chief, and Ana, King of the Eastern Anglo-Saxons. Ana having been put to flight, the monastery of Cnobresburg fell into the hands of the enemies. It was pillaged, and its superior, Foillan, barely escaped death. He hastened to ransom the captive monks, recovered the relics, put the holy books and objects of veneration on board ship, and departed for the country of the Franks, where his brother Fursey was buried. He and his companions were well received at Péronne by Erconwald, Mayor of the Palace. But soon, for some unknown reason, Foillan and his companions left Péronne and went to Nivelles, a monastery founded by St. Ita and St. Gertrude, wife and daughter of Duke Pepin I.

Foillan, like so many other Irishmen who went to the Continent in the seventh century, was invested with episcopal dignity, having doubtless been a monastic bishop at Cnobresburg. He was therefore of great assistance in the organization of worship, and the holy books and relics which he brought were great treasures for St. Ita and St. Gertrude. As the monastery of Nivelles was under Irish discipline, the companions of Foillan were well received and lived side by side with the holy women, occupying themselves with the details of worship under the general direction of the abbess. Through the liberality of Ita, Foillan was enabled to build a monastery at Fosses, not far from Nivelles, in the province of Namur. After the death of Ita in 652, Foillan came one day to Nivelles and sang Mass, on the eve of the feast of St-Quentin. The ceremony being finished, he resumed his journey, doubtless undertaken in the interests of his monastery.

In the forest of Seneffe the saint and his companions fell into a trap set by bandits who inhabited that solitude. They were slain, stripped, and their bodies concealed. But they were recovered by St. Gertrude, and when she had taken some relics of the saint his body was borne to the monastery of Fosses, where it was buried about 655.

Foillan was one of the numerous Irish travellers who in the course of the seventh century evangelized Belgium, bringing thither the liturgy and sacred vessels, founding prosperous monasteries, and sharing considerably in the propagation of the Faith in these countries. Owing to the friendship which united him with Erconwald, Mayor of the Palace, and with the members of Pepin's family, Foillan played a preponderant part in Frankish ecclesiastical history, as shown by his share in the direction of Nivelles and by the foundation of the monastery of Fosses. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should be honoured and venerated both at Nivelles and Fosses and to find at Le Rœulx (Belgium) a monastery bearing his name. As late as the twelfth century the veneration in which he was held inspired Philippe Le Harvenge, Abbot of Bonne-Espérance, to compose a lengthy biography of the saint. He is the patron of Fosses, near Charleroi. In the Diocese of Namur his feast is celebrated on 31 October, in the Dioceses of Mechlin and Tournai on 5 November.

*Additamentum Nivialese de Foillano*, ed. KRUSCH, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, IV, 449-451; *Acta SS., Vita Foillani*, October (ed. PALMÉ), XIII, 383 sqq. An appreciation in GHESQUIÈRE, *Acta SS. Belgii* (1785), III, and CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (London, 1516), 149-150; DE BUCK, *Commentarius pravius in Sanctum Foillanum*, *Acta SS.* (1883), October, XIII, 370-83, supplement, 922-25; ROUSSEAU, *Vie de S. Feuillien, évêque et martyr, patron de la ville de Fosses* (Liège, 1739); BERLIÈRE, *La plus ancienne vie de Saint Foillan in Revue Bénédicte* (1892), IX, 137-139; KRUSCH in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: loc. cit.*, 423 sqq.; VAN DER ESSEN, *Étude critique et littéraire sur les Vies des saints Mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique* (Louvain, 1907), 149-161; GUGAUP, *L'œuvre des Saints dans l'Europe continentale in Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (1908), IX, 27-28; STOKES, *Six Months in the Forests of France* (London); BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints*, s. v.; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*.  
L. VAN DER ESSEN.

**Folengo**, TEOFILO, Italian poet, better known by his pseudonym of MERLIN COCCAIO or COCAI; b. at Mantua in 1496; d. at the monastery of Santa Croce in Campese in 1544. He received some training at the University of Bologna and then entered the Benedictine Order. In 1524 or 1525, either through enmity for his abbot, Ignazio Squarcialupi, or because of a temporary impatience of monastic life, he divested himself of the habit and acted for a while as a private tutor. Then repenting of the step taken, he made overtures to his order for his readmission, which was granted in 1534, only after he had done penance and had cleared himself of certain suspicions of heterodoxy. Three years later he became prior of the monastery of Santa Maria delle Ciambre in Sicily. He returned to the mainland in 1543. Folengo's fame rests chiefly on his "Baldus" which was first printed in 1517 in seventeen books or *Macaronice*, and was reprinted in 1521 with eight additional books. The work, epic in its tendencies, belongs to the category of burlesque compositions in macaronic verse (that is in a jargon, made up of Latin words mingled with Italian words, given a Latin aspect), which had already been inaugurated by Tifi Odasi in his "Macaronea", and which, in a measure, marks a continuance of the goliardic traditions of the Middle Ages. For the first edition of the "Baldus", Folengo had derived burlesque traits and types of personages from the chivalrous romances of Boiardo and Pulci. His second edition reveals, in the greater amplitude of its action, in the improved manner of setting forth comic types, and in its generally better developed feeling for art, the author's reading of the "Orlando Furioso" of Ariosto. However, the poem is a parody not only of the Italian chivalrous

romance but also of the Virgilian epic, and, in its latter part, of Dante's "Divine Comedy" as well. Furthermore, it is grossly satirical in its treatment of the clergy and at times borders on the sacrilegious. In view of the general nature of the work, it is easily intelligible that it should have appealed to Rabelais, who found in it the prototype of his "Panurge" and his "Gargantua".

Among the lesser works of Folengo are the "Zanitonella", which parodies both the Virgilian pastoral and the Petrarchian love-lyric; the "Orlandino" (1526), which gives in Italian octaves a burlesque account of the birth and youth of Roland; the curious "Caos del Triperuno" (1527), which in verse and prose and in mingled Latin, Italian, and Macaronic speech, sets forth allegorically the author's own previous heretical leanings and finally states his confession of faith; and the "Moschæa", which in three books of Macaronic distichs relates, somewhat after the fashion of the "Batrachomachia", as well as of the chivalrous romances, the victory of the ants over the flies, and preludes the Italian mock-heroic poem of the seventeenth century. After his return to his order, Folengo wrote only religious works, such as the Latin poem "Janus", wherein he expresses his repentance for having written his earlier venturesome compositions; the "Palermittana", in Italian *terza rima*; and the "Hagiomachia", which, in Latin hexameters, describes especially the lives of eighteen saints.

PORTOLI, *Le opere maccheroniche di Merlin Coccaio* (Mantua, 1882-1889); LUZIO and RENDA in *Giornale storico*, XIII, XIV, XXIV; RENDA, *Studi Folenghiani* (Florence, 1899); SCHNEEGANS, *Geschichte der grotesken Satire* (Strasbourg, 1894); FLAMINI, *Il Cinquecento*, extensive bibliography on pp. 544 sqq.  
J. D. M. FORD.

**Foley**, JOHN S. See DETROIT, DIOCESE OF.

**Foley**, PATRICK. See KILDARE AND LEIGHLIN, DIOCESE OF.

**Foligno**, ANGELA DE. See ANGELA OF FOLIGNO.

**Foligno**, DIOCESE OF (FULGINATENSIS), in the province of Perugia, Italy, immediately subject to the Holy See. The city, situated on the river Topino, was founded on the site of the ancient Christian cemetery surrounding the basilica of San Feliciano, outside the ancient city of Fulginium, which, after the battle on the Esinus (295 B. C.), was annexed to Rome. The splendour of the ancient city is attested by numerous ruins of temples, aqueducts, circuses, etc. In the municipal museum of Foligno is a large collection of household utensils of the Roman and Umbrian periods. Mention must also be made of the Foligno "Hercules", a famous statue now in the Louvre at Paris. After the Lombard invasion (565) the city formed part of the Duchy of Spoleto, with which, in the eighth century, it came into the possession of the Holy See. During the thirteenth century it was Ghibelline; but in 1305 the Guelphs under Nello Trinci expelled the Ghibellines with their leader Corrado Anastasi; thenceforth until 1439 the Trinci governed the city as the pope's vicars. In 1420 their rule was extended to Assisi, Spello, Bevagna, Nocera, Trevi, Giano, and Montefalco.

Art and literature flourished vigorously at Foligno. Evidence of this may still be seen in the Trinci palace, with its magnificent halls decorated by Ottaviano Nelli, Gentile da Fabriano, and others. Better preserved is the chapel, on the ceiling of which is pictured the life of the Blessed Virgin; in the adjoining room the story of Romulus and Remus is depicted. Another room is called "The Hall of Astronomy"; the largest is "The Hall of the Giants", so called from its immense portraits of personages of Biblical and Roman history. This splendid edifice has unfortunately been disgracefully neglected and now serves as a court of justice, prison, etc. At the court of the Trinci, especially Nicolò, were many distinguished poets, e. g. Mastro Paolo da Foligno, Fra Tommasuccio da No-



cera, Candido Bontempi, and others; the most illustrious was the Dominican Federigo Frezzi, Bishop of Foligno (1403), whose "Quadrifoglio" is a kind of commentary on the "Hall of the Giants". After the murder of Nicolò Trinci in 1437, his brother Corrado began to rule in a tyrannical way; Eugene IV, therefore, in 1439 sent Cardinal Vitelleschi to demand his submission. Henceforth Foligno enjoyed a large communal liberty under a papal governor.

There is reason to believe that Christianity was introduced at Foligno in the first half of the second century. St. Felicianus, the patron of the city, though certainly not the first bishop, was consecrated by Pope Victor and martyred under Decius (24 January); the exact dates of his history are uncertain (Acta SS., Jan., II, 582-88; Analecta Boll., 1890, 381).



LATERAL FAÇADE, CATHEDRAL OF FOLIGNO, XIII CENTURY

Until 471 no other bishop is known. St. Vincentius of Laodicea in Syria was made bishop by Pope Hormisdas in 523. Of subsequent bishops the following may be mentioned: Eusebius, who persuaded King Luitprand to spare the city (740); Azzo degli Azzi, who distinguished himself at the Council of Rome in 1059 against Berengarius; Bonfiglio de' Bonfigli, who took part in the First Crusade; Blessed Antonio Bettini (1461), a Jesuit; Isidoro Clario (1547), a theologian at the Council of Trent. In 1146 a council was held at Foligno. The cathedral, of very early date, and possessing a beautiful crypt, was rebuilt in 1133; in 1201 a wing, with a façade, was added, famous for its sculptures by Binello and Rodolfo (statues of Frederick Barbarossa and of Bishop Anselm), restored in 1903. Other churches are: Santa Maria infra Portas, of the Lombard period, with Byzantine frescoes; San Claudio (1232); San Domenico (1251); San Giovanni Profanma (1231), whose name recalls the ancient city of Forum Flaminii. The monastery of Sassovio (1229), with a remarkable cloister of 120 columns, and the Palazzo Communale are also noteworthy.

The diocese has 55 parishes, 31,000 inhabitants, 3 male and 3 female educational institutions, 4 religious houses of men, and 12 of women; it has also a weekly Catholic paper.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), IV; FALOCI-PULIGNANI, *Foligno in L'Italia artistica* (Bergamo, 1907).

U. BENIGNI.

**Foliot, GILBERT**, BISHOP OF LONDON. See GILBERT FOLIOT.

**Folkestone Abbey**, or more correctly FOLKESTONE PRIORY, is situated in the east division of Kent about thirty-seven miles from Maidstone. It was originally a monastery of Benedictine nuns founded in 630 by St. Eanswith or Eanswide, daughter of Eadbald, King of Kent, who was the son of St. Ethelbert, the first Christian king among the English. It was dedicated to St. Peter. Like many other similar foundations it was destroyed by the Danes. In 1095 another monastery for Benedictine monks was erected on the same site by Nigel de Mundeville, Lord of Folkestone. This was an alien priory, a cell belonging to the Abbey of Lonley or Lolley in Normandy, dedicated to St. Mary and St. Eanswith, whose relics were deposited in the church. The cliff on which the monastery was built was gradually undermined by the sea, and William de Abrincis in 1137 gave the monks a new site, that of the present church of Folkestone. The conventual buildings were erected between the church and the sea coast. Being an alien priory it was occasionally seized by the king, when England was at war with France, but after a time it was made denizen and independent of the mother-house in Normandy and thus escaped the fate which befell most of the alien priories in the reign of Henry V. It continued to the time of the dissolution and was surrendered to the king on 15 Nov., 1535. The names of twelve priors are known, the last being Thomas Barrett or Bassett. The net income at the dissolution was about £50. It was bestowed by Henry VIII on Edmund, Lord Clinton and Saye; the present owner is Lord Radnor. The only part of the monastic buildings remaining is a Norman doorway, but the foundations may be traced for a considerable distance.

DUGDALE, *Monasticon*, Stevens' Supplement (London, 1722), I, 399; TANNER, *Notitia Monastica* (London, 1787), s. v. Kent; DUGDALE, *Monast. Anglic.* (London, 1846), IV, 672.

G. E. HIND.

**Fonseca, JOSÉ RIBEIRO DA**, Friar Minor; b. at Evora, 3 Dec., 1690; d. at Porto, 16 June, 1752. He was received into the Franciscan Order in the convent of Ara Coeli at Rome, 8 Dec., 1712. As minister general of the order, he was untiring in his efforts to restore discipline in places where it had become lax; and displayed in this regard singular prudence, tact, and executive ability. In 1740 he founded the large library in the old convent of Ara Coeli, and under his direction and patronage, the "Annales Minorum" of Wadding were published at Rome in seventeen volumes, between the years 1731 and 1741. Fonseca several times declined the episcopal dignity, but finally accepted (1741) the See of Oporto, to which he was nominated by John V of Portugal.

FLÓREZ, *España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1743), XXI, 233 sqq.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

**Fonseca, PEDRO DA**, philosopher and theologian, b. at Cortizada, Portugal, 1528; d. at Lisbon, 4 Nov., 1599. He entered the Society of Jesus in Coimbra in 1548, and in 1551 passed to the University of Evora, where, after completing his studies, he lectured upon philosophy with such subtlety and brilliancy as to win for himself the title of the "Portuguese Aristotle". His works, which for over a century after his death were widely used in philosophical schools throughout Europe, are: "Institutionum Dialecticarum Libri Octo" (Lisbon, 1564); "Commentariorum in Libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Stagiritæ" (Rome, 1577); "Isagoge Philosophica" (Lisbon, 1591). These works appeared in an immense number of editions from the Catholic press all over Europe. Fonseca also shares the fame of the "Conimbricenses" (q. v.), as it was

during his term of office as provincial and largely owing to his initiative that this celebrated work was undertaken by the Jesuit professors of Coimbra.

As a man of affairs, Fonseca was not less gifted than as a philosopher. He filled many important posts in his order, being assistant, for Portugal, to the general, visitor of Portugal, and superior of the professed house at Lisbon; while Gregory XIII and Philip II (from 1580 King of Portugal) employed him in affairs of the greatest delicacy and consequence. Fonseca used his influence wisely in promoting the interests of charity and learning. Many great institutions in Lisbon, notably the Irish college, owe their existence, at least in great part, to his zeal and piety. He is also credited with a considerable share in the drawing up of the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum. But his greatest claim to lasting reputation lies in the fact that he first devised the solution, by his *scientia media* in God, of the perplexing problem of the reconciliation of grace and free will. Nevertheless his fame in this matter has been somewhat obscured by that of his disciple, Luis de Molina, who, having more fully developed and perfected the ideas of his master in his work "Concordia Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratia Donis", etc., came gradually to be regarded as the originator of the doctrine.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, III, 337; DE BACKER, *Bibl. des Ecrivains de la C. de J.*, I, 313, VII, 239; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, SCHNEEMANN, *Zur Geschichte der Theorie von der Scientia Media in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, XVIII, 237; IDEM, *Die Entstehung der thomistisch-molinistischen Controverse*, Supplement ix to *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (Freiburg, 1880); IDEM, *Controversiarum de divina gratia liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus* (Freiburg, 1881).

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Fonseca Soares, ANTONIO DA** (ANTONIO DAS CHAGAS), Friar Minor and ascetical writer; b. at Vidi-gueira, 25 June, 1631; d. at Torres Vedras, 20 Oct., 1682. Having entered the Portuguese army as a common soldier, he was forced to flee to Bahia in Brazil, as the result of a duel. There he abandoned himself to a careless and dissolute life, but was converted through the writings of Louis of Granada and resolved to embrace the religious life. The execution of his resolution was deferred indefinitely, and having returned to Portugal, he continued to lead his former life of dissipation, until in 1662 he was taken with a grievous illness. On his recovery he hastened to fulfil his promise, and was admitted into the Franciscan Order in May of the same year, receiving in religion the name of Antonio das Chagas. He soon became famous throughout Portugal on account of his poetical and ascetical writings, in which he combined remarkable erudition with such singular elegance of style as to give him a merited place among the classics of Portugal. He died universally esteemed for his virtuous life, leaving a great part of his writings still unpublished. The following were published since his death: "Faiscas de amor divino e lagrimas da alma" (Lisbon, 1683); "Obras espirituas" (Lisbon, 1684-1687); "O Padre nosso commentado" (Lisbon, 1688); "Espelho do Espirito em que deve verse e compor-se a Olma" etc. (Lisbon, 1683); "Escola da penitencia e flagello dos peccadores" (Lisbon, 1687); "Sermoes Genuinos" etc. (Lisbon, 1690); "Cartas espirituas" (Lisbon, 1684); "Ramilhete espiritual" etc. (Lisbon, 1722).

GODINHO, *Vida do F. Antonio da Fonseca Soares* (Lisbon, 1687 and 1728); DE SOLEDAD, *Historia saeufica da provincia de Portugal*, III, 3, 17.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

**Font.** See BAPTISMAL FONT.

**Font, BLESSING OF.** See BAPTISMAL FONT.

**Fontana, CARLO**, architect and writer; b. at Bruciato, near Como, 1634; d. at Rome, 1714. There seems to be no proof that he belonged to the family of famous architects of the same name. Fontana went to Rome and studied architecture under Bernini. His principal works in Rome are the Ginetti chapel at

Sant' Andrea della Valle; the Cibo chapel in Madonna del Popolo; the cupola, great altar, and ornaments of the Madonna de' Miracoli; the church of the monks of Santa Marta; the façades of the church of Beata Rita and of San Marco in the Corso; the sepulchre of Queen Christina of Sweden in St. Peter's; the palaces Grimani and Bolognetti; the fountain of Santa Maria in Trastevere, and that in the piazza of St. Peter's which is towards Porta Cavallegieri; reparation of the church of Spirito Santo de' Napolitani, and the theatre of Tordinona. By desire of Innocent XI, his patron, he erected the immense building of San Michele at Ripa; the chapel of Baptism at St. Peter's; and finished Monte Citorio. By request of Clement XI he built the granaries at Termini; the portico of Santa Maria in Trastevere, and the basin of the fountain of San Pietro Montorio. He restored the Library of Minerva, the cupola of Montefiascone and the casino in the Vatican, and collected all the models of the building. He sent a model for the cathedral of Fulda, and others to Vienna for the royal stables. By order of Innocent XI he wrote a diffuse description of the Templum Vaticanum (1694). In this work Fontana advised the demolition of that nest of houses which formed a sort of island from Ponte Sant' Angelo to the piazza of St. Peter's. Fontana made a calculation of the whole expense of St. Peter's from the beginning to 1694, which amounted to 46,800,052 crowns, without including models. He published also works on the Flavian Amphitheatre; the Aqueducts; the inundation of the Tiber, etc. He was assisted by his nephews Girolamo and Francesco Fontana. Fontana seems to have been considered an able artist and a good designer and more successful as an architect than as a writer.

MICHAUD, *Biographie Universelle*; MELIZEAS, *Lives of Celebrated Architects*, II, 264; LONGFELLOW, *Cyclopedia of Architecture in Italy, Greece and the Levant*, 365, etc.; ANDERSON, *Italian Renaissance Architecture*, 168, 172, 176; MOORE, *Character of Renaissance Architecture; Rome as an Art City in Langham Series of Art Monographs*, 62.

THOMAS H. POOLE.

**Fontana, DOMENICO**, Roman architect of the Late Renaissance, b. at Merli on the Lake of Lugano, 1543; d. at Naples, 1607. He went to Rome before the death of Michelangelo and made a deep study of the works of ancient and modern masters. He won in particular the confidence of Cardinal Montalto, later Pope Sixtus V, who in 1584 charged him with the erection of the Cappella del Presepio (Chapel of the Manger) in S. Maria Maggiore, a powerful domical building over a Greek cross, a marvellously well-balanced structure, notwithstanding the profusion of detail and overloading of rich ornamentation, which in no way interferes with the main architectural scheme. It is crowned by a dome in the early style of S. Biagio at Montepulciano. For the same patron he constructed the Palazzo Montalto near S. Maria Maggiore, with its skilful distribution of masses and rich decorative scheme of reliefs and festoons, impressive because of the dexterity with which the artist adapted the plan to the site at his disposal. After his accession as Sixtus V, Montalto appointed Fontana architect of St. Peter's, bestowing upon him among other distinctions the title of Knight of the Golden Spur. He added the lantern to the dome of St. Peter's, and it was he who proposed the prolongation of the interior in a well-defined nave. Of more importance were the alterations he made in St. John Lateran (c. 1586) where he introduced into the loggia of the north façade an imposing double arcade of wide span and ample sweep, and probably added the two-story portico to the Scala Santa. This predilection for arcades as essential features of an architectural scheme, was brought out in the different fountains designed by Domenico and his brother Giovanni, e.g. the Fontana dell' Acqua Paola, or the Fontana di Termini planned

along the same lines. Among profane buildings his strong restrained style, with its suggestion of the School of Vignola, is best exemplified in the Lateran Palace (begun 1586), in which the vigorous application of sound structural principles and a power of coordination are undeniable, but also the utter lack of imagination and barren monotony of style. It was characteristic of him to remain satisfied with a single solution of an architectural problem, as shown in the fact that he reapplied the *motif* of the Lateran Palace in the later part of the Vatican containing the present papal residence, and in the additions to the Quirinal Palace. Fontana also designed the transverse arms separating the courts of the Vatican. In 1586 he set up the obelisk in the Square of St. Peter's, of which he gives an account in "Della transportatione dell' obelisco Vaticano e delle fabbriche di Sisto V" (Rome, 1590). The knowledge of statics here displayed, which aroused universal astonishment at the time, he availed himself of in the erection of three other ancient obelisks on the Piazza del Popolo, Piazza di S. Maria Maggiore, and Piazza di S. Giovanni in Laterano. After his patron's death he continued for some time in the service of his successor, Clement VIII. Soon, however, dissatisfaction with his style, envy, and the charge that he had misappropriated public moneys, drove him to Naples where, in addition to canals, he erected the Palazzo Reale on a design totally devoid of imagination. His aim was to execute a sharply defined plan in vigorous sequence, without concern for detail, employing the means available but without much originality. The chief lack in his work is a want of the distinctive character of an individual creation. Undue spaciousness, tremendous expanse, with an appalling barrenness and coldness and without the inspiration of inner *motif*, are his ideals.

Domenico's brother Giovanni (b. 1546; d. at Rome, 1614) is of less importance. His chief creations are gigantic fountains, spiritless in detail, at Frascati and Rome, where the Palazzo Giustiniani is also ascribed to him.

GURLETT, *Geschichte des Barockstils in Italien* (Stuttgart, 1887), I, 217-18.

JOSEPH SAUER.

**Fontana, FELICE**, Italian naturalist and physiologist, b. at Pomarolo in the Tyrol, 15 April, 1730; d. at Florence, 11 January, 1805. He received his early education at Rovereto and spent several years at the Universities of Padua and Bologna. After filling the chair of philosophy at Pisa, to which he was appointed by the Emperor Francis I, he was summoned to Florence by the Grand-Duke Peter Leopold and made court physician. He was at the same time commissioned to organize and equip the museum, which is well known for its geological and zoological collections and its physical and astronomical instruments, some of which are of much historical value. A special feature of the collections is the unique set of anatomical models which were made of coloured wax under Fontana's personal direction. They were of excellent workmanship and excited much attention at the time. Emperor Joseph II engaged him to make a similar set for the Academy of Surgeons in Vienna. Fontana spent the latter part of his life in Florence where his position as curator of the museum gained for him the acquaintance of most of the scientific men of the time. Though never in Holy orders, he is said to have worn the ecclesiastical dress. His death was due to a fall received on the public street, and he was buried in the church of Santa Croce near Galileo and Viviani. Fontana was a follower of Haller and wrote a series of letters in confirmation of the latter's views on irritability. He made a special study of the eye and in 1765 carried on a series of experiments on the contractile power of the iris. He investigated the physiological action of poisons, par-

ticularly of serpents and of the laurel berry. He discovered that the staggers, a disease of sheep, is due to hydatids in the brain. He also gave much attention to the study of the physical and chemical properties of gases. He published a number of memoirs and though a laborious writer was not always exact. His chief works are "De' moti dell' iride" (Lucca, 1765); "Ricerche filosofiche sopra la fisica animale" (Florence, 1775); "Ricerche fisiche sopra 'l veneno della vipera" (Lucca, 1767), of which a larger and much extended edition was published in two volumes in 1781; "Descrizioni ed usi di alcuni stromenti per misurar la salubrità dell' aria" (Florence, 1774); "Recherches physiques sur la nature de l'air déphlogistique et de l'air nitreux" (Paris, 1776).

COUVIER in *Biog. Univ. (Paris)*, XIV; BAAS, *Outlines of History of Medicine* (New York, 1889).

HENRY M. BROCK.

**Fontbonne, JEANNE**, in religion MOTHER ST. JOHN, second foundress and superior-general of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Lyons, b. 3 March, 1759, at Basen-Basset, Velay, France; d. 22 November, 1843, at Lyons. In 1778 she entered a house of the Sisters of St. Joseph which had just been established at Monistrol (Haute-Loire) by Bishop de Gallard of Le Puy. The following year she received the habit and soon gave evidence of unusual administrative powers, particularly through her work in the schools. On her election, six years later, as superior of the community, Mother St. John, as she was now called, co-operated with the saintly founder in all his pious undertakings, aided in the establishment of a hospital, and accomplished much good among the young girls of the town. At the outbreak of the Revolution she and her community followed Bishop de Gallard in refusing to sign the Oath of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, notwithstanding the example of the Curé of Monistrol, who went so far as to abet the government officials in their persecution of the sisters. Forced to disperse her community, the superior remained at her post till she was dragged forth by the mob and the convent taken possession of in the name of the Commune, after which she returned to her father's home. Not long afterwards she was torn from this refuge, to be thrown into the prison of Saint-Didier, and only the fall of Robespierre on the day before that appointed for the execution saved her from the guillotine. Unable to regain possession of her convent at Monistrol, she and her sister, who had been her companion in prison, returned to their father's house. Twelve years later (1807), Mother St. John was called to Saint-Etienne as head of a small community of young girls and members of dispersed congregations, who at the suggestion of Cardinal Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons, were now established as a house of the Sisters of St. Joseph. She restored the asylum at Monistrol, repurchased and reopened the former convent, and on 10 April, 1812, the congregation received Government authorization. In 1816 Mother St. John was appointed superior general of the Sisters of St. Joseph, and summoned to Lyons to found a general mother-house and novitiate, which she accomplished after many difficult years of labour. During the remainder of her life she was busied in perfecting the affiliation of the scattered houses of the congregation, which had been formally decreed in 1828. She also established over two hundred new communities. An object of her special solicitude was the little band which she sent to the United States in 1836 and with which she kept in constant correspondence, making every sacrifice to provide them with the necessities of life. Towards the end of her life, Mother St. John was relieved of the arduous duties of superior, and spent the last few years in preparation for the end.

RIVAUD, *Life of Rev. Mother St. John Fontbonne*, tr. (New York, 1887).

F. M. RUDGE.

**Fonte-Avellana**, a suppressed order of hermits, which takes its name from their first hermitage in the Apennines. Its founder, Ludolph, the son of Giso, came of a German family that had settled in Gubbio. He was born about the year 956; in 977 he left his home and, with a companion called Julian, began to live the life of a hermit in a valley between Monte Catria and Monte Corvo, in the Apennines. This valley was known as Fonte-Avellana, from a spring among the pine-trees. Disciples soon gathered round the two hermits; by 989 they were sufficiently numerous to receive a rule from St. Romuald, who was then in that district. This rule seems to have been of great severity. The hermits lived in separate cells and were always occupied with prayer, study, or manual labour. Four days a week they ate nothing but bread and water in strictly limited quantities. On Tuesdays and Thursdays they added a little fruit and vegetables. Wine was used only for Mass and for the sick, meat not at all. They observed three "Lents" during the year, that of the Resurrection, that of the Nativity, and that of St. John the Baptist. During these they fasted on bread and water every day except Sundays and Thursdays, when they were allowed a few vegetables. They wore a white habit and their feet were bare. Every day, in addition to the office, they recited the whole Psalter before dawn. Many wore chains and girdles or other instruments of mortification, and each, according to his devotion and strength, was accustomed to scourge himself, to make many genuflections and to pray with arms extended in the form of a cross.

At first the body of hermits was known as the Congregation of the Dove, from the pure and gentle character of its founder; but when, about the year 1000, he built them their first regular hermitage, which was dedicated to St. Andrew, they soon became known as the Hermits of Fonte-Avellana. Ludolph is said by Ughelli to have resigned the office of prior in 1009 and to have become Bishop of Gubbio, but by leave of Benedict VIII he resigned this office in 1012 and retired again to his hermitage. It is not improbable that he was succeeded in the priorate by Julian about 1009, but there seems to be no satisfactory evidence that he was ever Bishop of Gubbio. He died in 1047. In 1034, St. Peter Damian became a hermit at Fonte-Avellana, at a time when, it is supposed, the famous Guido d'Arezzo was prior. St. Peter Damian succeeded to the office of prior about 1043 and held it until his death in 1072. He made some modifications of the rule; permitting the use of a little wine, except during the three Lents; restraining the immoderate use of the discipline, which had outgrown all prudence; and introducing the solemn observance of Fridays as a commemoration of the Holy Cross, for which reason the hermitage, since the year 1050, has been known as Holy Cross of Fonte-Avellana.

During the priorate of St. Peter Damian several hermits of great sanctity were members of Fonte-Avellana. The earliest of these was St. Dominic Loricatus, so-called from the breastplate (*lorica*) which he always wore next to his skin. This extraordinary ascetic was born about the year 990, and was destined for the priesthood by his parents, who bribed a bishop to ordain him before the canonical age. After living for a few years as a secular priest, he was struck with contrition for the sin of simony to which he had been a party, and became a monk. This was probably at the hermitage of Luceoli, as we are told that he placed himself under the direction of John of Monte Felto. Here he remained till about 1044, when, desiring to increase the severity of his penances, he came to Fonte-Avellana to be the disciple of St. Peter Damian. The record of his mortifications is almost incredible. Besides his cuirass, he wore habitually iron rings and chains round his limbs, and loaded with this weight he daily prostrated himself a thousand times or recited whole psalters with arms extended in the form of a

cross. Day and night he lacerated his body with a pair of scourges.

It had become the custom to regard the recital of thirty psalms while taking the discipline (i. e. about three thousand strokes) as equivalent to one year's canonical penance. So that to scourge oneself while reciting the whole psalter was to execute five years of penance. St. Dominic Loricatus is related to have accomplished in this manner one hundred years of penance (i. e. twenty psalters), spreading the penance over one week. And during one or two Lents he is said to have fulfilled in this way one thousand years of penance, scourging himself night and day for forty days, while he recited no less than two hundred psalters. Daily he used to recite two or three psalters, and daily in Lent eight or nine. Meanwhile he ate only the stricter diet of his fellow-hermits and he never slept save when, from sheer fatigue, he fell asleep in the midst of his prostrations. In 1059 St. Peter Damian appointed him prior of the hermitage of Sanvicino, near San Severino. Here he continued his terrible penances up to his death about 1060. His body still lies under the altar in the church at Sanvicino. Another saintly companion of St. Peter Damian was his biographer, St. John II of Lodi (Bishop of Gubbio), who entered Fonte-Avellana about the year 1055 and became prior of the hermitage soon after the death of his friend in 1072, which office he retained till he was made Bishop of Gubbio, one year before his death in 1106.

In addition, there were the blessed brothers Rudolph and Peter, who in 1054 gave their castle at Campo Regio to St. Peter Damian and retired to Fonte-Avellana. Rudolph became Bishop of Gubbio in 1059 and in that year attended a council at Rome. He died in 1061. Of his brother Peter little is known save that he lived a life of great mortification. Four years after the death of St. Peter Damian, Gregory VII in 1076 took the hermitage of Fonte-Avellana under the special protection of the Holy See, and for 250 years popes and emperors and nobles showered privileges upon it. In 1301 Boniface VIII subjected the hermitage immediately to the Holy See, and in 1325 John XXII raised it to the status of an abbey, and ordained that its abbots should always receive their blessing at the hands of the pope or of his legate *a latere*. In the early fourteenth century it had grown to be a great congregation with many subject houses. But the glory of Fonte-Avellana was soon to pass. In 1393 it was given *in commendam* to Cardinal Bartolomeo Medievacca, and the evils that follow this practice soon appeared. Slowly the fervour of observance departed, and the religious lived rather like secular clergy than like hermits. By the sixteenth century the habit had changed, and they wore a short white cassock, a blue mantle, shoes, and a white biretta.

In 1524 the great Camaldolese reformer, S. Paolo Giustiniani, suggested that the congregation of Fonte-Avellana should be united to his own order. The project then came to nothing, but in 1568 Cardinal Giulio della Rovere, the commendatory abbot of Fonte-Avellana, joined with his brother the Duke of Urbino in urging on Pius V the canonical visitation of the hermitage. This was performed early in 1569 by Giambattista Barba, general of the Camaldolese, and in November of the same year the pope, by the Bull "Quantum animus noster", suppressed the order of Fonte-Avellana, transferred its members to Camaldoli or any other house they might choose, and united all its possessions under the jurisdiction of the Camaldolese Order. On 6 January, 1570, the Camaldolese solemnly entered into possession, and the order of Santa Croce of Fonte-Avellana ceased to exist.

AUGUSTINUS FLORENTINUS, *Historiarum Camaldulensium*, Pars II (Venice, 1579), 209-232; MITTARELLI and COSTADONI, *Annales Camaldulenses* (Venice, 1755-72); MABILLON, *Annales O. S. B.*, IV (Lucca, 1739); HÉLYOT, *Histoire des Ordres Religieux*, V (Paris, 1718), 280-288; ST. PETER DAMIAN, *Opera in*

P. L., CXLIV, CXLV (Paris, 1867); *Acta SS.*, Feb., III, 406-427; Aug., VI, 811-812; Sept., III, 146-175; Oct., VI, 611-628, Oct., VIII, 182-199; HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, I (Paderborn, 1907), 262, 405; GIBELLI, *Monografia dell' antico monastero di S. Croce di Fontevellana* (Faenza, 1896); *Rivista Storica Benedettina*, I, 466; II, 127.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

**Fontenelle**, ABBEY OF (or ABBEY OF SAINT-WANDRILLE), a Benedictine monastery in Normandy (Seine-Inférieure), near Caudebec-en-Caux. It was founded by Saint-Wandrille (Wandregisilus; d. 22 July, 667), the land being obtained through the influence of his friend St-Ouen (Audoenus), Archbishop of Rouen. St-Wandrille was of the royal family of Austrasia and held a high position at the court of his kinsman, Dagobert I, but being desirous of devoting his life to God, he retired to the Abbey of Montfaucon, in Champagne, in 629. Later on he went to Bobbio and then to Romain-Moutiers, where he remained ten years. In 648 he returned to Normandy and founded the monastery which afterwards bore his name. He commenced by building a great basilica dedicated to St. Peter, nearly three hundred feet long, which was consecrated by St-Ouen in 657. This church was destroyed by fire in 756 and rebuilt by Abbot Ansegisus (823-833), who added a narthex and tower. About 862 it was wrecked by Danish pirates and the monks were obliged to flee for safety. After sojourning at Chartres, Boulogne, St-Omer, and other places for over a century, the community was at length brought back to Fontenelle by Abbot Maynard in 966 and a restoration of the buildings was again undertaken. A new church was built by Abbot Gérard, but was hardly finished when it was destroyed by lightning in 1012. Undaunted by this disaster the monks once more set to work and another church was consecrated in 1033. Two centuries later, in 1250, this was burnt to the ground, but Abbot Pierre Mauviel at once commenced a new one. The work was hampered by want of funds and it was not until 1331 that the building was finished. Meanwhile the monastery attained a position of great importance and celebrity. It was renowned for the fervour, no less than for the learning of its monks, who during its periods of greatest prosperity numbered over three hundred. Many saints and scholars proceeded from its cloisters. It was especially noted for its library and school, where letters, the fine arts, the sciences, and above all calligraphy, were assiduously cultivated.

One of the most notable of its early copyists was Hardouin, a celebrated mathematician (d. 811), and who wrote with his own hand four copies of the Gospels, one of St. Paul's Epistles, a Psalter, three Sacramentaries, and many other volumes of homilies and lives of the saints, besides numerous mathematical works. The Fontenelle "Capitularies" were compiled under Abbot Ansegisus in the eighth century. The monks of St-Wandrille enjoyed many rights and privileges, amongst which were exemption from all river-tolls on the Seine, and the right to exact taxes in the town of Caudebec. The charter, dated 1319, in which were enumerated their chief privileges, was confirmed by Henry V of England and Normandy, in 1420, and by the Council of Basle, in 1436. Commendatory abbots were introduced at Fontenelle in the sixteenth century and as a result the prosperity of the abbey began to decline. In 1631 the central tower of the church suddenly fell, ruining all the adjacent parts, but fortunately without injuring the beautiful cloisters or the conventual buildings.

It was just at this time that the newly formed Congregation of St-Maur was revivifying the monasticism of France, and the commendatory abbot Ferdinand de Neuville invited the Maurists to take over the abbey and do for it what he himself was unable to accomplish. They accepted the offer, and in 1636 set about rebuilding not only the damaged portion of the church,

but also other parts of the monastery as well. They added new wings and gateways and also built a great chapter-hall for the meetings of the general chapter of the Maurist congregation. They infused new life into the abbey, which for the next hundred and fifty years again enjoyed some of its former celebrity. Then came the Revolution, and with it the extinction of monasticism in France. St-Wandrille was suppressed in 1791 and sold by auction the following year. The church was allowed to fall into ruins, but the rest of the buildings served for some time as a factory. Later on they passed into the possession of the de Stacpoole family, and were turned to domestic uses. The Duke de Stacpoole, who had become a priest and a domestic prelate of the pope, and who lived at Fontenelle until his death, in 1896, restored the entire property to the French Benedictines (Solemsnes congregation), and a colony of monks from Ligugé settled there in 1893, under Dom Pothier as superior. This community was expelled by the French government in 1901, and is at present located in Belgium. Besides the chief basilica, St-Wandrille built several other churches or oratories, both within and without the monastic enclosure. All of these have either perished in course of time, or been replaced by others of later date, except one, the chapel of St-Saturnin, which stands on the hillside overlooking the abbey. It is one of the most ancient ecclesiastical buildings now existing and, though restored from time to time, is still substantially the original erection of St-Wandrille. It is cruciform, with a central tower and eastern apse, and is a unique example of a seventh-century chapel. The parish church of the village of St-Wandrille also dates from the Saint's time, but it has been so altered and restored that little of the original structure now remains.

STE-MARTHE, *Gallia Christiana* (Paris, 1759), XI; D'ACHÉRY, *Chron. Fontanellense in Spicilegium*, III; MIGNÉ, *Dict. des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856); LANGLOIS, *Essai historique et descriptif sur l'Abbaye de St-Wandrille* (Rouen, 1825); SAUVAGE, *St-Wandrille* (Rouen, 1889); *Acta SS.*, July.

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Fontevrault**, ORDER AND ABBEY OF.—I. CHARACTER OF THE ORDER.—The monastery of Fontevrault was founded by Blessed Robert d'Arbrissel about the end of 1100 and is situated in a wooded valley on the confines of Anjou, Tours, and Poitou, about two and a half miles south of the Loire, at a short distance west of its union with the Vienne. It was a "double" monastery, containing separate convents for both monks and nuns. The government was in the hands of the abbess. This arrangement was said to be based upon the text of St. John (xix, 27), "Behold thy Mother", but want of capacity among the brethren who surrounded the founder would seem to be the most natural explanation. To have placed the fortunes of the rising institute in feeble hands might have compromised its existence, while amongst the nuns he found women endowed with high qualities and in every way fitted for government. Certainly the long series of able abbesses of Fontevrault is in some measure a justification of the founder's provision.

Fontevrault was the earliest of the three orders which adopted the double form and it may be useful to point out the chief differences in rule and government which mark it off from the similar institutions of the English St. Gilbert of Sempringham, founded in 1135 (see GILBERTINES), and that of the Swedish princess, St. Bridgett, founded in 1344 (see BRIGITTINES). At Fontevrault both nuns and monks followed the Benedictine Rule (see below, II), as did the Gilbertine nuns, but the male religious of that order were canons regular and followed the Rule of St. Augustine. The Briggittines of both sexes were under the *Regula Salvatoris*, an adaptation and completion of the Augustinian Rule. The Abbess of Fontevrault was supreme over all the religious of the order, and the heads of the dependent houses were prioresses. Each Briggittine house was independent, and was ruled by an abbess



who was supreme in all temporalities, but in matters spiritual was forbidden to interfere with the priests, who were under the confessor general. The head of the Gilbertines was a canon, the "Master" or "Prior of All", who was not attached to any one house; his power was absolute over the whole order. All three orders were primarily founded for nuns, the priests being added for their direction or spiritual service, and in all three the nuns had control of the property of the order. The habit of the Fontevryst nuns was a white tunic and surplice with a black girdle, a white guimp and black veil; the cowl was black. The monks wore a black tunic with a surplice and above it a hood and capuce; from the centre of the last, in front and behind, hung a small square of stuff known as the "Robert". In winter the monks wore an ample cloak without sleeves. The original habit was in both cases more simple.

II. THE RULE.—It appears certain from the biography of Blessed Robert, which is known as the "Vita Andreae", that the Rule was written down during the founder's lifetime, probably in 1116 or 1117. This original Rule dealt with four points: silence, good works, food, and clothing, and contained the injunction that the abbess should never be chosen from among those who had been brought up at Fontevrault, but that she should be one who had had experience of the world (*de conversis sororibus*). This latter injunction was observed only in the case of the first two abbesses and was abrogated by Innocent III in 1201. We have three versions of the Fontevryst Rule (P. L., CLXII, 1079 sqq.), but it is clear that none of these is the original, though it is probable that the second version is a fragment or possibly a selection with additions by the first abbess, Petronilla (for the argument see Walter, op. cit. infra, pp. 65-74). This Rule was merely a supplement to the Rule of St. Benedict and there were no important variations from the latter in the ordinary conventual routine, though some additions were necessitated by the conditions of the "double" life. The rules for the nuns enjoin the utmost simplicity in the materials of the habit, a strict observance of silence, abstinence from flesh meat even for the sick, and rigorous enclosure. The separation of the nuns from the monks is carried to such a point that a sick nun must be brought into the church to receive the last sacraments. The subjection of the monks is very marked. They are men "who of their own free will have promised to serve the nuns till death in the bonds of obedience, and that too with the reverence of due subjection. . . . They shall lead a common conventual life with no property of their own, content with what the nuns shall confer upon them." The very scraps from their table are to be "carried to the nuns' door and there given to the poor". A fugitive but penitent monk "shall ask pardon of the Abbess and through her regain the fellowship of the brethren." The monks cannot even receive a postulant without the permission of the abbess.

III. HISTORY OF THE ORDER.—At the death of Robert d'Arbrissel, in 1117, there are said to have been at Fontevrault alone 3000 nuns, and in 1150 even 5000: the order was approved by Paschal II in 1112. The first abbess, Petronilla of Chemillé (1115-1149), was succeeded by Matilda of Anjou, who ruled for five years. She was the daughter of Fulk, King of Jerusalem, and widow of William, the eldest son of Henry I, of England. The prosperity of the abbey continued under the next two abbesses, but by the end of the twelfth century, owing to the state of the country and the English wars, the nuns were reduced to gaining their livelihood by manual work. The situation was aggravated by internal dissensions which lasted a hundred years, and prosperity did not return till the beginning of the fourteenth century, under the rule of Eleanor of Brittany, grand-daughter of Henry III of England, who had taken the veil at the Fontevryst

priory of Amesbury, in Wiltshire. The next abbess was Isabel of Valois, great-grandchild of St. Louis, but on her death there succeeded another period of trouble and decadence largely due to the disaffection of the monks who were discontented with their subordinate position. During the fifteenth century there were several attempts at reform, but these met with no success till the advent to power, in 1457, of Mary, sister of Francis II, Duke of Brittany. The order had suffered severely from the decay of religion, which was general about this time, as well as from the Hundred Years War. In the three priories of St-Aignan, Breuil, and Ste-Croix there were in all but five nuns and one monk, where there had been 187 nuns and 17 monks at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and other houses were no better off. In 1459, a papal commission decided upon a mitigation of rules which could no longer be enforced, and nuns were even allowed to leave the order on the simple permission of their prioress. Dissatisfied with the mitigated life of Fontevrault, Mary of Brittany removed to the priory of La Madeleine-lez-Orléans in 1471. Here she deputed a commission consisting of religious of various orders to draw up a definite Rule based on the Rules of Blessed Robert, St. Benedict, and St. Augustine, together with the Acts of Visitations. The resulting code was finally approved by Sixtus IV in 1475, and four years later it was made obligatory upon the whole order. Mary of Brittany died in 1477, but her work was continued by her successors, Anne of Orléans, sister of Louis XII, and Renée de Bourbon. The latter may well be styled the greatest of the abbesses, both on account of the numbers of priories (28) in which she re-established discipline, and the victory which she gained over the rebellious religious at Fontevrault by the reform, enforced with royal assistance in 1502. The result was a great influx of novices of the highest rank, including several princesses of Valois and Bourbon. At Renée's death there were 160 nuns and 150 monks at Fontevrault. Under Louise de Bourbon (1534-1575), a woman of sincere but gloomy piety, the order suffered many losses at the hands of the Protestants, who even besieged the great abbey itself, though without success; many nuns apostatized, but twelve more houses were reformed. Eleanor of Bourbon (1575-1611) saw the last of these troubles. She had great influence with Henry IV, and her affection for him was so great that, towards the end of her life, when he was assassinated, her nuns dared not tell her lest the shock should be too great.

The Abbess Louise de Bourbon de Lavedan, aided by the famous Capuchins, Ange de Joyeuse and Joseph du Tremblay, sought to improve the status of the monks of St-Jean de l'Habit and made various attempts to establish theological seminaries for them. Her successor Jeanne-Baptiste de Bourbon, an illegitimate child of Henry IV by the beautiful Charlotte des Essarts, has the credit of finally giving peace to the order. In 1641 she obtained royal letters confirming the reform and finally quashing the claims of the monks, who sought to organize themselves independently of the authority of the abbess. The following year the Rule approved by Sixtus IV was printed at Paris. The "Queen of Abbesses", Gabrielle de Rochechouart (1670-1704), sister of Mme. de Montespan and friend of Mme. de Maintenon, is said to have translated all the works of Plato from the Latin version of Ficino. The abbey school was frequented by the children of the highest nobility, and her successors were entrusted with the education of the daughters of Louis XV. The last abbess, Julie Sophie Charlotte de Pardailan d'Antin, was driven from her monastery by the Revolution; her fate is unknown. Towards the end of the eighteenth century there were 230 nuns and 60 monks at Fontevrault, and at the Revolution there were still 200 nuns, but the monks were few in number and only formed a community at the mother-

house. In the course of his preaching journeys through France, Robert d'Arbrissel had founded a great number of houses, and during the succeeding centuries others were given to the order. In the seventeenth century the Fontevrist priories numbered about sixty in all and were divided into the four provinces of France, Brittany, Gascony, and Auvergne. The order never attained to any great importance outside France though there were a few houses in Spain and England. The history of the order is, as will already have been seen, that of the mother-house. The Angevin kings were much attached to Fontevrault; Henry II and his queen, Eleanor of Guienne, Richard Cœur de Lion, and Isabel of Angoulême, the wife of King John, were buried in the *Cimetière des Rois* in the abbey church, where their effigies may still be seen. The remains were scattered at the Revolution.

IV. THE ABBEY BUILDINGS.—The Abbey of Fontevrault was in four parts: the Grand Moustier, or convent of the nuns, the hospital and lazaretto of Saint-Lazare, the Madeleine for penitent women, and, some distance apart, the monastery of St-Jean de l'Habit for the monks, destroyed at the Revolution. The most notable buildings were naturally those belonging to the nuns with the great minster dedicated to Our Lady. This was consecrated by Pope Callistus II, in 1119, but the church was probably rebuilt in the second half of the same century. It is a magnificent specimen of late Romanesque and consists of an aisleless nave vaulted with six shallow cupolas, transepts, and an apsidal chancel with side chapels. In 1804 the abbey became a central house of detention for 15,000 prisoners, and the nave of the church was cut up into four stories forming dormitories and refectories for the convicts, while the choir and transepts were walled up and used as their chapel. Five of the six cupolas were destroyed, but the nave has recently been cleared, and a complete restoration begun. The length of the church is 84 metres (about 276 ft.), the width of the nave 14m. 60 (about 48 ft.), and the height 21m.45 (about 70 ft.). The interesting cloisters and chapter-house may be visited, but the magnificent refectory, dating from the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, is not shown.

V. ENGLISH HOUSES.—These were the Priors of Amesbury, in Wiltshire, and Nuneaton, in Warwickshire, and the Cell of Westwood, in Worcestershire, with six nuns. Amesbury had been an abbey, but on account of their evil lives the nuns were dispersed by royal orders and the monastery given to Fontevrault in 1177. The community was recruited from the highest ranks of society and in the thirteenth century numbered among its members several princesses of the royal house, among them Queen Eleanor of Provence, widow of Henry III. A survey of the English houses was taken in 1256, when there were 77 choir nuns, 7 chaplains and 16 *conversi* at Amesbury, and 86 nuns at Nuneaton. In the fourteenth century the officials were appointed by the Abbess of Fontevrault, but the bonds uniting the English nunneries to the mother-house were gradually loosened until from alien they became denizen, that is to say, practically independent. In the last days some of the Prioresses of Amesbury seem to have resumed the ancient abbatial title; at the dissolution, in 1540, the house was surrendered by Joan Darrell and thirty-three nuns. A Prior of Amesbury is mentioned in 1399, but it does not seem certain that there were at any time regular establishments of the Fontevrist monks in England.

VI. MODERN DEVELOPMENT.—In 1803 Madame Rose, a Fontevrist nun, opened a school at Chemillé, the home of the first abbess, and three years later was enabled to buy a house and start community life; only temporary vows were taken, and the constitutions were approved by the Bishop of Angers. A few years later the habit of Fontevrault was resumed. Twelve more Fontevrists joined the community, and the ancient Rule was kept as far as possible. In 1847 permis-

sion was granted by the government to remove the relics of Blessed Robert from Fontevrault to Chemillé, and by 1849 there were three houses of the revived congregation: Chemillé in the Diocese of Angers; Boulor in the Diocese of Auch; and Brioude in the Diocese of Puy. In this year a general chapter was held, in which certain modifications of the Rule were agreed upon: the many fasts were found ill adapted to the work of teaching; the houses were made subject to the ordinary; and the superioress elected only for three years. There are no Fontevrist monks.

For full bibliography see BEAUNIER, HEIMBUCHER, and WALTER as below.—The standard work is NICOQUET, *Hist. de l'Ordre de Fontevrault* (Paris, 1642); LARDIER, *Sainte Famille de Fontevrault* (1650), unfortunately still in MS. For the Rule see WALTER, *Ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs* (Leipzig, 1903), I; *Regula Ordinis Fontis-Ebraldi* (Fr. and Lat., Paris, 1642). See also HEIMBUCHER, *Ord. u. Kong. der Kath. Kirche* (Paderborn, 1907), I; COSNIER, *Fontisbraldi Eboradum* (Masserano, 1841); HÉLYOT, *Hist. des Ordres Religieux*, VI; BEAUNIER, *Recueil hist. des archevêques*, etc., Introductory vol. (Paris, 1906), 215-226; BESSE, *Fontevrault and the English Benedictines at the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century in The Ampleforth Journal*, II; BISHOP, *Bishop Giffard and the Reform of Fontevrault in The Downside Review* (Jan., 1886); JUBEN, *L'Abbesse Marie de Bretagne et la réforme de l'Ordre de Fontevrault* (Angers, 1879); CLÉMENT, *Abbesse de Fontevrault au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1869); UZUREAU, *Dernière Abbesse de Fontevrault in Revue Mabillon*, II. The only adequate account of the buildings, though now a little out of date, is given by BOSSE-BŒUF, *Fontevrault, son histoire et ses monuments* (Tours, 1890.)

RAYMUND WEBSTER.

**Fontfroide, ABBEY OF (B. MARIA DE FONTE FRIGIDO)**, a Cistercian monastery in the department of Aude, six miles north-west of Narbonne, formerly in the diocese of Narbonne, now in that of Carcassonne. It was founded at Narbonne some time before 1097 by Aimery, Count of Narbonne, and was originally a filiation of the Benedictine abbey of Grandseigne. In 1118 the monks settled at Fontfroide, so-called from a spring in the place where the new monastery was built, and in 1146 the Cistercian reform was adopted. The abbey held a position of considerable importance in the Middle Ages and many of its abbots and monks were drawn from the nobility and highest families of France. One, Jacques Fournier, was elevated to the papacy as Benedict XII in 1334; some became cardinals, amongst whom were Arnaud Novelli (1310), Augustin Trivulce (d. 1548), and Hippolyte d'Este (d. 1572); and several others became Bishops of Narbonne or neighbouring churches. In the seventeenth century three successive abbots were members of the de La Rochefoucauld family. Fontfroide was the burial place of the Counts of Narbonne, its chief patrons, and it had also many royal benefactors.

In 1401 the use of abbatial *pontificalia* was granted by Benedict XIII, and other papal privileges were conceded at different times. The abbots also exercised civil jurisdiction over their dependents. The abbey escaped the intrusion of commendatory abbots, so common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and flourished under the rule of monastic superiors right up to the time of the Revolution, when it was suppressed. The buildings then became private property and, dismantled and untenanted, were gradually falling into decay, when, in 1858, they were purchased for a sum of eighty thousand francs by Père Marie-Bernard (Louis Barnouin), the founder of the "Cistercians of the Immaculate Conception" and restorer of the abbey of Sénanque, which had been incorporated into the Order of Cîteaux a year previously. A colony of about a dozen monks, under Père Marie-Jean, as first abbot of the restored Fontfroide, was sent there from Sénanque. In 1905 the "Association Laws" obliged them to leave, and the community is now domiciled at Tàrrega, in the province of Lérida, Spain, in the diocese of Solsona. It numbers about thirty-one members, of whom fourteen are priests. They belong to the "Cistercians of the Common Observance", who were separated from the Trappists or "Stricter Observance" in 1834. The monasteries of

Fontfroide and Hautcombe (in Savoy) now form the "Congregation of Sénanque", formerly that "of the Immaculate Conception", of which the present Abbot of Fontfroide is the vicar-general. Its constitutions were approved in 1892. The buildings at Fontfroide are chiefly of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and include the church, cloisters, chapter-house, etc., comprising two quadrangles, all practically complete. (See CISTERCIANS.)

STE-MARTHE, *Galla Christiana* (Paris, 1739), VI; MIGNE, *Dict. des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856); REDON, *Vie de Dom Marie Bernard* (Lérins, 1904); *Catalogus Ord. Cist.* (Rome, 1906).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Fools, FEAST OF**, a celebration marked by much licence and buffoonery, which in many parts of Europe, and particularly in France, during the later middle ages took place every year on or about the feast of the Circumcision (1 Jan.). It was known by many names—*festum fatuorum*, *festum stultorum*, *festum hypodiaconorum*, to notice only some Latin variants—and it is difficult, if not quite impossible, to distinguish it from certain other similar celebrations, such, for example, as the Feast of Asses (q. v.), and the Feast of the Boy Bishop (q. v.). So far as the Feast of Fools had an independent existence, it seems to have grown out of a special "festival of the subdeacons", which John Beleth, a liturgical writer of the twelfth century and an Englishman by birth, assigns to the day of the Circumcision. He is among the earliest to draw attention to the fact that, as the deacons had a special celebration on St. Stephen's day (26 Dec.), the priests on St. John the Evangelist's day (27 Dec.), and again the choristers and mass-servers on that of Holy Innocents (28 Dec.), so the subdeacons were accustomed to hold their feast about the same time of year, but more particularly on the festival of the Circumcision. This feast of the subdeacons afterwards developed into the feast of the lower clergy (*esclaffardi*), and was later taken up by certain brotherhoods or guilds of "fools" with a definite organization of their own (Chambers, I, 373 sqq.). There can be little doubt—and medieval censors themselves freely recognized the fact—that the licence and buffoonery which marked this occasion had their origin in pagan customs of very ancient date. John Beleth, when he discusses these matters, entitles his chapter "*De quadam libertate Decembria*", and goes on to explain: "Now the licence which is then permitted is called Decembrian, because it was customary of old among the pagans that during this month slaves and serving-maids should have a sort of liberty given them, and should be put upon an equality with their masters in celebrating a common festivity" (P. L., CCII, 123).

The Feast of Fools and the almost blasphemous extravagances in some instances associated with it have constantly been made the occasion of a sweeping condemnation of the medieval Church. On the other hand some Catholic writers have thought it necessary to try to deny the existence of such abuses. The truth, as Father Dreves has pointed out (*Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, XLVII, 572), lies midway between these extremes. There can be no question that ecclesiastical authority repeatedly condemned the licence of the Feast of Fools in the strongest terms, no one being more determined in his efforts to suppress it than the great Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln. But these customs were so firmly rooted that centuries passed away before they were entirely eradicated. Secondly, it is equally certain that the institution did lend itself to abuses of a very serious character, even though the nature and gravity of these varied considerably at different epochs. In defence of the medieval Church one point must not be lost sight of. We possess hundreds, not to say thousands, of liturgical manuscripts of all countries and all descriptions. Amongst them the occurrence of anything which has to do with the Feast of Fools is extraordinarily rare.

In missals and breviaries we may say that it never occurs. At best a prose or a trope composed for such an occasion is here and there to be found in a gradual or an antiphony (Dreves, p. 575). It is reasonable to infer from this circumstance that though these extravagances took place in church and were attached to the ordinary services, the official sanction was of the slenderest.

The same conclusion follows from two well-known cases which Father Dreves has carefully studied. In 1199, Bishop Eudes de Sully imposed regulations to check the abuses committed in the celebration of the Feast of Fools on New Year's Day at Notre-Dame in Paris. The celebration was not entirely banned, but the part of the "Lord of Misrule" or "Præcentor Stultorum" was restrained within decorous limits. He was to be allowed to intone the prose "*Lætetur gaudiis*" in the cathedral, and to wield the precentor's staff, but this was to take place before the first Vespers of the feast were sung. Apart from this, the Church offices proper were to be performed as usual, with, however, some concessions in the way of extra solemnity. During the second Vespers, it had been the custom that the precentor of the fools should be deprived of his staff when the verse "*Deposuit potentes de sede*" (He hath put down the mighty from their seat) was sung at the Magnificat. Seemingly this was the dramatic moment, and the feast was hence often known as the "*Festum 'Deposuit'*". Eudes de Sully permitted that the staff might here be taken from the mock precentor, but enacted that the verse "*Deposuit*" was not to be repeated more than five times. A similar case of a legitimized Feast of Fools at Sens c. 1220 is also examined by Father Dreves in detail. The whole text of the office is in this case preserved to us. There are many proses and interpolations (*farsuræ*) added to the ordinary liturgy of the Church, but nothing which could give offence as unseemly, except the prose "*Orientis partibus*", etc., partly quoted in the article *ASSES, FEAST OF*. This prose or "*conductus*", however, was not a part of the office, but only a preliminary to Vespers sung while the procession of subdeacons moved from the church door to the choir. Still, as already stated, there can be no question of the reality of the abuses which followed in the wake of celebrations of this kind.

The central idea seems always to have been that of the old Saturnalia, i. e. a brief social revolution, in which power, dignity or impunity is conferred for a few hours upon those ordinarily in a subordinate position. Whether it took the form of the boy bishop or the subdeacon conducting the cathedral office, the parody must always have trembled on the brink of burlesque, if not of the profane. We can trace the same idea at St. Gall in the tenth century, where a student, on the thirteenth of December each year, enacted the part of the abbot. It will be sufficient here to notice that the continuance of the celebration of the Feast of Fools was finally forbidden under the very severest penalties by the Council of Basle in 1435, and that this condemnation was supported by a strongly-worded document issued by the theological faculty of the University of Paris in 1444, as well as by numerous decrees of various provincial councils. In this way it seems that the abuse had practically disappeared before the time of the Council of Trent.

A very large number of monographs and papers in the proceedings of learned societies have been devoted to this subject. Many of these are quoted by CHAMBERS *The Medieval Stage*, I, 274-419 (London, 1903), who himself deals with the matter more exhaustively than any other writer. The best short article on the whole question, as Chambers attests, is that of DREVES, *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, XLVII, 571-587 (Freiburg, 1894). See also LEBER, *Collection des meilleures dissertations*, vols. IX and X (Paris, 1832); CLÉMENT, *Histoire Générale de la Musique Religieuse* (Paris, 1890), pp. 122 sqq.; WALTER, *Das Eusefest* (Vienna, 1885). There is also an excellent article by HEUSER in the *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Feste*. For further bibliographical references consult CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibliographie*, s. v. *Fous*. Many articles written on this subject are mere lampoons directed against the medieval Church, and be-

tray a complete ignorance of the facts. An article entitled *Festum Stultorum* in the *Nineteenth Century* (June, 1905) is a typical specimen.

HERBERT THURSTON.

**Foppa**, AMBROGIO, generally known as CARADOSSO, Italian goldsmith, sculptor, and die sinker, b. at Mondonico in the province of Como, 1445, according to some authorities, and according to others in Pavia, the same year; d. about 1527. It is possible that this artist is not correctly known as Ambrogio, but that his Christian name was Cristoforo. He was in the service of Lodovico il Moro, Duke of Milan, for some years, and executed for him an exceedingly fine medal and several pieces of goldsmith's work. Later on he is heard of in Rome, working for Popes Julius II and Leo X. His will was executed in 1526 and he is believed to have died in the following year. Cellini refers at some length to a medal struck by him in Rome, having upon it a representation of Bramante and his design for St. Peter's, and he speaks of him as "the most excellent goldsmith of that time, who has no equal in the execution of dies". He is believed to have been responsible for the terra-cotta reliefs in the sacristy of San Satiro, works which in their remarkable beauty are almost equal to the productions of Donatello. In addition to the Bramante and Moro medals three others are attributed to him, one representing Julius II, another the fourth Duke of Milan, Francesco Sforza, and the third Gian Giacomo Trivulzio (1448-1518).

A large number of examples of fine goldsmith's work in the sacristies of the various churches of Italy are attributed to Foppa with more or less uncertainty. They especially include reliquaries, morses, and croziers. He was responsible for a papal mitre. A drawing of this tiara, made for Julius II, is in the print room at the British Museum, and was executed at the instance of an English collector named John Talman. An inaccurate engraving of it by George Vertue is also in existence, and this was reproduced by Muntz in his article on the papal tiara. He declares that the pope told his master of ceremonies that it cost two hundred thousand ducats. This wonderful work of art survived the sack of Rome through the accident of its being in pawn at the time, but was deliberately broken up and refashioned by Pope Pius VI. (See Thurston in the "Burlington Magazine" for October, 1895.) Foppa is believed to have designed several pendent jewels, but there is a good deal of uncertainty at present respecting his goldsmith's work, and but little can be attributed to him with anything like authority.

CICCOGNA, *Storia della Scultura* (Prato, 1823); CELLINI, *Vita del Benvenuto Cellini* (Florence, 1857); VASARI, *Vita dei Pittori* (Florence, 1878); SUPINO, *Il Medagliere Mediceo* (Florence, 1899.)

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Forbes**, JOHN, Capuchin; b. 1570; d. 1606. His father, John, eighth Lord Forbes, being a Protestant, and his mother, Lady Margaret Gordon, daughter of the fourth Earl of Huntly, a Catholic, John followed the religion of his father, while his elder brother was educated a Catholic. To preserve his Faith the latter went to Brussels and there entered the Capuchin order. His letters and the influence of a maternal uncle, James Gordon, S.J., led John into the Catholic Church, 1587. To recover his son to Protestantism Lord Forbes affianced him to a noble Protestant lady. On the eve of the marriage John, disguised as a shepherd, fled and, having eluded his father's spies, landed in Lille. Pressed into the English army, he escaped, was arrested by Spanish militia, imprisoned at Antwerp, but finally released. After some delay he was admitted to the Capuchin Order, August, 1593, at Tournai, and took the name of his deceased brother, Archangel. Persevering in spite of persuasion, force, and the stratagems of friends to the contrary, he completed his studies, was ordained a priest and after refusing an appointment as

guardian, was sent as chaplain to the Spanish garrison at Dendermond. Mindful of his own countrymen he wrote to his kinsman and companion in youth, James VI of Scotland, setting forth the claims of the Catholic religion. Learning of his whereabouts, many countrymen visited him, eighteen of whom he converted to Catholicity, also three hundred soldiers. To his great delight he was appointed missionary Apostolic to Scotland, but succumbed to an epidemic at Dendermond. He is said to have written an account of his conversion, though it was never published. His mother spent her declining years near her son; his betrothed became a nun in Rome.

BERNARD BONON., *Scriptores Ord. Cap.* (Venice, 1747), 31; ILG, *Geist des hl. Franziskus II* (Augsburg, 1879), 44-61; RASS, *Convertitenbilder XI* (Freiburg, 1873), 37-61; FAUSTINUS OF DREST, *Alter Alerius natione Scotus, P. Archangelus* (Cologne, 1620, 2nd ed., Liège, 1632, Italian tr., Modena, 1634; Flemish tr., Bruges, 1704); CAPUTO, *Vita del P. Archangelo* (Naples, 1650; Bologna, 1656); LUCIAN MONTIFONTANUS, *Ertz-Engelsche Lebensgeschichte* (Constance, 1677, 2nd ed., Bregenz, 1711).

JOHN M. LENHART.

**Forbin-Janson**, CHARLES - AUGUSTE - MARIE - JOSEPH, COMTE DE, Bishop of Nancy and Toul, founder of the Association of the Holy Childhood, b. in Paris, France, 3 Nov., 1785; d. near Marseilles, 12 July, 1844.

He was the second son of Count Michel Palamède de Forbin-Janson and of his wife Cornélie Henriette, princess of Galéan. He was a Knight of Malta from childhood, and a soldier at sixteen. Napoleon I made him Auditor of the Council of State in 1805. His family and the aristocracy looked forward to a most brilliant career as a statesman for him, but he surprised all by entering the seminary of St-Sulpice in the spring of 1808. He was ordained priest in Savoy in 1811, and was made Vicar-General of the Diocese of Chambéry, but eventually determined to become a missionary. Pius VII advised him to remain in France where missionary work was needed. He heeded the advice, and with his friend the Abbé de Rauzan, founded the *Missionnaires de France* and preached with great success in all parts of his native land. In 1817 he was sent to Syria on a mission, returned to France in 1819, and again took up the work of a missionary until 1823 when he was appointed Bishop of Nancy and Toul, and was consecrated in Paris, 6 June, 1824, by the Archbishop of Rouen; Bishop Cheverus of Boston, U. S. A., was a consecrator and Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati a witness. The French Government did not cease persecuting him for his refusal to sign the Gallican Declaration of 1682; finally, he was obliged to leave France in 1830, but succeeded in getting his own choice of a coadjutor bishop by threatening to return to Nancy. Every good cause appealed to his priestly heart, every good work to his purse. He aided Pauline Jaricot in the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. At the request of Bishop Flaget and Bishop Purcell, Gregory XVI sent him on a missionary tour through the United States of America in 1839.

During his two years stay in that country, he travelled far and wide giving missions to the people and



CHARLES-AUGUSTE, COMTE DE FORBIN-JANSON

retreats to the clergy. Louisiana was the first conspicuous field of his zeal, and he brought its Catholic people to the sacraments in numbers which have hardly been equalled since. On his way thither, he contributed one-third of the money with which the Fathers of Mercy bought Spring Hill College (now a Jesuit College, near Mobile, Alabama). All the large cities of the country, from New York to Dubuque; from New Orleans to Quebec, were witnesses of his zeal. More at home in Canada where his mother-tongue was spoken, he did wonderful missionary work, and some events regarded as supernatural keep his memory alive to this day among the French-Canadian people. He attended the Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore. His last visit in the United States was to Philadelphia, in November, 1841, when he assisted at the consecration of Dr. Kenrick as coadjutor Bishop of St. Louis. He left New York for France in December, 1841, and the next year visited Rome to give an account of his mission in America. Gregory XVI named him a Roman Count and Assistant at the Pontifical Throne, "because of his wonderful zeal for the propagation and defence of the Catholic Faith in the United States of America". On his return to France he founded (1843) the Society of the Holy Childhood, and spent that, and a part of the following year in spreading this good work through France, Belgium, and England. Death came to him unexpectedly at his family castle of Aygallades near Marseilles.

DE RIVIÈRE, *Vie de Mgr de Forbin-Janson, Missionnaire, évêque de Nancy et de Toul, primate de Lorraine, fondateur de la Ste Enfance* (Paris, 1892); MAES, *Life of Bishop de Forbin-Janson in America*, Mss.; SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1904).

CAMILLUS P. MAES.

**Forcellini**, EGRO, Latin lexicographer, b. at Fener, near Treviso, Italy, 26 Aug., 1688; d. at Padua, 4 April, 1768. His parents were poor, so that he was deprived of the opportunities of an early education, and he was of mature age when in 1704 he entered the seminary at Padua. There his ability and industry soon attracted the attention of his teacher, Facciolati, who secured his assistance in his lexicographical work. Forcellini collaborated with his master in revising the so-called "Calepinus", the Latin dictionary, in seven languages, of the monk Ambrosius Calepinus. While engaged in this work, Forcellini is said to have conceived the idea of an entirely new Latin lexicon, the most comprehensive ever compiled. Towards the end of 1718, under the direction of Facciolati, he began the laborious task of reading through the entire body of Latin literature as well as the whole collection of inscriptions. His labours were interrupted in 1724, when he was called to Ceneda, where he became professor of rhetoric and director of the seminary. He resumed his work on the lexicon on his recall to Padua in 1731. It was not until three years after Forcellini's death that this great lexicon, on which he had spent nearly forty years of untiring industry, and which is the basis of all the Latin lexicons now in use, was published at Padua in four folio volumes under the title, "Totius Latinitatis Lexicon". In it are given both the Italian and the Greek equivalents of every word, together with copious citations from the literature. There is an English edition by Bailey in two volumes (London, 1828). The latest complete edition is that of De Vit (Prato, 1858-87). (See LATIN LITERATURE.)

FERRARI, *Vita di Forcellini* (Padua, 1792).

EDMUND BURKE.

**Forconium**, DIOCESE OF See AQUILA.

**Foreman**, ANDREW, a Scottish prelate, of good border family; b. at Hatton, near Berwick-on-Tweed; d. 1522. His talents marked him out for early promotion in his ecclesiastical career; through the influence of King James IV, he soon became a prothonotary

Apostolic and was employed on various important missions. The king sent him in 1497 with two other envoys to conclude the truce of Aytoun with Henry VII of England, and four years later he was empowered to negotiate for the marriage of King James with King Henry's daughter Margaret. By 1502 Foreman was Bishop of Moray (for which see, notwithstanding the protest of the primate, he procured exemption from the metropolitan jurisdiction of St. Andrews); he was also "commendatory" abbot of important monasteries both in Scotland and England. Appointed ambassador to Henry VIII in 1509, he was commissioned by his sovereign to try to bring about universal peace with a view to a new crusade. King Louis of France, after concluding an alliance with the King of Scots against England, made Foreman Archbishop of Bourges, and it was Pope Julius II's intention to raise him to the cardinalate. The successor of Julius, Leo X, did not carry out this intention, but nominated Foreman in 1514 Archbishop of St. Andrews and legate *a latere*. He received at the same time the Abbey of Dunfermline *in commendam*, and seems to have held also at one time or another the rich Abbeys of Kilwinning, Dryburgh, and Arbroath. The new primate's eight years' tenure of his see was marked by vigorous administration; and he did much to consolidate the episcopal authority, procuring the restoration to his province of the Dioceses of Dunkeld and Dunblane, and holding an important synod, the enactments of which, still extant, throw an important light on the condition of the Scottish Church immediately before the Reformation. These statutes testify to the primate's zeal for the amelioration of the state of the clergy, for the reform of abuses, the advancement of learning, and the augmentation of the solemnity of the services of the Church. Archbishop Foreman was buried in Dunfermline Abbey.

ROBERTSON, *Concilia Scotiae*, 1225-1559; GORDON, *Scottish chronicon* (Glasgow, 1867); *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*, ed. DICKSON; *Calendar of Doc. Henry VIII*, ed. BREWER, I, II; BEULESHEIM, *Hist. of Cath. Church of Scotland*, II, 116-125; MICHEL, *Les Evêques en France* (Paris, 1862), I; KEITH, ed. RUSSEL, *Historical Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops* (Edinburgh, 1824); HERKLESS and KERR HANNAY, *The Archbishops of St. Andrews* (Edinburgh, 1907-09).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

**Forer**, LAURENZ, controversialist, b. at Lucerne, 1580; d. at Ratisbon, 7 January, 1659. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of twenty, in Landshut, and made part of his studies under Fathers Laymann and Tanner. He taught philosophy at Ingolstadt (1615-1619), and theology, moral and controversial, for six years at Dillingen. In the latter institution he held also the office of chancellor for several years. He spent the years 1632-1643 in the Tyrol, whither he had withdrawn with his illustrious penitent Heinrich von Knöringen, Bishop of Augsburg, on account of the inroads of the Swedes. Forer visited Rome (1645-1646) as the representative of the province of Upper Germany in the eighth congregation. He became rector of the college of Lucerne in 1650. Father Sommervogel enumerates sixty-two titles of publications from the pen of Forer; though not all of them are very voluminous, they show at least the writer's versatility and erudition, as well as his zeal for the integrity and the honour of the Catholic Faith. He wrote one or more treatises each against the apostates Reihing and de Dominis, against Melchior Nicolai, Hottinger, Kallisen, Schopp, Molinos, Haberkorn, Voet, Hoe, the Ubiquists, and others. Such works as "Lutherus thaumaturgus" (Dillingen, 1624), "Septem characteres Lutheri" (Dillingen, 1626), "Quaestio ubinam ante Lutherum protestantium ecclesia fuerit" (Pt. I, Amberg, 1653; Pt. II, Ingolstadt, 1654), "Bellum ubiquisticum vetus et novum inter ipsos Lutheranos bellatum et necdum debellatum" (Dillingen, 1627) are directed against all Protestants. Others, as "Anatomia anatomiae Societatis Jesu" (Innsbruck, 1634),



"Mantissa Ant-anatomie Jesuitica" (Innsbruck, 1635; Cologne, 1635), "Grammaticus Proteus, arcanorum Societatis Jesu Dædalus" (Ingolstadt, 1636), "Appendix ad grammaticum Proteum" (Ingolstadt, 1636), attack the enemies of the Society of Jesus; finally, two of his works, written for Catholics, "Disputirkunst für die einfaltigen Catholischen" (Ingolstadt, 1656) and "Leben Jesu Christi" (Dillingen, 1650-1658), have been re-edited and republished at Würzburg (1861) and Ratisbon (1856).

HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1892), I, 426 sq.; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, etc. (Brussels and Paris, 1892), III, 858 sqq.; BAUER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

A. J. MAAS.

**Forest, JOHN ANTONY.** See SAN ANTONIO, DIOCESE OF.

**Foresters, CATHOLIC ORDERS OF.**—I. On 30 July, 1879, some members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society of Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A., desiring to have a Catholic fraternal insurance society, organized one on the plan of the Foresters' courts and called it the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters. It was so chartered, and its membership was confined to the State of Massachusetts, except in one instance, where a court was formed at Providence, Rhode Island. On 1 January, 1909, the official report stated that there were 235 courts organized, with a membership of 27,757. Of the members 9679 were women. The insurance in force on 31 Dec., 1908, was \$27,757,000.

II. On 24 May, 1883, a number of Catholics of Chicago, Illinois, taking up the plan of this Massachusetts society, organized on the same lines the Catholic Order of Foresters of Illinois. A flat all-around death assessment of one dollar was adopted, and men of all ages were admitted to membership at the same rate. Later, when courts were established in a number of other States and in Canada, an international convention in 1895 adopted a graded system of assessment insurance. Catholics between eighteen and forty-five years of age are eligible for membership. From the date of organization to 1 June, 1908, it paid out \$10,639,936 for death claims, and \$2,500,000 in funeral and sick benefits. It had in April, 1909, 1600 courts and a membership of 136,212 distributed over twenty-six States and the Dominion of Canada. The main offices are at Chicago, Illinois. The official organ, "The Catholic Forester", is published at Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The word *Illinois* in the original title of the organization was dropped in 1888, as the membership had then extended beyond the limits of that State. This society is not affiliated with the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters.

III. A Women's Catholic Order of Foresters was organized in 1892 at Chicago, having for its object benevolent co-operation among Catholic women with assessment life-insurance at low rates. It has a membership of 54,350, with courts scattered over many of the States. The main offices are at Chicago.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Forgery, Forger.**—If we accept the definition usually given by canonists, forgery (Lat. *falsum*) differs very slightly from fraud. "Forgery", says Ferraris, who claims that his definition is the usually accepted one, "is a fraudulent interference with, or alteration of, truth, to the prejudice of a third person". It consists in the deliberate untruthfulness of an assertion, or in the deceitful presentation of an object, and is based on an intention to deceive and to injure while using the externals of honesty. Forgery is truly a falsehood and a fraud, but it is something more. It includes fraudulent misdemeanours in matters regulated by the law, and endangering the public peace. These misdemeanours are divided by canon law writers into three classes—according as the crime is committed by word, by writing, or by deed. The principal crime in each of these classes being false

witness, falsification of public documents, and counterfeiting money. A fourth category consists in making use of such forgery, and is equivalent to forgery proper. This classification, while slightly superficial, is exact, and presupposes the fundamental malice of the crime in question, viz., that it is prejudicial to public security and injurious to the interests of society at large, rather than to those of the individual.

Social order is seriously affected by false witness, which cripples the operation of justice; by the change or alteration of public documents, which hinders a right and proper administration of public affairs, and lastly, by the coining of base money, which hampers trade and commerce. If forgery is committed by public officials in violation of their professional duties, the crime becomes more serious, and more prejudicial to public order. The interests of private individuals, therefore, while not excluded, are secondary when this offence is in question, and it is for this reason that the penalties incurred by forgery, or complicity therein, are independent of the amount of damage it inflicts on individuals. Oral forgeries, e. g. false oaths, false witness (canonists add the crime of the judge who knowingly pronounces an unjust sentence), are treated under TRIAL; OATH; WITNESS; JUDGE. On the other hand false coinage does not immediately concern ecclesiastical law, though some attention is paid to it in the "Corpus Juris Canonici" and in various canon law treatises. John XXII punished false coinage by excommunication (Extrav. "Gradiens", Joan. XXII, de crimine falsi) and compared forgers to alchemists (Extrav. "Spondent", inter comm.). In many dioceses this crime was long a reserved sin (e. g. in Naples; "Prompta Bibliotheca", s. v.; see Neapolitan edition of Ferraris, s. v. *Falsum*, n. 35). By such penal measures the ecclesiastical authority merely assisted in suppressing a crime gravely prejudicial to civil welfare; it did not come before it as a crime against ecclesiastical law.

We are here concerned only with forgery properly so-called, i. e. the falsification of public documents and writings, especially Apostolic letters. What is here said of the latter, is also applicable, in due measure, to all public documents emanating from the Roman Curia or episcopal courts. The canonical legislation on this matter is better understood when we recall that the more usual form of this crime, and the source of judicial inquiries and consequent penalties, was the production of absolutely false documents and the alteration of authentic decisions, for the sake of certain advantages, e. g. a benefice, or a favourable verdict.

The forging of documents for purely historical purposes, with no intention of influencing administrative or legislative authority, does not fall within our scope. (For an account of several such forgeries see A. Giry, "Manuel de diplomatique", Paris, 1894, II, 861-87, and Wattenbach, "Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen", 9th ed. appendix.) We are concerned only with the falsification of Apostolic Letters, the only form of forgery that incurs excommunication *ipso facto* specially reserved to the pope. The most serious form of forgery is that committed by a public functionary charged to draw up or authenticate official documents, who violates his professional duties, by the fabrication of false documents, by forging a signature, by fraudulent use of an official seal, a stamp, or the like. There is no precise text in canon law punishing these crimes, and canonists always refer to Roman law, especially to the Lex Cornelia "de crimine falsi" (ff. XLVIII). Nevertheless in ecclesiastical law they are serious crimes; and instances might be given of officials of the Roman Curia who suffered death for such forgeries. Domenico of Viterbo and Francesco Maldente were tried and executed for this crime in 1489. They had forged, among other documents, a Bull authorizing the priests of Norway to celebrate Mass without wine (Benedict XIV, "De Beatif.", II, c. XXXII, n. 2; Pastor, "His-

tory of the Popes", tr. V, 351). Again the subdarius, Francesco Canonici, called Mascabruno, was condemned to death on 5 April, 1652, for many forgeries discovered only on the eve of his elevation to the cardinalate.

Canon law deals mainly with the attempt to put forgeries to a specific use. It connects forgery and the use of forged documents, on the presumption that he who would make use of such documents must be either the author or instigator of the forgery. In canon law, forgery consists not only in the fabrication or substitution of an entirely false document, "as when a false bulla, or seal, is affixed to a false letter" (Licet v, "De crimine falsi"), but even by partial substitution, or by any alteration affecting the sense and bearing of an authentic document or any substantial point, such as names, dates, signature, seal, favour granted, by erasure, by scratching out or by writing one word over another, and the like. The classical and oft-commented text on this matter is the chapter Licet v, "De crimine falsi" in which Innocent III (1198) points out to the bishop and chapter of Milan nine species of forgery which had come under his notice. This famous instruction was given in order to enable his correspondents to guard against future fraud. Following his teaching the gloss on this chapter enumerates among the six points a judge should examine into in order to discover a forgery:

Forma, stylus, flum, membrana, litura, sigillum. Haec sex falsata dant scripturam valere pusillum.

In other words a document is suspect, (1) If its outward appearance differs greatly from the usual appearance of such documents. (2) If the style varies from the usual manner of the Curia. Chapter iv, "De crimine falsi" gives us an example of this: Innocent III declares a Bull false wherein the pope addresses a bishop as "Dear Son" and not as "Venerable Brother", or in which any other person than a bishop is styled "Venerable Brother" instead of "Dear Son", or in which the plural *vos* is used to address a single individual. (3) If the thread which ties the leaden seal to the Bull is broken. (4) If the parchment bears traces of a doubtful origin (just as we distinguish the water-marks and letter-heads of modern documents). (5) If there are any erasures, or words scratched out. (6) If the seal is not intact, or is not clearly defined. If a judge discovers an evident forgery he ought to repudiate the document and punish the guilty party; but in case he considers it merely doubtful he ought to make inquiries at the office of the Roman Curia which is supposed to have issued it.


Substitution of false documents and tampering with genuine ones was quite a trade in the Middle Ages. In the chapter Dura vi, "De crimine falsi", written in 1198, (*pars decisa*), Innocent III relates that he had discovered and imprisoned forgers who had prepared a number of false Bulls, bearing forged signatures either of his predecessor or of himself. To obviate abuses, he orders under pain of excommunication or suspension that pontifical Bulls be received only from the hands of the pope or of the officials charged to deliver them. He orders bishops to investigate suspicious letters, and to make known, to all those having forged letters, that they are bound to destroy them, or to hand them over within twenty days, under pain of excommunication. The same pope legislated severely against forgery and the use of forged documents. In the chapter Ad falsarios, vii, "De crimine falsi", written in 1201, forgers of Apostolic Letters, whether the actual criminals or their aiders and abettors, are alike excommunicated, and if clerics, are ordered to be degraded and given over to the secular arm.

Whoever makes use of Apostolic Letters is invited to assure himself of their authenticity, since to use forged letters is punished in the case of clerics by privation of benefice and rank, and in the case of lay-

men by excommunication. The excommunication threatened by Innocent III, and extended to the forgery of supplicas or pontifical dispensations, was incorporated in the Bull "In Cœna Domini" (no. 6), and passed thence with some modifications into the constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis," where it is number 9 among the excommunications *lata sententiæ* specially reserved to the pope. It affects "all falsification of Apostolic Letters, even in the form of Briefs, and supplicas concerning favours sought or dispensations asked for, which have been signed by the Sovereign Pontiff, or the vice-chancellors of the Roman Church or their deputies, or by order of the pope", also all those who falsely publish Apostolic Letters, even those in the form of Brief; lastly, all those who falsely sign these documents with the name of the Sovereign Pontiff, the vice-chancellor or their deputies. The documents in question here are of two sorts: (a) Apostolic Letters, in which the pope himself speaks, whether they are in the form of Bulls or Briefs (q. v.); (b) Supplicas or requests addressed to the pope to obtain a favour, and to which, in proof that the request is granted, the pope or the vice-chancellor or some other official attaches his signature. It is from these supplicas thus signed that the official document conveying the concession is drawn up. Consequently rescripts of the Roman Congregations and of other offices, which are not signed by the pope or by his order, do not come under this heading.

The acts of falsification herein punished by excommunication are fewer than formerly. In the first place, the principal crime is the only one dealt with; the aiders and abettors of the forgery are not mentioned. In the next place, by a strict interpretation, allowable in penal matters but certainly opposed to the spirit of the Decretals of Innocent III, recent canonists exempt from the *ipso facto* censure forgers of entire Apostolic Letters, and bring under it only those who seriously alter authentic documents. It is certain, in any case, that the word *fabricantes* of the Bull "In Cœna Domini" becomes *publicantes* in the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis". There are therefore three acts contemplated by the latter text; the falsification, in the strict sense of the word, of Apostolic Letters and supplicas; the publication of false Apostolic Letters; the forging of signatures to supplicas. The "publication" which incurs this censure is not the material divulgence of a document, but presupposes that such document is offered as, and affirmed to be, authentic. Supplicas with forged signatures it would be useless to publish since they cannot take the place of the official document conveying the concession; but the officials issuing Apostolic Letters on the strength of such signed supplicas would have been misled by the false signature. It must be remembered that all other forms of forgery which escape the *ipso facto* excommunication are subject to penalties and censures "*ferendæ sententiæ*" according to the gravity of the case.

To have their full official weight before a tribunal, public documents must be presented either in the original, or in copies certified by some public officer. Hence the note of falsification does not attach to reproductions devoid of all guarantee of authenticity; nevertheless such reproductions are sometimes seriously criminal because of the perverse intention of their authors. Leitner ("Præl. Jur. Can." lib. V, tit. xx, in a note) gives two examples of fraudulent reproductions of this nature. Frederick II of Prussia forged a Brief of Clement XIII, and dated it 30 January, 1759, by which the pope was made to send his congratulations and a blessed sword to the Austrian Marshal Daun, after the battle of Hochkirch. A Bull purporting to be by Pius IX, dated 28 May, 1873, modifying the law in vigour for the election of a pope was forged, with the connivance at least, of the Prussian Government. Another false document, pub-



CHURCH OF SAN MERCURIALE, FORLÌ  
CAMFANILE BY FRANCESCO DEDDI (1178-1180)



lished by many newspapers in 1905, authorized the marriage of priests in South America, but no one placed any credence in it. (See BULLS AND BRIEFS.)

All canonical commentaries on the title *De crimine falsi*: Decret., lib. V, tit. XX, *Extravag.* of John XXII and commentary; FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Falsum*; all commentaries on the Constitution *Apostolica Sedis*, especially PENNACHI, t. I, appendix VIII, p. 293.

A. BOUDINHON.

**Forlì**, DIOCESE OF (FOROLIVIENSIS), in the province of Romagna (Central Italy), suffragan of Ravenna. The city of Forlì, the ancient Forum Livii, is situated between the rivers Ronco and Montone, and was founded in 206 B. c. by the consul M. Livius Salinator; destroyed 88 B. c. during the civil war of Marius and Sulla; and rebuilt by the prætor Livius Clodius. During the seventh and eighth centuries it was often seized by the Lombards (665, 728, 742), until its incorporation with the Papal States in 757. In the medieval struggle between the papacy and the empire it was Ghibelline. On the downfall of the Hohenstaufen, Simone Mestagueria had himself proclaimed Lord of Forlì (1257). He was succeeded by Maghinardo Pagano, Uguccione della Faggiuola (1297), and others, until in 1302 the Ordelaffi came into power. More than once this family sought to escape from the overlordship of the Holy See, and was therefore several times expelled, e. g. in 1327-29 and again in 1359-1375 (Gil d'Albornoz). Forlì was seized in 1488 by Visconti and in 1499 by Cæsar Borgia, after whose death it was again directly subject to the pope. In 1708 it was sacked by the Austrians.

St. Mercurialis is venerated as the first bishop, and is said to belong to the Apostolic Age; it is certain, however, that he is identical with the Mercurialis present at the Council of Rimini in 359. The Christian religion, however, must have been introduced, and a see established, much earlier. Among the illustrious bishops the following may be enumerated: Alessandro (1160), who built the episcopal palace; Fra Bartolomeo da Sanzetto (1351), compelled to flee by Francesco degli Ordelaffi; Giovanni Capparelli (1427), banished by Antonio degli Ordelaffi; Luigi Pirano (1437), who took an active part in the Council of Ferrara. The following were natives of Forlì: Blessed Jacopo Salomonio (d. 1314), a Dominican; Blessed Pellegrino Laziosi (d. 1345), a Servite; Blessed Marcolino Amanni (d. 1397), a Dominican. The Cathedral of Santa Croce existed as early as 562; in 1419 Martin V ordered restorations that were completed in 1475; and it was again enlarged in 1841. A noteworthy part of the cathedral is the chapel of the Madonna del Fuoco; the sacred image contained there was formerly in a private house, where it remained unharmed during a fire. Also worthy of mention are: the church of San Mercuriale, with its celebrated bell-tower, the work of Francesco Deddi (1428); San Biagio, with frescoes by Melozzo da Forlì and Palmegiani, and an "Immaculate Conception" by Guido Reni; Santa Maria dei servi (built by Blessed Pellegrino, buried there), with frescoes of the school of Giotto. The seminary has a rich collection of 500 Aldine first editions and of pictures. Near Forlì is the shrine of Santa Maria delle Grazie of Forno. The diocese has 61 parishes, 60,000 inhabitants, 3 male and 6 female educational institutions, 4 religious houses of men, and 7 of women, and a weekly Catholic paper.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), II, 307-67; MARCHESE, *Compendium histor. celeberrimæ civitatis Forlivenensis* (Forlì, 1678); ROSETTI, *Vite degli uomini illustri Forlivesi* (Forlì, 1858-61).

U. BENIGNI.

**Form** (Lat. *forma*; Gr. *εἶδος*, *μορφή*, ἡ κατὰ τὸν λόγον οὐσία, τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι: Aristotle).—The original meaning of the term *form*, both in Greek and Latin, was and is that in common use—*εἶδος* (derived from *εἶδω*, root *φῑδ*, an obsolete form from which comes the second

aorist *εἶδον*, *I see*, akin to Latin *video*), being translated, that which is seen, shape, etc., with secondary meanings derived from this, as form, sort, particular, kind, nature. It is also used by Plato to express kind, both as genus and species. From the primary and common signification given above, an easy transition is made to that in which it comes to signify the intrinsic determinant of quantity, from which figure or shape results, and thence to the further peripatetic and scholastic usage as the intrinsic determinant of anything that is determinable. Thus the term is employed even in such expressions as "form of contract", "form of worship", and as theological form, "form of words" (the theological statement of dogmatic truth); sacramental form (see below). In its more strict philosophical usage, however, it is limited to its signification of the intrinsic principle of existence in any determinate essence. This covers form, whether accidental or substantial. But there is a further extended use of the term form, derived from the fact that in all its previous significations it stands for the intrinsic constitutive element of the species, accidental or substantial, in sensible entities. Hence, all species or nature, whether in itself material or existent as immaterial, is called a form, though not, in the strict meaning of the term, a formal principle. In this manner, it is not unusual to speak of the angelic form, or even of the form of God, as signifying the nature, or essence, of the angel or of God. Hence, form is sometimes also used as a synonym of essence and nature. Thus also the form, or formal cause of Aristotle's theory of causality, is identified with the essence (*τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι*), as the form is that in virtue of which the essence, even of material and composite entities, is precisely what it is. This point will be further considered in the paragraph treating of the development of the idea of form.

The various kinds of form recognized in philosophy include the following, of which brief definitions are given. Substantial form, in material entities, is that which determines or actuates *materia prima* (see MATTER) to a specific substantial nature or essence, as the form of hydrogen, a rose, horse, or man. It is defined by Aristotle as the first entelechy of a physical body (*De Anima*, II, 1), and may be of such a nature that it is merely the determinant of matter (corporeal substantial form), or it may exceed, as it were, the potentiality of the determined matter (spiritual or subsistent form). Accidental form is that which determines a substance to one or other of the accidental modes as quantified, qualified, related, etc. (see CATEGORY). As the existence of an "accident" is a secondary one, consisting in an inexistence of inherence, an existent substance, as subject of inherence, is always connoted. A separated form is one which exists apart from the matter it actuates. No accidental form can thus exist, nor can corporeal substantial forms. The separated form is that of man—the human soul. Inherent form is an accidental form modifying or determining substance. The term is employed to emphasize the distinction of accidental from substantial forms. These latter do not inhere in matter, but are co-principles with it in the constitution of material substances. Forms of knowledge, according to Kant, are forms of (1) intuition (space and time), and (2) thought (the twelve categories in which all judgments are conditioned: unity, plurality, totality; reality, negation, limitation; substantiality, causality, relation; possibility, existence, necessity). They are all a priori and under them, as content, fall all our intuitions and judgments. The logical system of Kant is generally known as "formal" logic, from this connexion. So also that of Herbart, whose logical treatment of thought consists in the isolation of the content from its psychological and metaphysical implications. The point is related to the whole subject of epistemology (q. v.). The attempt to ascertain the nature, extent, and validity of knowledge was made by Kant through



a criticism, not of the content of thought, but of its essence. It is an endeavour to examine not the "*facta* of reason, but reason itself. . . ."

The development of the philosophical doctrine of form may be said to have begun with Aristotle. It provided a something fixed and immutable amidst what appears to be involved in a series of perpetual changes, thus obviating the difficulty of the Heraclitean position as to the validity of knowledge. The *πάντα χωρεῖ* destroys the possibility of a true knowledge of things as they are. Thus Aristotle may be looked upon as the one above all others who laid a solid base for any true system of epistemology. Like Plato, he saw the radical scepticism implied in an assertion of unending change. But unlike the doctrine of the former, providing unalterable but separated ideas as the ideal counterpart of sensible things, that of Aristotle, by its distinction of matter and form, makes it possible to abstract the unalterable and eternal from its concrete and mutable manifestation in individuals. Aristotle, however, identifies the form with the essence; and this because the substance is what it is (essentially) by reason of the substantial form. It would be a mistake, none the less, to suppose that his doctrine leaves no room for a distinction between the two. Indeed Grote clearly shows that "the Aristotelean analysis thus brings out, in regard to each individual substance (or *hoc aliquid*, to use his phrase), a triple point of view: (1) the form; (2) the matter; (3) the compound or aggregate of the two—in other words the inseparable *Ens* which carries us out of the domain of logic or abstraction into that of the concrete or reality" (Grote, "Aristotle", ed. Bain and Robertson, II, 182). The theory is a fundamental one in Aristotle's "Philosophia Prima", presenting, as it does, a phase, and that perhaps the most important, of the distinction between the potential and the actual. It is no less fundamental to the philosophical and theological system of St. Thomas Aquinas which is representative of the Christian School. Substantial form is an act, the principle of activity, and by it things actually exist (*Summa I, Q. lxxvi*) as they are. Moreover it is one. Thus man exists as man in virtue of his substantial form, the soul.

That the rational soul is the unique form of the body is of faith (Council of Vienne; V Lateran; Brief of Pius IX, 15 June, 1857). Man is learned or healthy in virtue of the accidental (qualifying) forms of learning or health that "inhere" in him. These, without detriment to his humanity, may be present or absent. Both kinds of form, it may be noted, though they specify their resultant essences, or quasi-essences, are individuated by the quantified matter in the one case, and the subject of inhesion in the other. Thus, while the accidental or substantial corporeal form falls back into mere potentiality when it does not actuate its subject, the incorporeal subsistent form of man, though continuing to exist when separated from the body, retains its habitude, or relationship, to the matter by which it was individuated. This doctrine is usual in the School, but it is interesting to observe that Scotus taught, in distinction to St. Thomas's doctrine of one substantial form, a plurality of form in individuals. Thus, e.g., while according to Aquinas man is all that he is substantially (corporeal, animal, rational, Socrates) in virtue of his one soul, according to Scotus each determination (generic or specific) superadds a form. In this way, man would be corporeal in virtue of a corporeal form, animal in virtue of a superadded animal form, etc., until he became Socrates, in virtue of the ultimate personal form (*socrateitas*). Occam also distinguished between a rational and a sensitive soul in man, and taught that the latter was corruptible. The terminology of the Scholastic doctrine of form is employed by the Church in dogmatic definitions, such as that of the Council of Vienne cited above, and in her teaching with regard to the sacraments. Thus, while

the matter of the sacrament of baptism, for example, is water; the sacramental form consists of the words *ego te baptizo*, etc., pronounced by the minister as he baptizes. The same terminology is adopted in the exposition of moral theology, as in the distinction of formal and material sin.

The principal alternative systems professing to give an account of corporeal substances are those of Descartes, Locke, Mill and Bain, the scientists (Atomists, etc.). Descartes places the essence of bodies in extension in three dimensions, thus identifying quantified substance with quantity and in no way accounting for substantial differences. Each substance possesses a "pre-eminent attribute, which constitutes its nature and essence and to which all others relate; thus extension", etc. To this Locke adds the qualities of the substance, making its essence consist of its primary qualities, or properties (extension, figure and mobility, divisibility and activity). Locke's doctrine, which seems to be the opinion of many contemporary men of science, labours under the same grave inconvenience as that of Descartes, as, by a *hysteron-proteron*, it accounts for the nature of a given substance by its accidents. Mill and Bain, considering substance from a psychological rather than an ontological viewpoint, define it by its relation to sense perception as an external and permanent possibility of our sensations. This view is not unlike that just alluded to, inasmuch as it expresses not the essence of bodies but at most their activity as permanently capable of evoking sensations in us. Akin to this is the doctrine of positivism, explaining the nature of "matter" as a series of sensations.

The topic of form is, as has been seen, closely connected with epistemology. As was said, a weapon for the defeat of scepticism and Heracliteanism was provided by Aristotle in his doctrine of forms and essences; Aquinas, also, would have our knowledge to be of the eternal essences, though derived by way of contemplation of contingent individuals. Kant, on the other hand, denies the possibility of such knowledge of the Thing-in-itself, and, establishing a set of mental forms (see above) into which our experience of concrete beings may be fitted, inaugurates an epistemology of the phenomenal. Hegel begins with the idea of pure being, identical, because of its entire lack of content, with nothing; and thence evolves, on idealistic lines, his theory of knowledge. The "realism" of Herbart is an attempt to reconcile the contradictions that arise in the formal conceptions presented in experience. His epistemological principle is, therefore, a critical and methodical transformation of such conceptions, issuing in the position that a multiplicity of simple, real essences exists, each possessing a single simple quality. Several of the modern systems (Pragmatism, Modernism, etc.), based directly and indirectly upon the teaching of Kant, assert a life-value or work-value to truth, inculcating an extreme relativity of knowledge and tending to pure subjectivism and solipsism. The scholastic theory of form is not that generally adopted by modern scientists, though it may be noticed that it is not directly impugned by any scientific system. From Bacon on, empirical science has been progressive; and there is reason to believe that the theoretic science of to-day is in a state of transition in its attitude with regard to the constitution of "matter" (substance). The atomic and molecular theories, principally on account of the discovery of the radio-active substances and their properties, are being modified or abandoned (at any rate in so far as they were held to represent the real constitution of matter) in favour of the electronic, a theory not unlike that of the Jesuit Bosovich. In any case the former did not go farther than to provide a theoretic account of the construction of "matter", leaving the ultimate constitution of substance unexplained. At this point the theory of hylomorphism and the doctrine of sub-

stantial form would apply. For a critical examination of the Mechanicist position in this connexion the reader is referred to Nys's "Cosmologie". Furthermore, there is a noticeable reaction towards the scholastic position in recent biology, in which a growing school of vitalism is making itself felt.

ARISTOTLE, *Opera* (Paris, 1629); ST. THOMAS, *Opera* (Palma, 1832-72); DUNS SCOTUS, *Opera* (Lyons, 1639); LORENZELLI, *Institutiones Philosophiae Theoreticae* (Rome, 1896); HARPER, *Metaphysics of the School* (London, 1879); MERCIER, *Ontologie* (Louvain, 1902); NYS, *Cosmologie* (Louvain, 1906); DE VORGES, *La Perception et la Psychologie Thomiste* (Paris, 1892); DE WULF, *Scholastic Philosophy*, tr. COFFEY (London, 1907); DALGAIRNS, *The Holy Communion* (Dublin, 1861); SHARPE AND AVELING, *The Spectrum of Truth* (London, 1908); WINDLE, *What is Life?* (London, 1908); GUR, *Theologia Moralis* (Prato, 1894); KANT, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Riga, 1781); HEGEL, *Werke* (Berlin, 1832); HERBERT, *Werke* (Leipzig, 1850-2); HOBBS, *Leviathan* (London, 1651); IDEM, *Elementorum Philosophiae sectio prima. De Corpore* (London, 1655); LOCKE, *An Essay concerning Humane Understanding* (London, 1714); CUDWORTH, *A Treatise concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality* (London, 1731); HUME, *Works*, ed. GREEN AND GROSE (London, 1878); HAMILTON, *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic*, ed. MANSEL AND VEITCH (Edinburgh, 1859-60); MANSEL, *Prolegomena Logica, An Inquiry into the Psychological Character of Logical Processes* (Oxford, 1851); MILL, *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (London, 1855); GROTE, *Aristotle*, ed. BAIN AND ROBERTSON (London, 1872); UEBERWEG, *System der Logik* (Bonn, 1857); IDEM, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Berlin, 1863-8).

FRANCIS AVELING.

**Formby, HENRY**, b. 1816; d. at Normanton Hall, Leicester, 12 March, 1884. His father, Henry Grenehalgh Formby, was the second son of Richard Formby of Formby Hall, Lancashire. The family had been Catholic until the eighteenth century, when, with the exception of a younger branch, they lost the Faith and closed the chapel of their fifteenth-century mansion. Henry Formby was educated at Clitheroe grammar-school, the Charterhouse School, London, and Brasenose College, Oxford, where he took his M.A. Having taken orders, he became vicar of Ruardean in Gloucestershire, where in 1843 he completed his first book, "A Visit to the East", and he showed the interest in ecclesiastical music that always characterized him in a pamphlet reprinted from "The English Churchman" called "Parochial Psalmody Considered" (1845). At this time he was profoundly influenced by the Oxford Movement, and soon after his friend Newman became a Catholic, he decided to resign his living and join the Church. His reception took place on 24 Jan., 1846, at Oscott, where he continued studying theology till he was ordained priest, 18 Sept., 1847. He was attached to St. Chad's Cathedral where the careful performance of plain chant has ever been a noted feature of the services, and while there he published three works on the subject: "The Catholic Christian's Guide to the Right Use of Christian Psalmody of the Psalter" (1847); "The Plain Chant the Image and Symbol of the Humanity of the Divine Redeemer and the Blessed Virgin Mary" (1848); and "The Roman Ritual and its Canto Fermo, Compared with the Works of Modern Music, in Point of Efficiency and General Fitness for the Purpose of the Catholic Church" (1849). He also published "The Young Singer's Book of Songs" (1852), "School Songs and Poetry to Which Music is Adapted" (1852), and he was one of the editors of the "First Series of Hymns and Songs for the Use of Catholic Schools and Families" (1853). Other works belonging to this period were: "The Duties and Happiness of Domestic Service" (1851), "The March of Intellect; or, The Alleged Hostility of the Catholic Church to the Diffusion of Knowledge Examined" (1852), and "State Rationalism in Education; An Examination into the Actual Working and Results of the System of the Board of Commissioners of National Education in Ireland" (1854).

Besides his interest in ecclesiastical music, Father Formby had much at heart the use of pictures as a means of spreading knowledge of the Scriptures and Catholic doctrine. In furtherance of this purpose he

published a series of carefully illustrated books. Chief among these was his very successful "Pictorial Bible and Church History Stories", which began with "Pictorial Bible Stories for the Young" (1856). An edition of the complete work was published in 1857, followed by another in three volumes with new illustrations in 1862, and an abridged one-volume edition in 1871. From 1857 to 1864 he took charge of the mission at Wednesbury; during which time he published "The Fifteen Mysteries of the Rosary" (1857), "The Life of St. Benedict" (1858), "The Parables of Our Lord Jesus Christ" (1858), "The Life of St. Patrick" (1862), all of which were illustrated. A sermon on "Our Lady of Salette" (1857) and "The Inquiry of a Retired Citizen into the Truth of the Catholic Religion" (1863) were also published while he was at Wednesbury. In 1864 he retired from active missionary work and withdrew to the Dominican priory at Hinckley in Leicestershire, where he spent the remaining twenty years of his life in issuing books and pamphlets and in helping to train the novices. For some years he edited "The Monthly Magazine of the Holy Rosary". His later publications included "The Cause of Poor Catholic Emigrants Pleaded" (1867); "Fleury's Historical Catechism continued to the Vatican Council" (1871); "The Book of the Holy Rosary" (1872); "De Annis Christi Tractatus" (1872); "Sacrum Septenarium" (1874); "The Children's Forget-me-not" (1877); "Compendium of the Philosophy of Ancient History"; "Little Book of the Martyrs of the City of Rome" (1877); "Five Lectures on the City of Rome" (1877); "Monotheism . . . the primitive Religion of the City of Rome" (1877); "Ancient Rome and its Connection with Christian Religion" (Part I, 1880; Part II, unfinished at his death); "The Growing Unbelief of the Educated Classes" (1880); "Safeguards of Divine Faith in the Presence of Sceptics, Atheists, and Free-thinkers" (1882); "A Familiar Study of the Sacred Scripture", his last work. He also wrote a great number of minor devotional and educational books.

*The Tablet* (22 March, 1884); *The Oscotan* (June, 1885), IV, No. 14; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; PURCELL, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (London, 1896), II, 494.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Formosus, POPE** (891-896).—The pontificate of this pope belongs to that era of strife for political supremacy in Italy, which succeeded the disruption of the Carolingian empire. Formosus was probably a native of Rome, and must have been born about 816, since, at his death, he is characterized by Vulgarius as an old man of eighty. The earliest historical information we possess concerning him is his nomination by Nicholas I as Cardinal-Bishop of Porto in 864. Nicholas must have reposed great confidence in the zeal and ability of the cardinal, since, when the Bulgarian prince Bogoris dispatched an embassy to Rome in 866 to submit a series of questions for papal decision, the pope appointed Formosus and Bishop Paulus of Populonia as his legates to Bulgaria. Formosus found such favour at the Bulgarian court that Bogoris petitioned Nicholas in 867 to appoint none other than him Archbishop of Bulgaria. To this proposal, however, Nicholas did not accede, since the canons forbade a bishop to leave his own see to undertake the government of another diocese, and Formosus returned to Rome. Bogoris afterwards renewed his petition to Hadrian II (867-872), the successor of Nicholas, but with no more favourable result. In 869, Hadrian sent Formosus with another bishop to France to assist the local bishops in allaying the domestic strife between King Lothair and his wife Theutberga. Although the death of Lothair on his return from Italy (8 Aug., 869) left the mission without an object, it gave rise to fresh complications among the Carolingian rulers, and Formosus was sent with Bishop Gauderich of Velletri to Trent in 872, where Empress Engelberga and Louis the German were discussing the

question of succession, Louis II having no male heir. At first Pope John VIII (872-882) reposed trust in Formosus, and, on the death of Louis II (875), employed him with two other bishops to convey his invitation to Charles the Bald, King of France, to come to Rome and receive the imperial crown from the hands of the pope. Charles obeyed the call, was crowned emperor on Christmas Day, 875, and, before returning home, appointed Dukes Lambert and Guido of Spoleto to assist the pope against the Saracens. In 871, these nobles had been deprived of their dignities for conspiring against Louis II; but they were restored by Charles.

In the pope's entourage there were many who viewed with disapproval the coronation of Charles, and favoured the widowed Empress Engelberga and Louis the German. Fearing severe chastisement, these political opponents of the pope left Rome secretly to seek safety elsewhere. Cardinal Formosus was among the fugitives, as he dreaded the anger of the pope without knowing exactly whereby he had incurred the papal resentment. From the fact that Formosus had been sent by the pope as ambassador to Charles and now directed his flight to Abbot Hugo at Tours in Western France, it must be inferred that he was not fundamentally opposed to the coronation of Charles. He cannot, however, have been in sympathy with the pope's political views, and consequently feared lest he might share the fate of John's opponents at the papal court. As early as 872 he had been a candidate for the papal see, so that John possibly viewed him in the light of an opponent. On the flight of Formosus and the other papal officials, John convened a synod, 19 April, which ordered the fugitives to return to Rome. As they refused to obey this injunction, they were condemned by a second synod on 30 June. Against Formosus, should he fail to return, sentence of excommunication and deposition were pronounced by the first synod, the charges being that, impelled by ambition, he had aspired to the Archbishopric of Bulgaria and the Chair of Peter, had opposed the emperor and had deserted his diocese without papal permission. It follows from this that John saw in Formosus a rival whom he gravely suspected. The second synod of 30 June, after several new accusations had been brought against Formosus (e. g. that he had despoiled the cloisters in Rome, had performed the divine service in spite of the interdict, had conspired with certain iniquitous men and women for the destruction of the papal see), excluded him from the ranks of the clergy. Such charges, made against a man who was religious, moral, ascetic, and intellectual can only be referred to party spirit.

The condemnation of Formosus and the others was announced to the emperor and the Synod of Ponthion in July. In 878 John himself came to France, and the deposition of Formosus, who appeared in person, was confirmed at the synod of Troyes. According to the acts of the synod, which are however of doubtful authenticity, the sentence of excommunication against Formosus was withdrawn, after he had promised on oath never to return to Rome or exercise his priestly functions. The succeeding years were spent by Formosus at Sens. John's successor Marinus (882-884) released Formosus from his oath, recalled him to Rome, and in 883 restored him to his Diocese of Porto. During the short pontificates of Marinus and his successor Hadrian III (884-885), and under Stephen V (885-891), we learn nothing important concerning Formosus. In September, 891, he was elected to succeed Stephen. Under Stephen V the political horizon had become very threatening. Charles the Fat had reunited the Frankish kingdom in 885, but after his deposition and death in 887, Arnulf of Carinthia, the natural son of Karlmann and the nominee of the Germans, was unable to preserve its unity. In the western kingdom, Count Eudes of Paris came forward as

king; in Provence (Arelate), Louis, son of Boso; in North Burgundy (Jura), Rudolf, son of the Count of Auxerre and grandson of Louis the Pious; in Italy, Berengar of Friaul. The last-mentioned was opposed and defeated by Duke Guido (Wido) of Spoleto, who thereupon took possession of Lombardy, and assumed the title of king. Ruling now over the greater portion of Italy, Guido was a very dangerous neighbour for the papal states, especially as the Archdukes of Spoleto had been on many occasions engaged in conflict with the popes. Stephen V (q. v.) had unwillingly crowned Guido emperor, as King Arnulf had been unable to accept the pope's invitation to come to Rome. Consequently Formosus, after he had been unanimously elected pope by clergy and people, found himself compelled to recognize Guido's dignity and to crown him and his son Lambert Roman Emperor on April, 892. Important ecclesiastical questions claimed the pope's attention immediately after his elevation. In Constantinople, the patriarch Photius had been ejected and Stephen, the son of Emperor Basilus, elevated to the patriarchate. Archbishop Stylian of Neo-Cæsarea and the clerical opponents of Photius had written to Stephen V, requesting dispensation and confirmation for those clerics who had recognized Photius only under compulsion and had received orders at his hands. In his reply to this petition (892) Formosus insisted on a distinction of persons; indulgence might be readily shown in the case of the laity, but in the case of clerics such a course was attended with difficulties; the rule must be the sentence of the Eighth General Council (Can. iv), viz. that Photius neither had been nor was a bishop, and all clerics ordained or appointed by him must resign their office; the papal legates, Landulf and Romanus, were to consult with Stylian and Theophylactus of Ancyra on the matter. In this instance, Formosus only corroborated the decisions of his predecessors, Nicholas I and Hadrian II.

A matter of a pressing character, affecting the Church in Germany, next called for the papal decision. A quarrel had broken out between Archbishop Hermann of Cologne and Archbishop Adalgar of Hamburg concerning the Bishopric of Bremen, which Hermann claimed as suffragan. Formosus decided, in accordance with the decrees of the Synod of Frankfurt (892), that Bremen should remain under the Archbishop of Hamburg until new dioceses were erected; Adalgar was to repair to the provincial synod of the Archbishop of Cologne. Formosus viewed with sorrow the political troubles that disturbed the old Frankish kingdom of the Carolingian dynasty. In the contest between Udes (Odo) of Paris and Charles the Simple for the French crown, the pope, influenced by the Archbishop of Reims, sided with Charles and called on Arnold, the German king, to support him. The political position in Italy directly affected the pope as head of the ecclesiastical estates, and consequently his independence as head of the Church. Emperor Guido of Spoleto, the oppressor of the Holy See and the papal territories, was too near Rome; and the position of the papacy seemed very similar to its condition in the time of the Lombard kingdom, when Stephen II summoned Pepin to his assistance. Formosus secretly persuaded Arnulf to advance to Rome and liberate Italy; and, in 894, Arnulf made his first expedition, subjugating all the country north of the Po. Guido died in December of the same year, leaving his son Lambert, whom Formosus had crowned emperor, in the care of his mother Agiltrude, the implacable opponent of the Carolingians. In the autumn of 895 Arnulf undertook his second Italian campaign, and in February, 896, stood before the walls of Rome. Agiltrude had fortified herself in the city, but Arnulf succeeded in entering and was solemnly crowned by the pope. The new emperor thence marched against Spoleto to besiege Lambert and his mother, but was struck with paralysis on the way and was unable to

continue the campaign. Shortly afterwards (4 April, 896) Formosus died. He was succeeded by Boniface VI, who reigned only fifteen days.

Under Stephen VI, the successor of Boniface, Emperor Lambert and Agiltrude recovered their authority in Rome at the beginning of 897, having renounced their claims to the greater part of Upper and Central Italy. Agiltrude being determined to wreak vengeance on her opponent even after his death, Stephen VI lent himself to the revolting scene of sitting in judgment on his predecessor, Formosus. At the synod convened for that purpose, he occupied the chair; the corpse, clad in papal vestments, was withdrawn from the sarcophagus and seated on a throne; close by stood a deacon to answer in its name, all the old charges formulated against Formosus under John VIII being revived. The decision was that the deceased had been unworthy of the pontificate, which he could not have validly received since he was bishop of another see. All his measures and acts were annulled, and all the orders conferred by him were declared invalid. The papal vestments were torn from his body; the three fingers which the dead pope had used in consecrations were severed from his right hand; the corpse was cast into a grave in the cemetery for strangers, to be removed after a few days and consigned to the Tiber. In 897 the second successor of Stephen had the body, which a monk had drawn from the Tiber, reinterred with full honours in St. Peter's. He furthermore annulled at a synod the decisions of the court of Stephen VI, and declared all orders conferred by Formosus valid. John IX confirmed these acts at two synods, of which the first was held at Rome and the other at Ravenna (898). On the other hand Sergius III (904-911) approved in a Roman synod the decisions of Stephen's synod against Formosus; all who had received orders from the latter were to be treated as lay persons, unless they sought reordination. Sergius and his party meted out severe treatment to the bishops consecrated by Formosus, who in turn had meanwhile conferred orders on many other clerics, a policy which gave rise to the greatest confusion. Against these decisions many books were written, which demonstrated the validity of the consecration of Formosus and of the orders conferred by him (see *AUXILIUS*).

JAFFÉ, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2nd ed., I (Leipzig, 1885), 435-39; DUMMLER, *Gesta Berengarii* (Halle, 1871); IDEM, *Auxilius und Vulgaris* (Leipzig, 1866); IDEM, *Geschichte des östfränkischen Reiches* (3 vols., 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1887-88); LAPÔTRE, *L'Europe et le Saint Siège à l'époque carolingienne*, I: *Le pape Jean VIII* (Paris, 1895); DUCHESNE, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical* (Paris, 1898), 153 sqq.; SALTER, *Les réordinations, étude sur le sacrement de l'Ordre* (Paris, 1907), 152 sqq.; HEFELÉ, *Concilien-gesch.* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1879), IV, 561 sqq.; LANGEN, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, III (Bonn, 1892), 295 sqq.; REUMONT, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, II (Berlin, 1867), 222 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Formularies** (*LIBRI FORMULARUM*), medieval collections of models for the execution of documents (*acta*), public or private; a space being left for the insertion of names, dates, and circumstances peculiar to each case. As is well known, it is practically inevitable that documents of the same nature, issued from the same office, or even from distinct offices, will bear a close resemblance to one another. Those charged with the execution and expedition of such documents come naturally to employ the same formulæ in similar cases; moreover, the use of such formulæ permits the drafting of important documents to be entrusted to minor officials, since all they have to do is to insert in the allotted space the particular information previously supplied them. Finally, in this way every document is clothed with all possible efficiency, since each of its clauses, and almost every word, has a meaning clearly and definitely intended. Uncertainties and difficulties of interpretation are thus avoided, and not unfrequently lawsuits. This legal formalism is usually

known as the "style" or habitual diction of chanceries and the documents that issue therefrom. It represents long efforts to bring into the document all necessary and useful elements in their most appropriate order, and to use technical expressions suited to the case, some of them more or less essential, others merely as a matter of tradition. In this way arose a true art of drafting public documents or private *acta*, which became the monopoly of chanceries and notaries, which the mere layman could only imperfectly imitate, and which in time developed to such a point that the mere "style" of a supposititious deed has often been sufficient to enable a skilful critic to detect the forgery. The earlier Roman notaries (*tabelliones*) had their own traditional formulæ, and the drafting of their *acta* was subject to an infinity of detail (see "Novels" of Justinian, xlv, lxvi); the imperial chanceries of Rome and Byzantium were more remarkable still for their formulæ. The chanceries of the barbarian kingdoms and that of the papacy followed in their footsteps. Nevertheless it is not directly from the chanceries that the formularies drawn up in the Middle Ages have come down to us, but rather from the monastic and ecclesiastical schools. Therein was taught, as pertaining to the study of law, the art of drafting public and private documents (see Du Cange, "Glossarium med. et infimæ Latinitatis", s. v. "Dictare"). It was called *dictare* as opposed to *scribere*, i. e. the mere material execution of such documents.

To train the *dictatores*, as they were known, specimens of public and private *acta* were placed before them, and they had to listen to commentaries thereon. Thus arose the yet extant formularies, between the fifth and the ninth centuries. These models were sometimes of a purely academic nature, but the number of such is small; in almost every case they are taken from real documents, in the transcription of which the individualizing references were suppressed so as to make them take on the appearance of general formulæ; in many instances, too, nothing was suppressed. The formulæ deal with public documents: royal decrees on civil matters, ordinances, etc.; with documents relative to legal processes and the administration of justice; or with private deeds drawn up by a notary: sales, exchanges, gifts to churches and monasteries, transference of ecclesiastical property, the manumission of slaves, the settlement of matrimonial dowries, the execution of wills, etc. Finally, there are deeds which refer solely to ecclesiastical concerns: consecrations of churches, blessings of various kinds, excommunications, etc. The study of the medieval formularies is of importance for students of the history of legislation, the rise of institutions, the development of manners and customs, of civil history, above all for the criticism of charters and diplomas, and for researches in medieval philology. In those times the ecclesiastical and civil orders were closely related. Many civil functions and some of the highest state offices were held by ecclesiastics and monks. The *ars dictandi* was taught in the schools connected with the monasteries and those under ecclesiastical control. For quite a long time all *acta* were drawn up only in Latin, and as the vernacular languages, in Romance lands, gradually fell away from classical Latin, recourse to ecclesiastics and monks became a matter of necessity. The formularies are, of course, anything but models of good Latinity; with the exception of the Letters (*Variae*) of Cassiodorus, and the St. Gall collection "Sub Salomone", they are written in careless or even barbarous Latin, though it is possible that their wretched "style" is intentional, so as to render them intelligible to the multitude.

The formularies of the Middle Ages date from the sixth to the ninth or tenth century; and we still possess many once used in one or other of the barbarian kingdoms. Many were edited in the seventeenth century by Jérôme Bignon, Baluze, Mabillon, and others; and

many more in the nineteenth century, especially by two savants who compiled collections of them: (1) Eugène de Rozière, "Recueil général des formules usitées dans l'empire des Francs du cinquième au dixième siècle" (3 vols., Paris, 1859-71). He groups these early medieval formulæ under five principal heads: "Formulæ ad jus publicum, ad jus privatum, ad iudiciorum ordinem, ad jus canonicum, et ad ritus ecclesiasticos spectantes". And he follows up this arrangement by a very complete set of tables of concordance. (2) Karl Zeumer, "Formulæ Merovingici et Karolini ævi" (Hanover, 1886) in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Leg.", V; he reproduces the formulæ in the work and gives a more complete study than de Rozière. In his pages will be found a complete bibliography of all written on the subject before that time; or Chevalier, "Topo-Bibl.", may be consulted under the word "Formulæ".

Some brief observations will here suffice on the formulæ used between the sixth and the ninth centuries in the various barbarian kingdoms.

(1) *The Ostrogoths*.—Cassiodorus, secretary and afterwards prime minister of King Theodoric, included in his "Variarum (epistolarum) libri XII", particularly in books six and seven, and, as he says, for the guidance of his successors, a great number of *acta* and letters drawn up by him for his royal master. It is a genuine formulary, though standing apart by itself. This collection dates from before 538 (P. L., LXIX). The Servite Canciani took ninety-two of these formulæ of Cassiodorus and included them in his "Barbarorum leges antiquæ" (Venice, 1781, I, 19-56).

(2) *The Visigoths*.—"Formulæ Visigothicæ", a collection of the forty-six formulæ made under King Sisebut (612-621). The king's name occurs twice in the curious formula xx, a dowry settlement in hexameter verse. Roman and Gothic law are followed either separately or together, according to the nationality of the covenanters. This collection was published in 1854 by de Rozière from a Madrid MS., which was copied in turn from an Oviedo MS. of the twelfth century, now lost.

(3) *The Franks*.—Their formularies are numerous: (a) "Formulæ Andecavenses", a collection made at Angers, consisting of sixty formulæ for private *acta*, some of them dating from the sixth century, but the greater number from the early part of the seventh; the last three of the collection belong to the end of the seventh century. They were first edited in 1685 by Mabillon from an eighth-century manuscript preserved at Fulda.—(b) "Formulæ Arvernenses" (also known as "Baluzianæ", from Baluze, their first editor, who issued the works in 1713), a collection of eight formulæ of private *acta* made at Clermont in Auvergne during the eighth century. The first of them is dated from the consulate of Honorius and Theodosius (407-422).—(c) "Marculfi monachi formularum libri duo", the most important of these collections, and dedicated by its author to a Bishop Landri, doubtless identical with the Bishop of Paris (650-656). The first book contains thirty-seven formulæ of royal documents; the second, *cartæ pagenses*, or private *acta*, to the number of fifty-two. The work, which was well done, was very favourably received, and became popular as an official textbook, if not in the time of the mayors of the palace, at least under the early Carolingians. During the reign of Charlemagne it received a few additions, and was re-arranged under the title "Formulæ Marculfinæ ævi Karolini". Zeumer edited six formulæ closely related to this collection.—(d) "Formulæ Turonenses", also known as "Sirmondicæ" (Baluze edited them under this title because they had been discovered by Père Sirmond in a Langres manuscript). This collection, made at Tours, contains forty-five formulæ, two of which are royal documents, many being judicial decisions, and the remainder private *acta*. It seems to belong to the middle of the

eighth century. Zeumer added to the list twelve other formulæ taken from various manuscripts.—(e) "Formulæ Bituricensis", a name given to nineteen formulæ taken from different collections, but all drafted at Bourges; they date from 720 to the close of the eighth century. Zeumer added to them twelve formulæ taken from the Abbey of Saint-Pierre de Vierzon.—(f) "Formulæ Senonenses", two distinct collections, both of which were made at Sens, and preserved in the same ninth-century manuscript. The first, "Cartæ Senonica", dates from before 775, and contains fifty-one formulæ, of which seven are for royal documents, two are letters to the king, and forty-two are private charters. Zeumer added six Merovingian formulæ. The second collection, "Formulæ Senonenses recentiores", dates from the reign of Louis the Pious, and contains eighteen formulæ, of which seven deal with judicial acts. Zeumer added five metrical formulæ, and two Merovingian formulæ written in Tironian notes.—(g) "Formulæ Pithoei". In a manuscript loaned by Pithou to Du Cange for his "Glossarium" of medieval Latin there was a rich collection of at least one hundred and eight formulæ, drawn up originally in territory governed by Salic law. This manuscript has disappeared. Under the above heading Zeumer has collected the various quotations made by Du Cange from this formulary.—(h) "Formulæ Salicæ Bignonianæ", so called from the name of their first editor, Bignon. It contains twenty-seven formulæ, one of which is for a royal decree; they were collected in a country subject to Salic law, about the year 770.—(i) "Formulæ Salicæ Merkelianæ", so called from the name of their editor, Merkel (about 1850), a collection of sixty-six formulæ taken from a Vatican manuscript; they were not brought to completion until after 817. The first part (1-30) consists of formulæ for private *acta*, modelled on "Marculf" and the "Formulæ Turonenses"; the second part (31-42) follows the "Formulæ Bignonianæ"; the third (43-45) contains three formulæ drawn up in some abbey; the fourth (46-66) has formulæ dating from the close of the eighth century and probably compiled in some episcopal town. Two formulæ of decrees of the bishops of Paris were discovered by Zeumer in the same manuscript.—(k) "Formulæ Salicæ Lindenbrogianæ", so called from the name of their first editor, Friedrich Lindenbrog, a Frankfurt lawyer (1613) who edited them together with other documents. The collection contains twenty-one formulæ of private *acta*, drawn up in Salic law territory. Four others were added by Zeumer.—(l) "Formulæ Imperiales e curia Ludovici Pii", also known as "Carpenterianæ" from Carpenter, who first edited them in his "Alphabetum Tironianum" (Paris, 1747). This is an important collection of fifty-five formulæ, drawn up after the fashion of the charters of Louis the Pious at the Abbey of St. Martin of Tours, between 828 and 832. The manuscript is written mainly in Tironian notes. This collection was used by the Carolingian chancery of the ninth century. Zeumer has added to the list two formulæ.—(m) "Collectio Flaviniensis", one hundred and seventeen formulæ compiled at the Abbey of Flavigny in the ninth century; of these, ten only are not to be met with elsewhere.—(n) "Formulæ collectionis Sancti Dionysii", a collection of twenty-five formulæ made at the Abbey of St-Denis under Charlemagne; for the most part it is taken from the archives of the abbey.—(o) "Formulæ codicis Laudunensis", a Laon manuscript containing seventeen formulæ, of which the first five were drawn up at the Abbey of St-Bavon in Ghent, and the remainder at Laon.

(4) *The Alamanni*.—The most important of their formulæ are: (a) "Formulæ Alsatice", under which name we have two collections, one made at the Abbey of Murbach (Formulæ Morbacenses) at the end of the eighth century and preserved in a manuscript of St. Gall, containing twenty-seven formulæ, one of which is



for a royal decree; the other embodies three formulæ made at Strasburg (*Formulæ Argentinenses*) and preserved in a Berne manuscript.—(b) "*Formulæ Augienses*", from the Abbey of Reichenau. This consists of three distinct collections: one from the end of the eighth century containing twenty-three formulæ of private *acta*; another belonging to the eighth and ninth centuries contains forty-three formulæ of private documents; the third, "*Formulæ epistolares Augienses*", is a "correct letter-writer" with twenty-six formulæ.—(c) "*Formulæ Sangallenses*" (from the Abbey of St. Gall), in two collections of this name. The "*Formulæ Sangallenses miscellanæ*" consists of twenty-five formulæ, many of which are accompanied by directions for their use. They date from the middle of the eighth to the end of the ninth century. The important "*Collectio Sangallensis Salomonis III tempore conscripta*" is so called because it seems to have been compiled by the monk Notker at St. Gall, under Abbot Salomon III (890–920), who was also Bishop of Constance. Notker died in 912. It contains, in forty-seven formulæ, models of royal decrees, of private documents, of *litteræ formatæ* and other episcopal documents. Zeumer added six formulæ taken from the same manuscript.

(5) *The Bavarians*.—Among their formulæ are: (a) "*Formulæ Salisburgenses*", a very fine collection of one hundred and twenty-six models of documents and letters, published in 1858, by Rockinger, and drawn up at Salzburg in the early part of the ninth century.—(b) "*Collectio Pataviensis*" (of Passau), containing seven formulæ, five of which are of royal decrees, executed at Passau under Louis the German.—(c) "*Formulæ codicis S. Emmerami*", fragments of a large collection made at St. Emmeram's, Ratisbon.

(6) *Rome*.—The most important of all ancient formularies is certainly the "*Liber diurnus romanorum pontificum*", a collection of one hundred and seven formularies long used by the Apostolic chancery. If it was not drawn up for the papal chancery, it copies its documents, and is largely compiled from the "*Registrum*" or letter-book of St. Gregory the Great (590–604). It was certainly in official use by the Roman chancery from the ninth to the end of the eleventh century. This collection was known to the medieval canonists, and is often quoted by Cardinal Deusdedit and Yves of Chartres; four of its documents were incorporated into the "*Decretum*" of Gratian. The best manuscript of the "*Liber diurnus*", written at the beginning of the ninth century, comes from the Roman monastery of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and was discovered in the Vatican Library. About the middle of the seventeenth century, the learned Lucas Holstenius used it when preparing an edition of the work which was officially stopped and suppressed on the eve of its appearance, because it contained an ancient profession of faith in which the popes anathematized their predecessor Honorius. In 1680 the Jesuit Garnier, using another manuscript of the College of Clermont (Paris), brought out an edition of the "*Liber diurnus*" not approved by Rome (P. L., CV). In the nineteenth century the Vatican manuscript was utilized for two editions, one by de Rozière (Paris, 1869), the other by von Sichel (Vienna, 1889). In 1891 the Abbate Ceriani discovered at the Ambrosiana (Milan) a third manuscript as yet unused. For a full bibliography of recent researches concerning the "*Liber diurnus*" see the "*Topo-Bibl.*" of Chevalier, s. v. While, in its complete form, the "*Liber diurnus*" cannot date back further than 786, the earliest forms of it go back to the end of the seventh century. Von Sichel holds that its opening formulæ (1–63) are even fifty years earlier than that date. It is badly arranged as a collection, but wonderfully complete. After a series of addresses and conclusions for papal letters, that vary according to the addressees, there are formulæ concerning the installation of bishops, the consecra-

tion of churches, the administration of church property, the grant of the pallium, and various other privileges. Then follow models for the official correspondence on the occasion of a vacancy of the Holy See and the election of a pope, also directions for the consecration and the profession of faith of the pope-elect; finally a group of formulae affecting various matters of ecclesiastical administration.

In the tenth century these formularies cease to be in universal use; in the eleventh, recourse is had to them still more rarely; other methods of training notaries are introduced. Copies of letters are no longer placed before them. In their stead, special treatises of instruction are prepared for these officials, and manuals of epistolary rhetoric appear, with examples scattered here and there throughout the text, or collected in separate books. Such treatises on composition, *artes dictaminis*, have hitherto been only partially studied and classified, chiefly by Rockinger in "*Briefsteller und Formelbücher des XI. bis XIV. Jahrhunderts*" (Munich, 1863). The most ancient of these manuals known to us is the "*Breviarium de dictamine*" of Alberic of Monte Cassino, about 1075; in the twelfth century treatises of this kind become more frequent, first in Italy, then in France, especially along the banks of the Loire at Orléans and at Tours. Side by side with these works of epistolary rhetoric we meet special treatises for the use of clerks in different chanceries, and formularies to guide notaries public. Such are the "*Formularium tabellionum*" of Irnerius of Bologna in the twelfth century, and the "*Summa artis notariæ*" of Ranieri of Perugia in the thirteenth; that of Salathiel of Bologna printed at Strasburg, in 1516, and the very popular one of Rolandino that went through many editions, beginning with the Turin edition of 1479.

As to the papal chancery, in general very faithful to its customs and its "style", after the reform of Innocent III many formularies and practical treatises appeared, none of them possessing an official value. The writings of Dietrich of Nieheim (an employé of the chancery in 1380), "*De Stilo*" and "*Liber Cancellariæ*", have been the subject of critical studies (see DIETRICH VON NIEHEIM). At a more recent date we meet many treatises on the Roman chancery and on pontifical letters, but they are not formularies, though their text often contains many models.

Quite recently, however, there has appeared an official publication of certain formulæ of the Roman Curia, i. e. the collection of formulæ for matrimonial dispensations granted by the *Dataria Apostolica* (see ROMAN CONGREGATIONS), published in 1901 as "*Formulæ Apostolicæ Datarie pro matrimonialibus dispensationibus, jussu Emi. Card. Pro Datarii Cajetani Aloisi-Masella reformatæ*".

Lastly, in a different order of ideas, it may be well to mention a collection of formulæ for use in episcopal courts, the "*Formularium legale-practicum*" of Francesco Monacelli (Venice, 1737), re-edited by the *Camera Apostolica* (3 vols. fol., Rome, 1834).

From the twelfth century onward the formularies of the papal Curia become more numerous but less interesting, since it is no longer necessary to have recourse to them to supplement the documents.

The formularies of the *Cancellaria Apostolica* are collections drawn up by its clerks, almost exclusively for their own guidance; they interest us only through their relation to the "*Rules of the Chancery*" (see ROMAN CURIA). The formularies of the *Pœnitentiaria* have a higher interest for us; they appear during the twelfth century when that department of Roman administration was not restricted, as it now is, to questions of conscience and the *forum internum*, but served as a sort of clearing-house for lesser favours granted by the Holy See, especially for dispensations. These interesting documents, including the formularies, have been collected and edited by Göller in "*Die*

papstliche Poenitentiarie bis Eugen IV." (Rome, 1907).

Previously, Lea had published "A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary in the Thirteenth Century" (Philadelphia, 1892), probably the work of Cardinal Thomasius of Capua (d. 1243). We must mention the "Summa de absolutiōibus et dispensationibus" of Nicholas IV; of particular value also is the formulary of Benedict XII (1336 at the latest), made by order of that pope and long in use. It contains five hundred and seventy letters of which more than two hundred are taken from the collection of Thomasius. Attention is also directed to the list of "faculties" conferred, in 1357, on Cardinal Alborno, first edited by Leca- cheux in "Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire des écoles françaises de Rome et d'Athènes", in 1898; and to later texts in Göller. It will suffice if we make a bare mention of the *taxæ* or "taxes" in use at the Penitentiaria, to which were occasionally joined those imposed by the Cancellaria; in the opinion of the writer, they are not in any way related to the formularies.

Besides the works mentioned above see GRY, *Manuel de diplomatique* (Paris, 1894), Bk. IV, ch. i, *Formulaires et manuels*; Bk. V, *Les Chanceleries*; from this work we have largely drawn; KOBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. vv. *Formelbücher*, and *Liber diurnus*.

A. BOUDINHON.

**Fornovo.** See SABINA, DIOCESE OF.

**Forrest, WILLIAM**, priest and poet; dates of birth and death uncertain. Few personal details are known of him. He is thought to have been related to John Forest, the Franciscan martyr, and was connected with Christ Church, Oxford, though in what capacity is not clear; probably he was a student there. It is certain that he was present when the university, in 1530, discussed the question of Henry VIII's divorce; he also gives a long account in his poem on Catherine of Aragon of the rebuilding of the college when it was remodelled, and we find him in receipt of a pension from it in 1555. Soon after the accession of Mary he was made a royal chaplain, but nothing is known of what became of him after her death. An interesting entry occurs in the State papers (domestic) of Elizabeth, under the date 23 Dec., 1592, to the effect that a certain Robert Faux being examined, confessed that "3 or 4 years since he had given a gray nag with a saddle and bridle to Forrest, a priest, at an ale house in Stoke, Northampton". This may have been William Forrest, and points perhaps to his being a fugitive at the time. He was a skilful musician and collected the manuscripts of some of the best contemporary English composers. This collection is now preserved in Oxford. The greater part of his poems are still in MS. None of them are of great poetical merit, but some are extremely interesting from the light they throw upon certain political, religious, and social events of his time. There are some enlightened suggestions in his work concerning points of social reform. Warton, in his "History of English Poetry", remarks that Forrest seems to have been able to "accommodate his faith to the reigning powers", and the statement rests upon the fact that he dedicated two of his works to the protector Somerset. Otherwise he seems to have been a loyal Catholic. Forrest's works are: "History of Joseph the Chaste" (in MS., Oxford and British Museum); "The Pleasant Poesie of Princely Practice" (in MS., British Museum)—a long extract from this poem is given in "Starkey's Life and Letters" (see below); A metrical version of certain Psalms and Canticles (in MS.); "A New Ballad of the Marigold", in praise of Queen Mary, printed in the "Harleian Miscellany", vol. X; "The History of Grisild the Second", a long poem upon Catherine of Aragon and her divorce, published entire by the Roxburghe Club (London, 1875), with memoir by the Rev. W. H. Macray; "The Life of the Virgin Mary", and other poems (Harleian MS., 1703).

COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; *Starkey's Life and Letters* (Early Eng. Text Soc., London, 1878); WARTON, *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, ed. HAZLITT (London, 1871), IV; WOOD, *Athenæ Oxon.*, ed. BLISS (London, 1812), I; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v. K. M. WARREN.

**Förster, ARNOLD**, German entomologist; b. at Aachen, 20 Jan., 1810; d. in the same city, 12 Aug., 1884. His father died while he was quite young, and it was only by strict economy and by tutoring that he was able to complete his gymnasium course, which he began in 1824. He was an apt student, and showed a decided preference for natural history. The entomologist Meigen, who resided in the neighbourhood, fostered and directed this preference and his influence may be traced throughout Förster's subsequent work in entomology. Förster began the study of medicine at Bonn in 1832, but soon abandoned it to devote himself entirely to natural science. He made rapid progress, and, while still a student, became assistant to Goldfuss and tutor in his family. In 1836 he was appointed instructor in the high school—known to-day as the Realgymnasium—of his native city, with which he was connected until his death.

Förster was a conscientious teacher, and endeavoured to awaken in his pupils a love of and interest in the wonders of nature. His wealth of knowledge and his untiring spirit of research would, however, have found a wider and more suitable field in the university than in the gymnasium. Most of his leisure was devoted to his studies in entomology, though botany also claimed part of his attention. He was regarded in particular as an authority in the "microhymenoptera". He was an indefatigable collector and a keen observer, but was inclined to magnify minute differences, and so multiply species and divisions. Förster belonged to a number of societies of natural history, and carried on an extensive correspondence with entomologists both at home and abroad. In 1853 he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy *honoris causa* at Bonn, and in 1855 the title of professor from the Minister of Instruction. He was abstemious in his habits, and a devout and practical Catholic, conspicuous for his charity towards the poor. Among his papers on entomology are "Beiträge zur Monographie der Pteromalinen"; "Einige neuen Arten aus der Familie der Blattwespen"; "Hymenopterologische Studien"; "Monographie der Gattungen Campoplex u. Hylæus"; "Flora Excursoria des Regierungsbezirks Aachen". WACKERZAPF, *Verhandl. d. Naturhistorischen Vereins d. preussischen Rheinlande, Westfalens und d. Regierungsbezirks Osnabrück* (Bonn, 1886), *Correspondenzblatt*, p. 38.

HENRY M. BROCK.

**Forster, FROBENIUS**, Prince-Abbot of St. Emmeram at Ratisbon, b. 30 Aug., 1709, at Königfeld in Upper Bavaria; d. 11 Oct., 1791, at Ratisbon. After studying the humanities and philosophy at Freising and Ingolstadt, he entered the Benedictine monastery of St. Emmeram at Ratisbon where he took vows on 8 Dec., 1728. He made his theological studies partly at his monastery and partly at Rott, where the Bavarian Benedictines had their common study house. Shortly after his elevation to the priesthood, in 1733, he became professor of philosophy and theology at St. Emmeram and for some time held the office of master of novices. In 1745 he was sent to the Benedictine university at Salzburg to teach philosophy and physics. Two years later he returned to his monastery where he taught philosophy and Holy Scripture until he became librarian and prior in 1750. He had gained an enviable reputation as a philosopher and scientist, and was one of the first religious who endeavoured to reconcile Scholastic philosophy with the Cartesian and the Leibniz-Wolffian school. Though leaning towards the Leibniz-Wolffian philosophy, he rejected many of its teachings, such as the cosmological optimism of Leibniz and the mechanism of Wolff, and was rather an eclectic than a slavish follower of any one system. In

1759 Forster was chosen one of the first members of the newly founded Bavarian academy of sciences. A year later he laid down the office of prior and was appointed provost at Hohengebraching, a dependency of St. Emmeram, situated about five miles south of Ratisbon. On 24 July, 1762, he was elected as successor to the deceased Prince-Abbot Johann Baptist Kraus of St. Emmeram.

Forster's election was the inauguration of the golden era of St. Emmeram. The learned new prince-abbot endeavoured to impart his own love for learning to each of his subjects and offered them every facility to advance in knowledge. During his reign the course given in the natural sciences at St. Emmeram became famous throughout Germany and drew scholars not only from the Benedictine monasteries of Bavaria, but also from the houses of other religious orders. In order to promote the study of Holy Scripture, Forster called the learned Maurist philologist, Charles Lancelot of St-Germain-des-Prés, who instructed the monks of St. Emmeram in Oriental languages from 1 Oct., 1771, to 27 May, 1775. To encourage his young monks still more in their respective studies, he founded a physical, a mineralogical, and a numismatic cabinet and procured the best available literature in the various branches. Forster's chief literary production is his carefully prepared edition of the works of Alcuin which appeared in two folio volumes (4 parts) at Ratisbon in 1777. It is reprinted in the Latin Patrology of Migne (vols. C and CI). He also wrote in Latin five short philosophical treatises and a dissertation on the Vulgate. From a codex preserved in the library of the cathedral chapter at Freising he edited the decrees of the Synod of Aschheim and made a German translation of it for "Abhandlungen der Bayr. Akad. der Wissenschaften" (I, 39-60); and from a codex in the library of St. Emmeram he published in Mansi's "Collectio Ampl. Conciliorum" (XIII, 1025-28), the decrees of a Bavarian synod held during the times of the Agilolfings.

ENDRES, *Frobenius Forster in Strassburger theol. Studien* (Freiburg im Br., 1900), IV, fasc. 1; LINDNER, *Die Schriftsteller des Benediktiner-Ordens in Bayern* (Ratisbon, 1880), I, 56-62; SCHNEIDER in *Hist.-Polit. Blätter* (Munich, 1901), CXXVII, 902-913.

MICHAEL ÖTT.

**Forster, THOMAS IGNATIUS MARIA**, astronomer and naturalist, b. at London, 9 Nov., 1789; d. at Brussels, 2 Feb., 1860. His literary education was neglected, as his father, a distinguished botanist, was a follower of Rousseau. He made up this deficiency, and during his lifetime became master of a number of modern languages. His early studies were, however, desultory, and he seems to have put off the choice of a profession until some years after attaining to man's estate. As early as 1805 he had compiled a "Journal of the Weather" and had published his "Liber Rerum Naturalium". A year later, inspired by Gall's works, he took up the study of phrenology. The comet of 1811 aroused his interest in astronomy, a science which he continued to pursue, and eight years later, on 3 July, 1819, he himself discovered a new comet. He finally matriculated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in order to study law, but soon abandoned it for medicine, taking his degree in 1819. Two years before, he had married the daughter of Colonel Beaufoy and taken up his residence at Spa Lodge, Tunbridge Wells. After the birth of his only daughter he moved to Hartwell in Sussex, and then went abroad, where he spent three years. His observations and studies on the Continent led to the publication, in 1824, of his "Perennial Calendar". It was also during this period that he was attracted by the claims of the Catholic Church, to which he became a convert. After his return to England he became a fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society and helped to found a meteorological society, which, however, had but a brief existence.

His father died in 1825, and he soon after took up

VI.—10

his residence in Chelmsford in order to be near his daughter, who was a pupil at Newhall Convent. Here he undertook a series of researches on the influence of atmospheric conditions on diseases, and particularly on cholera. In 1830 he collected and published the letters of Locke, Shaftesbury, and Algernon Sydney. In 1833 he again went abroad, where he spent most of his remaining years, settling finally in Bruges. He continued his literary activity during the latter part of his life, some of his writings being poetical. He also composed selections for the violin. Forster was remarkable for his versatility and industry. He numbered among his friends many of the prominent authors and scholars of his time, such as Gray, Porson, Shelley, Peacock, Herschel, and Whewell. Besides the works mentioned, he also wrote, "Researches about Atmospheric Phenomena" (London, 1812; 2nd ed., 1823); "Reflections on the Destructive Operation of Spirituous Liquors" (London, 1812); "Pocket Encyclopedia of Natural Phenomena" (from his father's MSS., 1826); "Beobachtungen über den Einfluss des Luftdruckes auf das Gehör" (Frankfort, 1835); "Observations sur l'influence des Comètes" (1836); "Pan, a Pastoral" (Brussels, 1840); "Essay on Abnormal Affections of the Organs of Sense" (Tunbridge Wells, 1841); "Annales d'un Physicien Voyageur" (Bruges, 1848); and numerous articles in "The Gentleman's Magazine".

FORSTER, *Recueil de ma Vie* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1835); *Epistolarium Forsterianum* (Bruges, 1845-50); BOULGER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.

HENRY M. BROCK.

**Fortaleza**, DIOCESE OF (FORTALEXIENSIS), is co-extensive with the State of Ceará in the Republic of Brazil, having an area of 46,912 square miles, and a population of 850,000 souls, of whom fewer than 1000 are non-Catholics. Fortaleza, or Ceará, the episcopal city, has a population of 60,000. Formerly a part of the Diocese of Pernambuco, this district was erected into a separate diocese, suffragan to Bahia, by Pius IX, 8 June, 1854. João Guerino Gomes was named as first bishop but did not accept the appointment. Father Gomes, who was famous in his day both as an orator and as a philosopher, died in 1859; a biographical notice of him was presented to the Historical Institute of Bahia by his cousin, José Antonio Teixeira. The first bishop, Luis Antonio dos Santos, founded the diocesan seminaries at Fortaleza and Crato, and, for the education of girls, the College of the Immaculate Conception, besides building the church of the Sacred Heart at Fortaleza.

Dom Luis Antonio dos Santos having been elevated to the metropolitan See of Bahia, Joaquim José Vieira—b. 1836, consecrated at Campinas in the State of S. Paulo, 9 December, 1883—took possession of the See of Fortaleza on 24 February, 1884. His incumbency has been fruitful in the increase of means for the education of the poor, the college of Canindé and the Jesus-Mary-Joseph School at Fortaleza owing their existence to his pastoral zeal. In 1908 this diocese contained 77 parishes with 120 priests. The diocesan seminary is conducted by the Lazarist Fathers; there is a Benedictine abbey, with a college, at Quixadá; the Italian Capuchins have charge of the Sacred Heart church at Fortaleza and the church of St. Francis of the Wounds at Canindé, to which latter is attached a college for poor boys. The Sisters of Charity have under their care the Misericórdia Hospital at Fortaleza, the College of the Immaculate Conception, the Jesus-Mary-Joseph School, and the lunatic asylum at Parangaba. The principal lay association in the diocese is the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, consisting of a superior council, 32 particular councils, and 156 conferences, and maintains 10 primary schools and 9 libraries, besides publishing, as its official organ, the "Revista do Conselho Central".

GUILHERME STUDART.

**Fortalitiium Fidei.** See SPINA, ALFONSO DE.

**Fort Augustus Abbey.**—St. Benedict's Abbey, at Fort Augustus, Inverness-shire, is at present the only monastery for Benedictine monks in Scotland. It owed its inception to the desire of John, third Marquess of Bute, for the restoration of monasticism in a country which, before the Reformation, possessed so many glorious abbeys and priories, and in later days owned many others on the Continent. The marquess brought the matter before the superiors of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation in 1874, promising substantial pecuniary help in the establishment of a house in Scotland, with the understanding that when two other monasteries should have been founded they should all form a separate Scottish congregation. The suggestion was approved of, and the Anglo-Benedictine authorities resolved to incorporate with the Scottish monastery the more ancient foundation of Sts. Adrian and Denis, formerly existing at Lamspring, in Hanover, which was peopled by English monks from 1645 to 1803, and when suppressed by a hostile government was afterwards resuscitated in England; inadequacy of funds had prevented any lasting restoration of this house, but with the help promised by Lord Bute, it seemed possible to revive it in Scotland. Dom Jerome Vaughan, a brother of Cardinal Vaughan, was appointed to superintend the work, and succeeded in collecting from rich and poor in England, Scotland, and Ireland, sufficient means for the erection of a fine monastery at a cost of some £70,000. A site was given by Simon, fifteenth Baron Lovat, comprising the buildings of a dismantled fort, built in 1729 and known as Fort Augustus, a title given in compliment to George Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, son of George II. The fort, originally erected for the suppression of Highland Jacobites, had been purchased from the Government by the Lovat family, in 1867. The monastic buildings commenced in 1876 were completed in 1880. They occupy the four sides of a quadrangle about one hundred feet square. In one wing a school for boys of the upper classes was conducted by the monks, with the assistance of university graduates and other lay masters, for about sixteen years, but was reluctantly closed in 1894, as its distance from England and the dearth of Scottish Catholic families of rank made its continuance a matter of difficulty. This school was one of the pioneers of a more refined style of equipment than was usual at the time of its inception.

Up to the year 1882 St. Benedict's monastery remained under the jurisdiction of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation, but in response to the wishes of the Scottish hierarchy, and of the leading Scottish nobility—notably Lords Lovat and Bute—Leo XIII, by his Brief "*Summā cum animi letitiā*", dated 12 December, 1882, erected it into an independent abbey, immediately subject to the Holy See, thus separating it from English rule. When this step had been accomplished, Lord Lovat made over the property to the Scottish community, by signing the title deeds, which for a time had been held over. In 1888 Dom Leo Linse of the Beuron Benedictine Congregation, who had resided for more than ten years in England, part of that time as superior of Erdington Priory, near Birmingham, was nominated abbot by the Holy See and received the abbatial benediction at the hands of Archbishop, afterwards Cardinal, Persico, who had been sent to the abbey as Apostolic Visitor. In 1889, special constitutions, based upon those of the Beuron Benedictine Congregation, were adopted, with the approval of the Holy See, for a term of ten years. These, after certain modifications suggested by experience, received definite approbation in 1901. In 1905, in view of the exceptional position of the monastery as an independent abbey, the Holy See conferred upon the primate of the Benedictine Order, as regards

Fort Augustus Abbey, the powers ordinarily exercised by the president of a congregation. This arrangement has not only provided for regular canonical visitations at definite intervals, but has facilitated intercourse with the Holy See, under whose immediate jurisdiction the abbey still remains.

From its foundation the monastery made it a prominent duty, in accordance with the tenor of its constitutions, to fulfil St. Benedict's precept regarding the celebration with befitting solemnity of the liturgical worship of the Church. Mass, Vespers, and the Divine Office are daily celebrated with the music and ritual demanded by the varying importance of season or festival. Since 1893 the Solesmes version of the Gregorian melodies, since recognized as the authoritative edition of the chant, has been exclusively used in all liturgical services. The time that is not occupied by choir duties and other community exercises is claimed by a variety of occupations. The management of a large farm and of an adjoining estate, annually let to tenants for shooting purposes; the generation of electric light for the use of the abbey and of many of the residents of the village; the working of a small printing press; the spiritual charge of a tract of country forty square miles in extent, containing many habitations of Catholics scattered over the hills; the preaching of missions, and the giving of retreats both within and without the abbey; the rendering of assistance to the diocesan clergy when required; Biblical, theological, musical, artistic, and scientific studies; literary work, facilitated by a fine library of some 20,000 volumes and some rare and precious manuscripts; all these afford abundant employment to a community of about fifty monks and lay brothers. The graceful group of buildings whose spires and turrets rise above the trees forms a conspicuous object from Loch Ness, and is visible from a distance of many miles. A church of large size, designed by Peter Paul Pugin, was commenced in 1890; a temporary wooden church has been in use since 1880.

*Archives of Fort Augustus Abbey; The Nineteenth Century* (October, 1884); *The Catholic World* (New York, September, 1895).

MICHAEL BARRETT.

**Fort-de-France.** See MARTINIQUE, DIOCESE OF.

**Fortescue, ADRIAN, BLESSED, Knight of St. John, martyr;** b. about 1476, executed 10 July, 1539. He belonged to the Salden branch of the great Devonshire family of Fortescue, and was a true country gentleman of the period, occasionally following the king in the wars with France (1513 and 1522), not unfrequently attending the court, and at other times acting as justice of the peace or commissioner for subsidies. He was knighted in 1503 (Clermont); but D. N. B. gives 1528), attended the Field of the Cloth of Gold (1520), and late in life (1532) became a Knight of St. John. When Anne Boleyn became queen, Sir Adrian (whose mother, Alice Boleyn, was Anne's grand-aunt) naturally profited to some extent, but, as we see from his papers, not very much. The foundations of his worldly fortunes had been laid honourably at an earlier date. He was a serious thrifty man, painstaking in business, careful in accounts, and a lover of the homely wit of that day. He collected and signed several lists of proverbs and wise saws, which, though not very brilliant, are never offensive or coarse, always sane, and sometimes rise to a high moral or religious level.

All of a sudden this quiet, worthy gentleman was overwhelmed by some unexplained whim of the Tudor tyrant. On 29 August, 1534, he was put under arrest, no one knows why, but released after some months. On 3 February, 1539, he was arrested a second time and sent to the Tower. In April he was condemned untried by an act of attainder; in July he was beheaded. No specific act of treason was alleged against

him, but only in general "sedition and refusing allegiance". The same attainder, however, went on to decree death against Cardinal Pole and several others because they "adhered themselves to the Bishop of Rome". Catholic tradition has always held that Sir Adrian died for the same cause, and modern Protestant critics have come to the same conclusion. His cultus has always flourished among the Knights of St. John, and he was beatified by Leo XIII in 1895.

CAMM, *Lives of the English Martyrs*, I, 413-461; FORTESCUE (LORD CLERMONT), *Family of Fortescue* (1880), 255-311; G. K. FORTESCUE, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Fortitude.**—(1) Manliness is etymologically what is meant by the Latin word *virtus* and by the Greek *ἀνδρεία*, with which we may compare *ἀρετή* (virtue), *ἀριστος* (best), and *ἄνθρωπος* (man). *Mas* (male) stands to *Mars*, the god of war, as *ἀρσεν* (male) to the corresponding Greek deity *Ἄρης*. While *ἀνδρεία* (manliness) has been specialized to signify valour, *virtus* has been left in its wider generality, and only in certain contexts is it limited, as by Cæsar when he says: "Helvetii reliquos Gallos virtute præcedunt". Here the writer was certainly not taking the pious outlook upon virtue, except in so far as for primitive peoples the leading virtue is bravery and the skilful strength to defend their lives and those of their fellow-tribesmen. At this stage of culture we may apply Spinoza's notion that virtue is the conservatory force of life. "In proportion as a man aims at and is successful in pursuing his *utile*, that is his *esse*, so much the more is he endowed with *virtue*; on the other hand, in proportion as he neglects to cultivate his *utile* or his *esse*, so much the greater is his impotence" (Eth., IV, prop. 20). "Virtue is that human faculty, which is defined only by the essence of man, that is, which is limited only by the efforts of man to persevere in his *esse*" (prop. 22). The idea is continued in Propositions 23, 24, 25, 27. The will to live—*der Wille zu leben*—is the root virtue. Of course Spinoza carries his doctrine higher than does the savage warrior, for he adds that the power preservative and promotive of life is adequacy of ideas, reasonable conduct, conformity to intelligent nature: finally that "the highest virtue of the intellect is the knowledge of God" (lib. V, prop. xlii). Spinoza usually mixes the noble with the ignoble in his views: for a rude people his philosophy stops short at virtue, the character of the strong man defending his existence against many assaults.

Aristotle does not say that fortitude is the highest virtue; but he selects it first for treatment when he describes the moral virtues: *ἐπιώμεν πρώτον περὶ ἀνδρείας* (Eth. Nic., III, 6); whereas St. Thomas is at pains to say explicitly that fortitude ranks third after prudence and justice among the cardinal virtues. The *braves* in a warrior tribe and the glamour of *braverie* in knight-errantry, the display of pomp by modern armies on parade, were not objects to disturb the sense of proportion in the mind of the Friar Preacher. Still less could etymology deceive his judgment into thinking that the prime virtue was the soldier's valour commended on the Victoria Cross. Neither would he despise the tribute "For Valour" in its own degree.

(2) To come now to definitions. If we consult Plato and Aristotle we find the former comparing man to the god Glaucus who from dwelling in the sea had his divine limbs encrusted beyond recognition with weeds and shells; and that represents the human spirit disguised by the alien body which it drags about as a penalty. The soul in its own rational nature (for our present purpose we fuse together the two terms *ψυχή* and *νοῦς*, distinguished by Aristotle, into one—the soul) is simple: man is compound, and, being conflictingly compounded, he has to drive a pair of steeds in his body, one ignoble—the concupiscences—the other relatively noble—the spiritual element, in which is "go", "dash", "onslaught", "pluck", "endurance".

Upon the latter element is based fortitude, but the animal spirit needs to be taken up and guided by the rational soul in order to become the virtue. It is in the breast that *ὁ θυμὸς, τὸ θυμοειδές* (courage, passion) dwells, midway between reason in the head and concupiscence in the abdomen. Plato's high spirituality kept him from speaking too exaltedly of fortitude which rested on bodily excellence: consequently he would have wise legislators educate their citizens rather in temperance than in courage, which is separable from wisdom and may be found in children or in mere animals (Laws, I, 630, C, D, E; 631, C; 667, A).

Although Aristotle makes animal courage only the basis of fortitude—the will is courageous, but the animal spirit co-operates (*ὁ δὲ θυμὸς συνέργει*)—he has not a similar contempt for the body, and speaks more honourably of courage when it has for its prime object the conquest of bodily fear before the face of death in battle. Aristotle likes to narrow the scope of his virtues as Plato likes to enlarge his scope. He will not with his predecessor (Laches, 191, D, E) extend fortitude to cover all the firmness or stability which is needful for every virtue, consequently Kant was able to say: "Virtue is the moral strength of the will in obeying the dictates of duty" (Anthropol., sect. 10, a). The Platonic Socrates took another limited view when he said that courage was the *ἐπιστήμη τῶν δυνάων καὶ μὴ* (Laches, 199); hence he inferred that it could be taught. Given that in themselves a man prefers virtue to vice, then we may say that for him every act of vice is a failure of fortitude. Aristotle would have admitted this too; nevertheless he chose his definition: "Fortitude is the virtue of the man who, being confronted with a noble occasion of encountering the danger of death, meets it fearlessly" (Eth. Nic., III, 6). Such a spirit has to be formed as a habit upon data more or less favourable; and therein it resembles other virtues of the moral kind. Aristotle would have controverted Kant's description of moral stability in all virtue as not being a quality cultivatable into a habit: "Virtue is the moral strength of the will in obeying the dictates of duty, never developing into a custom but always springing freshly and directly from the mind" (Anthropol., I, 10, a). Not every sort of danger to life satisfies Aristotle's condition for true fortitude: there must be present some noble display of prowess—*ἀλκή καὶ κάλον*. He may not quite positively exclude the passive endurance of martyrdom, but St. Thomas seems to be silently protesting against such an exclusion when he maintains that courage is rather in endurance than in onset.

As a commentator on Aristotle, Professor J. A. Stewart challenges the friends of the martyrs to make a stand for their cause when he says: "It is only when a man can take up arms and defend himself, or where death is glorious, that he can show courage" (p. 283). Here the disjunctive "or" may save the situation: but there is no such reserve on p. 286, where he adds: "Men show courage when they can take up arms and defend themselves, or (¶) where death is glorious. The former condition may be realized without the latter, in which case the *ἀνδρεία* would be of a spurious kind: the latter condition, however, cannot be realized without the former. Death in a good cause which a man endured fearlessly, but could not actively resist, could not be *καλὸς θάνατος*" (a glorious death). Does Aristotle positively make this exclusion? If so, St. Thomas corrects him very needfully, as Britons would admit on behalf of their soldiers who, off the coast of S. Africa in 1852, nobly stood in their ranks and went unresistingly down in the sinking ship, Birkenhead, that they might give the civilians a better chance of being saved. As specimens of courage not in the higher order Aristotle gives the cases of soldiers whose skill enables them to meet without much apprehension what others would dread, and who are ready to flee as soon as grave danger is seen: of animally cour-



ageous men whose action is hardly moral: of courage where hope is largely in excess over dread: of ignorance which does not apprehend the risk: and of civic virtue which is moved by the sanction of reward and penalty. In the above instances the test of ἀνδρεία διὰ τὸ καλὸν πᾶντοισι—"the exercise of fortitude is virtue", a principle which is opposed to the mere pragmatism that would measure courage by efficiency in soldiery—fails. Aristotle says that mercenaries, who have not a high appreciation of the value of their own lives, may very well expose their lives with more readiness than could be found in the virtuous man who understands the worth of his own life, and who regards death as the πέρας—the end of his own individual existence (φοβερύτατον δ' ὁ θάνατος πέρας γάρ). Some have admired Russian nihilists going to certain death with no hope for themselves, here or hereafter, but with a hope for future generations of Russians. It is in the hope for the end that Aristotle places the stimulus for the brave act which of itself brings pain. *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* ("It is sweet and noble to die for one's native land"—Horace, Odes, III, ii, 13): the nobility is in the act, the sweetness chiefly in the anticipated consequences, excepting so far as there is a strongly felt nobility (Aristotle, Eth. Nic., III, 5-9) in the self-sacrifice.

(3) St. Thomas keeps as close to Aristotle as he may, departing from him as to the dignity, perhaps, which is to be found in the passive martyr's death, as to the hope of future life, and as to the character of virtue as a matter mainly of fine conduct aesthetically. He calls the specific virtue of fortitude that which braves the greatest dangers and therefore that which meets the risk of life in battle. Fortitude is concerned not so much with *audacia* as with *timor*: not so much with *aggredi* (attack) as with *sustinere* (endurance): which means that the courageous man has to attend rather to bearing up against terrifying circumstances than to mastering his impetuosity or else to arousing it to the requisite degree: *principalior actus fortitudinis est sustinere, immobiliter sistere in periculis, quam aggredi*. Seneca as a Stoic also attacks Aristotle's use of anger as an instrument in the hand of virtue; he treats the passion as bad and to be suppressed. In the onslaught is displayed the animal excitement, the battle rage, which St. Thomas calls the irascible passion: and of this St. Thomas says, what Aristotle says of θυμὸς, that it is an agency to be used by the rational will within due limits. Anything like a malignant desire to slaughter a hated enemy out of vengeance or out of savage delight in blood-shedding should be excluded. For the endurance (*sustinere*), says St. Thomas, the irascible part is not demanded, since the reasonable will suffice, "as the act of endurance rests only with the reason *per se*". As a cardinal virtue, which is a consideration not taken up by Aristotle, fortitude is treated by St. Thomas from the aspect of its need for ensuring the stability of the virtues in general: *Cardinales principales dicuntur virtutes, quae praecipue sibi vindicant id quod pertinet communiter ad virtutes*. Virtues in general must act with that firmness which fortitude bestows (II-II, Q, cxxiii).

(4) Fortitude as one of the gifts from the Holy Ghost is a supernatural virtue, and passes beyond the Aristotelian range. It is what, as Christians, we must always have in mind in order to make our actions acceptable for eternal life. But we still keep hold upon the natural principles of fortitude as those whereon grace has to build. In the spiritual life of the ordinary Christian much that Aristotle has said remains in its own degree true, though we have to depart especially from the master's insistence upon the field of battle. Our exercise is mainly not in war strictly so-called, but in moral courage against the evil spirit of the times, against improper fashions, against human respect, against the common tendency to seek at least the comfortable, if not the voluptuous. We need

courage also to be patient under poverty or privation, and to make laudable struggles to rise in the social scale. It requires fortitude to mount above the dead level of average Christianity into the region of magnanimity, and, if opportunity allow it, of magnificence, which are the allied virtues of fortitude, while another is perseverance, which tolerates no occasional remissness, still less occasional bouts of dissipation to relieve the strain of high-toned morality and religion.

(5) The physical conditions of fortitude are treated for instance by Bain in "The Emotions and the Will", and they are such as these: "goodness of nervous tone which keeps all the currents in their proper courses with a certain robust persistence; health and freshness; tonic coolness; light and buoyant spirit; elate and sanguine temperament; acquired mastery over terror, as when the soldier gets over the cannon fever of his first engagement, and the public speaker over the nervousness of his first speech" (Chap. V, no. 17). These physical matters, though not directly moral, are worthy of attention; there is much interaction between moral and physical qualities, and our duty is to cultivate the two departments of Fortitude conjointly.

See authors quoted in this article and in the article CARDINAL VIRTUES.

J. RICKABY.

**Fortunato of Brescia**, morphologist and Minorite of the Reform of Lombardy; b. at Brescia, 1701; d. at Madrid, 1754. He received the religious habit in 1718. A distinguished philosopher and theologian, Fortunato was also renowned for his studies in the natural sciences. He was secretary general of his order, and stood in high favour at the Bourbon court of Spain. A special importance attaches to his philosophical works, as he was among the first to bring together the teachings of Scholastic philosophy and the discoveries of the physical sciences. His scientific work is rendered important by his extensive use of the microscope, in which he followed the lead of Malpighi. Avoiding the then prevalent discussions on vitalism, he devoted himself to a positive study of the problems of natural science. Convinced that a knowledge of microscopic anatomy is the key to the secrets of nature, he deemed two things to be of prime importance: first, an experimental study of the histological constitution of the various organs, to learn their functions; and second, the separation of these organs into their elements, to determine their embryological origin. In spite of all opposition, this view, so clearly set forth in the works of Fortunato, has prevailed in pathological and physiological schools, and has indicated a method of examining what was formerly considered the most complex and delicate part of the human body, namely the central nervous system. The same view has also led to some of the most remarkable discoveries in biology. In this sense Fortunato is a pioneer. In fact it was a century after that Bichat, following Bourdeu's lead, and, later on, Cuvier, advanced in the same direction. True to his purpose, Fortunato gave no heed to the anti-vitalistic controversies of his day, and spent no time investigating plastic force and the *visus formativus*; he confined himself to the microscopic study of the parts of the organism, and in this way succeeded in classifying tissues and organs many years before Bichat (1800), who received all the credit for the classification. Fortunato was the first to distinguish between tissues and organs. He established the idea of tissues, or, as he wrote, "of those organic parts which possess a definite structure visible with the microscope and characterized by their component elements". With sufficient accuracy he described connective and bony tissue. The morphological complex of the various tissues he calls the "system of tissues"; and the physiological complex of the various organs he calls the "system of organs". These exact notions must have been the reward of wide and difficult investigation, as at that time there was no

systematic technic in microscopy. From his many accurate descriptions, it is evident that his researches extended to many animals, and particularly to insects. In view of all this, it seems warranted to assert that Fortunatus was the first morphologist, especially as not the slightest hint of this most important branch of comparative anatomy is found in Malpighi, Morgagni, Leeuwenhoek, or Haller, the path-finders in microscopic anatomy.

GEMELLI, *Un precursore della moderna morfologia comparata in Atto del Congresso dei Naturalisti Italiani* (Milan, 1907); IDEM, *P. Fortunato da Brescia in Rivista di fisica, matematica e scienze naturali* (Pavia, 1908), with portrait and complete bibliography.

A. GEMELLI.

**Fortunatus, FATHER.** See RAJPUTANA, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF.

**Fortunatus, VENANTIUS HONORIUS CLEMENTIANUS**, a Christian poet of the sixth century, b. between 530 and 540 in Upper Italy, between Ceneda and Treviso. He received his literary education at Ravenna. Here he first manifested his poetical ability by a poem celebrating the dedication of a church to St. Andrew by the bishop, Vitalis. He appears to have left Ravenna in 565, crossing the Alps and a part of Southern Germany and reaching in the autumn the banks of the Moselle. The stages of his journey may be traced in his poems. They were: Mainz, where he celebrated the construction of the baptistery and church of St. George (II, 11 and 12), and in which he compliments the bishop, Sidonius (IX, 9); Cologne, where he accepted the hospitality of Bishop Carentinus (III, 14); Trier, where he praises Bishop Nicetius (III, 11) who had built a castle on the Moselle (III, 12); Metz, which he describes (III, 13). He then made a journey on the Moselle, of which he gives a humorous account (VI, 8). But the principal event of his sojourn at Metz was his presentation at the court of King Sigebert, where he arrived at the time of the king's marriage with Brunehild (566), for which occasion he wrote an epithalamium (VI, 1). Shortly afterwards Brunehild renounced Arianism for Catholicism, and Fortunatus extolled this conversion (VI, 1\*). He won the favour of the courtiers by his eulogies, notably that of Gogo and Duke Lupus, the latter one of the most remarkable men of the time, a real survival, amid barbarian surroundings, of Roman culture and traditions. Fortunatus soon resumed his journey. New poems repaid the hospitality of the Bishops of Verdun (II, 23) and Reims (III, 15); at Soissons he venerated the tomb of St. Medardus (II, 16), and finally arrived at Paris, where he praised the clergy for their zeal in reciting the Divine Office (II, 9). His description of the chanting of the Office on the eve of a feast accompanied by an orchestra is a curious document. He made the acquaintance of King Caribert, whom he compares to Solomon, Trajan, and Fabius, and whose Latin eloquence he praises highly (VI, 2). From Paris he went to Tours, which was probably his original destination, for while at Ravenna he had been miraculously cured of a disease of the eyes through the intercession of St. Martin. He worshipped at the tomb of the saint and gave thanks to the bishop, Euphronius (III, 3), whom he afterwards came to know more intimately.

From Tours Fortunatus went to Poitiers, attracted, no doubt, by the renown of St. Radegunde and her monastery. This circumstance had a decisive influence on the remainder of his life. Radegunde, daughter of the King of Thuringia, had been taken prisoner by Clotaire I, the son of Clovis, after the defeat of her uncle, Hermanfried, and the conquest of her country (531). Hermanfried had slain her father. She became, against her will, the wife of Clotaire. Her brother having been put to death by the Franks, she sought refuge with St. Medardus, Bishop of Vermandois (St-Quentin and Soissons), who caused her to

take the veil, and she remained at Poitiers. The monastery of Poitiers was very large and contained about 200 religious. At first they lived without a definite rule, but about 567 Radegunde accepted that of St. Cæsarius of Arles. At this time, which was previous to the death of Caribert (568), she caused the consecration as abbess of her beloved adoptive daughter Agnes. It was at the same period that Fortunatus became the friend of the two women and took up his residence at Poitiers, where he remained till the death of Radegunde, 13 Aug., 587, Agnes, doubtless, having died shortly before. The closest friendship sprang up between them, Fortunatus calling Radegunde his mother and Agnes his sister. It was one of those tender and chaste friendships between ecclesiastics and pious women; similar, for example, to the relations between St. Jerome and the Roman ladies, delicate friendships enhanced by solid piety, confirmed in peace by a mutual love of God, and which do not exclude the charming child's play usually marking feminine friendship. In this instance it brought about a constant interchange of letters in which the art and grace of Fortunatus found their natural vent. He was an epicure, and there were sent to him from the convent, milk, eggs, dainty dishes, and savoury meats in the artistic arrangement of which the cooks of antiquity exercised their ingenuity. He did not allow himself to be outdone and sent to his friends at one time flowers, at another chestnuts in a basket woven by his own hands. The little poems which accompanied them are not included in the works published by Fortunatus himself; it is probable that many of them are lost, no great importance being attached to them. Circumstances provided him with graver subjects which necessitated the production of more serious works. About 568 Radegunde received from Emperor Justin a particle of the True Cross, to which the monastery had been dedicated, and Fortunatus was commissioned to thank the emperor and empress for their gift. This religious event led him to write a series of poems (II, 1-6); two, the "Vexilla Regis Prodeunt" and the "Pange Lingua" (II, 6, 2), have been adopted by the Church. The vigorous movement of these poems shows that Fortunatus was not lacking in strength and seriousness. Two of this series are "figurate" poems, i. e. the letters of each verse, being arranged with due regularity, form artistic designs. It was one of the least happy inventions of this period of literary decadence.

Radegunde was in constant communication with Constantinople, for Amalafried, a cousin whom she dearly loved, had found refuge in the East where he was in the service of the empire. Through Fortunatus Radegunde bewailed the sad lot of her country and her family; this long elegy, full of life and movement, and addressed to Amalafried, is one of the poet's best and most celebrated works (Appendix, I). Another elegy deplores the premature death of Amalafried (Appendix, 3). The death of Galeswintha was also the occasion for one of those elegies in which Fortunatus shows himself at once so profound and so natural. This princess, the sister of Brunehild, was married to Chilperic, and had just been put to death by the order of her husband (569 or 570). Shortly before this Fortunatus had seen her arrive from Spain and pass through Poitiers in a silver chariot, and it was on this occasion she had won the heart of Radegunde. In recalling these things and in his portrayal of the mother of the unhappy young woman and their heart-breaking farewell, he succeeded, despite many rhetorical artifices, in depicting true grief. Other poems written at Poitiers deal with religious subjects. Fortunatus explained to his "sister" Agnes that his love was wholly fraternal (XI, 6), and devoted 400 lines to the praise of virginity (VIII, 3). While abounding in Christian sentiments he develops in a singularly realistic style the inconveniences of marriage, especially the

physiological sufferings it imposes upon woman. It is probably an academic theme. Fortunatus also took part in ecclesiastical life, assisting at synods, being invited to the consecration of churches, all of which occasions were made the pretext for verses. He was especially associated with Gregory of Tours, who influenced him to make and publish a collection of his verses, with Leontius of Bordeaux, who sent him many invitations, and with Felix of Nantes, whom he praised, especially for the rectifying of a watercourse (III, 10). Fortunatus was now a celebrated man and a much-sought-for guest. Rendered more free by the death of his friends, he visited the Court of Austrasia, where he was received with greater evidence of regard than on a former occasion when he had arrived from Italy poor and unknown. To this period belongs his account of a journey on the Moselle which is full of graceful details (X, 10). He celebrates the completion of the basilica of Tours in 590 (X, 6), and in 591 the consecration of Plato, the new Bishop of Poitiers, an archdeacon of Gregory (X, 14). His predecessor Maroveus, whose barbarous name indicates that he was a person lacking in culture, had been entirely neglected by the Roman Fortunatus and his refined friends. This date is the last known to us, but some time before the end of the sixth century he succeeded to the See of Poitiers. In the episcopal list of that city he follows Plato and may have become bishop about 600. He was already dead when, shortly after this time, Baudonivia, a nun of the monastery of the Holy Cross, added a second book to Venantius' life of Radegunde.

The poems of Fortunatus comprise eleven books. The researches of Wilhelm Meyer have established the fact that Fortunatus himself published successively Books I-VIII, about 576; Book IX in 584 or 585; Book X after 591. Book XI seems to be a posthumous collection. A Paris manuscript has happily preserved some poems not found in the eleven-book manuscripts. These poems form an appendix in Leo's edition. Apart from these occasional poems Fortunatus wrote between 573 and 577 a poem in four books on St. Martin. He follows exactly the account of Sulpicius Severus, but has abridged it to such an extent as to render his own work obscure unless with the aid of Sulpicius Severus. He wrote in rhythmic prose the lives of several saints, St. Albin, Bishop of Angers, St. Hilary and Pascentius, Bishops of Poitiers, St. Marcellus of Paris, St. Germanus of Paris (d. 576), his friend Radegunde, St. Paternus, Bishop of Avranches, and St. Medardus. The poetical merit of Fortunatus should not be overestimated. Like most poets of this period of extreme decadence, he delights in description, but is incapable of sustaining it; if the piece is lengthy his style runs into mannerisms. His vocabulary is varied but affected, and while his language is sufficiently exact, it is marred by a deliberate obscurity. These defects would render him intolerable had he not written in verse; poetic tradition, Boissier well says, imposed a certain sobriety. The prose prefaces which Fortunatus adds to each of his works exhibit a command of bombastic Latin scarcely inferior to the "Hisperica famina". His versification is monotonous, and faults of prosody are not rare. By his predilection for the distich he furnished the model for most Carolingian poetry. Fortunatus, like a true Roman, expresses with delicate sincerity the sentiments of intimacy and tenderness, especially when mournful and anxious. He interprets with success the emotions aroused by the tragic occurrences of surrounding barbarian life, particularly in the hearts of women, too often in those times the victims of brutal passions. In this way, and by his allusions to contemporary events and persons, and his descriptions of churches and works of art, he is the painter of Merovingian society. His entire work is an historical document. Fortunatus has been praised for abstaining from the use of mythological allegory, despite the fact

that his epithalamium for Sigebert is a dialogue between Venus and Love. Occasionally one encounters in his works the traditional academic themes, but in general he refrains from these literary ornaments less through disdain than through necessity. Every writer of occasional verse is perforce a realist, e. g. Statius in the "Silva", Martial in his epigrams. In his portrayal of the barbarian society of Gaul Fortunatus exhibits the manner in which contemporary Christian thought and life permeated its gross and uncultured environment. Leaving aside the bishops, all of them Gallo-Romans, it is the women of the period, owing to native intuition and mental refinement, who are most sensitive to this Christian culture. They are the first to appreciate delicacy of sentiment and charm of language, even refined novelties of cookery, that art of advanced civilizations and peoples on whose hands time hangs heavily. From this point of view it may be said that the friendship of Fortunatus with Radegunde and Agnes mirrors with great exactness the life of sixth-century Gaul.

The best edition of Fortunatus is that of F. Leo and B. Krusch, the former edited the poems, the latter the prose writings in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Auct." (Berlin, 1881-85), IV.

HAMELIN, *De vitâ et operibus V. Fortunati* (Rennes, 1873); MEYER, *Der Gelegenheitsdichter V. Fortunatus* (Berlin, 1901); LEO, *Venantius Fortunatus in Deutsche Rundschau* (1882), XXXII, 414-26; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im B., St. Louis, 1908), 647-50.

PAUL LEJAY.

**Fort Wayne, DIOCESE OF (WAYNE CASTRENSIS).**—The Diocese of Vincennes, Indiana, U. S. A., established in 1834, comprised the whole State of Indiana till the Holy See, on 22 September, 1857, created the Diocese of Fort Wayne, assigning to it that part of Indiana north of the southern boundary of Warren, Fountain, Montgomery, Boone, Hamilton, Madison, Delaware, and Randolph Counties, a territory of 17,431 square miles, numbering 20,000 Catholics, with 14 priests, 20 churches, and two religious institutions, with educational establishments of the Fathers, Brothers, and Sisters of the Congregation of the Holy Cross. The Right Rev. John Henry Luers was nominated first Bishop of Fort Wayne and consecrated in Cincinnati, Ohio, 10 January, 1858. He was born 29 September, 1819, in Germany, and emigrated to America in 1831. He was ordained priest in Cincinnati, 11 November, 1846. Entering upon the administration of the new diocese, he devoted himself zealously to the founding of new parishes and missions, provided a home for the orphans, and built a cathedral. In June, 1871, during a vacancy of the See of Cleveland, Ohio, he was called to that city to confer ordination on a number of seminarians. After the function, on his way to the train, he suffered an apoplectic stroke and fell dead (29 June, 1871). At the time of Bishop Luer's death there were in the Diocese of Fort Wayne 69 priests, 75 churches, 10 chapels, 1 hospital, 1 orphan asylum, 1 college, 11 academies for girls, 40 parochial schools, and a Catholic population estimated at 50,000.

The Rev. Joseph Dwenger was then appointed to the see. He was born near Minster, Ohio, in 1837. Orphaned at an early age, he was educated by the Fathers of the Precious Blood, entered their community, and was ordained priest 4 September, 1859. Appointed professor in the seminary of his community, he filled that position until 1862, and was then assigned to parochial work. From 1867 to 1872 he was occupied in preaching missions. He was consecrated 14 April, 1872. In 1874 Bishop Dwenger was the head of the first American pilgrimage to Rome. In 1875 he erected an orphan asylum and manual labour school for boys at Lafayette. He was a zealous promoter of the parochial school system. In 1884 he attended the Third Plenary Council at Baltimore, and

in the following March was deputed, with Bishops Moore and Gilmour, to present the decrees of the council to the Holy Father. In 1886 he erected an asylum for orphan girls at Fort Wayne. In 1888 and in 1891 he again went to Rome, the last time in the interest of the North American College. Soon after his return he was attacked by a lingering illness, to which he succumbed 22 January, 1893.

The Right Rev. Joseph Rademacher, Bishop of Nashville, Tennessee, was transferred to Fort Wayne, 13 July, 1893. He was born 3 December, 1840, in Westphalia, Michigan, and ordained priest 2 August, 1863, by Bishop Luers, to whose diocese he had been affiliated. In April, 1883, he was appointed Bishop of Nashville, Tennessee, and was consecrated 24 June. At Fort Wayne Bishop Rademacher applied himself assiduously to increase the number of churches, schools, and missions. In 1896 he remodelled the cathedral at an expense of \$75,000. In 1898 his health gave way. Symptoms of mental collapse appeared and he had to relinquish the government of the diocese. He expired peacefully 12 January, 1900. During his illness, and until the appointment of a successor, Very Rev. J. H. Guendling, vicar-general and pastor of the cathedral, was administrator of the diocese.

The Rev. H. J. Alerding, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Indianapolis, was appointed successor of Bishop Rademacher 30 Aug., 1900. He was born 13 April, 1845, in Germany. During his infancy his parents emigrated to the United States and settled in Newport, Kentucky. He was ordained priest by Bishop Maurice de St. Palais of Vincennes 22 September, 1868, and appointed assistant at St. Joseph's church, Terre Haute, where he remained till 1871, attending, besides, a number of missions. From October, 1871, to August, 1874, he was pastor of Cambridge City, whence he was transferred to Indianapolis and entrusted with the organization of St. Joseph's parish, where he built the church, the school, and a parochial residence. In 1885 he published "A History of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Vincennes", a work of deep historical research and accuracy. Bishop Alerding was consecrated in the cathedral of Fort Wayne 30 November, 1900. Since then he has founded new parishes, aided struggling ones, reorganized the parochial school system, provided for the orphans, and promoted all good works. He held a diocesan synod in the cathedral 11 November, 1903. The statutes enacted were promulgated 19 March, 1904. Among other salutary regulations the establishment of six deaneries was decreed—Fort Wayne, South Bend, Hammond, Logansport, Lafayette, and Muncie. In 1907, for the fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the diocese, Bishop Alerding published "A History of the Diocese of Fort Wayne", an elaborate historical work, covering the period from 1669 to 1907.

Diocesan statistics for 1908 give priests, secular, 128; religious, 71; churches with resident priest, 110; missions with churches, 43; stations, 6; chapels, 49; parochial schools, 82, with 14,252 pupils; orphan asylums, 2; orphans, 239; hospitals, 13; old people's homes, 2; Catholic population, 93,844. Educational Institutions: the University of Notre Dame, in charge of the Fathers of the Holy Cross; St. Joseph's College (Collegeville), conducted by the Fathers of the Precious Blood. For girls: academies, 11. The number of pupils in colleges and academies is 1262. Religious Communities.—Men: Fathers and Brothers of the Holy Cross; Franciscans; Fathers and Brothers of the Precious Blood. Women: Sisters of the Holy Cross; Poor Handmaids of Christ; Franciscan Sisters (various branches); Dominican Sisters; Sisters of the Precious Blood; of Notre Dame; of St. Joseph; of Providence; of the Holy Family; of St. Agnes. The following communities have novitiates in the diocese: The Fathers and Brothers of the Holy Cross, at Notre

Dame; the Franciscan Sisters of Perpetual Adoration, at Lafayette; the Sisters of the Holy Cross, at Notre Dame; the Poor Handmaids of Christ, at Fort Wayne; the Sisters of St. Joseph, at Tipton.

ALERDING, *The Diocese of Fort Wayne* (Fort Wayne, 1907); *The Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin).

BONAVENTURE HAMMER.

**Forty Hours' Devotion**, also called *Quarant' Ore* or written in one word *Quarantore*, is a devotion in which continuous prayer is made for forty hours before the Blessed Sacrament exposed. It is commonly regarded as of the essence of the devotion that it should be kept up in a succession of churches, terminating in one at about the same hour at which it commences in the next, but this question will be discussed in the historical summary. A solemn high Mass, "Mass of Exposition", is sung at the beginning, and another, the "Mass of Deposition", at the end of the period of forty hours; and both these Masses are accompanied by a procession of the Blessed Sacrament and by the chanting of the litanies of the saints. The exact period of forty hours' exposition is not in practice very strictly adhered to; for the Mass of Deposition is generally sung, at about the same hour of the morning, two days after the Mass of Exposition. On the intervening day a solemn Mass *pro pace* is offered—if possible, at a different altar from the high altar upon which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. It is assumed that the exposition and prayer should be kept up by night as well as by day, but permission is given to dispense with this requirement when an adequate number of watchers cannot be obtained. In such a case the interruption of the devotion by night does not forfeit the indulgences conceded by the Holy See to those who take part in it.

**HISTORY OF THE DEVOTION.**—Although the precise origin of the Forty Hours' Devotion is wrapped in a good deal of obscurity, there are certain facts which must be accepted without dispute. The Milanese chronicler Burigozzo (see "Archiv. Stor. Ital.", III, 537), who was a contemporary, clearly describes the custom of exposing the Blessed Sacrament in one church after another as a novelty which began at Milan, in May, 1537. He does not ascribe the introduction of this practice to any one person; but he gives details as to the church with which it started, etc., and his notice seems to have been actually written in that year. Less than two years afterwards, we have the reply of Pope Paul III to a petition soliciting indulgences for the practice. This is so important, as embodying an official statement of the original purpose of the devotion, that we copy it here: "Since [says the pontiff] . . . Our beloved son the Vicar General of the Archbishop of Milan at the prayer of the inhabitants of the said city, in order to appease the anger of God provoked by the offences of Christians, and in order to bring to nought the efforts and machinations of the Turks who are pressing forward to the destruction of Christendom, amongst other pious practices, has established a round of prayers and supplications to be offered both by day and night by all the faithful of Christ, before our Lord's Most Sacred Body, in all the churches of the said city, in such a manner that these prayers and supplications are made by the faithful themselves relieving each other in relays for forty hours continuously in each church in succession, according to the order determined by the Vicar. . . We, approving in our Lord so pious an institution, and confirming the same by Our authority, grant and remit", etc. (Sala, "Documenti", IV, 9; cf. Ratti in "La Scuola Cattolica" [1895], 204).

The parchment is endorsed on the back in a contemporary hand, "The first concession of Indulgence" etc., and we may feel sure that this is the earliest pronouncement of the Holy See upon the subject. But the practice without doubt spread rapidly, though

the details cannot be traced exactly. Already before the year 1550 this, or some analogous exposition, had been established by St. Philip Neri for the Confraternity of the Trinità dei Pellegrini in Rome; while St. Ignatius Loyola, at about the same period, seems to have lent much encouragement to the practice of exposing the Blessed Sacrament during the carnival, as an act of expiation for the sins committed at that season. As this devotion also commonly lasted for a period of about two days or forty hours, it seems likewise to have shared the name "Quarant' Ore"; and under this name it is still maintained in many places abroad, more especially in France and Italy. This form of the practice was especially promoted by the Oratorian Father, Blessed Juvenal Ancina, Bishop of Saluzzo, who has left elaborate instructions for the carrying out of the devotion with greater solemnity and decorum. It seems that it is especially in connexion with these exercises, as they flourished under the direction of the Oratorian Fathers, that we trace the beginning of those sacred concerts of which the memory is perpetuated in the musical "Oratorios" of our greatest composers. Elaborate instructions for the regulation of the Quarant' Ore and for an analogous devotion called "Oratio sine intermissione" (uninterrupted prayer) were also issued by St. Charles Borromeo and will be found among the "Acta Mediolanensis Ecclesiae". However, the most important document belonging to this matter is the Constitution "Graves et diuturnæ" of Pope Clement VIII, 25 Nov., 1592. In the presence of numberless dangers threatening the peace of Christendom and especially of the distracted state of France, the pontiff strongly commends the practice of unwearied prayer. "We have determined", he says, "to establish publicly in this Mother City of Rome (in hac alma Urbe) an uninterrupted course of prayer in such wise that in the different churches (he specifies the various categories), on appointed days, there be observed the pious and salutary devotion of the Forty Hours, with such an arrangement of churches and times that, at every hour of the day and night, the whole year round, the incense of prayer shall ascend without intermission before the face of the Lord". It will be noticed that, as in the case of the previously cited Brief of Paul III, the keynote of this document is anxiety for the peace of Christendom. "Pray," he says, "for the concord of Christian princes, pray for France, pray that the enemies of our faith the dreaded Turks, who in the heat of their presumptuous fury threaten slavery and devastation to all Christendom, may be overthrown by the right hand of the Almighty God". Curiously enough the document contains no explicit mention of the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, but inasmuch as this feature had been familiar on such occasions of public prayer both in Milan and at Rome itself for more than half a century, we may infer that when the pope speaks of "the pious and salutary devotion of the Forty Hours" he assumes that the prayer is made before the Blessed Sacrament exposed. More than a century later Pope Clement XII, in 1731, issued a very minute code of instructions for the proper carrying out of the Quarant' Ore devotion. Upon this, which is known as the "Instructio Clementina", a word must be said later.

With regard to the actual originator of the Forty Hours' Devotion there has been much difference of opinion. The dispute is too intricate to be discussed here in detail. On the whole the evidence seems to favour the conclusion that a Capuchin Father, Joseph Piantanida da Fermo, was the first to organize the arrangement by which the Forty Hours' Exposition was transferred from church to church in Milan and was there kept up without interruption throughout all the year (see Norbert in the "Katholik", Aug., 1898). On the other hand, the practice of exposing the Blessed Sacrament with solemnity for forty hours was cer-

tainly older; and in Milan itself there is good evidence that one Antonio Bellotto organized this in connexion with a certain confraternity at the church of the Holy Sepulchre as early as 1527. Moreover, a Dominican, Father Thomas Nieto, the Barnabite, St. Antonio Maria Zaccharia, and his friend, Brother Buono of Cremona, known as the Hermit, have all been suggested as the founders of the Forty Hours' Devotion. The claims of the last named, Brother Buono, have recently been urged by Bergamaschi ("La Scuola Cattolica", Milan, Sept., 1908, 327-333), who contends that the Quarant' Ore had been started by Brother Buono at Cremona in 1529. But the evidence in all these cases only goes to show that the practice was then being introduced of exposing the Blessed Sacrament with solemnity on occasions of great public calamity or peril, and that for such expositions the period of forty hours was generally selected. That this period of forty hours was so selected seems in all probability due to the fact that this was about the length of time that the Body of Christ remained in the tomb, and that the Blessed Sacrament in the Middle Ages was left in the Easter Sepulchre. St. Charles Borromeo speaks as if this practice of praying for forty hours was of very ancient date; and he distinctly refers it to the forty hours our Lord's Body remained in the tomb, seeing that this was a period of watching, suspense, and ardent prayer on the part of all His disciples. In all probability this was the exact truth. The practice of reserving the Blessed Sacrament with some solemnity in the Easter Sepulchre began in the thirteenth or fourteenth century; and seems in some places, e. g. at Zara in Dalmatia, to have been popularly known as the "Prayer [or Supplication] of the Forty Hours". From this the idea grew up of transferring this figurative vigil of forty hours to other days and other seasons. The transference to the carnival tide was very obvious, and is likely enough to have occurred independently to many different people. This seems to have been the case with Father Manare, S.J., at Macerata, c. 1548, but probably the idea suggested itself to others earlier than this.

**RUBRICAL REQUIREMENTS.**—The "Instructio Clementina" for the Quarant' Ore which has been already mentioned stands almost alone among rubrical documents in the minuteness of detail into which it enters. It has also been made the subject of an elaborate commentary by Gardellini. Only a few details can be given here. The Blessed Sacrament is always, except in the patriarchal basilicas, to be exposed upon the high altar. Statues, pictures, and relics in the immediate neighbourhood are to be removed or covered. At least twenty candles are to be kept burning day and night. The altar of exposition is only to be tended by clerics wearing surplices. Everything is to be done, e. g. by hanging curtains at the doorways, by prohibiting the solicitation of alms, etc., to promote recollection and silence. There must be continuous relays of watchers before the Blessed Sacrament; and these, if possible, should include a priest or cleric in higher orders who alone is permitted to kneel within the sanctuary. At night the great doors of the church must be closed and women excluded. No Masses must be said at the altar at which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. Precise regulations are made as to the Masses to be said at the time of Exposition and Deposition. Except on greater feasts, this Mass must be a solemn votive Mass of *Sanctissimo Sacramento*. No bells are to be rung in the church at any private Masses which may be said there while the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. When a votive Mass of *Sanctissimo Sacramento* cannot be said, according to the rubrics, the collect of the Blessed Sacrament is at least to be added to the collects of the Mass. No Requiem Masses are permitted. As already intimated, the Mass *pro pace* is to be sung on the second day of the Exposition; and the litanies of the saints are to be



chanted, under conditions minutely specified, at the conclusion of the procession both at the opening and at the close of the Quarant' Ore. Finally it may be said that this "Instructio Clementina" is the foundation upon which is based the ritual for all ordinary Benedictions and Expositions. For example, the incensing of the Blessed Sacrament at the words "Genitori Genitoque" of the "Tantum Ergo", the use of the humeral veil, and the giving of the Blessing with the monstrance, etc., are all exactly prescribed in section thirty-one of the same document.

WILDT in *Kirchenlex.*, V, 151-155; THURSTON, *Lent and Holy Week* (London, 1904), III, 110-148; RAISLE, *Der Tabernakel einst und jetzt* (Freiburg, 1908), 273-292; NORBERT, *Zur Geschichte des vierzigstündigen Gebetes* in *Katholik*, Aug., 1898, 15 sqq.; RATTI in *La Scuola Cattolica* of Milan, Aug., 1895; and also BERGAMASCHI in the same periodical, Aug. and Sept., 1908; BERGAMASCHI, *Dell' Origine delle SS. Quarantore* (Cremona, 1897); GARDELLINI, in MÜHLBAUER, *Decreta Authentica Cong. SS. Rituum*, I. Further authorities are cited in the notes to the chapter of *Lent and Holy Week* just mentioned.

HERBERT THURSTON.

**Forty Martyrs**, a party of soldiers who suffered a cruel death for their faith, near Sebaste, in Lesser Armenia, victims of the persecution of Licinius, who, after the year 316, persecuted the Christians of the East. The earliest account of their martyrdom is given by St. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea (370-379), in a homily delivered on the feast of the Forty Martyrs (Hom. xix in P. G., XXXI, 507 sqq.; Ruinart, *Acta sincera*, ed. Ratisbon, 545 sqq.). The feast is consequently more ancient than the episcopate of Basil, whose eulogy on them was pronounced only fifty or sixty years after their martyrdom, which is thus historic beyond a doubt. According to St. Basil, forty soldiers who had openly confessed themselves Christians were condemned by the prefect to be exposed naked upon a frozen pond near Sebaste on a bitterly cold night, that they might freeze to death. Among the confessors, one yielded and, leaving his companions, sought the warm baths near the lake which had been prepared for any who might prove inconstant. One of the guards set to keep watch over the martyrs beheld at this moment a supernatural brilliancy overshadowing them and at once proclaimed himself a Christian, threw off his garments, and placed himself beside the thirty-nine soldiers of Christ. Thus the number of forty remained complete. At daybreak, the stiffened bodies of the confessors, which still showed signs of life, were burned and the ashes cast into a river. The Christians, however, collected the precious remains, and the relics were distributed throughout many cities; in this way the veneration paid to the Forty Martyrs became widespread, and numerous churches were erected in their honour.

One of them was built at Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, and it was in this church that St. Basil publicly delivered his homily. St. Gregory of Nyssa was a special client of these holy martyrs. Two discourses in praise of them, preached by him in the church dedicated to them, are still preserved (P. G., XLVI, 749 sqq., 773 sqq.), and upon the death of his parents, he laid them to rest beside the relics of the confessors. St. Ephraem, the Syrian, has also eulogized the Forty Martyrs (Opera, ed. Assemani, II, Gr., 341-356; Hymni in SS. 40 martyres, in Opera, ed. Lamy, III, 937-958). Sozomen, who was an eye-witness, has left us (Hist. Eccl., IX, 2) an interesting account of the finding of the relics in Constantinople through the instrumentality of the Empress Pulcheria. Special devotion to the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste was introduced at an early date into the West. St. Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia in the beginning of the fifth century (d. about 410 or 427), received particles of the ashes of the martyrs during a voyage in the East, and placed them with other relics in the altar of the basilica which he had erected, at the consecration of which he delivered a discourse, still extant (P. L., XX, 959 sqq.). Near the Church of Santa Maria Antiqua, in

the Roman Forum, built in the fifth century, a chapel was found, built, like the church itself, on an ancient site, and consecrated to the Forty Martyrs. A picture, still preserved there, dating from the sixth or seventh century, depicts the scene of the martyrdom. The names of the confessors, as we find them also in later sources, were formerly inscribed on this fresco [Papers of the British School at Rome, I (London, 1902), 109 sqq.]. Acts of these martyrs, written subsequently, in Greek, Syriac and Latin, are yet extant, also a "Testament" of the Forty Martyrs. Their feast is celebrated in the Greek, as well as in the Latin Church, on 9 March.

*Acta SS.*, March, II, 12 sqq.; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, ed. BOLLANDISTS, II, 1092 sqq.; RUINART, *Acta sincera* (ed. Ratisbon), 543 sqq.; *Acta martyrum et sanctorum* syr., ed. BERJAN, III (Paris, 1892); BONWETSCH, *Testament der 40 Märtyrer* in *Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift*, 1892, pp. 713 sqq.; cf. HAUSLEITER, *ibid.*, 978 sqq.; *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum*, ed. DELEHAYE (Brussels, 1902), 521 sqq.; GÖRRES, *Die Licinianische Christenverfolgung* (Jena, 1875); ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions*, V (Paris, 1890), 307 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Forum, ECCLESIASTICAL.**—That the Church of Christ has judicial and coercive power is plain from the constitution given to it by its Divine Founder. (See COURTS, ECCLESIASTICAL.) This judicial jurisdiction is expressed by the word *Forum*, the Latin designation for a place containing a tribunal of justice. As the Church is a perfect society, she possesses within herself all the powers necessary to direct her members to the end for which she was instituted and she has a correlative right to be obeyed by those subject to her. This right is called jurisdiction, and it is the source of all the Church's action that is not derived from the power of Sacred orders. It is this jurisdiction which is the foundation of ecclesiastical law, both externally and internally binding, and from Apostolic times it has been put into practice by the Church's rulers. The public judicial power of the Church is explicitly mentioned in Holy Scripture (Matt., xviii, 17), and the exercise of it is also recorded (Acts, xv, 29). In other words, just as the civil state has the legitimate jurisdiction over its subjects to guide them to the end for which it was instituted, because it is a perfect society, so likewise the Church, being constituted by Christ as a perfect society, possesses within itself all the powers necessary for lawfully and effectively attaining the end for which it was established.

As the power of the Church extends not only to its individual members but also to the whole corporate body, not only to questions concerning the conscience but also to the public actions of its subjects, ecclesiastical jurisdiction is distinguished into that of the internal and external forum. The jurisdiction of the internal forum deals with questions concerning the welfare of individual Christians and with their relation to God. Hence it is called the forum of conscience (*Forum conscientiae*). It is also denominated the forum of Heaven (*forum poli*) because it guides the soul on the path to God. The internal forum is subdivided into the sacramental or penitential, which is exercised in the tribunal of penance or at least is connected with it, and the extra-penitential forum. Causes concerning the private and secret needs of the faithful can often be expedited outside of sacramental confession. Thus, vows may be dispensed, secret censures may be absolved, occult impediments of matrimony may be dispensed outside of the tribunal of penance. The internal forum deals therefore directly with the spiritual welfare of the individual faithful. It has reference to the corporate body only secondarily, inasmuch as the good of the whole organization is promoted by that of the individual members. Owing to the nature of the civil state and the end for which it was instituted, it has no jurisdiction corresponding to the ecclesiastical forum of conscience. Finally, it may so chance that circumstances may bring about a conflict

between the internal and external forum. Thus, for example, a marriage may be null and void in the forum of conscience, but binding in the external forum for want of judicial proofs to the contrary, and vice versa.

The Church's jurisdiction in the external forum has reference to matters touching the public and social good of the corporate body. It corresponds, consequently, very closely to the powers exercised by civil magistrates in affairs belonging to their competence. While the external forum may busy itself with the concerns of individuals, it does so only in as far as these affect the public good. Thus the absolution of sins belongs to the internal forum, but the concession of the faculty for performing such absolution is an act of the external forum. The jurisdiction of the external forum is subdivided into voluntary and necessary. Voluntary, or extra-judicial, is that which a superior can exercise towards those who invoke his power, or even against those who are unwilling, but without his using the formalities prescribed in law. Necessary or contentious jurisdiction is that which the judge employs in punishing crimes or deciding disputes according to prescribed forms. In general, the acts of jurisdiction of the external forum are the decision of disputes concerning faith, morals or discipline, the making and enforcing of laws, the punishment of transgressors of ecclesiastical statutes, and the like.

The competence of the ecclesiastical forum arises either from the persons or the cause to be judged. As to persons, all clerics are subject to its judgments both in civil and criminal causes (see IMMUNITIES, CLERICAL). As to causes: they may be purely civil, or ecclesiastical, or they may be mixed. Purely civil causes would not of themselves properly belong to the Church's forum, as she recognizes the full competence of the state in such matters. Accidentally, however, such causes might be brought before the ecclesiastical tribunal, as when a civil judge is wanting in his duty and the defect can be supplied by an ecclesiastical judge. This supposes, however, the practical recognition of the Church's forum by the civil power. Ecclesiastical causes themselves are called civil when they concern either spiritual things, as the sacraments, or matters connected with them, as church property, the right of patronage, etc. They are called criminal when they involve the dealing with delinquents guilty of simony, apostasy, schism and the like. They are called mixed causes when they are subjects proper for decision by either the ecclesiastical or civil forum, as usurious contracts, concubinage, violations of the Church's peace, etc. Causes are likewise called mixed when they have both a spiritual and temporal end. Thus matrimony, in its sacramental nature as to validity or nullity, belongs to the Church; in its temporal aspect, as to the property of married persons and similar things, it may be dealt with by the civil tribunals. To this class of mixed causes can also be reduced the suppression of heresy, where Church and State co-operate with each other for the maintenance of the integrity of the faith and the preservation of the civil peace. Finally, many causes, of their own nature civil, are accounted mixed by canonists, either because the State relinquished them to the Church's tribunals or custom gradually caused them to be relegated to the ecclesiastical forum, such as the recognition of last wills and testaments, the care of the poor, etc.

The punishments which may be inflicted by the external ecclesiastical forum are not only spiritual, as excommunication, but also temporal or corporal. As regards the infliction of the death penalty, canonists generally hold that ecclesiastical law forbids inferior church tribunals to decree this punishment directly, but that the pope or a general council has the power, at least indirectly, inasmuch as they can demand that a Catholic state inflict this punishment when the good of the Church requires it. Finally, they hold that there is no valid argument to prove that the direct exercise

of this power does not fall within the competence of the ecclesiastical forum, although it was the custom of the latter to hand over the criminal to the secular arm for the infliction of the death penalty. The encroachments of the civil power on the domain of the Church's jurisdiction have in our days, practically though unwarrantably, restricted the ecclesiastical forum to spiritual causes only.

PIERANTONELLI, *Præcis Fori Eccl.* (Rome, 1883); LAURENTIUS, *Inst. Jur. Eccl.* (Freiburg, 1903); ENDEMANN, *Das Zivilprozessverf. nach kanonischer Lehre* (Berlin, 1890); FERRARIS, *Bibl. Can.*, s. v. (Rome, 1886), III; SMITH, *Elements of Eccl. Law* (New York, 1895).

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

**Fossano, DIOCESE OF (FOSSANENSIS).**—Fossano is a town in the province of Cuneo, in Piedmont, Northern Italy, a suffragan of Turin, situated in a fertile plain on the banks of the Stura; it is an important centre for agriculture and farm-stock; other industries are silk-weaving, paper-making, and basket-making; there are also some mineral springs in the neighbourhood. In the early middle ages it was an independent commune, but it soon passed under the sway of the Marquesses of Saluzzo, who in turn with the House of Asti held it from 1251 to 1305. From 1305 to 1314 it belonged to King Robert of Naples, when it passed into the hands of the House of Savoy, whose head dwelt there for some time in the "castello" or stronghold still shown. In 1396 the town was destroyed by Facino Cane, the *visconti condottiere*, then planning a "stato" of his own, inclusive of Alessandria, Novara and Tortona. In 1535 it was taken by the French during their invasion of Lombardy; in the following year they were driven out by Charles V, after a long siege.

The French again captured it in 1796, and in 1799 the Austrians, under General Melas, drove out the French under Championnet. The painter and architect, Ambrogio da Fossano, better known as "Il Borgognone", designer of the Certosa at Pavia, was a native of Fossano.

The episcopal see dates from 1592; from 1801 to 1817 it was suppressed, after which it was again re-established. It contains 25 parishes and 36,000 souls, has 3 religious houses for men and 13 for women, 2 educational establishments for boys and 2 for girls, 5 charitable institutions, and one weekly Catholic paper.

ANON., *Antichità e origini di Fossano* (1894); CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1858), XIV, 281-286.

U. BENIGNI.

**Fossombrone (FORUM SEMPRONII), DIOCESE OF (FOROSEMPRONIENSIS),** in the province of Pesaro, Italy, a suffragan of Urbino. The ancient Forum Sempronii took its name from Caius Sempronius Gracchus. The city and its environs abound in antiquities, especially inscriptions. Noteworthy remains are the statue of the god Vertumnus; the Furlo Pass, constructed by the Emperor Vespasian (70-76) to shorten the passage of that mountain; and the bridge of Trajan (115) near Calmazzo, and that of Diocletian (292), both over the Metaurus. Near the Furlo Pass, during the Gothic War, was fought (552) the battle of Petra Pertusa (the pierced rock), in which Totila was overcome by the Byzantine general, Narses. Fossombrone was included in the Donation of Pepin, but remained subject to the Duchy of Spoleto until 1198, when it passed under papal rule. It was then held in fief of the Holy See by different families: by the house of Este (1210-28), the Malatesta (1340-1445), the Montefeltro (of Urbino, 1445-1631); from 1500 to 1503 it acknowledged the rule of Cæsar Borgia.

Christianity was introduced there, according to Ughelli, by St. Felicianus of Foligno. The martyrologies mention several martyrs: Aquilinus, Geminus, Gelasius, Magnus and Donata, also a bishop, Timothy, and his daughter (4 February). The first bishop of

certain date is Innocent, present at the synods of Pope Symmachus (504). Other noteworthy bishops were: Fulcuinus (1086), present at the Council of Salona as legate of Gregory VII to receive the oath of fidelity to the Holy See from Demetrius, King of Dalmatia; St. Aldebrando Faberi (1119), who died at the age of 118 years; Blessed Riccardo (date uncertain); Addo Ravieri (1379), poet and *littérateur*; Paul of Middelburg (1494), of German origin, a skillful mathematician, and author of a work on the computation of Easter; Giacomo Guidiccioni (1524), a famous poet and writer; Cardinal Nicolò Ardinghelli (1541), who left an important correspondence; Giulio Aloisini (1808), internuncio in Russia. The diocese has 20,050 inhabitants, 40 parishes, 1 educational institution, a Capuchin convent, and three religious houses of women.

CAPPILLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), III, 245-83; VERNARECCI, *Fossombrone dai tempi antichissimi ai nostri* (Fossombrone, 1907).

U. BENIGNI.

**Fossors** (Lat. *fossore*, *fossarii* from  *fodere*, to dig), grave diggers in the Roman catacombs in the first three or four centuries of the Christian Era. The determination, from the first days of the Church, of the ecclesiastical authorities to inter the mortal re-

by Cardinal Mai (Spicil. Rom., IX, 133) enumerates the orders of the clergy as *ostiarius*, *fossorius*, *lector*, etc. At first the fossors seem to have received no regular salary, but were paid by individuals for the work accomplished; with the organization of the Church, however, they appear to have been paid from the common treasury. In the fourth century the corporation of fossors were empowered to sell burial spaces, as we learn from inscriptions. For example, in the cemetery of St. Cyriacus two women bought from the fossor Quintus a *bisomus*, or double grave, *retro sanctos* (near a martyr's tomb), and there are several other references to this practice. The corporation of fossors, there is good reason to believe, did not consist merely of the labourers who excavated the galleries of the catacombs; it included also the artists who decorated the tombs, as appears from another allusion in the "Gesta Apud Zenophilum" already cited. According to this authority two fossors were brought before the judge (*inductis et adplicitis Victore Samsurici et Saturnino fossoribus*); when interrogated as to their calling, one replied that he was a fossor, the other that he was an *artifex*. The latter term at that period included the professions of painter and sculptor. Thus it would seem that this person who is generically referred to as a fossor is also an artist.

Among the representations of fossors in the catacombs the one best known, through Wiseman's "Fabiola", is that of the fossor Diogenes, discovered by Boldetti. The picture, which was seriously injured in an attempt to remove it from the wall, represents Diogenes with his pick over his right shoulder and a sack, probably containing his midday meal, on his left shoulder, while in his left hand he carries a staff with a light attached. The inscription reads: *DIOGENES FOSSOR, IN PACE DEPOSITVS, OCTAVY KALENDAS OCTOBRIS* (the fossor Diogenes, interred in peace, the eighth day before the calends of October). The oldest fresco of a fossor, or rather of two fossors, dating from the latter half of the second century, is in one of the so-called Sacrament Chapels in the catacomb of St. Callistus. The figures are represented pointing toward three Eucharistic scenes, probably to indicate another of their duties, which was to exclude unauthorized persons from taking part in the liturgical celebrations held occasionally in the cemeteries in commemoration of martyrs. Representations of fossors are usually near the entrance to the subterranean cemeteries.

KRAUS in *Real-Encycl. der christlichen Alterthum* (Freiburg, 1882), s. v.; NORTHCOLE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotterranea* (London, 1878); VENABLES in *Dict. Christ. Antig.*, s. v.; KAUFMANN, *Manuale di archeol. cristiana* (Rome, 1907).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.



DIOGENES THE FOSSOR  
Fourth Century, Catacomb of Domitilla

mains of the faithful in cemeteries reserved exclusively to Christians, brought into existence the class of workmen known as fossors. The duties of the Christian fossor corresponded in a general way with those of the pagan *vespillones*, but whereas the latter were held in anything but esteem in pagan society, the fossors from an early date were ranked among the inferior clergy of the Church (Wieland, *Ordines Minores*, 1897), an excellent example of the elevating influence of Christianity on the lowest orders of society. An interesting literary reference to fossors, in their character of one of the orders of the inferior clergy, is found in the "Gesta apud Zenophilum", an appendix to the work of St. Optatus of Mileve against the Donatists. Speaking of the "house in which Christians assembled" at Circa in the year 303, during the persecution of Diocletian, this writer enumerates first the higher orders of the clergy present, from the bishop to the subdeacons, and then mentions by name the fossors Januarius, Heraclius, Fructuosus, *et ceteris fossoribus* ("Opp. S. Optati", ed. C. Ziwsa, in "Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat." Vienna, 1893, XXVI, 187). St. Jerome also (Ep. lix) alludes to fossors as *clerici*, and a sixth-century chronicle edited

**Foster**, JOHN GRAY, soldier, convert, b. at Whitfield, New Hampshire, U. S. A., 27 May, 1823; d. at Nashua, New Hampshire, 2 September, 1874. After graduating at the West Point Military Academy in 1846, he served as a lieutenant in the Engineer Corps during the Mexican War, where he was wounded at the battle of Molino del Rey. A service on the Coast Survey, 1852-54, brought him promotion to a first lieutenantancy and assignment as assistant professor of engineering at West Point, where he was stationed from 1855 to 1857.

When the Civil War broke out Foster was in command at Fort Moultrie, Charleston harbour, and during the night of 26 December, 1860, succeeded in transferring the garrison under his command to Fort Sumter, in the subsequent defence of which he took so conspicuous a part as to earn the brevet rank of major. He was commissioned a brigadier-general of volunteers, 23 October, 1861, and assisted in Burnside's North Carolina expedition. It was at this time that his conversion occurred, his baptism taking place in New York, 4 November, 1861. He was commander of the Department of North Carolina, during 1862-3, with the rank of major-general. The combined De-

partments of Virginia and North Carolina were assigned to him from July to November, 1863, and then that of Ohio, which he had to relinquish, owing to injuries received by a fall from his horse. He next aided Sherman in the reduction of Charleston, and for gallant services in the capture of Savannah was breveted brigadier-general in the regular army. During 1865-6 he was in command of the Department of Florida, and then superintended various river and harbour improvements. In the harbours of Boston and Portsmouth he conducted, with great ability and success, important submarine operations, an experience which added the value of direct experience to his work on "Submarine Blasting in Boston Harbor" (New York, 1869) and his articles in various periodicals on engineering subjects, which received high professional approval.

*Pilot* (Boston, Sept., 1874), files; *Cyclopædia of American Biography*, II, s. v.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Fothad**, SAINT, surnamed NA CANOINE (of the Canon), a monk of Fahan-Mura, County Donegal, Ireland, at the close of the eighth century. He became bard, counsellor, and tutor to Aedh Oirnidh (the dignified), Ard Righ (Head King) of Ireland, who ruled from 794 to 818. He is specially venerated in the Irish Church from the fact that, in 804, when he accompanied King Aedh in his expedition against the Leinstermen, he obtained from that monarch exemption of the clergy forever from military service. His literary gifts were so highly thought of that St. Aengus submitted his "Féilire" to him for his approval, and, in return, St. Fothad presented St. Aengus with a copy of his "Remonstrance", addressed to King Aedh, protesting against the conscription of ecclesiastics. This "Remonstrance", which was really a rhymed judicial opinion, was known as a canon or decree, and hence St. Fothad was ever after called "Fothad na Canoine". It commences thus: "The Church of the living God let her alone, waste her not".

O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.); HYDE, *Lit. Hist. of Ireland* (London, 1901); HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1902); O'CURRY, *Lectures* (Dublin, 1861); MATHEW, *The O'Neills of Ulster* (Dublin, 1907).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Fouard**, CONSTANT, ecclesiastical writer; b. at Elbeuf, near Rouen, 6 Aug., 1837; d. at his native place, 3 Dec., 1903. The whole of his early life was a preparation for the work on which his fame rests. He studied the classics at Boisguillaume, philosophy at Issy (1855-1857), and made his theological studies at St-Sulpice, Paris (1857-61). Among his professors at Paris were Abbé John Hogan, who remained throughout life the inspirer and mentor of his studies, and Abbé Le Hir, who initiated him and his fellow-disciple Vigouroux into Biblical science, to which they devoted their lives. He was ordained priest in 1861 and entered the "Solitude", the novitiate of the Sulpicians, but left on account of illness after several months without joining their society. He taught for some time at Boisguillaume, then pursued the study of classics at the college of Saint Barbara, Paris, obtained the degree of Licentiate in Letters, 1867, and resumed the teaching of classics at Boisguillaume, taking the class of rhetoric, 1867-1876. His piety drawing him to sacred sciences, he was appointed by the State (1876) to the chair of Holy Scripture in the faculty of theology at Rouen; he continued, however, to reside at Boisguillaume and to share in the duty of governing the student-body.

Honours came to him: he was made doctor of theology (1877), canon of the cathedral of Rouen (1884), and member of the Biblical Commission (1903). His ecclesiastical science, his piety, his spiritual wisdom were continually at the service of religion in his native diocese. For the benefit of his studies he travelled in Palestine, Syria, Greece, and Italy. The Faculty of

Theology being suppressed about 1884, his teaching ceased. His writings are: "La Vie de N-S Jésus-Christ" (1880); "Saint Pierre et les premières années du Christianisme" (1886); "Saint Paul, ses Missions" (1892); "Saint Paul, ses dernières années" (1897); "Saint Jean et la fin de l'âge apostolique" (posthumous, 1904). The dates witness, incidentally, to the extremely painstaking character of his labours. All these books form part of one grand work, "Les Origines de l'Eglise", which Fouard wrote as an answer to the presentation of the same subject by Renan, who like himself had been a pupil of Le Hir. Each successive book of the Abbé Fouard immediately gained a wide popularity and was translated into nearly all the languages of Europe.

His work is esteemed for the interest of its narratives, the purity of its diction, its correctness in doctrine, its conservative but not reactionary critical viewpoint, its breadth and accuracy of erudition, and for its evidently sincere piety, the manifestation of a good and gentle spirit, loving God, delighting in nature, and earnestly desiring to do good to men. With one touch of genius, or greater depth of feeling (gifts which were denied him), he might have fused the various elements of his writings into a truly great work. His works are not remarkable in originality of view or acuteness of critical insight, but present, as a whole, a faithful picture of early Christianity, satisfying to the Christian heart. Perhaps his most esteemed books are the two on Saint Paul. The English translation of his writings is exceptionally well done.

*Bulletin des Anciens Elèves de St-Sulpice* (Paris, 1904).

JOHN F. FENLON.

**Foucault**, JEAN-BERTRAND-LÉON, physicist and mechanic, b. at Paris, 19 Sept., 1819; d. there 11 Feb., 1868. He received his early schooling at home and showed his mechanical skill by constructing a boat, a mechanical telegraph, and a working steam-engine. He passed the examinations for the B.A. and began to study medicine. Later, unable to bear the sight of blood, he abandoned medicine and worked for Donné as preparator in his course on medical microscopy. His elementary mathematical and scientific training had been very deficient and he supplemented it as he became interested in invention and experiment. In 1845 he succeeded Donné as scientific editor of the "Journal des Débats". In 1850 he was awarded the Copley medal, the highest honour of the Royal Society of London, for his work showing the relation between mechanical energy, heat, and magnetism. The position of physicist of the Paris Observatory was created especially for him in 1855. A member of the Bureau of Longitudes (1862), he was finally elected to the Academy in 1865. Those of Berlin and St. Petersburg, and the Royal Society of London also honoured him.

Foucault worked along several lines. With Fizeau he experimented upon the interference of red rays and their influence on daguerrotype plates, while with Regnault he studied binocular vision. We are indebted to him for the crucial experiment overturning the corpuscular or emission theory of light, defended by Kepler, Newton, and Laplace. Following Arago's suggestion he used the rotating mirror of Wheatstone to determine the difference between the velocities of light in various transparent media. Contrary to the emission theory he found that light travels faster in air than in the denser medium water (17 May, 1850). Light was reflected from a mirror through a tube, containing the medium to be studied, to a concave reflector and back again to the mirror. If the mirror was rotated, the image was observed to shift by an amount depending on the speed of light through the particular medium in the tube. Exceedingly accurate measurements were made of this enormous velocity (about 186,000 miles per second) with an apparatus occupying only twelve feet of space. Foucault invented an

automatic regulator for the feed of the Davy electric arc lamp and thus made electric lighting practicable. The Foucault pendulum was invented to demonstrate visibly the rotation of the earth; the one exhibited at the Pantheon in Paris, in 1851, was 220 feet long. The gyroscope with its intricate and puzzling movements was another device invented by him to show also the earth's motion around its axis. This gained for him the cross of the Legion of Honour. Foucault currents are heating currents of electricity developed in a disc of metal rotating between the poles of a strong magnet. He had observed and reported this effect in 1855. As physicist at the observatory he applied himself also to the improvement of large telescopic lenses and reflectors, devising a method for silvering the surface of a glass reflector. The mercury interrupter used with the induction coil and an excellent form of engine governor are also due to him. Foucault at first appeared careless in the performance of his religious duties but in later years he was a practical Catholic. A stroke of paralysis put an untimely end to his useful work, just as he was about to enjoy the comforts of a well-equipped laboratory. His contributions to science are found in the "Comptes rendus", "Procès verbaux de la Société Philomathique", and "Bibliothèque d'Instruction populaire". His collected works have been put in order by C. M. Gabriel and published by his mother, "Recueil des Travaux Scientifiques de Léon Foucault" (Paris, 1878).

*Putnam's Magazine* (New York), October, 1856; MOIGNO, *Les Mondes* (Paris, 1868); LISSAJOUS in *Recueil* (Paris, 1878); BERTRAND, *Eloges académiques* (Paris, 1890).

WILLIAM FOX.

**Foulque de Neuilly**, a popular Crusade preacher; d. March, 1202. At the end of the twelfth century he was *curé* at the church of Neuilly-sur-Marne, in the Diocese of Paris (now the department of Seine-et-Oise). According to Jacques de Vitry he once led an irregular life, but experienced a sudden conversion. Ashamed of his ignorance, he went to Paris to study under Pierre, a chanter of Notre-Dame. It was not long before his master noticed his earnestness and had him preach in the church of Saint-Séverin before a number of students. His eloquence was so great that he was thought to be inspired by the Holy Ghost. Large crowds assembled to hear him in the Place Champeaux where he was wont to preach. He was especially severe in his denunciation of usurers and dissolute women. In 1195, according to Rigord, with the assent of the Bishop of Paris, he began to preach in the neighbourhood of Paris, and is soon afterwards met with successively in Normandy, at Lisieux and Caen, later in Burgundy, Picardy, and Flanders. He was credited with power to work miracles, and from every quarter the sick were brought to him, whom he cured by the laying on of hands and by the sign of the cross. After 1198 he preached the Fourth Crusade amid much popular enthusiasm. He declared later that in three years he had given the cross to more than 200,000 persons. According to Jean de Flixecourt, it was Pierre le Chantre who pointed out his ability as a preacher to Innocent III. In November, 1198, the pope conferred upon him the necessary powers, with the right of choosing his assistants among the secular clergy (*Historiens de France*, XIX, 369). The chief of these were Pierre de Roussi, Eustache, Abbot of Flai, and Herloin, a monk of Saint-Denis. Herloin even led a band of Breton Crusaders as far as Saint-Jean d'Acre. In 1200 many nobles of Northern France had taken the cross. On the nineteenth of March of that year Foulque preached at Liège (*Hist. de France*, XVIII, 616). After Boniface of Montserrat had been chosen leader of the crusade Foulque gave him the cross at Soissons. In 1201 he assisted at the chapter of Cîteaux with Boniface, and entrusted to the Cistercians a portion of the alms he had collected for the Holy Land. These were used to

repair the ramparts of Acre and Tyre, but he had aroused distrust, and his later success was slight. He returned to Neuilly, where he restored the parish church, which is still in existence. When Foulque died, he was regarded as a saint. He had taken a decisive part in the preparation for the Crusade of 1204.

LEBŒUF, *Histoire du diocèse de Paris* (Paris, 1794), VI; DU CANGE, notes in his edition of VILLEHARDVOIN. Most of the documents concerning Foulque are in BOUQUET, *Historiens de France*, XVIII and XIX; LUCHAIRE, *Innocent III (La Question d'Orient)* (Paris, 1907). LOUIS BRÉHIER.

**Foundation** (Lat. *fundatio*; Ger. *Stiftung*).—An ecclesiastical foundation is the making over of temporal goods to an ecclesiastical corporation or individual, either by gift during life or by will after death, on the condition of some spiritual work being done either in perpetuity or for a long time. It would be difficult to say exactly when foundations, as distinct from oblations or offerings, began to be considered as a normal means of ecclesiastical support. Offerings which were given on the occasion of some ecclesiastical ministrations are a distinctive feature of the Apostolic Church. In early Christian times (the first three centuries) these offerings were spontaneous, but in the course of time the Church had to exercise her right to demand support from the faithful. The custom of giving and consecrating the first-fruits (*primitiæ*) to God and the maintenance of His ministers appears to have lasted until about the fifth century. Quite ancient also are the *decimæ*, or tithes (not necessarily a tenth): a portion of the harvest, or goods, or wealth, offered for the same purpose of maintenance of the clergy and for the due preservation of the services of the Church; this also has now almost entirely disappeared (see *ITIHES*). Such popular contributions are often mentioned in early Christian writers, e. g. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. xliii, in Ep. I. ad Cor., ch. xvi; St. Jerome, vol. VI, inc. iii Malachia; St. Augustine, "Enarratio in Ps.", cxlvi. Under Emperor Constantine the mutual relations of the Church and State were readjusted; the prerogatives of the Church and the sphere of her action were enlarged. Having obtained political recognition, she acquired also the right of accepting donations and legacies, which, as a rule, were set apart by the bishops for the erection and maintenance of hospitals for the sick, orphan asylums, and homes for the aged and those destitute of all other means of support. At a Synod of Orléans (541) it was enacted that if an overlord wished to have an ecclesiastical district established on his property he must previously make a competent provision in land for the maintenance of the church and of the ecclesiastics who were to serve it. To the voluntary offerings made to the clergy must be added the numerous legacies which the Church began to receive from the converted barbarian peoples from the sixth and seventh centuries on; also, at an earlier date, the contributions of corn and wheat granted annually out of the public granaries by order of Constantine. In the West these revenues were usually divided into four parts, and allotted respectively to the bishop, the clergy, the poor, and the care of the ecclesiastical buildings. At the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century the energy displayed by the clergy in political affairs gave rise to a spirit of public enterprise which manifested itself in the formation of industrial guilds and the creation of charitable institutions, such as orphan asylums, founding homes, hospitals, houses for the aged and infirm, hospices, and leper-hospitals, the majority of which were liberally endowed. For an account of this wonderful era of popular generosity, see Thomassin, "Vetus ac nova eccles. disciplina", III, 1-30; and Lallemand, "Hist. de la Charité" (Paris, 1906).

In general, the Church now derives its support mainly from voluntary offerings, civil aid or subsidy, and pious foundations. Foundations for pious uses



may come under any one of the following heads: legacies for Masses; legacies to a particular diocese, church, school, etc.; to a charitable institution, e. g. an orphanage or a hospital; to any society established for an educational or charitable purpose, or in general for a religious end.

Foundations are contracts; therefore there must be mutual consent between the founder and the administrator of the institute receiving the gift. Moreover, there is the obligation of performing some work specified in the deed of foundation. The consent of the bishop, or, in the case of a regular community, the consent of the regular prelate, must be obtained, since it would not be just that ecclesiastical institutions should be placed under obligations which they are unable to fulfil (Sacred Congregation of the Council, 23 Nov., 1697). Benedict XIV considers supervision of the execution of pious legacies one of the most solemn and important duties of a bishop (De Synodo, Bk. XIII). The Council of Trent says (Sess. XXII, ch. ix): "The administrators, whether ecclesiastical or lay, of the fabric of any church whatsoever, even though it be a cathedral, as also of any hospital, confraternity, charitable institutions called 'montes pietatis', and of any place whatsoever, shall be bound to give in once a year an account of their administration to the ordinary, all customs and privileges to the contrary being set aside; unless it should happen that, in the institution and regulations of any church or fabric, it has been otherwise expressly provided. But if from custom, or privilege, or some regulation of the place, their account has to be rendered to others deputed thereunto, in that case also the ordinary shall be employed jointly with them, and all acquittances given otherwise shall be of no avail to the said administrators."

In the list of questions to be answered by bishops on their Roman visits *ad limina* the Congregation of Propaganda asks the following (nos. 49, 50): Are there any pious foundations in the diocese or legacies bequeathed for pious purposes? Are the proceeds of such bequests properly administered and the canons relating to such matters attended to? (See also the Constitution of Leo XIII affecting congregations of simple vows and known as "Conditæ a Christo", 8 Dec., 1900.) The bishop by a general statute may stipulate that foundations are only to be accepted under certain conditions. It is to be noted that acceptance without the consent of the bishop does not invalidate the legacy, but it is in the power of the bishop to rescind the contract if he judge it proper, although in the case of Masses in perpetuity Urban VIII approved a decree which postulates the consent of the bishop as necessary before such obligation can be incurred. The founder can, on the occasion of his gift, make any reservations that please him, provided the conditions are possible and fitting, are in no way adverse to the Divine and natural law, and are admitted by the bishop. The specific works which have to be fulfilled must be set forth in the deed of foundation. On the other hand, the founder, or his heirs, and the bishop cannot change the terms of a foundation once canonically erected, especially if the change would be to the detriment of a third person.

In the decrees of Urban VIII, "Cum Sæpe" (21 Jan., 1625), and Innocent XII, "Nuper a congregatione" (23 Dec., 1697), it is ordered that the stipulated Masses or other works must be fulfilled as a matter of justice; and, if not fulfilled, those responsible for the omission sin gravely and are bound to restitution. Money left as a foundation must be invested as soon as possible. A list of founded Masses is to be kept in a conspicuous place in the church; and when the Masses have been celebrated the fulfilment of the obligation is to be noted in a book kept for that purpose. The obligation of a foundation ceases absolutely when the income or principal is lost without fault on the part of anyone; but non-fulfilment, even

for a lengthy period, does not prescribe against a foundation in perpetuity. The reduction of a foundation obligation is a matter for the judgment and decision of the Holy See, although it is not uncommon for bishops to receive faculties to make such reduction. Condonation and absolution for past omissions in the fulfilment of foundation obligations belong also to the Holy See, though here again bishops usually receive triennial faculties to act in such circumstances. Commutation of the wishes of the founder similarly belongs to the Holy See; but if it is merely a matter of interpretation of the wishes of the founder, bishops are competent to act, since they are the executors of all pious dispositions whether the endowment is given in the form of legacy, or the grant should take effect during the lifetime of the donor (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, ch. viii). It may be noted that, with regard to foundations for Masses, if the founder has given no definite instruction as to intention, the Congregation of the Council has often decided that the Masses must be applied for the founder, the interpretation being that he intended them for himself.

The synods of Westminster (Eng. tr., Stratford-on-Avon, 1886) have the following decrees: "It is fitting that the bishop select from the body of the chapter or from the body of the clergy prudent men to help him in the temporal administration of the diocese. He should often use their advice." "New obligations should not be accepted without the consent of the bishop. If those which he has already to fulfil appear to be too burdensome, or there does not exist a congruous endowment, let the priest apply to the bishop or lay the matter before him at the visitation." "If any of the faithful wish to found a daily or anniversary Mass the matter must be treated with the bishop, and the sum contributed for this object must be profitably invested so as to produce an annual interest for a perpetual endowment, as far as circumstances of time and places will allow, the canonical sanctions being observed." For similar legislation concerning Ireland see the "Acta et Decreta" of the plenary Synod of Maynooth, 1900 (Dublin, 1906), pp. 67-78. In the United States secular priests cannot accept foundations of Masses without the written permission of the bishop. Regulars must have the consent of their superiors general or provincials. No general rule has been laid down as to the requisite amount of the fund, each ordinary being free to fix the sum for his diocese. The councils of Baltimore urge that great circumspection should be used in accepting foundations, especially of perpetual Masses. It would seem advisable to accept foundations only on the following conditions: That the obligation to celebrate shall cease, if the fund, no matter from what cause, be either entirely lost or yield no income; that the ordinary shall have power to reduce the number of Masses if the interest on the capital, no matter for what reasons, becomes insufficient to make up the stipend fixed by the founder; that if, for whatever cause, the church in which the Masses are to be said is destroyed or deprived of a priest, the Masses can be said in any church to be designated by the ordinary.

In order to prevent the annulment or failure of a foundation particular attention should be given to the civil law of the place in question. In England (but not in Ireland) bequests to what the civil law regards as superstitious uses are void, as, for example, to maintain a priest, or an anniversary or obit, or a lamp in a church, or to say Masses for the testator's soul, or to circulate pamphlets inculcating the pope's supremacy. Legacies of money for charitable purposes, as for the use of schools, churches, etc., are valid; but if the money is to be laid out in the purchase of land for such purposes, the direction to purchase land shall be disregarded and the money shall be held for the charity. Land may be given by will for charitable purposes; but, by the Act 54 and 55 Vic., c. 73, the land must

(with certain exceptions) be sold within a year from the testator's death; gifts of land for charitable purposes, otherwise than by will, are valid if the requirements of the Act 51 and 52 Vic., c. 42, are observed. Of these the principal ones are: (1) the conveyance must be by deed; (2) the gift must take effect twelve months before the death of the donor; and (3) the gift must be without any reservation or condition for the benefit of the donor. For the English legislation and court practice concerning trusts and bequests for Catholic religious uses see, in general, Lilly and Wallis, "A Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics" (London, 1893), 135-167. In the United States property cannot legally be devised to a corporation (e. g. to a church when incorporated) unless such corporation is authorized by its charter to receive bequests by will. Many theologians believe that bequests for religious and charitable purposes are valid and binding in conscience, even though null according to law; however, D'Annibale does not agree (Summula Theol. Mor., II, 339).

For the ecclesiastical legislation of the Diocese of Quebec see "La discipline du diocèse de Québec" (Quebec, 1895), 131; for the ecclesiastico-civil law of the Province of Quebec, Mignault, "Le droit paroissial" (Montreal, 1893), 138, 260-62. (See PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL; MASS; ENDOWMENT.)

For the law of ecclesiastical foundations in Germany see Sagmüller, "Kirchenrecht" (Freiburg, 1904), III, 800-3; and for the German civil law, Götz in "Staatslexikon" (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1904), V, 574-78. For France see Bargilliat, "Prælectiones Jur. can." (Paris, 1907), nos. 1363-81; also André-Wagner, "Diet. de droit canonique" (2nd ed., Paris, 1901), II, 225-28. For the administration of the important ecclesiastical foundations in Hungary see Vering, "Kirchenrecht" (3rd ed., Freiburg, 1893), 149; in Baden: op. cit., 249-50.

TAUNTON, *Law of the Church* (London, 1906); SMITH, *Elements of Eccles. Law* (New York, 1886); BOUVI, *De Episcopis* (Paris, 1859); BARGILLIAT, *Prælect. Jur. can.* (27th ed., Paris, 1907); LUCIDI, *De visit. sac. liminum* (3rd ed., Rome, 1883); VON OBERCAMP in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v. *Causa Pia*; FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca prompta* (ed. Rome, 1883).

DAVID DUNFORD.

**Foundling Asylums.**—Under this title are comprised all institutions which take charge of infants whose parents or guardians are unable or unwilling to care for them. At the present time many foundling asylums give shelter to orphans, but originally their activity was confined almost entirely to the rescue and care of foundlings in the strict sense, that is, infants who had been deliberately abandoned by their natural protectors. The practice of exposing to the risk of death by the elements or by starvation those infants whom they were unwilling to rear was very common among parents in the ancient pagan nations. Very general, too, was the more direct method of infanticide. Both methods had the sanction of law and public opinion. Lycurgus and the Decemviri decreed that deformed children should be killed in the interests of healthy citizenship. Aristotle advocated the enactment of laws which would prescribe the exposure of deformed infants and also of all infants in excess of a socially useful number, and which would make the practice of abortion compulsory whenever it was required by the public welfare. In his opinion these measures should find a place in the ideal state, and in every existing community where they were not already approved by the laws and customs (Politics, vii, 16). Even Pliny and Seneca thought it wise sometimes to allow deformed and superfluous infants to perish. In the city of Rome two places were formally set aside for the exposure of infants who were unwelcome to their parents. The proportion of abandoned children that was rescued was very small, and the purposes for which they were rescued were cruelly selfish. Under Roman law they were slaves.

The prevalence of these inhuman practices in Greek and Roman society is undoubtedly explained to a great extent by the pagan theory that neither the fœtus nor the newly born child was in the full sense a human being, as well as by the view that the individual existed for the sake of the State. Against both these beliefs Christianity laid down the doctrine that the human offspring is intrinsically sacred, and not a mere means to any end whatever. Hence we find that the first noteworthy condemnation of the practice of infant exposure, and the first systematic measures of rescue, came from Christian writers, priests, and bishops. Among the earliest of these were Lactantius, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, and Cyprian. Influenced by the Christian teaching and practice, the Emperors Gratian and Valentinian decreed that infanticide should be punished by death, while Justinian relieved foundlings of the disability of slavery and placed them under the patronage of the bishops and prefects. The work of rescue was at first performed by individuals—as, in France, by the deaconesses—and the rescued infants were adopted into Christian families. A marble basin was placed at the church door in which unfortunate or inhuman parents could place their infants, with the assurance that the latter would be cared for by the Church. Although mention is made of a foundling asylum at Trier in the seventh century, the first one of which there is any authentic record was established in Milan by the archpriest Datheus in 787. In 1070 one was founded at Montpellier. Innocent III caused one to be erected in 1198 at Rome in connexion with the hospital of the Holy Ghost. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries witnessed a great increase of foundling asylums, especially in Italy. Prominent among these were the institutions at Einbeck (1200), Florence (1316), Nuremberg (1331), Paris (1362), and Vienna (1380). During the Middle Ages most of the foundling asylums were provided with a revolving crib (*tour, ruota, Drehladen*) which was fitted into the wall in such a way that one half of it was always on the outside of the building. In this the infant could be placed, and then brought into the building by turning the crib. This device completely shielded the person who abandoned the child, but it also multiplied unnecessarily the number of children abandoned. Hence it has been almost universally abolished, even in Italy.

Foundling asylums did not, however, become general throughout Europe. In many places infants were still deposited at the doors of the churches, and thence taken in charge by the church authorities with a view to their adoption by families. In France the means of caring for foundlings had become quite inadequate during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The original foundling asylum of Paris seems to have been no longer in existence at this period; for the only institution of this nature that we hear of is the "Maison de la Couche", in charge of a widow and two servants. So badly was it managed that it had won the nickname of "Maison de la Mort". Through the all-embracing pity of Saint Vincent de Paul the place came under the direction of the Ladies of Charity, and through his influence the king and the nobles subscribed an annual sum of 40,000 francs to carry on the work of child saving. As a result there was a great increase in the number of foundling asylums in France during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

At present the care of foundlings varies considerably in different countries. Methods in France have undergone many changes since the middle of the eighteenth century. Under the government of the Revolution all foundlings were treated as wards of the nation, and for a time subsidies were paid to the mothers of illegitimate children. In 1811 this legislation was repealed, and the care of foundlings was transferred from the central authorities to the departments. At the same time it was decreed that every

foundling asylum should be provided with a revolving crib. The consequence was that the number of abandoned children greatly increased, and the crib had to be abolished. By the law of 1874 every child under two years of age which is taken care of for hire outside the home of its parents becomes an object of public guardianship. Nevertheless, the actual work and expense of caring for foundlings are to a large extent undertaken by religious communities and private associations, both in asylums and in families. In Germany the asylum method seems never to have been as common as in Italy and in France. To-day that country has no foundling asylum in the strict sense of the term. The prevailing practice is to place the infant temporarily in an institution, usually an orphan asylum, and then to give it into the charge of a family. Both the public authorities and the religious communities follow this system. Since the days of Joseph II, foundling asylums have been rather general in Austria. When the mother engages herself to serve in the hospital for four months as a nurse, the child will be taken in and kept permanently, that is, until it reaches the age of ten or, in some asylums, of six years. In case the mother does not reclaim it at the end of this period, it is turned over to the magistracy of her legal residence. When the child is not taken subject to this condition, it is placed in a family as soon as a suitable one can be found. The asylum in Vienna is the largest in the world, having under its care either within or without its doors more than 30,000 children every year. Of the seventy odd thousand infants received during ten years only 902 were legitimate.

In proportion to its population, Italy exceeds all other countries in the number of institutions which are exclusively devoted to the care of foundlings. The number in 1898 was 113, and the number of children cared for 100,418. Most of these, however, were placed out in families, although the famous asylum of Florence (founded 1316) sheltered more than six thousand five hundred in the year 1899. The revolving crib has all but disappeared, owing to the conviction of competent authorities that it increased both illegitimacy and child-abandonment. In 1888 the province of Rovigo introduced a system according to which all mothers who acknowledge their infants are supported for one and one-half years. Experience has shown that this method is more favourable to the child and less expensive to the community. It has been extended to other provinces, was approved by the charity congress of Turin in 1899, and has been embodied in a bill introduced in the Italian Parliament. Russia has two very large foundling asylums, which were established by Catherine II. In 1899 the one at St. Petersburg cared for 33,366 children, while the Moscow institution had charge of 39,033. The policy of the latter is to induce the mother, if possible, to nurse her child, and to pay her for this service. If she does not appear, the infant is kept only a few weeks; it is then placed in the family of some peasant. In England the care of foundlings is in the hands of the Poor Law Guardians, religious and private associations, and the managers of the London Foundling Hospital. Those who are under the care of the guardians are sometimes kept in the general workhouse, and sometimes boarded out in families. The Catholic authorities place foundlings both in the private family and in the orphan asylum. The London Foundling Hospital (established 1739) seems to be the only institution of any considerable size which is devoted exclusively to this class of unfortunates. Scotland has never had a foundling asylum, but utilizes the workhouse and the system of boarding-out. These methods and the care of foundlings in orphan asylums by religious communities are the prevailing ones in Ireland.

About the only public institutions available for the care of foundlings in the United States are the county almshouses, or poorhouses. In most of the large


cities there are foundling asylums under the management of individuals, private associations, or religious bodies and communities. In 1907 the Catholic infant asylum of Chicago had 676 inmates; that of Boston, 858; that of Milwaukee, 408; that of San Francisco, 480. In most places, however, foundlings are received in the Catholic orphan asylums, and are not separately classified in any official publication. The same practice obtains in many orphan asylums under the control of private persons and non-Catholic societies. The volume of the United States census (1904) on benevolent institutions gives the number of orphanages and children's homes, public, private, and religious, as 1075, and the number of inmates as 92,887. The majority of these children are of course not foundlings but orphans. On the other hand, the foundlings in these institutions undoubtedly form only a minority of the whole number in the country; for there is a considerable number in poorhouses, and a still larger number in families. Thus, the State of Massachusetts places all the foundlings committed to it in families under public supervision. Hence it is impossible to give even approximately the total number of foundlings in the country.

The ideal method of caring for foundlings is still as much a disputed question as most of the other problems of practical charity. One phase of the general question has, however, received a fairly definite answer. Experience and a due regard for the respective interests of the infant, the parent, the community, and good morals have led to the conclusion that in every case a reasonable amount of effort should be made to discover the parents and to compel them to assist as far as possible in caring for the child. The other method, which had its most thorough exemplification in the revolving crib, tends, indeed, to diminish infanticide, but it also increases illegitimacy, and by depriving the infant of its natural protector produces at least as high a rate of mortality as the inquisition system. Moreover, it throws upon public and private charity a burden that in many cases could be borne by the parents. Hence the present tendency is everywhere towards the method which aims to give the child the benefit of a mother's care and to keep alive in parents a proper sense of their responsibility.

A question more variously answered is, whether the maintenance of foundling asylums is wise. Those who take a stand for the negative point to the very high death-rate in these places (sometimes more than 90 per cent), to the smaller expense of the family system, and to the obvious fact that the family is the natural home for young children. Most of the Protestant countries and communities prefer the method of placing the foundling in a family. The positive arguments in its favour are unanswerable, but against them must be set the fact that it is not always possible to find suitable families who are willing to care for foundlings. Experience shows that sufficient homes of the right kind cannot now be found for all orphan children who have arrived at an age which renders them more attractive as well as more useful than utterly helpless infants. It would seem, therefore, that institutions are necessary which will shelter foundlings for a number of years. Nevertheless, the foundling asylum should endeavour to ascertain the identity of the parents, to induce the mothers to act as nurses to their infants in the institution, and to keep alive the natural bond between child and parent.

HENDERSON, *Modern Methods of Charity* (New York, 1904); DEVINE, *Principles of Relief* (New York, 1905); *The St. Vincent de Paul Quarterly* (New York); *Proceedings of the National Conferences of Charities and Correction* (Indianapolis, 1874-1908); BROGLIE, *St. Vincent de Paul*, tr. PARTRIDGE (London, 1899); RATZINGER, *Armenpflege* (Freiburg, 1884); EPSTEIN, *Studien zur Frage, Findelanstalten* (Prague, 1882); LALLEMAND, *Histoire des enfants abandonnés et délaissés* (Paris, 1885); RATZINGER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Findelhaus*; BERNARD in *La grande encyclopédie*, s. v. *Enfants Trouvés*.

JOHN A. RYAN.



FOUNTAINS ABBEY FROM ABBOTS HOUSE





**Fountains Abbey**, a monastery of the Cistercian Order situated on the banks of the Skell about two and a half miles from Ripon in Yorkshire, was established by thirteen Benedictine monks of St. Mary's Abbey, York. Wishing to observe a more strict discipline, they obtained in 1132 from Thurstan, Archbishop of York, a grant of land near Ripon. Richard, the prior of St. Mary's, was the leader of the party. Leaving St. Mary's on 9 October, they reached Fountains on 26 December, 1132, and immediately placed themselves under St. Bernard, who sent Geoffrey of Clairvaux to teach them the Cistercian Rule. After two years of privation and poverty they decided to leave England and seek a home among their brethren abroad. This step was rendered unnecessary when Hugh, Dean of York, joined them, bringing with him money and property. He was followed by two canons of York, Serlo and Tosti, who brought still more wealth by means of which the suffering community was relieved and enabled to carry on the new foundation. In 1135 all their possessions were confirmed to them by King Stephen. The earliest buildings erected there were destroyed in 1146 by the followers of William, Archbishop of York, who thus wreaked their vengeance on Abbot Murdac, whom they considered the chief opponent of their master. The archbishop in after years made amends for the excesses of his adherents and expressed his deep sorrow for what had occurred. This loss did not check a rapid development; new buildings were immediately begun and that immense pile, the ruins of which still stand, was finished before the year 1250. In 1146 a colony of monks was sent to Bergen in Norway, and the monasteries of Sawley, Roche, Woburn, Meaux, Kirkstall, and Vandy were founded from Fountains. This period of prosperity was followed by one of want, caused by the constant inroads of the Scots. On account of this Edward II exempted the monks from all taxation (1319). Among the worthies of Fountains should be numbered Henry Murdac, its abbot, and afterwards Archbishop of York (1147-1153), John de Pherd (de Fontibus) another abbot, one of the greatest architects of his day, who became Bishop of Ely in 1220, and John de Cancia, another renowned builder, who ruled over the abbey from 1220 to 1247. The names of thirty-eight abbots are known; the last but one was William Thirsk, executed at Tyburn for refusing the Oath of Supremacy (1536); the last abbot was Marmaduke Bradley who surrendered the abbey to the king in 1540. At the Dissolution there were thirty-one monks with the abbot, and the revenue was estimated at about £1000. Richard Gresham purchased the site for £1163; in 1596 Sir Stephen Proctor acquired it for £4500; the family of Messenger next held it; in 1786 Sir W. Aislabie bought it for £18,000; it is now owned by the Marquess of Ripon. The abbey with its offices stood in an enclosure of twelve acres, and the present ruins occupy two acres. The walls of the church, with one tower, still stand, and there are very substantial remains of the chapter house, cloister, refectory, and calefactory. These ruins are most carefully preserved. Some idea of the abbey's greatness may be gained from the fact that the church was 351 feet in length with a nave 65 feet wide; the refectory was 108 feet by 45, and the cloister 300 feet by 42.

RAINE, *Fasti Eboracenses* (London, 1863), 210-217; WALBRAN, *Memorials of Fountains Abbey* (Surtees Society, London, 1863), I, pp. v-lxx; FLETCHER, *A Picturesque History of Yorkshire* (London); DUGDALE, *Monast. Anglicanum* (London, 1756), V, 286 sqq.; BURTON, *Monasticon Eboracense* (York, 1848), 141.

G. E. HIND.

**Fouquet, JEHAN (or JEAN)**, French painter and miniaturist, b. at Tours, c. 1415; d. about 1480. He was perhaps the son of Huguet Fouquet, who about 1400 worked for the Dukes of Orléans at Paris. At the end of the fourteenth century French painting had reached a period of incomparable brilliancy. Every-

VI.—11

thing heralded the Renaissance (see EYCK, HUBERT AND JAN VAN), and little was wanting to make it a distinctively French movement, which, however, the disasters of the monarchy prevented. Paris ceased to be the centre of the new intellectual life. Art, driven from its centre, retreated to the outlying provinces in the North, the East, and the South-East, to the Duchy of Burgundy. The principal centre was Bruges, while secondary centres were established at Dijon in Provence. Each of these had its masters and its school. The only remnant of truly French life found refuge in the valley of the Loire, in the neighbourhood of Tours, since the time of St. Martin the true heart of the nation in every crisis of French history. Here grew up the first of our painters who possesses not only a definite personality but a French physiognomy. Fouquet was the contemporary of Joan of Arc, and his character is as national as that of the heroine herself. For the basis of his style we must look to the School of Burgundy, itself simply a variant of that of Bruges. Tours is not far from Bourges and Dijon, and in Fouquet's work there is always something reminiscent of Claus Sluter and of the Van Eycks. To this must be added some Italian mannerisms. It is not known on what occasion Fouquet went to Italy, but it was certainly about 1445, for while there he painted the portrait of Pope Eugene IV between two secretaries. This famous work, long preserved at the Minerva gallery, is now known only from a sixteenth-century engraving. Filarete and Vasari speak admiringly of it, while Raphael paid it the honour of recalling it in his "Leo X" of the Pitti Palace.

Fouquet remained under the charm of the early Italian Renaissance. The influence of the bas-reliefs of Ghiberti and Della Robbia, the paintings of Masaccio, Paolo Uccello, Filippo Lippi, and Gentile da Fabriano which he saw at Florence and at Rome may always be traced in his work. He appears to have been in France in 1450. Some critics are inclined to believe that he made a second journey, for they find it hard to believe that Fouquet never saw the "Lives of St. Lawrence and St. Stephen" by Fra Angelico in the chapel of Nicholas V. It is these Italian works which most closely resemble his own. The harmonizing of the two Renaissance movements (North and South), the intimate and natural fusion of the genius of both in the creative soul of one French artist, without any effort or shadow of pedantry, narrowness, or system, constitutes Fouquet's charm and originality. If French character consists in a certain effacement of all racial characteristics, in the power of assimilation (cf. Michelet, *Introduction à la philosophie de l'histoire*), no artist has ever been more "French" than Fouquet. Withal he does not lack the savour of his country. Without poetry or depth of thought, his style has at least two striking characteristics. In depicting the human countenance, he possessed to a rare degree the gift of taking life, as it were, by surprise, and not even Benozzo could tell a story as he could.

We know through a contemporary that Fouquet painted pictures in the church of Notre-Dame la Riche at Tours, but it is not known whether they were mural or altar-pieces. He is known to have been charged with the preparations for Louis XI's entry into the city in 1461. Of all his works, however, there remain to-day a half-dozen portraits and about a hundred miniatures. The oldest of these portraits appears to be the "Charles VII" in the Louvre, a portrait striking for its sadness, its fretful expression, and the force of its ugliness and veracity. At the Louvre also is the portrait of "Guillaume Juvenal des Ursins", magnificently obese and bloated, radiant with gold. Another portrait has a curious history. It is that of Etienne Chevalier, the great patron of the painter, and was formerly to be seen in the church of Melun. The work is charming in breadth of style. The figure of St. Stephen presenting his client recalls Giorgione by its

vigour and delicacy. In 1896 this piece found its way to the Berlin Museum. It formed part of a diptych, the other wing of which shows the Virgin, surrounded by angels, nursing the Infant Jesus. The Virgin is also a portrait, that of the beautiful Agnes Sorel of whom Chevalier was a favourite. This second wing is at Antwerp. The two parts, having been separated, were never reunited except for a short time at Paris during the Exposition of the French "Primitives" in 1904. Still another of Fouquet's portraits must be mentioned: the bust of a young man (Lichtenstein collection), dated 1456, which is admirable in the intensity of touch displayed in the colour scheme, with its greyish tone and deliberate reserve. This would be the master's best portrait, were it not for the precious little enamel at the Louvre, in which he himself is depicted in golden lines on a black background.

His work as a miniaturist at present comprises three series: (1) the fragments of the "Livre d'heures d'Etienne Chevalier" (1450-60), forty of which are at Chantilly, two at the Louvre, one at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and one at the British Museum; (2) twenty *jeuillots* of the "Jewish Antiquities" of Josephus at the Bibliothèque Nationale. The second volume, discovered by Mr. Yates Thomson, was presented to the French Republic by King Edward VII in 1908 (Duriu, op. cit. *infra*); (3) part of the illustrations of the "Chroniques de France" (Fr. 6465, Bibl. Nat.). To these must be added: (4) the frontispiece and miniatures for a French translation of the works of Boccaccio at the Royal Library of Munich (c. 1459), and the frontispiece of the statutes of the Order of St. Michael (c. 1462) at the Bibliothèque Nationale. The most important of these works, as well as the most famous and the most beautiful, is unquestionably Etienne Chevalier's "Book of Hours", the "Quarante Fouquet", which is one of the treasures of Chantilly. Of the forty-four pages of the "Book of Hours" hitherto recovered, twenty-five (following the order of the Breviary) tell the story of the Gospel and of the life of the Blessed Virgin, fourteen are scenes from the lives of the saints; one, dealing with the story of Job, is an Old-Testament scene; and one, "The Last Judgment", is from the Apocalypse. The frontispiece, two pages reproducing the diptych of Melun, and the page of the Office for the Dead, are consecrated to the memory of Etienne Chevalier. We are impressed immediately with the exquisite clearness, animation and life. Italian mannerisms abound in the details; the artist speaks with a more flowery tongue than in his portraits. This work is one of joy in which the imagination delights in lovely caprices. Here are chubby-faced little angels, flowing draperies and garments, Burgundian luxuriance with the large folds of its draperies; to one side are the playing children (*putti*), musicians of Prato and Pistoia, pilastered niches, classic cornices, the Corinthian acanthus, and architectural foliage like the Florentine cypress and yew. His style is extremely composite. Nowhere else are its elements so deftly combined. There is gold everywhere, golden skies and golden hatching, an enveloping tissue delicately gilt. Since his time no one has been able to master the process, which is in fact only the radiant atmosphere of the artist's ideas and the colour of his spirit.

The fundamental note is wonderfully sustained despite the appearance of playful improvisation. Although the artist delights in allowing free play to pleasant reminiscences, and has made use of his sketches of travel as adornments for his ideas, the basis of all is an ardent love of reality, and he glances at them only to refresh his memory. As a story-teller and dramatist he has the regard for the letter and the text which was to become the predominant trait of the great French historical painters, Poussin and Delacroix. But above all he feels the craving for truth, which underneath the embellishments of his style con-

stitutes the real merit of his miniatures and his portraits. Fouquet is a "naturalist" from conviction. This he is after his own fashion, but as truly as Van Eyck or Filippo Lippi. He resembles them in being of their time, but he differs from them inasmuch as with him imitation never prevails over his passionate worship of nature.

This naturalism was so strong that Fouquet lacked the power to conceive what he had not seen. He did not dispense with models and all his works were not only observed but posed. He fails completely in ideal scenes and those of intense expression (e. g. Calvary) for which he could have no model. If his "Last Judgment" is a thrilling picture, it is because the memory of the glass-worker came to the aid of the painter, for the artist beheld heaven as the rose window of a cathedral (Dante, *Parad.*, xxxi). In "The Martyrdom of St. Apollonia" he depicts quite clearly a scene from a popular mystery; it is, indeed, the most exact document we possess as to the scenic effects in the mysteries of the Middle Ages (Emil Mâle, "Le renouvellement de l'art par les mystères" in "Gazette des Beaux Arts", 1904, I, 89). This influence of the theatre is seen throughout the "Book of Hours", in the costumes, the decoration, and local colour, the capricious and grotesque appearance of which proceeds directly from the store of dramatic accessories and the tinsel adornments of the actors. It was thus that the age of Fouquet conceived historical painting. Finally another custom of Fouquet was to give as background to the scenes taken from the Bible or the Gospel, instead of Palestine of which he knew nothing, France or Touraine which he knew so well. Thus the representation of "Job" has as a decorative background the castle keep of Vincennes. The "Paschal Supper" takes place in an inn, and through the open door is seen the roof of Notre-Dame de Paris. "Calvary" is placed on the hill of Montrouge. This excess of *naïveté* must not lead us to think that Fouquet knew not what he did. The anachronism of the "Primitives" is a conscious and voluntary system. Fouquet was not at all *naïf*, as has been too frequently asserted, when in the scene of the Epiphany he substituted for one of the Magi of history the portrait of King Charles VII, in a mantle ornamented with fleurs-de-lis, surrounded by his guards and rendering homage to the Blessed Virgin. Perhaps this was a way of bringing home the teaching of the Gospel and of expressing its eternal truths and undying realities rather than the historical incident. Above all it was the *parti pris* of an age which, weary of abstractions and symbols, underwent a passionate reaction towards the youthful, and towards life. No contemporary expressed life better than Fouquet. He loved it in all its forms, in art, whether Italian, Flemish, Gothic, or Renaissance, in the theatre as well as in nature. He loved beautiful horses, beautiful arms, rich costumes, gay colours, beautiful music (his works are full of concerts). He loved the elegance of the new architecture, and he loved also the tapering spires, the cathedral windows, and the pointed towers on the pepper-box roofs. A thousand details of the life of his times would have been lost except for him, e. g. a row of quays on the banks of the Seine at the extremity of the city, a view of Paris from Montmartre or the Pré aux Clercs, the performance of a mystery, a funeral scene, the interior of the ancient basilica of St. Peter. He is the best witness of his time; he is in turn good-natured, bantering, tender, and emotional. Neither a dreamer nor a mystic, he is full of faith and purity. Nothing could be more chaste than his work, which appeals at once to the learned and to the masses. The mind of this humble miniaturist was one of the best informed and most well-ordered of his time. Above all he had also a creative side, for he is one of the great landscape painters of the world. No one has depicted as well as he the charming countryside of France. Nothing

could be more sweetly rustic than his "Sainte Marguerite". In this Fouquet immediately foreshadows Corot. His "Mount of Olives" and his "Nativity" are two of the most beautiful nocturnal scenes ever painted. The Alps in his "Grandes Chroniques" are perhaps the earliest example of mountain landscape.

Fouquet's influence has been considerable. He had numerous pupils, the best-known of whom are his two sons (one of them has a "Calvary" in the church of Loches) and Jean Colombe, the brother of the sculptor, while the greatest was Jehan Bourdichon, who in 1507 painted the famous "Hours" of Anne of Brittany. But none of these artists comes near to the master in merit. Fouquet remains the sole type of a French Renaissance which died out with his pupils. After 1500 Italy took a decided lead over the rest of Europe, and France was unable to contest her prestige. For more than two centuries she lost even the memory of her first original master. It is only in modern times that he has been drawn from obscurity and restored to his rank among the most charming men of genius of the early Renaissance.

CURMER, *Œuvres de Jean Fouquet* (Paris, 1865) (chromos); BOUCHOT, *Jean Fouquet in Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1890), II, 273; LÉPÉRIER, *Jean Fouquet in Revue de l'Art* (1897), I, 25; LAFENESTRE, *Jean Fouquet in Revue des Deux Mondes* (15 Jan., 1902); FRIEDLANDER, *Die Votivtafel des Etienne Chevalier von Fouquet in Jahrbuch der Museum of Berlin* (1897), 206; GRUYER, *Les Quarante Fouquet* (of Chantilly), (Paris, 1900); MICHEL, *Les Miniatures de Fouquet à Chantilly in Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1897), I, 214; DURRIET, *L'Exposition des Primitifs français in Revue de l'Art* (1904), I, 82; FRX in *Burlington Magazine* (1904), I, 279; BOUCHOT, DELISLE, etc., *Exposition des Primitifs français au Louvre* (Paris, 1904); DURRIET, *Le Livre des Antiquités Judaïques* (Paris, 1908).

LOUIS GILLET.

**Four Crowned Martyrs.**—The old guide-books to the tombs of the Roman martyrs make mention, in connexion with the catacomb of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus on the Via Labicana, of the Four Crowned Martyrs (*Quatuor Coronati*), at whose grave the pilgrims were wont to worship (De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, I, 178-79). One of these itineraries, the "Epitome libri de locis sanctorum martyrum", adds the names of the four martyrs—in reality five:—"IV Coronati, id est Claudius, Nicostratus, Simpronianus, Castorius, Simplicius". These are the names of five martyrs, sculptors in the quarries of Pannonia (now a part of Austria-Hungary, south-west of the Danube), who gave up their lives for their Faith in the reign of Diocletian. The Acts of these martyrs, written by a revenue officer named Porphyrius probably in the fourth century, relates of the five sculptors that, although they raised no objections to executing such profane images as Victoria, Cupid, and the Chariot of the Sun, they refused to make a statue of Æsculapius for a heathen temple. For this they were condemned to death as Christians. They were put into leaden caskets and drowned in the River Save. This happened towards the end of 305. The foregoing account of the martyrdom of the five sculptors of Pannonia is substantially authentic; but later on a legend sprang up at Rome concerning the *Quatuor Coronati*, according to which four Christian soldiers (*cornicularii*) suffered martyrdom at Rome during the reign of Diocletian, two years after the death of the five sculptors. Their offence consisted in refusing to offer sacrifice to the image of Æsculapius. The bodies of the martyrs were interred by St. Sebastian and Pope Melchades at the third milestone on the Via Labicana, in a sandpit where rested the remains of others who had perished for the Faith. Since the names of the four martyred soldiers could not be authentically established, Pope Melchades commanded that, the date of their death (8 November) being the same as that of the Pannonian sculptors, their anniversary should be celebrated on that day, under the names of Sts. Claudius, Nicostratus, Symphorianus, Castor, and Simplicius. This report has no historic foundation. It is merely a tenta-

tive explanation of the name *Quatuor Coronati*, a name given to a group of really authenticated martyrs who were buried and venerated in the catacomb of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus, the real origin of which, however, is not known. They were classified with the five martyrs of Pannonia in a purely external relationship. Numerous manuscripts on the legend as well as the Roman Martyrology give the names of the Four Crowned Martyrs, supposed to have been revealed at a later date, as Secundus, Severianus, Carpoforus, and Victorinus. But these four martyrs were not buried in Rome, but in the catacomb of Albano; their feast was celebrated on 7 August, under which date it is cited in the Roman Calendar of Feasts of 354. These martyrs of Albano have no connexion with the Roman martyrs described above. Of the Four Crowned Martyrs we know only that they suffered death for the Faith and the place where they were buried. They evidently were held in great veneration at Rome, since in the fourth or fifth century a basilica was erected and dedicated to them on the Cælian Hill, probably in the neighbourhood of the spot where tradition located their execution. This became one of the titular churches of Rome, was restored several times, and still stands. It is first mentioned among the signatures of a Roman council in 595. Pope Leo IV ordered the relics removed, about 850, from the Via Labicana to the church dedicated to their memory, together with the relics of the five Pannonian martyrs, which had been brought to Rome at some period now unknown. Both groups of martyrs are commemorated on 8 November.

MOMBRIUS, *Sanctuarium*, I, 162-65; WATTENBACH in *Sitzungsberichte der k. k. Akademie der Wiss. in Wien*, X (1853), 118 sqq.; IDEM in BUDINGER, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Kaiser-gesch.*, III (Leipzig, 1870), 324 sqq.; IDEM, *Ueber die Legende der hl. "Vier Gekronten" in Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin: Phil.-hist. Klasse* (1896), 1292-1302; MEYER, *Ueber die Passio ss. Quatuor Coronatorum in Forschungen zur deutschen Gesch.*, XVIII (1878), 579 sqq.; (cf. *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Gesch.*, V, 227; XII, 426); IDEM, *Ueber die Passio ss. Quatuor Coronatorum* (Berlin, 1886); DE ROSSI, *I santi Quattro Coronati e la loro chiesa sul Celio in Bull. di archeol. crist.* (1879), 45-90; PETSCHENIG, *Zur Kritik und Würdigung der Passio ss. Quatuor Coronatorum in Sitzungsberichte der k. k. Akademie der Wiss. in Wien*, XCII (1880), 761 sqq.; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécution* (Paris, 1892), IV, 130 sq.; V, 24 sqq.; DUFOURCQ, *Les Gestes martyrum romains* (Paris, 1900), 153-60.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Fourier, PETER.** See PETER FOURIER, SAINT.

**Four Masters, ANNALS OF THE**, the most extensive of all the compilations of the ancient annals of Ireland. They commence, nominally at least, at A. M. 2242 and are continued down to A. D. 1616. The entries which are bare and meagre during the earlier period grow less so as the "Annals" progress, and towards the end they become in parts almost like a history in their diffuseness. The principal compiler of these "Annals" was Michael O'Clery, a native of Donegal, who had been by profession a trained antiquary and poet, but who afterwards joined the Franciscan Order, and went to their Irish house in Louvain. Thence he was sent back to Ireland by his famous compatriot, Father John Colgan, to collect the lives of Irish saints. Many of these lives which he copied upon that visit, out of the old vellum books of Ireland, are now in the Burgundian Library at Brussels. Afterwards, under the patronage of Fergal O'Gara, Lord of Moy Gara and Coolavin, in the County Sligo, he conceived the pious idea of collecting and redacting all the ancient vellum books of annals which he could find throughout Ireland, and of combining them into one continuous whole. "I thought", says O'Clery, in his dedication to O'Gara, "that I could get the assistance of the chroniclers for whom I had most esteem, in writing a book of annals in which these matters might be put on record, for that should the writing of them be neglected at present, they would not again be found to be put on record even to the end of the world. All the best and most copious books of annals that I could

find throughout all Ireland were collected by me—though it was difficult for me to collect them—into one place to write this book.” It was to the secluded convent of Donegal that the learned friar retired while engaged upon this work which was commenced by himself and his fellow labourers on the 22nd of January, 1632, and concluded on the 10th of August, 1636. His forebodings as to the fate of the material that he worked from were prophetic. Scarcely one of the ancient books which he brought together with such pains has survived to the present day—they probably perished in the cataclysm of the Cromwellian and Williamite wars.

It was Father Colgan, the celebrated author of the “*Trias Thaumaturga*” and the “*Acta sanctorum Hiberniæ*”, who, in the preface to this latter work, first conferred the title by which they are now always known, “*The Annals of the Four Masters*”, upon these annals of O’Clery. “As in the three works before mentioned”, writes Colgan, “so in this fourth one, three (helpers of O’Clery) are eminently to be praised, namely Farfassa O’Mulconry, Peregrine O’Clery, and Peregrine O’Duignan, men of consummate learning in the antiquities of their country, and to these were subsequently added the co-operation of other distinguished antiquarians, as Maurice O’Mulconry who for one month and Conary O’Clery who for many months laboured in its promotion. But since those ‘Annals’ which we shall very frequently have occasion to quote, have been collected and compiled by the assistance and separate study of so many authors, neither the desire of brevity would permit us always to quote them individually, nor would justice permit us to attribute the labour of many to one, hence it sometimes seemed best to call them the ‘Annals of Donegal’, for in our convent of Donegal they were commenced and concluded. But afterwards, for other reasons, chiefly for the sake of the compilers themselves, who were four most learned masters in antiquarian lore, we have been led to call them the ‘Annals of the Four Masters’.”

These “Annals”, written in a very archaic language, difficult to be understood, even then, except by the learned, give us the reigns, deaths, genealogies, etc., not only of the high-kings of Ireland, but also of the provincial kings, chiefs, and heads of distinguished families, men of science, historians, poets, etc., with their respective dates given as accurately as the Masters are able to give them. They record the demise and succession of saints, abbots, bishops, and ecclesiastical dignitaries. They tell of the foundation and occasionally the overthrow of countless churches, castles, abbeys, convents, and religious institutions. They give meagre details of battles, murders, tribal wars, wars with the foreigners, battles with Norsemen, Normans, and English, and political changes. Sometimes they quote ancient verses in corroboration of the facts they mention, but no such verses are quoted prior to the third century. We have here the condensed pith and substance of the old vellum books of Ireland which were then in existence, but most of which, as the Four Masters foresaw, have long since perished. Their facts and dates are not their own facts and dates. From confused masses of very ancient matter, they, with labour and much sifting, drew forth their dates, and as far as possible synchronized their facts. It is not too much to say that there is no event in the whole of Irish history from the birth of Christ down to the beginning of the seventeenth century that the first enquiry of the student about it must not be: “What do the Four Masters say of this?”

These “Annals” have been published, at least in part, three times, but are now always read in the edition of the great Irish scholar, John O’Donovan. In this splendid work the Irish text is given with a translation into English and a mass of the most valuable notes, topographical, genealogical, and historical, the

whole contained in seven great quarto volumes. So long as Irish history exists the “Annals of the Four Masters” will be read in O’Donovan’s translation, and the name of O’Donovan be inseparably connected with that of the O’Clerys.

O’DONOVAN, ed., *Annala Ríoghachta Éireann, Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland, by the Four Masters, from the earliest period to the year 1616* (Dublin, 1851); CONNELLAN, *The Annals of Ireland translated from the original Irish of the Four Masters, with annotations by Philip MacDermott, Esq., M.D., and the translator* (Dublin, 1846). Connellan’s translation is only from the year 1171 to the end and he does not publish the Irish text. O’CONOR, ed., *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores Tom. III, complectens annales IV Magistrorum ex ipso O’Clery autographo in Bibliotheca Stowense* (Buckingham, 1826). The Rev Charles O’Conor publishes the Annals only up to the year 1171. O’CURRY, *Lectures on the MSS. materials of Ancient Irish history*, 142–161, appendix 543–548; HYDE, *Literary History of Ireland* (London, 1899), 573–580; IDEM, *Story of Early Irish Literature*, 136–142; JOYCE, *Social History of Ancient Ireland*, I, 524–526; GILBERT, *National MSS. of Ireland* (London, 1884), 311–313; MOORE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. O’Clery.

DOUGLAS HYDE.

Fowler, JOHN, scholar and printer, b. at Bristol, England, 1537; d. at Namur, Flanders, 13 Feb., 1578–9. He studied at Winchester School from 1551 to 1553, when he proceeded to New College, Oxford, where he remained till 1559. He became B.A. 23 Feb., 1556–7 and M.A. in 1560, though Antony à Wood adds that he did not complete his degree by standing *in comitia*. On Elizabeth’s accession he was one of the fifteen Fellows of New College who left of their own accord or were ejected rather than take the Oath of Supremacy (Rashdall, *History of New College*, 114). This disposes of the calumny circulated by Acworth in his answer to Sander, called “*De visibili Romanarchiâ*”, to the effect that Fowler took the oath to enable him to retain the living of Wonston in Hampshire. There is, indeed, no trace of any desire on his part to receive Holy orders and he subsequently married Alice Harris, daughter of Sir Thomas More’s secretary. On leaving Oxford he withdrew to Louvain, where like other scholars of his time he turned his attention to the craft of printing. His intellectual attainments were such as to enable him to take high rank among the scholar-printers of that age. Thus Antony à Wood says of him: “He was well skilled in the Greek and Latin tongues, a tolerable poet and orator, and a theologian not to be contemned. So learned he was also in criticisms and other polite learning, that he might have passed for another Robert or Henry Stephens. He did diligently peruse the Theological Summa of St. Thomas of Aquin, and with a most excellent method did reduce them into a Compendium.” To have a printing press abroad in the hands of a competent English printer was a great gain to the Catholic cause, and Fowler devoted the rest of his life to this work, winning from Cardinal Allen the praise of being *catholicissimus et doctissimus librorum impressor*. The English Government kept an eye on his work, as we learn from the State papers (Domestic, Eliz., 1566–1579), where we read the evidence of one Henry Simpson at York, in 1571, to the effect that Fowler printed all the English books at Louvain and that Dr. Harding’s Welsh servant, William Smith, used to bring the works to the press. He seems to have had a press at Antwerp as well as at Louvain, for his Antwerp books range from 1565 to 1575, whereas his Louvain books are dated 1566, 1567 and 1568; while one of his publications, Gregory Martin’s “*Treatise of Schism*”, bears the impress, Douay, 1578. More thorough bibliographical research than has yet been made into the output of his presses will probably throw new light upon his activity as a printer. The original works or translations for which he was personally responsible are: “An Oration against the unlawful Insurrections of the Protestantes of our time under pretence to reforme Religion” (Antwerp, 1566), translated from the Latin of Peter Frarinus, which provoked a reply from Fulke; “*Ex universa summâ Sacræ Theologiæ Doctoris S.*

Thomæ Aquinatis desumptæ conclusiones" (Louvain, 1570); "M. Maruli dictorum factorumque memorabilium libri VI" (Antwerp, 1577); "Additiones in Chronica Genebrandi" (1578); "A Psalter for Catholics", a controversial work answered by Sampson; epigrams and verses. The translation of the "Epistle of Orosius" (Antwerp, 1565), ascribed to him by Wood and Pitts, was really made by Richard Shacklock. Pitts also states that he wrote in English a work "Ad Ducisam Feriæ confessionis forma". Fowler also edited Sir Thomas More's "Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation" (Antwerp, 1573).

PITTS, *De illustribus Angliæ Scriptoribus* (Paris, 1623); Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.*, ed. Bliss (London, 1813-1820), I; Dodd, *Church History* (Brussels, 1737), I, Pt. III, Bk. II, Art. 6, following ANTONY A WOOD in every detail; TIMPERLEY, *Typographical Encyclopedia* (London, 1842); KNOX, *Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen* (London, 1882); BOASE AND CLARKE, *Register of the University of Oxford* (Oxford Hist. Soc., 1883), I; GILLOW, *Bibl. Diet. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II; COOPER in *Diet. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), XX.

EDWIN BURTON.

**FOX, GEORGE.** See FRIENDS, SOCIETY OF.

**FOX, JOSEPH J.** See GREEN BAY.

**Foxe's Book of Martyrs.** See BOOK OF MARTYRS.

**Fractio Panis** (BREAKING OF BREAD), the name given to a fresco in the so-called "Capella Greca" in the catacomb of St. Priscilla situated on the Via

the table immediately before him is a two-handed cup. Further along the table there are two large plates, one containing two fishes, the other five loaves. At each extremity of the picture upon either side we notice baskets filled with loaves—four baskets at one end, three at the other.

As a very little reflection will suffice to prove, no doubt can be felt as to the significance of the scene. It depicts beyond question that striking Eucharistic act, "the breaking of the bread" (*κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*—*fractio panis*), which seems to have so much impressed our Lord's immediate disciples. The phrase itself at once transports us back to the very beginnings of Christianity. No wonder that De Rossi, whose last years were gladdened by this find, described it as "the pearl of Catacomb discoveries". To point out briefly how constantly this phrase "fractio panis" recurs in early Christian literature, we may note that not only is the "blessing and breaking" of the bread mentioned in each of the four accounts of the Last Supper, but repeatedly also in the other Apostolic writings. For example, in I Cor., x, 16, "The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" So again in Acts, ii, 42, "And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers" (cf. Acts, ii, 46).



FRACTIO PANIS  
Capella Greca, Catacomb of St. Priscilla

Salara Nova. The fresco, which with the whole of the decorations of the chapel dates from the first half of the second century, is of the highest liturgical and theological importance. The painting is found upon the face of the arch immediately over the altar tomb, upon which beyond all reasonable doubt the Holy Sacrifice was offered. By a providential accident this particular fresco, having been covered by a thick crust of stalactites, escaped the notice of the early explorers of the catacombs, who, by their over-eagerness and ignorance combined, often did much irreparable harm. In the year 1893, Mgr. Joseph Wilpert, the most distinguished of a band of young scholars who looked upon the great archaeologist De Rossi (q. v.) as their master, arrived at the conclusion that the roof and arches of this chapel were decorated with frescoes. Chemical reagents were used to remove the crust which covered the surface, and by the patient care of Mgr. Wilpert this delicate operation was attended with complete success. The most important fresco thus recovered was that already referred to over the altar tomb. The scene represented is a picture of seven persons at table, six men and a woman. It seems clear that six of these are reclining as the ancients reclined at their meals. But the seventh personage, a bearded and impressive figure, sits somewhat apart at the extremity of the table in an attitude which is highly significant. His head is thrown back, he has a small loaf or cake in his hands, and his arms stretched out in front of him show that he is breaking it. Upon

And particularly Acts, xx, 7, "And on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread", where this practice is closely associated with the observance of Sunday. (Cf. also the disciples at Emmaus on Easter day—Luke, xxiv, 30, 35, and Acts, xxvii, 35.) Similar prominence is given to this conviction in other sub-Apostolic writings, notably in the *Didache* (q. v.) or "Teaching of the Apostles" (xiv, I), where it is associated with the observance of the Sunday as well as with the explicit mention of Sacrifice and with confession. "And on the Lord's day come together and break bread and give thanks, having first confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure." Further, in ch. xi of the same early treatise the consecrated Host is clearly designated by the term *κλάσμα*, i. e. "broken bread". Nothing then could be more natural than that, in the earliest form of the liturgy, the breaking of the bread should have been regarded as the climax of the ritual employed, and should have been for the early Christians what the Elevation in the Mass is nowadays for us. Moreover, this Eucharistic significance of the picture is borne out by all the accessories. The loaves and the fishes upon the table point directly to the miraculous multiplication twice performed by Christ. The association of this miracle with the Blessed Eucharist is familiar, not only in other archaeological monuments, but also in early Christian literature. See for example Origen, "In Matt.", x, 25 (P. G., XIII, 902), and Ambrose, "De Virgin.", I, 3 (P. L., XVI, 219). Upon the sym-



bolic significance of the fish and the anagram *ixôus*, it cannot be necessary to insist. Both the inscription of Abercius (q. v.) of the close of the second century and that of Autun a little later, as well as a large number of allusions in early Christian literature, make it clear that our Saviour Jesus Christ was indicated by this symbol (see e. g. Mowat in the "Atti del Congresso Internaz. d'Archeol. Crist.", Rome, 1902, pp. 2-4). Moreover, the Abercius inscription clearly conveys that this "great fish" was to be the permanent food of the soul. We may also note that the one female figure among the guests depicted in the Fractio Panis fresco is veiled, which is not the case with the female figures represented in those other banqueting scenes found in the catacombs and usually interpreted as symbolic of the joys of heaven. The fresco of which we speak is not, as will be readily understood, either entirely realistic or entirely symbolical. That the president (*προεδρος*) of the synaxis (assembly) should break the bread seated, is probably not to be understood as implying that the bishops in the primitive church were in fact seated when they offered the liturgy, any more than the attitude of the guests implies that the early Christians reclined on couches when they assisted at the Holy Sacrifice. On the other hand, the action of the breaking of the bread is clearly realistic. A further indication of the Eucharistic significance of the fresco here under discussion is afforded by the fact that in the fresco next to it in the same chamber is depicted the sacrifice of Abraham. On the other side is a representation of Daniel in the lions' den, to which Mgr. Wilpert also attaches a Eucharistic significance on account of the supernatural feeding of Daniel through the intervention of the prophet Habacuc (Dan., xiv, 36).

WILPERT, in 1895, published a monograph giving a full account of this discovery under the title *Fractio Panis, die allerste Darstellung der eucharistischen Opfers* (Freiburg im Br.). This was translated into French the next year. It contains a collection of very carefully executed photogravures of the frescoes in the Capella Greca, but the dimness of the tones in the original fresco makes it impossible to distinguish the details clearly in any photographic copy. For this reason the coloured reproduction included by Mgr. Wilpert in his later work *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms*, two folio volumes (Freiburg, 1903), also published at Rome in Italian, is much to be preferred. The Fractio Panis is shown upon plate xv, vol. I. Compare also MARCCHI, *Éléments d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Paris, 1899-1902), I, pp. 284-299; LECLERCQ in *Dict. d'Archéologie*, I, 3159-3162.

#### HERBERT THURSTON.

**France**, the fifth in size (usually reckoned the fourth) of the great divisions of Europe.

**DESCRIPTIVE GEOGRAPHY.**—The area of France is 207,107 square miles; it has a coast line 1560 miles and a land frontier 1525 miles in length. In shape it resembles a hexagon of which the sides are: (1) From Dunkirk to Point St-Mathieu (sands and dunes from Dunkirk to the mouth of the Somme; cliffs, called *falaises*, extending from the Somme to the Orne, except where their wall is broken by the estuary of the Seine; granite boulders intersected by deep inlets from the Orne to Point St-Mathieu). (2) From Point St-Mathieu to the mouth of the Bidassoa (alternate granite cliffs and inlets as far as the River Loire; sandy stretches and arid moors from the Loire to the Garonne; sands, lagoons, and dunes from the Garonne to the Pyrenees). (3) From the Bidassoa to Point Cerbère (a formation known as Pyrenean chalk). (4) From Point Cerbère to the mouth of the Roya (a steep, rocky frontier from the Pyrenees to the Tech; sands and lagoons between the Tech and the Rhone, and an unbroken wall of pointed rocks stretching from the Rhone to the Roya). (5) From the Roya to Mount Donon (running along the Maritime, the Côtian, and the Graian Alps, as well as the mountains of Jura and the Vosges). (6) From Mount Donon to Dunkirk (an artificial frontier differentiated by few marked physical peculiarities).

France is the only country in Europe having a

coast line both on the Atlantic and on the Mediterranean; moreover the passes of Belfort, Côte d'Or, and Naurouse open up ready channels of communication between the Rhine, the English Channel, the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean. Furthermore it is noteworthy that wherever the French frontier is defended by lofty mountains (as, for instance, the Alps, the Pyrenees) the border peoples are akin to the French either in race, speech, or customs (the Latin races), while on the other hand the Teutonic races, differing so widely from the French in ideas and sentiment, are physically divided from them only by the low-lying hills and plains of the North-East. Hence it follows that France has always lent itself with peculiar facility to the spread of any great intellectual movement, coming from the shores of the Mediterranean, as was the case with Christianity. France was the natural highroad between Italy and England, between Germany and the Iberian Peninsula. On French soil the races of the North mingled with those of the South; and the very geographical configuration of the country accounts in a certain sense for the instinct of expansion, the gift of assimilation and of diffusion, thanks to which France has been able to play the part of general distributor of ideas. In fact, two widely different worlds meet in France. A journey from North to South leads through three distinct zones: the grain country reaching from the northern coast to a line drawn from Mézières to Nantes; the vine country and the region of berries, southward from this to the latitude of Grenoble and Perpignan; the land of olive-garths and orange-groves, extending to the southern boundary of the country. Its climate ranges from the foggy promontories of Brittany to the sunny shores of Provence; from the even temperature of the Atlantic to the sudden changes which are characteristic of the Mediterranean. Its people vary from the fair-haired races of Flanders and Lorraine, with a mixture of German blood in their veins, to the olive-skinned dwellers of the south, who are essentially Latin and Mediterranean in their extraction. Again Nature has formed, in the physiography of this country, a multitude of regions, each with its own characteristics—its own personality, so to speak—which, in former times, popular instinct called separate countries. The tendency to abstraction, however, which carried away the leaders of the Revolution, is responsible for the present purely arbitrary divisions of the soil, known as "departments". Contemporary geography is glad to avail itself of the old names and of the old divisions into "countries" and "provinces" which more nearly correspond with the geological formations as well as with the natural peculiarities of the various regions. There is a great contrast between a region such as the "Massif Central" (the Central Plateau), a rugged land inhabited by a stubborn race that is often glad to leave its fastnesses, and those lands of comfort that lie along the great Northern Plain, the valley of the Loire, and the fertile basin in which Paris stands. But in spite of this variety France is a unit. These regions, so unlike and so diversified, balance and complete each other like the limbs of a living body. As Michelet puts it, "France is a person."

**STATISTICS.**—In 1901 France had 39,031,000 inhabitants. The census no longer inquires as to the religion of French citizens, and it is only by way of approximation that we can compute the number of Catholics at 38 millions; Protestants, 600,000; Jews, 68,000. The population of the French colonies amounts to 47,680,000 inhabitants, and in consequence France stands second to England as a colonizing power; but the difference between them is very great, the colonies of England having more than 356 millions of inhabitants.

There are two points to be noted in the study of French statistics. The annual mean excess of births over deaths for each 10,000 inhabitants during the

period 1901-1905 in France was 18, while in Italy it was 106, in Austria 113, in England 121, in Germany 149, in Belgium 155. In 1907 the deaths were more numerous than the births, the number of deaths being 70,455, while that of the births was only 50,535—an excess of 19,920 deaths—and this notwithstanding the fact that in 1907 there were nearly 45,000 more marriages than in 1890. Official investigators attribute this phenomenon to sterile marriages. In 1907, in only 29 out of 86 departments, the number of births exceeded the number of deaths. It may perhaps be legitimately inferred that the sterility of marriages coincides with the decay of religious belief. Again, it is important to note the increase in population of the larger cities between the years 1789 and 1901: Marseilles, from 106,000 to 491,000; Lyons, from 139,000 to 459,000; Bordeaux, from 83,000 to 256,000; Lille, from 13,000 to 210,000; Toulouse, from 55,000 to 149,000; Saint-Etienne, from 9000 to 146,000. Paris, which in 1817 had 714,000 inhabitants, had 2,714,000 in 1901; Havre and Roubaix, which in 1821 had 17,000 and 9000 respectively, now have 130,000 and 142,000. In these great increases the multiplication of parishes has not always been proportionate to the increase of the population, and this is one of the causes of the religious indifference into which so many of the working people have fallen. It should be remembered that in former days nine-tenths of the people of France lived in the country; that while 556 out of every 1000 Frenchmen lived by agriculture in 1856, that number had fallen to 419 in 1891. The emigrants from the country hurried into the industrial towns, many of which multiplied their population by fifteen, and there, accustomed as they had been to the village bell, they found no church in the neighbourhood, and after a few brief generations the once faithful family from the country developed the faithless dweller in the town.

**HISTORY, TO THE THIRD REPUBLIC.**—The Treaty of Verdun (843) definitely established the partition of Charlemagne's empire into three independent kingdoms, and one of these was France. A great churchman, Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims (806-82), was the deviser of the new arrangement. He strongly supported the kingship of Charles the Bald, under whose sceptre he would have placed Lorraine also. To Hincmar the dream of a united Christendom did not appear under the guise of an empire, however ideal, but under the concrete form of a number of unit States, each being a member of one mighty body, the great Republic of Christendom. He would replace the empire by a Europe of which France was one member. Under Charles the Fat (880-88) it looked for a moment as if Charlemagne's empire was about to come to life again; but the illusion was temporary, and in its stead were quickly formed seven kingdoms: Francia, Navarre, Provence, Burgundy beyond the Jura, Lorraine, Germany, and Italy. Feudalism was in the seething-pot, and the imperial edifice was crumbling to dust. Towards the close of the tenth century, in the Frankish kingdom alone, twenty-nine provinces or fragments of provinces, under the sway of dukes, counts, or viscounts, constituted veritable sovereignties, and at the end of the eleventh century there were as many as fifty-five of these minor States, of greater or less importance. As early as the tenth century one of these feudal families had begun to take the lead, that of the Dukes of Francia, descendants of Robert the Strong, and lords of all the country between the Seine and the Loire. From 887 to 987 they successfully defended French soil against the invading Northmen, and Eudes, or Odo, Duke of Francia (887-898), Robert, his brother (922-923), and Raoul, or Rudolph, Robert's son-in-law (923-936), occupied the throne for a brief interval. The weakness of the later Carolingian kings was evident to all, and in 987, on the death of Louis V, Adalberon, Archbishop of Reims, at

a meeting of the chief men held at Senlis, contrasted the incapacity of the Carolingian Charles of Lorraine, the heir to the throne, with the merits of Hugh, Duke of Francia. Gerbert, who afterwards became Sylvester II, adviser and secretary to Adalberon, and Arnoul, Bishop of Orléans, also spoke in support of Hugh, with the result that he was proclaimed king. Thus the Capetian dynasty had its rise in the person of Hugh Capet. It was the work of the Church, brought to pass by the influence of the See of Reims, renowned throughout France since the episcopate of Hincmar, renowned since the days of Clovis for the privilege of anointing the Frankish kings conferred on its titular, and renowned so opportunely at this time for the learning of its episcopal school presided over by Gerbert himself.

The Church, which had set up the new dynasty, exercised a very salutary influence over French social life. That the origin and growth of the "*Chansons de geste*," i. e. of early epic literature, are closely bound up with the famous pilgrim shrines, whither the piety of the people resorted, has been recently proved by the literary labours of M. Bédier. And military courage and physical heroism were schooled and blessed by the Church, which in the early part of the eleventh century transformed chivalry from a lay institution of German origin into a religious one, by placing among its liturgical rites the ceremony of knighthood, in which the candidate promised to defend truth, justice, and the oppressed. The Congregation of Cluny, founded in 910, which made rapid progress in the eleventh century, prepared France to play an important part in the reformation of the Church undertaken in the second half of the eleventh century by a monk of Cluny, Gregory VII, and gave the Church two other popes after him, Urban II and Paschal II. It was a Frenchman, Urban II, who at the Council of Clermont (1095) started the glorious movement of the Crusades, a war taken up by Christendom when France had led the way.

The reign of Louis VI (1108-37) is of note in the history of the Church, and in that of France; in the one, because the solemn adhesion of Louis VI to Pope Innocent II assured the unity of the Church, which at the time was seriously menaced by the Antipope Anacletus; in the other, because for the first time Capetian kings took a stand as the champions of law and order against the feudal system and as the protectors of public rights. A churchman, Suger, Abbot of St-Denis, a friend of Louis VI and minister under Louis VII (1137-80), developed and realized this ideal of kingly duty. Louis VI, seconded by Suger, and counting on the support of the towns—the "*communes*," as they were called when they had obliged the feudal lords to grant them charters of freedom—fulfilled to the letter the rôle of prince as it was conceived by the theology of the Middle Ages. "*Kings have long arms*," wrote Suger, "*and it is their duty to repress with all their might, and by right of their office, the daring of those who rend the State by endless wars, who rejoice in pillage, and who destroy homesteads and churches.*" Another French churchman, St. Bernard, won Louis VII for the Crusades; and it was not his fault that Palestine, where the First Crusade had set up a Latin kingdom, did not remain a French colony in the service of the Church. The divorce of Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine (1152) marred the ascendancy of French influence by paving the way for the growth of Anglo-Norman pretensions on the soil of France from the Channel to the Pyrenees. Soon, however, by virtue of feudal laws the French king, Philip Augustus (1180-1223), proclaimed himself suzerain over Richard Cœur de Lion and John Lackland, and the victory of Bouvines which he gained over the Emperor Otto IV, backed by a coalition of feudal nobles (1214), was the first event in French history which called forth a movement of national solidarity around a French king. The war

against the Albigenses under Louis VIII (1223-26) brought in its train the establishment of the influence and authority of the French monarchy in the south of France.

St. Louis IX (1226-1270), "ruisselant de piété, et enflammé de charité", as a contemporary describes him, made kings so beloved that from his time dates that royal cult, so to speak, which was one of the moral forces in olden France, and which existed in no other country of Europe to the same degree. Piety had been for the kings of France, set on their thrones by the Church of God, as it were a duty belonging to their charge or office; but in the piety of St. Louis there was a note all his own, the note of sanctity. With him ended the Crusades, but not their spirit. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries project after project, attempt after attempt to set on foot a crusade was made, and we refer to them merely to point out that the spirit of a militant apostolate continued to ferment in the soul of France. The project of Charles of Valois (1308-09), the French expedition under Peter I of Cyprus against Alexandria and the Armenian coasts (1365-1367), sung of by the French trouvère, Guillaume Machault, the crusade of John of Nevers, which ended in the bloody battle of Nicopolis (1396)—in all these enterprises the spirit of St. Louis lived, just as in the hearts of the Christians of the East, whom France was thus trying to protect, there has survived a lasting gratitude towards the nation of St. Louis. If the feeble nation of the Maronites cries out to-day to France for help, it is because of a letter written by St. Louis to the nation of St. Maroun in May, 1250. In the days of St. Louis the influence of French epic literature in Europe was supreme. Brunetto Latini, as early as the middle of the thirteenth century, wrote that "of all speech [*parlures*] that of the French was the most charming, and the most in favour with every one." French held sway in England until the middle of the fourteenth century; it was fluently spoken at the Court of Constantinople from the time of the Fourth Crusade, and in Greece in the dukedoms, principalities and baronies founded there by the Houses of Burgundy and Champagne. And it was in French that Rusticiano of Pisa, about the year 1300, wrote down from Marco Polo's lips the story of his wonderful travels. The University of Paris, founded by favour of Innocent III between 1208 and 1213, was saved from a spirit of exclusiveness by the happy intervention of Alexander IV, who obliged it to open its chairs to the mendicant friars. Among its professors were Duns Scotus; the Italians, St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure; Albert the Great, a German; Alexander of Hales, an Englishman. Among its pupils it counted Roger Bacon, Dante, Raimundus Lullus, Popes Gregory IX, Urban IV, Clement IV, and Boniface VIII.

France was also the birthplace of Gothic art, which was carried by French architects into Germany. The method employed in the building of many Gothic cathedrals—i. e. by the actual assistance of the faithful—bears witness to the fact that at this period the lives of the French people were deeply penetrated with faith. An architectural wonder such as the cathedral of Chartres was in reality the work of a popular art born of the faith of the people who worshipped there.

Under Philip IV, the Fair (1285-1314), the royal house of France became very powerful. By means of alliances he extended his prestige as far as the Orient. His brother Charles of Valois married Catherine de Courtenay, an heiress of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. The Kings of England and Minorca were his vassals, the King of Scotland his ally, the Kings of Naples and of Hungary connexions by marriage. He aimed at a sort of supremacy over the body politic of Europe. Pierre Dubois, his jurisconsult, dreamed that the pope would hand over all his domains to Philip and receive in exchange an annual income,

while Philip would thus have the spiritual head of Christendom under his influence. Philip IV laboured to increase the royal prerogative and thereby the national unity of France. By sending magistrates into the feudal territories, by defining certain cases (*cas royaux*) as reserved to the king's competency, he dealt a heavy blow to the feudalism of the Middle Ages. But on the other hand under his rule many anti-Christian maxims began to creep into law and politics. Roman law was slowly reintroduced into the social organization, and gradually the idea of a united Christendom disappeared from the national policy. Philip the Fair, pretending to rule by Divine right, gave it to be understood that he rendered an account of his kingship to no one under heaven. He denied the pope's right to represent, as the papacy had always done in the past, the claims of morality and justice where kings were concerned. Hence arose in 1294-1303, his struggle with Pope Boniface VIII, but in that struggle he was cunning enough to secure the support of the States-General, which represented public opinion in France. In later times, after centuries of monarchical government, this same public opinion rose against the abuse of power committed by its kings in the name of their pretended Divine right, and thus made an implicit *amende honorable* to what the Church had taught concerning the origin, the limits, and the responsibility of all power, and which had been forgotten or misinterpreted by the lawyers of Philip IV when they set up their pagan concept of the State as the absolute source of power. The election of Pope Clement V (1305) under Philip's influence, the removal of the papacy to Avignon, the nomination of seven French popes in succession, weakened the influence of the papacy in Christendom, though it has recently come to light that the Avignon popes did not always allow the independence of the Holy See to waver or disappear in the game of politics. Philip IV and his successors may have had the illusion that they were taking the place of the German emperors in European affairs. The papacy was imprisoned on their territory; the German Empire was passing through a crisis, was, in fact, decaying, and the kings of France might well imagine themselves temporal vicars of God, side by side with, or even in opposition to, the spiritual vicar who lived at Avignon.

But at this juncture the Hundred Years War broke out, and the French kingdom, which aspired to be the arbiter of Christendom, was menaced in its very existence by England. English kings aimed at the French crown, and the two nations fought for the possession of Guienne. Twice during the war was the independence of France imperilled. Defeated on the Ecluse (1340), at Crécy (1346), at Poitiers (1356), France was saved by Charles V (1364-80) and by Duguesclin, only to suffer fresh defeat under Charles VI at Agincourt (1415) and to be ceded by the Treaty of Troyes (1420) to Henry V, King of England. At this darkest hour of the monarchy the nation itself was stirred. The revolutionary attempt by Etienne Marcel (1358) and the revolt which gave rise to the *Ordonnance Cabochienne* (1418) were the earliest signs of popular impatience at the absolutism of the French kings, but internal dissensions hindered an effective patriotic defence of the country. When Charles VII came to the throne, France had almost ceased to be French. The king and court lived beyond the Loire, and Paris was the seat of an English government. Blessed Joan of Arc was the saviour of French nationality as well as French royalty, and at the end of Charles's reign (1422-61) Calais was the only spot in France in the hands of the English.


The ideal of a united Christendom continued to haunt the soul of France in spite of the predominating influence gradually assumed in French politics by purely national aspirations. From the reign of

Charles VI, or even the last years of Charles V, dates the custom of giving to the French kings the exclusive title of *Rex Christianissimus*. Pepin the Short and Charlemagne had been proclaimed "Most Christian" by the popes of their day; Alexander III had conferred the same title on Louis VII; but from Charles VI onwards the title comes into constant use as the special prerogative of the kings of France. "Because of the vigour with which Charlemagne, St. Louis, and other brave French kings, more than the other kings of Christendom, have upheld the Catholic Faith, the kings of France are known among the kings of Christendom as 'Most Christian'." Thus wrote Philippe de Mézières, a contemporary of Charles VI. In later times the Emperor Frederick III, addressing Charles VII, wrote: "Your ancestors have won for your name the title *Most Christian*, as a heritage not to be separated from it." From the pontificate of Paul II (1464) the popes, in addressing Bulls to the kings of France, always use the style and title *Rex Christianissimus*. Furthermore, European public opinion always looked on Bl. Joan of Arc, who saved the French monarchy, as the heroine of Christendom, and believed that the Maid of Orléans meant to lead the king of France on another crusade when she had secured him in the peaceful possession of his own country. France's national heroine was thus heralded by the fancy of her contemporaries, by Christine de Pisan, and by that Venetian merchant whose letters have been preserved for us in the Morosini Chronicle, as a heroine whose aims were as wide as Christianity itself.

The fifteenth century, during which France was growing in national spirit, and while men's minds in France were still conscious of the claims of Christendom on their country, was also the century during which, on the morrow of the Great Schism and of the Councils of Basle and of Constance, there began a movement among the powerful feudal bishops against pope and king, and which aimed at the emancipation of the Gallican Church. The propositions upheld by Gerson, and forced by him, as representing the University of Paris, on the Council of Constance, would have set up in the Church an aristocratic regime analogous to what the feudal lords, profiting by the weakness of King Charles VI, had dreamed of establishing in the State. A royal proclamation, in 1418, issued after the election of Pope Martin V, maintained in opposition to the pope "all the privileges and franchises of the kingdom", put an end to the custom of annates, limited the rights of the Roman court in collecting benefices, and forbade the sending to Rome of articles of gold or silver. This proclamation was assented to by the young King Charles VII in 1423, but at the same time he sent Pope Martin V an embassy asking to be absolved from the oath he had taken to uphold the principles of the Gallican Church and seeking to arrange a concordat which would give the French

king a right of patronage over 500 benefices in his kingdom. This was the beginning of the practice adopted by the French kings of arranging the government of the Church directly with the popes over the heads of the bishops. Charles VII, whose struggle with England had left his authority still very precarious, was constrained, in 1438, during the Council of Basle, in order to appease the powerful prelates of the Assembly of Bourges, to promulgate the Pragmatic Sanction, thereby asserting in France those maxims of the Council of Basle which Pope Eugene IV had condemned. But straightway he bethought him of a concordat, and overtures in this sense were made to Eugene IV. Eugene replied that "he well knew the Pragmatic Sanction—"that odious act"—was not the king's own free doing, and a concordat was discussed between them. Louis XI (1461-83),

whose domestic policy aimed at ending or weakening the new feudalism which had grown up during two centuries through the custom of presenting appanages to the brothers of the king, extended to the feudal bishops the ill will he professed towards the feudal lords. He detested the Pragmatic Sanction as an act that strengthened ecclesiastical feudalism, and on 27 November, 1461, he announced to the pope its suppression. At the same time he pleaded, as the demand of his Parliament, that for the future the pope should permit the collation to ecclesiastical benefices to be made either wholly or in part through the civil power. The Concordat of 1472 obtained from Rome very material concessions in this respect. At this time, besides "episcopal Gallicanism", against which pope and king were working together, we may trace, in the writings of the lawyers of the closing years of the fifteenth century, the beginnings of a "royal Gallicanism" which taught that in France



CATHEDRAL OF SAINTE-CÉCILE, ALBI

the State should govern the Church.

The Italian wars undertaken by Charles VIII (1493-98), and continued by Louis XII (1498-1515), aided by an excellent corps of artillery and all the resources of French *furia*, to assert certain French claims over Naples and Milan, did not quite fulfil the dreams of the French kings. They had, however, a threefold result in the worlds of politics, religion, and art. Politically, they led foreign powers to believe that France was a menace to the balance of power; and hence arose alliances to maintain that balance, such, for instance, as the League of Venice (1495) and the Holy League (1511-12). From the point of view of art they carried a breath of the Renaissance across the Alps. And in the religious world they furnished France an opportunity on Italian soil of asserting for the first time the principles of royal Gallicanism. Louis XII and the Emperor Maximilian, supported by the opponents of Pope Julius II, convened in Pisa a council that threatened the rights of the Holy See. Matters looked very serious. The understanding between the pope and the French kings hung in the bal-

ance. Leo X understood the danger when the victory of Marignano opened to Francis I the road to Rome. The pope in alarm retired to Bologna, and the Concordat of 1516, negotiated between the cardinals and Duprat, the chancellor, and afterwards approved of by the Œcumenical Council of the Lateran, recognized the right of the King of France to nominate not only to 500 ecclesiastical benefices, as Charles VII had requested, but to all the benefices in his kingdom. It was a fair gift indeed. But if in matters temporal the bishops were thus in the king's hands, their institution in matters spiritual was reserved to the pope. Pope and king by common agreement thus put an end to an episcopal aristocracy such as the Gallicans of the great councils had dreamed of. The concordat between Leo X and Francis I was tantamount to a solemn repudiation of all the anti-Roman work of the great councils of the fifteenth century. The conclusion of this concordat was one of the reasons why France escaped the Reformation. From the moment that the disposal of church property, as laid down by the concordat, belonged to the civil power, royalty had nothing to gain from the Reformation. Whereas the kings of England and the German princelings saw in the Reformation a chance to gain possession of ecclesiastical property, the kings of France, thanks to the concordat, were already in legal possession of those much-envied goods. When Charles V became King of Spain (1516) and emperor (1519), thus uniting in his person the hereditary possessions of the Houses of Austria and Germany, as well as the old domains of the House of Burgundy in the Low Countries—uniting, moreover, the Spanish Monarchy with Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, the Northern parts of Africa, and certain lands in America, Francis I inaugurated a struggle between France and the House of Austria. After forty-four years of war, from the victory of Marignano to the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1515–59), France relinquished hopes of retaining possession of Italy, but had wrested the Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun from the empire and had won back possession of Calais. The Spaniards were left in possession of Naples and the country around Milan, and their influence predominated throughout the Italian Peninsula. But the dream which Charles V had for a brief moment entertained of a world-wide empire had been shattered.


During this struggle against the House of Austria, France, for motives of political and military exigency, had been obliged to lean on the Lutherans of Germany, and even on the sultan. The foreign policy of France since the time of Francis I has been to seek exclusively the good of the nation and no longer to be guided by the interests of Catholicism at large. The France of the Crusades even became the ally of the sultan. But, by a strange anomaly, this new political grouping allowed France to continue its protection to the Christians of the East. In the Middle Ages it protected them by force of arms; but since the sixteenth century, by treaties called capitulations, the first of which was drawn up in 1535. The spirit of French policy has changed, but it is always on France that the Christian communities of the East rely, and this protectorate continues to exist under the Third Republic, and has never failed them.

The early part of the sixteenth century was marked by the growth of Protestantism in France, under the forms of Lutheranism and of Calvinism. Lutheranism was the first to make its entry. The minds of some in France were already prepared to receive it. Six years before Luther's time, the mathematician Lefebvre of Etaples (Faber Stapulensis), a protégé of Louis XII and of Francis I, had preached the necessity of reading the Scriptures and of "bringing back religion to its primitive purity". A certain number of tradesmen, some of whom, for business reasons, had travelled in Germany, and a few priests, were infatuated with the Lutheran ideas. Until 1534, Francis

I was almost favourable to the Lutherans, and he even proposed to make Melancthon President of the Collège de France. But on learning, in 1534, that violent placards against the Church of Rome had been posted on the same day in many of the large towns, and even near the king's own room in the Château d'Amboise, he feared a Lutheran plot; an inquiry was ordered, and seven Lutherans were condemned to death and burned at the stake in Paris. Eminent ecclesiastics like du Bellay, Archbishop of Paris, and Sadolet, Bishop of Carpentras, deplored these executions and the Vaudois massacre ordered by d'Oppède, President of the Parliament of Aix, in 1545. Laymen, on the other hand, who ill understood the Christian gentleness of these prelates, reproached them with being slow and remiss in putting down heresy; and when, under Henry II, Calvinism crept in from Geneva, a policy of persecution was inaugurated. From 1547 to 1550, in less than three years, the *chambre ardente*, a committee of the Parliament of Paris, condemned more than 500 persons to retract their beliefs, to imprisonment, or to death at the stake. Notwithstanding this, the Calvinists, in 1555, were able to organize themselves into Churches on the plan of that at Geneva; and, in order to bind these Churches more closely together, they held a synod at Paris in 1559. There were in France at that time seventy-two Reformed Churches; two years later, in 1561, the number had increased to 2000. The methods, too, of the Calvinist propaganda had changed. The earlier Calvinists, like the Lutherans, had been artisans and workingmen, but in the course of time, in the South and in the West, a number of princes and noblemen joined their ranks. Among these were two princes of the blood, descendants of St. Louis: Anthony of Bourbon, who became King of Navarre through his marriage with Jeanne d'Albret, and his brother the Prince de Condé. Another name of note is that of Admiral de Coligny, nephew of that Duke of Montmorency who was the Premier Baron of Christendom. Thus it came to pass that in France Calvinism was no longer a religious force, but had become a political and military cabal; and the French kings in opposing it were but defending their own rights.

Such was the beginning of the Wars of Religion. They had for their starting-point the Conspiracy of Amboise (1560) by which the Protestant leaders aimed at seizing the person of Francis II, in order to remove him from the influence of Francis of Guise. During the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III, a powerful influence was exercised by the queen-mother, who made use of the conflicts between the opposing religious factions to establish more securely the power of her sons. In 1561 Catharine de' Medici arranged for the Poissy discussion to try and bring about an understanding between the two creeds, but during the Wars of Religion she ever maintained an equivocal attitude between both parties, favouring now the one and now the other, until the time came when, fearing that Charles IX would shake himself free of her influence, she took a large share of responsibility in the odious massacre of St. Bartholomew. There were eight of these wars in the space of thirty years. The first was started by a massacre of Calvinists at Vassy by the troopers of Guise (1 March, 1562), and straightway both parties appealed for foreign aid. Catharine, who was at this time working in the Catholic cause, turned to Spain; Coligny and Condé turned to Elizabeth of England and handed over to her the port of Havre. Thus from the beginning were foreshadowed the lines which the Wars of Religion would follow. They opened up France to the interference of such foreign princes as Elizabeth and Philip II, and to the plunder of foreign soldiers, such as those of the Duke of Alba and the German troopers (*Reiter*) called in by the Protestants. One after another, these wars ended in weak provisional treaties which did not last. Under





THE RELIQUARY OF ST. GENEVIEVE  
PROCESSION OF THE CITIZENS OF PARIS IN PENITENTIAL GARB, 1496  
MAILLOT, THE PANTHEON, PARIS



the banners of the Reformation party or under those of the League organized by the House of Guise to defend Catholicism, political opinions ranged themselves, and during these thirty years of civil disorder monarchical centralization was often in danger of overthrow. Had the Guise party prevailed, the trend of policy adopted by the French monarchy towards Catholicism after the Concordat of Francis I would have assuredly been less Gallican. That concordat had placed the Church in France and its episcopate in the hands of the king. The old episcopal Gallicanism which held that the authority of the pope was not above that of the Church assembled in council, and the royal Gallicanism, which held that the king had no superior on earth, not even the pope, were now allied against the papal monarchy strengthened by the Council of Trent. The consequence of all this was that the French kings refused to allow the decisions of that council to be published in France, and this refusal has never been withdrawn.

At the end of the sixteenth century it seemed for an instant as though the home policy of France was to shake off the yoke of Gallican opinions. Feudalism had been broken; the people were eager for liberty; the Catholics, disheartened by the corruption of the Valois court, contemplated elevating to the throne, in succession to Henry III, who was childless, a member of the powerful House of Guise. In fact, the League had asked the Holy See to grant the wish of the people, and give France a Guise as king. Henry of Navarre, the heir presumptive to the throne, was a Protestant; Sixtus V had given him the choice of remaining a Protestant, and never reigning in France, or of abjuring his heresy, receiving absolution from the pope himself, and, together with it, the throne of France. But there was a third solution possible, and the French episcopate foresaw it, namely, that the abjuration should be made not to the pope, but to the French bishops. Gallican susceptibilities would thus be satisfied, dogmatic orthodoxy would be maintained on the French throne, and moreover it would do away with the danger to which the unity of France was exposed by the proneness of a certain number of Leaguers to encourage the intervention of Spanish armies and the ambitions of the Spanish king, Philip II, who cherished the idea of setting his own daughter on the throne of France.

The abjuration of Henry IV made to the French bishops (25 July, 1593) was a victory of Catholicism over Protestantism, but none the less it was the victory of episcopal Gallicanism over the spirit of the League. Canonically, the absolution given by the bishops to Henry IV was unavailing, since the pope alone could lawfully give it; but politically that absolution was bound to have a decisive effect. From the day that Henry IV became a Catholic, the League was beaten. Two French prelates went to Rome to crave absolution for Henry. St. Philip Neri ordered Baronius—smiling, no doubt, as he did so—to tell the pope, whose confessor he, Baronius, was, that he himself could not have absolution until he had absolved the King of France. And on 17 September, 1595, the Holy See solemnly absolved Henry IV, thereby sealing the reconciliation between the French monarchy and the Church of Rome. The accession of the Bourbon royal family was a defeat for Protestantism, but at the same time half a victory for Gallicanism. Ever since the year 1598 the dealings of the Bourbons with Protestantism were regulated by the Edict of Nantes. This instrument not only accorded to Protestants the liberty of practising their religion in their own homes, in those towns and villages where it had been established before 1597, and in two localities in each *bailliage*, but it also opened to them all employments and created mixed tribunals in which the judges were chosen equally from among Catholics and Calvinists; it

furthermore made them a political power by recognizing them for eight years as masters of about one hundred towns which were known as "places of surety" (*places de sûreté*). Under favour of the political clauses of the Edict the Protestants rapidly became an *imperium in imperio*, and in 1627, at La Rochelle, they formed an alliance with England to defend, against the government of Louis XIII (1610–43), the privileges of which Cardinal Richelieu, the king's minister, wished to deprive them. The taking of La Rochelle by the king's troops (November, 1628), after a siege of fourteen months, and the submission of the Protestant rebels in the Cévennes, resulted in a royal decision which Richelieu called the *Grâce d'Alais*: the Protestants lost all their political privileges and all their "places of surety", but on the other hand freedom of worship and absolute equality with the Catholics were guaranteed them. Both Cardinal Richelieu and his successor, Cardinal Mazarin, scrupulously observed this guarantee, but under Louis XIV a new policy was inaugurated. For twenty-five years the king forbade the Protestants everything that the Edict of Nantes did not expressly guarantee them, and then, foolishly imagining that Protestantism was on the wane, and that there remained in France only a few hundred obstinate heretics, he revoked the Edict of Nantes (1685) and began an oppressive policy against Protestants, which provoked the rising of the Camisards in 1703–05, and which lasted with alternations of severity and kindness until 1784, when Louis XVI was obliged to give Protestants their civil rights once more. The very manner in which Louis XIV, who imagined himself the religious head of his kingdom, set about the Revocation, was only an application of the religious maxims of Gallicanism.

In the person of Louis XIV, indeed, Gallicanism was on the throne. At the States-General, in 1614, the *tiers état* had endeavoured to make the assembly commit itself to certain decidedly Gallican declarations, but the clergy, thanks to Cardinal Duperron, had succeeded in shelving the question; then Richelieu, careful not to embroil himself with the pope, had taken up the mitigated and very reserved form of Gallicanism represented by the theologian Duval. As for Louis XIV, he considers himself a God on earth—his religion is the State's; every subject who does not hold that religion is outside of the State. Hence the persecutions of Protestants and of Jansenists. But at the same time he would never allow a papal Bull to be published in France until his Parliament had decided whether it interfered with the "liberties" of the French Church or the authority of the king. And in 1682 he invited the clergy of France to proclaim the independence of the Gallican Church in a manifesto of four articles, at least two of which—relating to the respective powers of pope and a council—broached questions which only an œcumenical council could decide. In consequence of this a crisis arose between the Holy See and Louis XIV which led to thirty-five sees being left vacant in 1689. The policy of Louis XIV in religious matters was adopted also by Louis XV. His way of striking at the Jesuits in 1763 was in principle the same as that taken by Louis XIV to impose Gallicanism on the Church—the royal power pretending to mastery over the Church. The domestic policy of the seventeenth-century Bourbons, aided by Sully, Richelieu, Mazarin, and Louvois, completed the centralization of the kingly power. Abroad, the fundamental maxim of their policy was to keep up the struggle against the House of Austria. The result of the diplomacy of Richelieu (1624–42) and of Mazarin (1643–1661) was a fresh defeat for the House of Austria; French arms were victorious at Rocroi, Fribourg, Nördlingen, Lens, Sommershausen (1643–48), and, by the Peace of Westphalia (1648) and that of the Pyrenees (1659), Alsace, Artois, and Roussillon were annexed to French territory. In the struggle

Richelieu and Mazarin had the support of the Lutheran princes of Germany and of Protestant countries such as the Sweden of Gustavus Adolphus. In fact it may be laid down that during the Thirty Years War, France upheld Protestantism. Louis XIV, on the contrary, who for many years was arbiter of the destinies of Europe, was actuated by purely religious motives in some of his wars. Thus the war against Holland, that against the League of Augsburg, and his intervention in the affairs of England were in some respects the result of a religious policy and of a desire to uphold Catholicism in Europe. The expeditions in the Mediterranean against the pirates of Barbary have all the halo of the old ideals of Christendom—ideals which in the days of Louis XIII had haunted the mind of Father Joseph, the famous confidant of Richelieu, and had inspired him with the dream of crusades led by France, once the House of Austria should have been defeated.

The long and complex reign of Louis XIV, in spite of the disasters which mark its close, gained for France possession of Flanders and of Franche-Comté, and saw a Bourbon, Philip V, grandson of Louis XIV, seated on the throne of Spain. The seventeenth century in France was *par excellence* a century of Catholic awakening. A number of bishops set about reforming their dioceses according to the rules laid down by the Council of Trent, though its decrees did not run officially in France. The example of Italy bore fruit all over the country. Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, Bishop of Clermont and afterwards of Senlis, had made the acquaintance of St. Charles Borromeo. Francis Taurugi, a companion of St. Philip Neri, was Archbishop of Avignon. St. Francis de Sales Christianized lay society by his "Introduction to the Devout Life", which he wrote at the request of Henry IV. Cardinal de Bérulle and his disciple de Condren founded the Oratory. St. Vincent de Paul, in founding the Priests of the Mission, and M. Olier, in founding the Sulpicians, prepared the uplifting of the secular clergy and the development of the *grands séminaires*. It was the period, too, when France began to build up her colonial empire, when Samuel de Champlain was founding prosperous settlements in Acadia and Canada. At the suggestion of Père Coton, confessor to Henry IV, the Jesuits followed in the wake of the colonists; they made Quebec the capital of all that country, and gave it a Frenchman, Mgr. de Montmorency-Laval, as its first bishop. The first apostles of the Iroquois were the French Jesuits, Lallemand and de Brébeuf; and it was the French missionaries, as much as the traders who opened postal communication over 500 leagues of country between the French colonies of Louisiana and Canada. In China the French Jesuits, by their scientific labours, gained a real influence at Court and converted at least one Chinese prince. Lastly, from the beginning of this same seventeenth century, under the protection of Gontaut-Biron, Marquis de Salignac, Ambassador of France, dates the establishment of the Jesuits at Smyrna, in the Archipelago, in Syria, and at Cairo. A Capuchin, Père Joseph du Tremblay, Richelieu's confessor, established many Capuchin foundations in the East. A pious Parisian lady, Madame Ricouard, gave a sum of money for the erection of a bishopric at Babylon, and its first bishop was a French Carmelite, Jean Duval. St. Vincent de Paul sent the Lazarists into the galleys and prisons of Barbary, and among the islands of Madagascar, Bourbon, Mauritius, and the Mascarenes, to take possession of them in the name of France. On the advice of the Jesuit Father de Rhodes, Propaganda and France decided to erect bishoprics in Annam, and in 1660 and in 1661 three French bishops, François Pallu, Pierre Lambert de Lamoignon, and Cotelendi, set out for the East. It was the activity of the French missionaries that paved the way for the

visit of the Siamese envoys to the court of Louis XIV. In 1663 the Seminary for Foreign Missions was founded, and in 1700 the Société des Missions Étrangères received its approved constitution, which has never been altered.

To repeat a saying of Ferdinand Brunetière, the eighteenth century was the least Christian and the least French century in the history of France. Religiously speaking, the alliance of parliamentary Gallicanism with Jansenism weakened the idea of religion in an atmosphere already threatened by the philosophers, and although the monarchy continued to keep the style and title of "Most Christian", unbelief and libertinage were harboured, and at times defended, at the court of Louis XV (1715-74), in the salons, and among the aristocracy. Politically, the traditional strife between France and the House of Austria ended, about the middle of the eighteenth century, with the famous *Renversement des Alliances* (see CHOISEUL, ETIENNE-FRANÇOIS, DUC DE FLEURY, ANDRÉ-HERCULE DE). This century is filled with that struggle between France and England which may be called the second Hundred Years War, during which England had for an ally Frederick II, King of Prussia, a country which was then rapidly rising in importance. The command of the sea was at stake. In spite of men like Dupleix, Lally-Tollendal, and Montcalm, France lightly abandoned its colonies by successive treaties, the most important of which was the Treaty of Paris (1763). The acquisition of Lorraine (1766) and the purchase of Corsica from the Genoese (1768) were poor compensations for these losses; and when, under Louis XVI, the French navy once more lifted its head, it helped in the revolt of the English colonies in America, and thus seconded the emancipation of the United States (1778-83).

The movement of thought of which Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot, each in his own fashion, had been protagonists, an impatience provoked by the abuses incident to a too centralized monarchy, and the yearning for equality which was deeply agitating the French people, all prepared the explosion of the French Revolution. That upheaval has too long been regarded as a break in the history of France. The researches of Albert Sorel have proved that the diplomatic traditions of the old regime were perpetuated under the Revolution; the idea of the State's ascendancy over the Church, which had actuated the ministers of Louis XIV and the adherents of the Parliament—the *parlementaires*—in the days of Louis XV, reappears with the authors of the "Civil Constitution of the Clergy", even as the centralizing spirit of the old monarchy reappears with the administrative officials and the commissaries of the Convention. It is easier to cut off a king's head than to change the mental constitution of a people.

The Constituent Assembly (5 May, 1789-30 September, 1791) rejected the motion of the Abbé d'Eymar declaring the Catholic religion to be the religion of the State, but it did not thereby mean to place the Catholic religion on the same level as other religions. Voulant, addressing the Assembly on the seaminess of having one dominant religion, declared that the Catholic religion was founded on too pure a moral basis not to be given the first place. Article 10 of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" (August, 1789) proclaimed toleration, stipulating "that no one ought to be interfered with because of his opinions, even religious, provided that their manifestation does not disturb public order" (*pourvu que leur manifestation ne trouble pas l'ordre public établi par là*). It was by virtue of the suppression of feudal privileges, and in accordance with the ideas professed by the lawyers of the old regime where church property was in question that the Constituent Assembly abolished tithes and confiscated the possessions of the Church, replacing them by an annual grant from the treasury. The

"Civil Constitution of the Clergy" was a more serious interference with the life of French Catholicism, and it was drawn up at the instigation of Jansenist lawyers. Without referring to the pope, it set up a new division into dioceses, gave the voters, no matter who they might be, a right to nominate parish priests and bishops, ordered metropolitans to take charge of the canonical institution of their suffragans, and forbade the bishops to seek a Bull of confirmation in office from Rome. The Constituent Assembly required all priests to swear to obey this constitution, which received the unwilling sanction of Louis XVI, 26 December, 1790, and was condemned by Pius VI. By Briefs dated 10 March and 13 April, Pope Pius VI forbade the priests to take the oath, and the majority obeyed him. Against these "unsworn" (*insermentés*) or "refractory" priests a period of persecution soon began. The Legislative Assembly (1 October, 1791–21 September, 1792), while it prepared the way for the republic which both the great parties (the Mountain and the Girondists) equally wished, only aggravated the religious difficulty. On 29 November, 1791, it decreed that those priests who had not accepted the "Civil Constitution" would be required within a week to swear allegiance to the nation, to the law, and to the king, under pain of having their allowances stopped and of being held as suspects. The king refused to approve this, and (26 August, 1792) it decreed that all refractory priests should leave France under pain of ten years' imprisonment or transportation to Guiana.

The Convention (21 September, 1792–26 October, 1795), which proclaimed the Republic and caused Louis XVI to be executed (21 January, 1793), followed a very tortuous policy towards religion. As early as 13 November, 1792, Cambon, in the name of the Financial Committee, announced to the Convention that he would speedily submit a scheme of general reform including the suppression of the appropriation for religious worship, which, he asserted, "cost the republic 100,000,000 livres annually". The Jacobins opposed this scheme as premature, and Robespierre declared it derogatory to public morality. During the first eight months of its existence the policy of the Convention was to maintain the "Civil Constitution" and to increase the penalties against "refractory" priests who were suspected of complicity in the Vendée rising. A decree dated 18 March, 1793, punished with death all compromised priests. It no longer aimed at refractory priests only, but any ecclesiastic accused of disloyalty (*incivisme*) by any six citizens became liable to transportation. In the eyes of the Revolution there were no longer good priests and bad priests; for the *sans-culottes* every priest was a suspect.

Then, from the provinces, stirred up by the propaganda of André Dumont, Chaumette, and Fouché, there began the movement of dechristianization. The constitutional bishop, Gobel, abdicated in November, 1793, together with his vicars-general. At the feast of Liberty which took place in Notre-Dame on 10 November an altar was set up to the Goddess of Reason, and the church of Our Lady became the temple of that goddess. Some days after this a deputation attired in priestly vestments, in mockery of Catholic worship, paraded before the Convention. The Commune of

Paris, on 24 November, 1793, with Chaumette as its spokesman, demanded the closing of all churches. But the Committee of Public Safety was in favour of temporizing, to avoid frightening the populace and scandalizing Europe. On 21 November, 1793, Robespierre, speaking from the Jacobin tribune of the Convention, protested against the violence of the dechristianizing party, and in December the Committee of Public Safety induced the Convention to pass a decree assuring liberty of worship, and forbidding the closing of the Catholic churches. Everywhere throughout the provinces civil war was breaking out between the peasants, who clung to their faith and religion, and the fanatics of the Revolution, who, in the name of patriotism threatened, as they said, by the priests, were overturning the altars. According to the locality in which they happened to be, the propagandists either encouraged or hindered this violence against religion; but even in the very bitterest days of the Terror there was never a moment when Catholic worship was suppressed throughout France.

When Robespierre had sent the partisans of Hébert and of Danton to the scaffold, he attempted to set up in France what he called *la religion de l'Etre Suprême*. Liberty of conscience was suppressed, but atheism was also a crime. Quoting the words of Rousseau about the indispensable dogmas, Robespierre had himself acclaimed as a religious leader, a pontiff, and a dictator; and the worship of the *Etre Suprême* was held up by his supporters as the religious embodiment of patriotism. But after the 9th of Thermidor Cambon proposed once more the principle of separation between Church and State, and it was decided that henceforth the Republic would not pay the expenses of any form of worship (18 September, 1794). The Convention next voted the laicization of the primary schools, and the establishment, at intervals of ten days, of feasts called *fêtes*



SAINTE-CHAPELLE, PARIS

*décadaires*. When Bishop Grégoire in a speech ventured to hope that Catholicism would some day spring up anew, the Convention protested. Nevertheless the people in the provinces were anxious that the clergy should resume their functions, and "constitutional" priests, less in danger than others, rebuilt the altars here and there throughout the country. In February, 1795, Boissy-d'Anglas carried a measure of religious liberty, and the very next day Mass was said in all the chapels of Paris. On Easter Sunday, 1795, in the same city which a few months before had applauded the worship of Reason, almost every shop closed its doors. In May, 1795, the Convention restored the churches for worship, on condition that the pastors should submit to the laws of the State; in September, 1795, less than a month before its dissolution, it regulated liberty of worship by a police law, and enacted severe penalties against priests liable to transportation or imprisonment who should venture back on French soil. The Directory (27 October, 1795–9 November, 1799), which succeeded the Convention, imposed on all religious ministers (Fructidor, Year V) the obligation of swearing hatred to royalty and anarchy. A certain number of "papist" priests took the oath and the "papist" religion was thus established here and there, though it continued to be disturbed by the incessant arbitrary acts of interference on the part of the



administrative staff of the Directory, who by individual warrants deported priests charged with inciting to disturbance. In this way 1657 French, and 8235 Belgian, priests were driven into exile. The aim of the Directory was to substitute for Catholicism the *culte décadaire*, and for Sunday observance the rest on the *décadis*, or tenth days. In Paris fifteen churches were given over to this cult. The Directory also favoured the unofficial attempt of Chemin, the writer, and a few of his friends to set up a kind of national Church under the name of "Theophilanthropy"; but Theophilanthropy and the *culte décadaire*, while they disturbed the Church, did not satisfy the needs of the people for priests, altars, and the traditional festivals.

All these were restored by the Concordat of Napoleon Bonaparte, who became Consul for ten years on 4 November, 1799. The Concordat assured to French Catholicism, in spite of the interpolation of the *articles organiques*, a hundred years of peace. The conduct of Napoleon I, when he became emperor (18 May, 1804), towards Pius VII was most offensive to the papacy; but even during those years when Napoleon was ill-treating Pius VII and keeping him a prisoner, Catholicism in France was reviving and expanding day by day. Numerous religious congregations came to life again or grew up rapidly, often under the guidance of simple priests or humble women. The Sisters of the Christian Schools of Mercy, who work in hospitals and schools, date from 1802, as do also the Sisters of Providence of Langres; the Sisters of Mercy of Montauban from 1804; the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus at St-Julien-du-Gua date from 1805. In 1806 we have the Sisters of Reuilly-sur-Loire, founded by the Abbé Dujarie; the Sisters of St. Regis at Aubenas, founded by the Abbé Therne; the Sisters of Notre-Dame de Bon Secours at Charly; the Sisters of Mercy of Billom. The Sisters of Wisdom founded by Blessed Grignon de Montfort remodelled their institutions at this time in La Vendée, and Madame Dupleix was founding at Lyons and at Dorat the Confraternity of Mary and Joseph for visiting the prisons. The year 1807 saw the coming of the Sisters of Christian Teaching and Nursing (*de l'Instruction chrétienne et des Malades*) of St-Gildas-des-Bois founded by the Abbé Deshayes, and the great teaching order of the Sisters of Ste-Chrétienne of Metz. In 1809 there appeared in Aveyron the Sisters of the Blessed Virgin Mary; in 1810, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Vaur (Ardèche), the Sisters Hospitaliers of Rennes, and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny.—Such was the fruit of eight years of religious revival, and the list could easily be continued through the years that followed.

In the Wars of the Revolution, which began 20 April, 1792, the French missionary qualities which, under the old regime, had been employed in the service of the Christian ideal were consecrated to "the Rights of Man" and to emancipating the people from "the tyrants"; but in the Napoleonic Wars which followed, these very peoples, fired with principles of liberty which had come to them from France, expressed their newly developed national consciousness in a struggle against French armies. In this way the propaganda of the Revolution had in the end a disastrous reaction, on the very country where its ideals originated. During the nineteenth century France was destined to undertake several wars for the emancipation of nationalities—the Greek War (1827–28) under the Restoration; the Italian War (1859) under the Second Empire—and it was in the name of the principle of nationality that the Second Empire allowed German unity to grow until, in 1870, it had reached its full growth at the expense of France.

Under the Restoration parliamentary government was introduced into France. The Revolution of July, 1830, the "liberal" and "bourgeois" revolution, asserted against the absolutism of Charles X those rights which had been guaranteed to Frenchmen by

the Constitution—the "Charte" as it was called—and brought to the throne Louis Philippe, Duke of Orléans, during whose reign, as "King of the French", the establishment of French rule in Algeria was finally completed. One of the most admirable charitable institutions of French origin dates from the July Monarchy, namely the Little Sisters of the Poor begun (1840) by Jeanne Jugan, Fanchon Aubert, Marie Jamet, and Virginie Trédaniel, poor working-women who formed themselves into an association to take care of one blind old woman. In 1900 the congregation thus begun counted more than 3000 Little Sisters distributed among 250 to 260 houses all over the world, and caring for 28,000 old people. Under the July Monarchy, also, the conferences of St. Vincent de Paul were founded, the first of them at Paris, in May, 1833, by pious laymen under the prompting of Ozanam, for the material and moral assistance of poor families; in 1900 there were in France alone 1224 of these conferences, and in the whole world 5000. In 1895 the city of Paris had 208 conferences caring for 7908 families. The mean annual receipts of the conferences of St. Vincent de Paul in the whole of France amount to 2,198,566 francs (\$440,000.00 or £88,000), and the mean annual expenditure 2,221,035 francs (\$444,000.00 or £88,800). In 1906 the receipts of the conferences all over the world amounted to 13,453,228 francs (\$2,690,645), and their expenditures to 13,541,504 francs (\$2,708,300), while, to meet extraordinary demands, they had a reserve balance of 3,069,154 francs (\$613,830). The annual expenditure always exceeds the amount annually received. As Cardinal Regnier was fond of saying, "The conferences have taken the vow of poverty."

The Revolution of February, 1848, against Louis Philippe and Guizot, his minister, who wished to maintain a property qualification for the suffrage, led to the establishment of the Second Republic and universal suffrage. By granting liberty of teaching (*Loi Falloux*), and by sending an army to Rome to assist Pius IX, it earned the gratitude of Catholics. At this point in history, when so many social and democratic aspirations were being agitated, the social efficaciousness of Christian thought was demonstrated by the Vicomte de Melun, who developed the "Société Charitable" and the "Annales de la Charité" and carried a law on old-age pensions and mutual benefit societies; and by Le Prévost, founder of the Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, who, leading a religious life in the garb of laymen, visited among the working classes.

The Second Empire, the issue of Louis Napoléon Bonaparte's *coup d'état* (2 December, 1851), affirmed universal suffrage and thus secured the victory of French democracy; but it reduced *parlementarisme* to an insignificant rôle, the Plébiscite being employed as an ordinary means of ascertaining the will of the people. It was the Second Empire, too, that gave Nizza, Savoy, and Cochinchina to France.

THE THIRD REPUBLIC, tumultuously proclaimed, 4 September, 1870, on the ruins of the Empire overthrown at Sedan, was victorious, thanks to Thiers and to the Army of Versailles, over the Parisian outbreak called the Commune (March–May, 1871). Effectively defined by the Constitution of 1875, it had to acquiesce in the Treaty of Frankfort (1871) by which Alsace and Lorraine were ceded to Germany. On the other hand it enriched the colonial possessions, or the sphere of influence, of France by the acquisition of Tongking, Tunis, and Madagascar. Under the Third Republic a parliamentary system with two chambers was established on the double principle of a responsible ministry and a president above all responsibility, the latter elected by the two chambers for a period of seven years. Thiers, MacMahon, Jules Grévy, Sadi-Carnot, Félix Faure, Emile Loubet, Armand Fallières have been successively at the head of the French State since 1870.

Through all these changes of government French foreign policy, either knowingly or by force of habit and precedent, has been of service to the Catholic Church, service amply repaid by the Church in perpetuating in some measure the Christian ideal of earlier times. The Crimean War, undertaken (1855) by Napoleon III, originated in the desire to protect Latin Christians in Palestine, the clients of France, against Russian encroachments. During the course of the nineteenth century French diplomacy at Rome and in the East has aimed at safeguarding the prerogatives of France as patron of Oriental Christendom, and of thus justifying the traditional trust of the Orientals in the "Franks" as the natural champions of Christianity in the Ottoman Empire. French influence in this field was threatened by Austria, Italy, and Germany in turn; the first of these powers alleged certain treaties with the sultan, dating from the eighteenth century, as giving it the right to defend Catholic interests at the *Sublime Porte*; the other two made repeated efforts to induce Italian and German missionaries to seek protection from their own consuls rather than those of France. But on 22 May, 1888, the circular "*Aspera rerum conditio*", signed by Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of the Propaganda, commanded all missionaries to respect the prerogatives of France as their protecting power. Even at the present time, in spite of the separation of Church and State, the diplomacy of the Third Republic in the East enjoys the prestige acquired by the France of St. Louis and Francis I. And amid all the ideas and tendencies of "laicization" this protectorate continues to exist as a relic and a right of Christian France.—"Anticlericalism is not an article for exportation", said Gambetta, and up to within recent years this has always been the motto of Republican France. In spite of the constant threats under which the congregations have lived during the Third Republic, it is unquestionable that certain important institutes have seen the number of their members increase notably. This is illustrated by the following table:—

Institute	Members	
	1879	1900
Société des Missions Etrangères	480	1200
Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny	2067	4000+
Daughters of Wisdom	3600	4650
Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres	1119	1732
Brothers of St. Gabriel	791	1350
Little Brothers of Mary	3600	4850
Little Sisters of the Poor	2683	3073
Brothers of the Holy Ghost	515	902

Taine has proved that vocations to the religious life increased remarkably in the France of the nineteenth century, when they were entirely spontaneous, as compared with the France of the eighteenth century, when many families, for worldly reasons, placed their daughters in convents.

MISSIONARY FRANCE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—The reawakening of English Catholicism at the beginning of the nineteenth century was in some measure due to the influence of the French refugee clergy whom the Revolution had driven into exile. And when, in 1789, in the United States of America, John Carroll was named Bishop of Baltimore, it was to the Sulpician Fathers that he appealed to establish his seminary, thus preparing for the part which that splendid institute of French priests was to take, and still continues to play, in building up the Church in America. The discussion between Monsignor Dubourg, Bishop of New Orleans, and Madame Petit, a widow of Lyons, on the spiritual needs of Louisiana (1815), and the letter written by the Abbé Jaricot to his sister Pauline, who

also lived at Lyons, on the poverty of the foreign missions (1819), led these two ladies to organize, each independently of the other, societies for the collection of alms from the faithful for the propagation of Christianity, and from these first feeble beginnings was born, 3 May, 1822, the great work known to English-speaking Catholics as the "Propaganda of Lyons". In 1898 this society collected from one country or another, 6,700,921 francs (\$1,140,180.00 or £228,000) for missionary purposes. Of this sum no less than 4,077,085 francs was contributed by France alone, while, in 1908, owing to the many needs of the Church at home, France's contribution fell from 6,402,586 francs to 3,082,131 francs. In 1898 the work of the Sainte-Enfance (The Holy Childhood), also of French origin, which aspires to save both the bodies and the souls of Chinese children, collected 3,615,845 francs (about \$723,000.00 or £145,000), of which 1,094,092 francs came from France alone, while in 1908-09, for the reason referred to above, French generosity could only contribute 813,952 francs to this work. The general receipts of which amounted to 3,761,954 francs. That work in 1907-08 helped in 236 missions, 1171 orphanages, 7372 schools, and 2480 manual-training establishments. In 1898, again, L'Œuvre des Ecoles d'Orient, an association for supplying schools in the East, collected in France 584,056 francs, in 1907 it collected in France 243,634 francs, and in other countries only 27,596 francs. In 1898 the Society of African Missions collected 50,000 francs, the Anti-Slavery Society, 120,000 francs, while the Good-Friday alms for the maintenance of the Holy Land amounted to 122,000 francs, making in all, for the year 1898, a total of 6,047,231 francs contributed by France to foreign missionaries without distinction of nationality.

But France furnishes not money only but men and women to these missions. On the eve of the Law of 1901 the Abbé Kannengieser compiled the following approximate estimates of the religious, men and women, of French nationality engaged in mission work:—

Société des Missions Etrangères.....	1200
Society of Jesus.....	750
Lazarists.....	500
Augustinians of the Assumption.....	216
Brothers of the Christian Schools.....	813
Capuchins.....	160
Dominicans.....	80
Missionaries of St. Francis de Sales.....	60
Carmelites.....	14
Marianists.....	80
Little Brothers of Mary.....	359
Oblates of St. Francis de Sales.....	25
Franciscans.....	95
Fathers of the Holy Spirit.....	429
White Fathers.....	500
African Missions.....	123
Oblates of Mary Immaculate.....	400
Marists.....	320
Picpus Fathers.....	80
Missionaries of Mary.....	46
Brothers of St. Gabriel.....	53
Redemptorists.....	100
Priests of Bétharram.....	80
Christian Brothers of Ploërmel.....	272
Christian Brothers of the Sacred Heart.....	346
Missionaries of the Sacred Heart.....	27
Sulpician Fathers.....	30
Congregation of Holy Cross.....	40
Fathers of Mercy.....	21
Children of Mary Immaculate.....	15
Brothers of Our Lady of the Annunciation.....	60
Brothers of the Holy Family.....	40
Benedictines of La-Pierre-qui-Vire.....	25
Fathers of La Salette.....	5
Trappists.....	21

A similar list of the women engaged in religious

work on the missions, drawn up on the eve of the Law of 1901, gave a grand total of 7745 religious men and 9150 religious women supplied by France alone for this work. The Missions Étrangères in 1908 had in its missions 37 bishops, 1371 missionaries, 778 native priests, 3050 catechists, 45 seminaries, 2081 seminary students, 305 religious men, 4075 religious women, 2000 Chinese virgins, 5700 churches and chapels, 347 *crèches* and orphanages, sheltering 20,409 children, 484 pharmacies and dispensaries, 108 hospitals and lepers' asylums. Within the same year (1908) it brought about the baptism of 33,169 adults and 139,956 infants. At Jerusalem Cardinal Lavigerie founded in 1855 the seminary of St. Anne for Oriental rites; the French Dominicans, founded in 1890, at Jerusalem, a school for Biblical study, and on the northwest coast of Asia Minor, near Constantinople, the French Assumptionists reorganized the Uniat Greek Church, and prepared the way for the success of the Eucharistic Congress of 1893, presided over by the French Cardinal Langénieux, as legate of Pope Leo XIII, at which Christians of the many Oriental rites were assembled. For the Lebanon district, French Jesuits have a school at Beirut with 520 students, for the most part medical, and a printing press unrivalled for its Arabic printing. Besides this they have 195 elementary schools about their university. At Smyrna French Lazarists have a congregation of 16,000 Catholics where, in 1800, there were only 3000. In Syria alone, the French schools, or schools under French influence, have upwards of 19,000 pupils, and in the vilayet of Smyrna nearly 3000 pupils. The schools of the French Capuchins in Palestine have 1000 pupils; those of the French Jesuits in European Turkey, 7000 pupils.

In 1860 France intervened in behalf of the Christians of the East, who were menaced by the fanaticism of Turks, Arabs, and Druses. It was on this occasion that Fuad Pasha is reported to have said, pointing to some religious who were present, "I do not fear the 40,000 bayonets you have at Damascus, but I do fear those sixty robes there". At Mosul, some French Dominicans, assisted by Sisters of the Presentation of Tours, have had a residence since 1856; they have established hospitals, workshops, and dispensaries all over Mesopotamia, as well as a Syro-Chaldean seminary. These missionaries won back to Christian unity, under the pontificate of Leo XIII, 50,000 Nestorians and 30,000 Armenian Gregorians. In like manner, twenty-six Jesuits of the province of Lyons have been building schools throughout Armenia during the past thirty years. The old See of Babylon was replaced in 1844 by the See of Bagdad where a French bishop rules over 90,000 Catholics of various rites. In Persia the French Lazarists have a congregation of 8000 faithful, where, in 1840, there were only 400. The French Capuchins established at Aden are breaking ground in Arabia. French Jesuits are evangelizing Ceylon. Under the priests of the Missions Étrangères, who are assisted by five communities of religious women, the number of Catholics in Pondicherry increased tenfold during the nineteenth century. Priests of St. Francis de Sales of Annecy have had charge of the vicariate of Vizagapatam since 1849. The city of Bombay alone has no fewer than twenty-seven conferences of St. Vincent de Paul. In Burma the priests of the Missions Étrangères minister to 40,000 Catholics, where there were only 5000 in 1800. The mission of Siam, made famous by Fénelon, and ruined at the beginning of the nineteenth century, numbers to-day more than 20,000 souls. And at the Penang Seminary French priests are forming a native clergy. The nine French missions of Tongking and Cochin-China have 650,000 Catholics. It was a missionary, Mgr Puginier, who, from 1880 to 1892, did so much to open up those regions to French exploration. "Were it not for the missionaries and the Christians", a

Malay pirate once said, "the French in Tongking would be as helpless as crabs without legs."

China is the mission-field of Jesuits, Lazarists, and French priests of the Missions Étrangères. The French-Corean dictionary published by the priests of the Missions Étrangères; the works on Chinese philology, begun in the eighteenth century by the Jesuit Amiot, and carried on in the nineteenth by the French Jesuits in their Chinese printing establishment at Zi-ka-wei; the researches in natural science made in China by the Lazarist David and the Jesuits Heude, Desgodins, Dechevrens; the work accomplished in the fields of astronomy and meteorology by the French Jesuits at Zi-ka-wei—all these achievements of French missionaries have won the applause of the learned world. In the nineteenth century the recovery of Japan to the Church was begun by Mgr Forcade, afterwards Archbishop of Aix, and French Marists are labouring to build up a native Japanese clergy.

In Oceania, since the year 1836, when Chanel, Bataillon, and a few other Marists came to take possession of the thousands of islands scattered between Japan and New Zealand, the work of evangelizing has gone on through Australia, New Zealand, the Wallis Islands, New Caledonia, the New Hebrides, and Sydney Island. The Fathers of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun are in the Gilbert Isles; the Fathers of Pious are working in the Hawaiian Islands, Tahiti, and the Marquesas. The fame of Father Damien (Joseph Damien de Veuster), one of the Pious Fathers, the apostle of the lepers at Molokai, has spread throughout the world.

In Africa Father Libermann (a converted Alsatian Jew) and his Congregation of the Holy Ghost and the Immaculate Heart of Mary undertook, in 1840, the evangelization of the black race. It has now spread over the whole of that pagan continent; and the missions established by Mgr Augouard in Ubangi are in the very heart of the cannibal districts. Jesuits, Holy Ghost Fathers, and Lazarists are working in Madagascar; Jesuits are established along the Zambesi River, and the African Missionaries of Lyons have settlements around the Gulf of Guinea, at the Cape of Good Hope, and at Dahomey, while the Oblates of Mary are in Natal. In Senegal Mother Anne-Marie Javouhey, foundress of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny—she of whom Louis Philippe said: "Madame Javouhey c'est un grand homme"—opened the first French schools in 1820, and set on foot the first attempts at agriculture in that region. In Egypt French Jesuits have two colleges; the Lyons Missionaries, one; the Brothers of the Christian Schools teach more than 1000 pupils; and 60 parish schools, with more than 3000 children, are under the care of French sisterhoods. French Lazarists minister to 13,000 souls in Abyssinia. The ecclesiastical province of Algeria, which in 1800 reckoned 4000 souls, had at the time of Cardinal Lavigerie's death 400,000, with 500 priests, 260 churches or chapels, and 230 schools, while Tunis, which in 1800 had contained but 2000 Catholics, numbered 27,000, ministered to by 153 religious in 22 parishes. The Brothers of the Christian Schools were the pioneers of the French language in Tunis, as they had been throughout the Ottoman Empire from Constantinople to Cairo, and the Congregation of the White Fathers, who sent out their first ten missionaries from Algiers on the 17th of April, 1878, towards equatorial Africa, founded, in Uganda and along Lake Tanganyika, Christian communities, one of which, in May, 1886, gave to the Faith 150 martyrs.

Side by side with this peaceful conquest of the African Continent by the initiative of a French cardinal, a place of honour must be given to the wonderful part played in the colonization and development of French Guiana, since the year 1828, by Mother Javouhey, of whose efforts in Senegal we have already spoken. It was she, who under the July Monarchy,

and at the request of the Government, undertook in Guiana the work of civilizing the unfortunate negroes taken by the men-of-war from the captured slave ships, and whom she eventually employed as free workmen. Her example alone would suffice to refute the slander so often repeated that the French are not a colonizing race.

Only in one part of the world—the East—is this vast missionary movement aided, however slightly, by the French Treasury. In the Levant a certain number of church schools receive state aid as a help to the spreading of the French language, but of late years these subventions have been opposed and diminished. On 12 December, 1906, M. Dubief, in moving the Budget of Foreign Affairs, proposed to suppress the sums voted in aid of schools conducted by religious congregations in the East. M. Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs, promised to hasten the work of laicization, and by means of this promise he secured the continuation of the credit of 92,000 francs. It is a matter for regret that the aim of the Chambers for some years past has been to cut down the assistance given by France to these religious schools, and to create in the East French educational institutions of a purely secular character. M. Marcel Charlot, in 1906, and M. Aulard, in 1907, the one in the name of the State, the other in the interest of *la Mission Laïque*, made a critical study of our religious schools in the East, and contributed to the laicizing movement which, if successful, would mean the dissolution of France's religious *clientèle* in the East and a lessening of French political influence.

FRANCE AT ROME.—Side by side with the part which France has played in the missionary field, the diplomatic activity at Rome of the Third Republic, in its character of a protector of pious institutions, is worth noting. It tends to prove the depth, the reality, the force which underlay the old saying: *Gallia Ecclesie Primogenita Filia*.

In 1890, on the occasion of the French working-men's pilgrimage, Count Lefebvre de Behaine, the French ambassador, formally renewed the claims of the French Republic over the chapel of St. Petronilla, founded by Pepin the Short in the basilica of St. Peter. The principal religious establishments over which certain prerogatives were exercised by the French Embassy at Rome, until its suppression in 1903, were: the church and community of chaplains of St. Louis of the French, the French national church in Rome, dating back to a confraternity instituted in 1454; the pious foundation of St. Yves of the Bretons, which dates from 1455; the church of St. Nicholas of the Lorrainers, which dates from 1622; the church of St. Claudius of the Burgundians, which dates from 1652; the convent of the Trinità on the Pincian Hill, which was founded by Charles VIII, in 1494, for the Friars Minor, and became, in 1828, a boarding school under the care of the French Ladies of the Sacred Heart. There has also been an ancient bond between France and the Lateran Chapter, by reason of the donations made to the chapter by Louis XI and Henry IV, and the annual grant apportioned to it by Charles X, in 1825, and by Napoleon III, in 1863. Although this grant was discontinued by the Republic in 1871, the Lateran Chapter until the suppression of the Embassy to the Holy See (1904) always kept up official relations with the French ambassador whom, on the 1st of January each year, it charged with a special message of greeting to the President of the Republic. Lastly, since 1230 there has always been a French auditor of the Rota. In 1472 Sixtus IV formally recognized this to be the right of the French nation. The allowance made by France to the auditor was discontinued in 1882, but the office has survived, and the reorganization of the tribunal of the Rota made by Pope Pius X (September and October, 1908) was followed by the appointment of a French auditor.

VI.—12

ECCLESIASTICAL DIVISIONS.—In 1789 France, with the exception of the Venaissin, which belonged immediately to the pope, was divided into 135 dioceses: eighteen archbishoprics or ecclesiastical provinces with one hundred and six suffragan sees and eleven sees depending on foreign metropolitans. The latter eleven sees were: Strasburg, suffragan of Mainz; St-Dié, Nancy, Metz, Toul, Verdun, suffragans of Trier; and five in Corsica, suffragans of Genoa or of Pisa. The eighteen archiepiscopal sees were: Aix, Albi, Arles, Auch, Besançon, Bordeaux, Bourges, Cambrai, Embrun, Lyons, Narbonne, Paris, Reims, Rouen, Sens, Toulouse, Tours, Vienne. In 1791 the Constituent Assembly suppressed the one hundred and thirty-five dioceses and created ten metropolitan sees with one suffragan diocese in each department. The Concordat of 1801 set up fifty bishoprics and ten archbishoprics; the Concordat of 1817 made a fresh arrangement, which was realized in 1822 and 1823 by the creation of new bishoprics. France and its colonies are at present divided into ninety dioceses, of which eighteen are metropolitan and seventy-two suffragan, as follows:—

Metropolitans	Suffragans
Aix.....	Marseilles, Fréjus, Digne, Gap, Nice, Ajaccio.
Albi.....	Rodez, Cahors, Mende, Perpignan.
Algiers....	Constantine, Oran.
Auch.....	Aire, Tarbes, Bayonne.
Avignon...	Nîmes, Valence, Viviers, Montpellier.
Besançon...	Verdun, Belley, St-Dié, Nancy.
Bordeaux...	Agen, Angoulême, Poitiers, Périgueux, La Rochelle, Luçon, La Basse-Terre (Guadeloupe, W. I.), Réunion (Indian Ocean), Fort-de-France (Martinique, W. I.).
Bourges....	Clermont, Limoges, Le Puy, Tulle, St-Flour.
Cambrai...	Arras.
Chambéry...	Annecey, Tarentaise, Maurienne.
Lyons.....	Autun, Langres, Dijon, St-Claude, Grenoble.
Paris.....	Chartres, Meaux, Orléans, Blois, Versailles.
Reims.....	Soissons, Châlons-sur-Marne, Beauvais, Amiens.
Rennes....	Quimper, Vannes, St-Brieuc.
Rouen.....	Bayeux, Évreux, Séez, Coutances.
Sens.....	Troyes, Nevers, Moulins.
Toulouse...	Montauban, Pamiers, Carcassonne.
Tours.....	Le Mans, Angers, Nantes, Laval.

THE THIRD REPUBLIC AND THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.

—The policy known as anticlerical, inaugurated by Gambetta in his speech at Romans, 18 September, 1878, containing the famous catchword "Le cléricalisme, c'est l'ennemi", was due to the influence of the Masonic lodges, which ever since that date have shown their hatred even of the very idea of God. If one carefully follows up the series of aspirations uttered at the Masonic meetings, there will surely be found the first germ of the successive laws which have been framed against the Church. To justify its action before the people, the Government has asserted that the sympathies of a great number of Catholics, including many of the clergy, were for the monarchical parties. This policy also presented itself as a retaliation for the attempt of the 16th of May, 1877, by which the monarchists had tried to impede in France the progressive action of the Liberals (*la Gauche*) and of the democratic spirit. Its first embodiments were, in 1879, the exclusion of the priests from the administrative committees of hospitals and of boards of charity; in 1880, certain measures directed against the religious congregations; from 1880 to 1890, the substitution of lay women for nuns in many hospitals; and, in 1882 and 1886, the "School Laws" (*lois scolaires*) which will later on be discussed in detail.

The Concordat continued to govern the relations of

Church and State, but in 1881 the method of stoppage of salary (*suppression de traitement*) began to be employed against priests whose political attitude was unsatisfactory to the Government, and the Law of 1893, which subjected the financial administration of church property to the same rules as the civil establishments, occasioned lively concern to the clergy. As early as March, 1888, Leo XIII had written to President Grévy complaining of the anti-religious bitterness, and expressing a hope that the eldest daughter of the Church would find it possible to abandon this struggle if she would not forfeit that unity and homogeneity among her citizens which had been the source of her own peculiar greatness, and thus oblige history to proclaim that one inconsiderate day's work had destroyed in France the magnificent achievement of the ages. Jules Grévy replied that the religious feeling complained of was the outcome mainly of the hostile attitude of a section of the clergy towards the Republic. Some years later (12 November, 1890), Cardinal Lavergne, returning from Rome, and inspired by Leo XIII, delivered a speech in the presence of all the authorities, military and civil, of Algeria, in which he said: "When the will of a people as to the form of its government has been clearly affirmed, and when, to snatch a people from the abysses which threaten it, unreserved adhesion to this political form is necessary, then the moment has come to declare the test completed, and it only remains to make all those sacrifices which conscience and honour permit us, and command us, to make for the good of our country." This speech, which caused a great commotion, was followed by a letter of Cardinal Rampolla, Secretary of State to Leo XIII, addressed to the Bishop of St-Flour, in which the cardinal exhorted Catholics to come forward and take part in public affairs, thus entering upon the readiest and surest path to the attainment of that noble aim, the good of religion and the salvation of souls. Lastly, a Brief of Leo XIII to Cardinal Lavergne, in the early part of the year 1891, assured him that his zeal and activity answered perfectly to the needs of the age and the pope's expectations.


From these utterances dates the policy known in France as the "Ralliement", and as "Leo's Republican Policy". At once the Archbishops of Tours, Rouen, Cambrai, the Bishops of Bayeux, Langres, Digne, Bayonne, and Grenoble declared their adhesion to the "Algiers Programme", and the Monarchical press accused them of "kissing the Republican feet of their executioners". On 16 January, 1892, a collective letter was published by the five French cardinals, enumerating all the acts of oppression sanctioned by the Republic against the Church and concluding, in conformity with the wish of Rome, by announcing the following programme: Frank and loyal acceptance of political institutions; respect for the laws of the country whenever they do not clash with conscientious obligations; respect for the representatives of authority, combined with steady resistance to all encroachments on the spiritual domain.

Within a month seventy-five bishops subscribed to the above programme, and in the atmosphere thus prepared the voice of Pope Leo once more spoke out. In the Encyclical "Inter innumeras sollicitudines", dated 10 February, 1892, Leo XIII besought Catholics not to judge the Republic by the irreligious character of its government, and explained that a distinction must be drawn between the form of government, which ought to be accepted, and its laws, which ought to be improved. Thus was the policy of rallying to the Republic precisely stated, as recommended to the Catholics of France, and expounded in the brochures, in Paris, of Cardinal Perraud and, at Rome, of Father Brandi, editor of the "Civiltà Cattolica". Anticlericals and Monarchists were alarmed. The Monarchists protested against the interference of the pope in French politics, and the Anticlericals declared that the


Republic had no room for "Roman Republicans". Both parties asserted that it was impossible to distinguish between the Republican form of government and the Republican laws. A trifling incident, arising out of a visit paid by some French pilgrims to the Pantheon in Rome, which contains the tomb of Victor Emmanuel, called forth from M. Fallières, Minister of Justice, a circular against pilgrimages (October, 1891), and occasioned a lively debate in the French Chamber on the separation of Church and State. But in spite of these outbreaks of Anticlericalism, the political horizon, especially after the Encyclical of February, 1892, became more serene. The policy of combining the Republican forces by a fusion of Moderates and Radicals to support a common programme of Republican concentration, which programme was incessantly developing new anticlerical measures as concessions to the radicals—gradually went out of fashion. After the October elections, in 1893, for the first time in many long years, a homogeneous ministry was formed, one ministry composed exclusively of moderate Republicans, and known as the Casimir Perier-Spüller Ministry. On 3 March, 1894, in a discussion in the Chamber on the prohibition of religious emblems by the Socialist Mayor of Saint-Denis, Spüller, the Minister of Public Worship, declared that it was time to make a stand against all fanaticisms whatsoever—against all sectaries, regardless of the particular sect to which they might belong—and that the Chamber could rely at once on the vigilance of the Government to uphold the rights of the State, and on the new spirit (*esprit nouveau*) which animated the Government, and tended to reconcile all citizens and bring back all Frenchmen to the principles of common sense and justice, and of the charity necessary for every society that wishes to survive. Thus it seemed that there would be developing, side by side with the policy of *ralliement* practised by the Church, a similar conciliatory policy on the part of the State.

A letter from Cardinal Rampolla, dated 30 January, 1895, to M. Auguste Roussel, formerly an editor of the "Univers", but who had become editor-in-chief of the "Vérité", found fault with the latter periodical for stirring up feeling against the Republic, fostering in the minds of its readers the conviction that it was idle to hope for religious peace from such a form of government, creating an atmosphere of distrust and discouragement, and thwarting the movement towards general good-feeling which the Holy See desired, especially in view of the elections. This letter created a great sensation, and newspaper polemics contrasted the Catholics of the "Univers" and the "Croix", "docile towards Leo XIII", with the refractory Catholics of the "Vérité". On 5 February, 1896, Félix Faure wrote as follows to Pope Leo: "The President of the Republic cannot forget the generous motives which prompted the advice given by Your Holiness to the Catholics of France, encouraging them to accept loyally the government of their country. Your Holiness regrets that these appeals for harmony and peace have not been everywhere listened to; and we join in those regrets. That enlightened advice given to the opponents of the Republic, for whose consciences the authority of the Head of the Church is 'all-powerful', ought to have been followed by all. Nevertheless, we note at the present time, with regret, that there are men who, under the cloak of religion, foment a policy of discord and of strife. It would, however, be unjust not to recognize that, while the salutary instructions of Your Holiness have not produced all the effects that might have been expected of them, very many loyal Catholics have bowed before them. At the same time, this manifestation of goodwill produced among those Republicans who were most firmly attached to the rights of the civil power a spirit of conciliation which has largely contributed to mitigate the conflict of passions which saddened us."







THE CATHEDRAL, BORDEAUX  
CORPS LÉGISLATIF, PARIS



NOTRE-DAME, PARIS  
HOTEL DE VILLE, PARIS





This letter, published for the first time at the end of the year 1905, in the "White Book" of the Holy See, places in clear relief the relations existing between the Church and the Republic four years after the Encyclical of February, 1892, and three months before the formation of the Méline Ministry, which was to lead the Republic towards even greater moderation. The Méline Ministry (1896-98) secured for Catholics for two years a certain amelioration of their lot. But the division among Catholics persisted, and this division, which arose from their indocility to Leo XIII, was the principal cause of their defeat in the elections of 1898, when the Méline Ministry came to an end. The old Anticlerical Republican party came once more into power; the Dreyfus affair, a purely judicial matter around which political factions grew up, was made the pretext on the morrow of the death of President Faure (16 February, 1899) for beginning a formidable anti-militarist, and anticlerical agitation which led to the formation of the Waldeck-Rousseau and the Combes Ministries.

The Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry (1899-1902) passed fresh legislation against the congregations (it will be found in detail at the end of this article) and brought France to the verge of a breach with Rome over the question of the *Nobis nominavit*. These two words, which occurred in episcopal Bulls, signified that the priest chosen by the State to fill a bishopric had been designated and presented to the Holy See. On 13 June, 1901, when Bulls were required for the bishops of Carcassonne and Annecy, the Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry proposed that the word *Nobis* should be omitted, in order to affirm more clearly the State's right of nomination. The Combes Ministry (1902-05) continued the dispute over this matter, and on 22 November, 1903, the Holy See, to avoid a breach with France, agreed to omit the obnoxious word, on condition that in future the President of the Republic should demand the canonical institution of bishops by letters patent containing the words, *We name him, and present him to Your Holiness*. In spite of this concession by the Holy See, M. Combes set himself the task of planning the separation of Church and State. He felt that public opinion was not yet quite ripe for this stroke, and all his efforts were directed to making separation inevitable. The laicization of the naval and military hospitals (1903-04), the order prohibiting soldiers to frequent Catholic clubs (9 February, 1904), the vote of the Chamber (14 February, 1904), in favour of the motion to repeal the Falloux Law were episodes less serious than the succession of calculated acts by which the breach with Rome was being approached.

Three quarrels succeeded one another. (1) In regard to vacant sees, Combes's policy was to demand canonical institution for the candidate of his choice without previously consulting Rome. The Holy See refused its consent in the cases of the Bishoprics of Maurienne, Bayonne, Ajaccio, and Vannes, and accepted M. Combes's candidate for that of Nevers. "All or none", replied M. Combes, on the 19 March, 1904, to the nuncio, Mgr Lorenzelli; and, all the sees remained vacant. (2) On 25 March, 1904, the Chamber agreed, by 502 votes against 12, to allocate a sum of money to defray the expenses of a visit by M. Loubet, President of the Republic, to Rome. M. Loubet was thus the first head of a Catholic State to pay a visit to the King of Italy in Rome. A note from Cardinal Rampolla to M. Nisard, the French Ambassador, dated 1 June, 1903, and a dispatch from the cardinal to the nuncio, Lorenzelli, dated 8 June, had explained the reasons why such a visit would be considered a grave affront to the Holy See. On 28 April, 1904, Cardinal Merry del Val sent a protest to M. Nisard against M. Loubet's visit to Rome. On 6 May, M. Nisard handed to Cardinal Merry del Val a diplomatic note in which the French Government objected to the reasons given by the Holy See and to the

manner in which they were presented. At the same time, to prevent the heads of other Catholic countries from following President Loubet's example, the Holy See sent a diplomatic note to all the powers in which it was explained that if, in spite of this visit, the nuncio to France had not been recalled, it was only for very grave reasons of an order and nature altogether special. By an indiscretion, which has been attributed to the Government of the Principality of Monaco, "L'Humanité", a newspaper belonging to the Socialist deputy, Jaurès, published this note on 17 May. On 20 May, M. Nisard sought an explanation from Cardinal Merry del Val; on 21 May was granted leave of absence by his Government; and on 28 May, in the Chamber, the Government gave it to be understood that M. Nisard's departure from Rome had a significance much more serious than that of a simple leave of absence. (3) Having learned of a letter from Cardinal Serafino Vannutelli (17 May, 1904) inviting Monsignor Geay, Bishop of Laval, in the name of the Holy Office, to resign his see, and of a letter in which Monsignor Lorenzelli, the papal nuncio, requested Monsignor Le Nordez, Bishop of Dijon, to desist from holding ordinations until further orders, the French Government caused its chargé d'affaires at Rome, M. Robert de Courcel, to inquire into the matter. When, on 9 July, 1904, Cardinal Merry del Val cited Mgr Le Nordez to appear at Rome within fifteen days, under pain of suspension, M. Robert de Courcel announced to the cardinal that, unless this letter to Mgr Le Nordez was withdrawn, diplomatic relations between France and the Holy See would cease; and, on 30 July, 1904, a note handed by M. Robert de Courcel to Cardinal Merry del Val announced that France had decided to put an end to these relations.

In this way the breach was effected without any formal denunciation of the Concordat. On 10 February, 1905, the Chamber declared that "the attitude of the Vatican" had rendered the separation of Church and State inevitable. The "Osservatore Romano" replied that this was an "historical lie". The discussions in the Chamber lasted from 21 March to 3 July, and in the Senate from 9 November to 6 December, and on 11 December, 1905, the Separation Law was gazetted in the "Journal Officiel".

*Laws Affecting the Congregations.*—The Monarchy had taken fiscal measures against property held in mortmain ("the dead hand"), but the first rigorous enactments against religious congregations date from the Revolution. The Law of 13 February, 1790, declared that monastic vows were no longer recognized, and that the orders and congregations in which such vows were made were forever suppressed. The Concordat itself was silent as to congregations; but the eleventh of the Organic Articles implicitly prohibited them, declaring that all ecclesiastical establishments except chapters and seminaries were suppressed. Two years later, a decree, dated 3 Messidor, Year XII, suppressing certain congregations which had come into existence in spite of the law, added a provision that the civil authority could, by decree, formally authorize such associations after having taken cognizance of their statutes. The Lazarists, the Missions Etrangères, the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, and the Sulpicians were, in virtue of this law, authorized by decree in 1804; the Brothers of the Christian Schools, in 1808. Under the Restoration, the Chamber of Peers refused the king the right of creating congregations by royal warrant (*par ordonnance*), asserting that for each particular re-establishment of a congregation a law was necessary.

Such was the principle which ruled until the year 1901; but the applications of that principle varied with the changes of government. Under the Second Empire it was admitted in practice that a simple administrative authorization was sufficient to legalize a

congregation of women, provided that such congregation adopted the statutes of a congregation previously authorized. Under the Third Republic, it was on the pretext of a strict enforcement of the law that, in 1880, the Society of Jesus was dissolved, and the other congregations were ordered to apply for authorization within three months. The protests of Catholics, and the criticisms which became general on the archaic character of the laws upon which these decrees were based, had this much effect, that, after a brutal application of the decrees to most of the congregations of men, the Government dared not apply them to the unauthorized congregations of women; they gradually became a dead letter, and little by little the congregations of men were re-formed in the name of individual liberty. But in this condition of affairs only the formally authorized congregations could be considered as "moral persons" before the law. Since 1849 the religious congregations had been paying into the treasury a "mortmain tax" (*taxe des biens de main-morte*) in lieu of the succession duties which the property of "moral persons" escapes. On the twofold consideration, that this tax did not touch personal estate and that property held in unacknowledged mortmain evaded it, the Third Republic passed the following enactments: (1) A law of increment (*droit d'accroissement*), so called because it was intended to reach that increase in the individual interest of each surviving member of a congregation in the common estate which should accrue upon the decease of a fellow-member. This duty is represented by a composition tax (*taxe d'abonnement*) assessed at the rate of 3 per cent on the market value of the real and personal estate held by the association. On real estate held by associations not subject to the mortmain law, the rate is 4 per cent. (2) A tax of 4 per cent on the revenue of property owned or occupied by congregations, this revenue being assumed equal to one-twentieth of the gross value of the property.

On 1 January, 1901, France numbered 19,424 establishments of religious congregations, with 159,628 members. Of these establishments 3126 belonged to congregations of men; 16,298 to congregations of women (2870 of the latter being regularly authorized, and 13,428 unrecognized). The members of the male congregations numbered 30,136, of whom 23,327 belonged to teaching institutes, 552 served in hospitals, and 7277 followed the contemplative vocation. The value of real property taxed as being held by congregations amounted to 463,715,146 francs (about \$92,000,000, or between £18,000,000 and £19,000,000), and in this estimate was included all the property devoted by the religious to benevolent and educational purposes. But the Department of Domains, in drawing up its statistical report (which statistics were with justice questioned), explained that, in addition to the real property taxed as belonging to congregations, account should be taken of the real property occupied by them through the complaisance of lay corporations or proprietors whom the State declared to be mere intermediaries (*personnes interposées*), and the department placed the combined value of these two classes of real property at 1,071,775,260 francs. To this unfair estimate may be traced the popular notion—which was cleverly exploited by certain political parties—about *le milliard des congrégations*.

The Law of Associations, of 1 July, 1901, provided that no congregation, whether of men or of women, could be formed without a legislative authorizing act, which act should determine the functions of such congregation. Thus ended the regime of tolerance to congregations of women which had been inaugurated by the Empire. Congregations previously authorized and those which should subsequently obtain authorization had, according to this law, the status of "moral persons"; but this status held them to an obligation and kept them perpetually under a threat. On the

one hand, it was enacted that they must each year draw up a list of their members, an inventory of their possessions, and a statement of their receipts and expenses, and must present these documents to the prefectural authority upon demand. On the other hand, it was provided that, to deprive any congregation of its authorization, nothing more was required than an ordinary decree of the Council of Ministers. And lastly, these authorized congregations could found "new establishments" only in virtue of a decree of the Council of State, and the Council of State, in interpreting the law, considers that there is a "new establishment" when laymen in co-operation with one or more members of a congregation set up a school or a hospital. If the master of an industrial enterprise rewards a sister for teaching or caring for the children of his workmen, the law considers that there is a new establishment, for which an authorization of the Council of State is necessary. As for the unauthorized congregations, the Law of 1901 declared them dissolved, allowing them three months to apply for authorization. Congregations which should re-form after dissolution, or which should in the future be formed without authorization, were, by the same law, made liable to pains and penalties (fines of from 16 to 5000 francs; terms of imprisonment of from 6 days to one year); double penalties were to be inflicted on founders and administrators, and the act of providing premises for, and thus abetting, the operations of such congregations was, in 1902, declared an offense entailing the same penalties. Moreover, the law made every member of an unauthorized religious congregation incapable of directing any teaching establishment, or of teaching in one, under pain of fine or imprisonment, and this offence might entail the closing of the establishment. The Government found itself face to face with 17,000 unauthorized congregations; it decided to dissolve all of them without exception—educational establishments, industrial establishments, contemplative establishments—though charitable establishments were tolerated provisionally.

From another point of view the law was singularly arbitrary and juridically defective: it struck at every member of a religious congregation who was not secularized, but it did not precisely state what constitutes secularization. Is it sufficient, for secularization to be effective and sincere, that the religious—or, to employ the current French term, the *congréganiste*—should be absolved from his vows and should re-enter the diocese from which he originally came? The prevalent legal opinion does not admit this; it admits the right of the courts to ascertain whether other elements of fact do not result in a virtual persistence of the congregation. Thus the courts may regard as religious persons who, in the eyes of the Church, are no longer such; and the fact of being a *congréganiste*, which fact constitutes an offence, is not a precise, material fact, defined and limited by the letter of the enactment; it is a point upon which the interpretation of the courts remains the sovereign authority.

The principles of liquidation were as follows: Property belonging to *congréganistes* before their entrance into the congregation, or acquired since that time, whether by succession independent of testamentary provision (*ab intestat*) or by legacy in direct line, was to be restored to them. Gifts and bequests made otherwise than in the direct line could not be legally claimed by such former *congréganistes* unless they established the point that they had not been intermediaries (*personnes interposées*). Benefactions to congregations could be reclaimed by the benefactors or their heirs within a term of six months. After these deductions made by the *congréganistes* and their benefactors, the residue of the estate of the congregation was to be subject to the disposition of the courts. The law refused to recognize that property created by the labour or thrift of the *congréganistes* necessarily ought

to be distributed among them, and it was held sufficient that, by an administrative ruling of 16 August, 1901, provision was made for allowances to former *congréganistes* who had no means of subsistence or who should establish the fact of having by their labour contributed to the acquisition of the property under liquidation.

The judicial liquidation of the congregational estates had some serious consequences. The Chamber soon perceived that too often the liquidators intentionally complicated the business with which they were charged (it being to their interest to multiply lawsuits the expenses of which could not in any case fall upon them) and that the personal profits derived by the liquidators from these operations were exorbitant. In confiding so delicate a business to irresponsible functionaries, the framers of the Law of 1901 had committed a grave error of judgment. On 31 December, 1907, the Senate resolved to nominate a commission of inquiry to examine the accounts of the liquidators, and the report of this commission, published early in September, 1908, revealed enormous irregularities. It was to satisfy these belated misgivings, that the Government, in February, 1908, introduced a bill substituting for the irresponsible judicial liquidation an administrative liquidation under the control of the prefects. But this provision is to apply only to the congregations which shall be dissolved hereafter; what has happened in the past seven years is irreparable, and when Catholic publicists speak of "the evaporation of the famous milliard of the congregations" the champions of the Law of 1901 are painfully embarrassed.

*The Laicization of Primary Instruction.*—(a) As to the Matter of Instruction.—The Law of 28 March, 1882, which made primary instruction obligatory, gratuitous, and secular (*laïque*), intentionally omitted religious instruction from the curriculum of the public school, and provided one free day every week, besides Sunday, to allow the children, if their parents saw fit, to receive religious instruction; but this instruction was to be given outside of the school buildings. Thus the priest no longer had any right to enter the school, even outside of class hours, to hold catechism. The school regulations of 18 January, 1887, laid it down that the children could be sent to church for catechism or religious exercises only outside of class hours, and that teachers were not bound either to take them to church or to watch over their behaviour while there. It was added that during the week preceding the First Communion teachers were to allow pupils to leave the school when their religious duties called them to the church. The spirit of the Law of 1882 implied that religious emblems should be excluded from the schools, but, out of regard for the religious feelings of the people in those neighbourhoods, the prefects allowed the crucifixes to remain in a certain number of schools; they took care, however, that no religious emblem

should be placed in any of the newly erected school buildings. This temporizing policy was continued by the ministerial order of 9 April, 1903, but in 1906 and 1907 the administration at last called for the definitive disappearance of the crucifix from all public schools.

The Law of 1882 is silent as to the teaching, in the public schools, of the pupils' duty towards God. The Senate, after a speech by Jules Ferry, refused to entertain the proposal of Jules Simon, that these duties should be mentioned in the law; but the Board of Education (*Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction Publique*), acting on a recommendation of Paul Janet, the Spiritualist philosopher, inserted in the executive instructions, with which it supplemented the text of the law, a recommendation that the teacher should admonish pupils not to use the name of God lightly, to respect the idea of God, and to obey the laws of God as revealed


by conscience and reason. However, in the public schools dependent on the municipality of Paris, the antispiritualist tendency became so violent that, after 1882, the new editions of certain school books expunged, even where they occurred in selected specimens of literature, the words *God*, *Providence*, *Creator*. These early manifestations led Catholics to declare that the laic and neutral school was in reality a Godless school. In the controversy which arose, some quotations from the public school textbooks became famous. For instance, *La Fontaine's* lines

Petit poisson deviendra grand,  
Pourvu que Dieu lui prête vie

were made to read, "que l'on lui prête vie". And while politicians were deprecating the assertion that the schools were Godless, the Masonic conventicles and the professional articles written by certain state pedagogues were explaining that the notion

of God must eventually disappear in the school. In practice, the chapter of duties towards God was one which very few teachers touched upon. In 1894, M. Devinat, afterwards director of the normal school of the department of the Seine, wrote: "To teach God, it is necessary to believe in God. Now, how are we to find in these days teachers whose souls are sincerely and profoundly religious? It may be affirmed without any exaggeration that, since 1882, the lay public school has been very nearly the Godless school."

This frank and unimpeachable testimony, justifying, as it does, all the sad predictions of the Catholics, has been corroborated by the experience of the last fifteen years. With the cry, *Laïciser la laïque*, a certain number of teachers have carried on an active campaign for the formal elimination of the idea of God, as a remnant of "Clericalism", from the school programme. The powerful organization known as the "Ligue de l'Enseignement", whose Masonic affinities are indisputable, has supported this movement. For the exponents of the tendency, to be *laïque* one must be the enemy of all rational metaphysics—to be *laïque* one must be an atheist.



CHURCH OF NOTRE-DAME, COULANGES,  
XVII Century



The very idea of neutrality in education, to which anti-religious teachers have not always consistently adhered, is nowadays altogether out of favour with many members of the pedagogical profession. In 1904 the teachers of the department of the Seine advocated, almost unanimously, in place of "denominational neutrality" (*neutralité confessionnelle*), which they said was a lie (*un mensonge*), the establishment of a "critical teaching" (*enseignement critique*), which, in the name of science, should abandon all reserves in regard to denominational susceptibilities. But that neutrality was something very closely resembling a lie, is just what Catholic orators were saying in 1882; and thus the evolution of the primary school, and these fits of candour in which the very truth of the matter is confessed, justify, after a quarter of a century, the fears expressed by Catholics at the very outset. It is to be feared, moreover, that this substitution of critical for neutral teaching will very soon issue in the introduction, even in the primary schools, of lessons on the history of religions which shall serve as weapons against Christian revelation; such a step is already being advocated by the Freemasons and by certain groups of unbelieving savants, and herein lies one of the gravest perils of to-morrow. Bills introduced by MM. Briand and Doumergue impose heavy penalties on fathers whose children refuse to make use of the irreligious books given them by their teachers, and render it impossible for parents to prosecute teachers whose immoral and irreligious instruction may give them reason for complaint. These bills, which are soon to be discussed, are now (June, 1909) producing a very painful impression.

(b) *Laicization of the Teaching Staff.*—The Law of 30 October, 1886, drawn and advocated by René Goblet, called for the laicization of the teaching staff in the public schools. In the schools for boys this laicization has been an accomplished fact since 1891, since which date no Brother of the Christian Schools has acted either as principal or as teacher in public primary instruction. The difficulty of forming a body of female lay teachers impeded the process of laicizing the public schools for girls; but this, too, has been complete since 1906, except in some few communes, where it is to be effected before the year 1913.

*Denominational Primary Instruction.*—From the eleventh century onwards, history shows unmistakable traces, in most provinces of France, of small schools founded by the Church, such as were recommended by Charlemagne's capitulary in the year 789. The ever-increasing number of schools, writes Guibert de Nogent in the twelfth century, makes access to them easy for the humblest. The seventeenth century saw the foundation of a certain number of teaching institutes: the Ursulines, who between the year 1602 and the Revolution, founded 289 houses, and who numbered 9000 members in 1792; the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, founded in 1630, recognized in 1657; the Congregation of Notre-Dame, founded by St. Peter Fourier, recognized in 1622; the Brothers of the Christian Schools, called, in the eighteenth century, Brothers of Saint-Yon, founded by St. John Baptist de la Salle, and who had 123 classes in 1719, when their founder died, and 550 classes in 1789. In the last twenty years a large number of monographs which have been given restricted publication in the provinces, have presented historical evidence of the care which the Church was devoting to primary education during the period immediately preceding the Revolution. At the beginning of the Consulate, Fourcroy, anti-religious as he was, alarmed, to use his own words, at the "almost total ineffectiveness of the primary schools" (*nullité presque totale*), recommended it as a useful expedient, to confide a portion of the primary teaching to the clergy and to revive "the Institute of the Brothers, which had formerly been of the greatest service". In 1805 the

Brothers, having re-established a mother-house at Lyons, were solicited to furnish teachers in thirty-six towns. The Government of the First Empire authorized in ten years 880 communities or establishments of teaching sisters; the Restoration, less generous, authorized only 599; the Monarchy of July, only 389. Until 1833 these congregations could exercise their functions only in schools controlled by the State, for the University would allow no infringement of its monopoly. The magnificent tribute to the educational activity of the clergy which Guizot uttered during the debates on the Law of 1833 was endorsed by the law itself, which, partially suppressing the monopoly of the University, established the principle of free primary teaching. The Law of 25 March, 1850, held "letters of obedience", given by religious associations to their members, to be equivalent to the diplomas given by the State, which legally qualified their recipients to be teachers. Between 1852 and 1860 the Empire issued 884 decrees recognizing congregations or local establishments of teaching sisters; from 1861 to 1869—the period of change which followed the Italian War—while Duruy was Minister of Public Instruction, only 77 of these decrees were issued.

The Law of 28 March, 1882, deprived the "letters of obedience" of all their value, by providing that every teacher must hold a diploma (*brevet*) from one of the government *jurys*, or examining boards. The *congréganistes* (see above) submitted to this formality. With this exception, the Law upheld the liberty of private teaching. The Law of 1886 authorized mayors and school inspectors (*inspecteurs d'académie*) to oppose the opening of any private school on hygienic or moral grounds; in such cases the litigation was taken before one of the university councils (*conseils universitaires*), in which the private educational establishments were represented by elected delegates, and the council gave a decision. These councils could also take disciplinary action against private teachers, in the form of censure or suspension of teaching licence. The masters and mistresses of private schools might give religious instruction in their schools, and were left free in the choice of methods, programmes, and books, but the state authority, after consultation with the Council of Public Instruction (*Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction Publique*), might prohibit the introduction and use of books judged contrary to morality, the Constitution, or the law. An order of the Council of State, dated 29 July, 1888, declared that neither departments nor communes had a legal right to grant appropriations, on their respective local budgets, to private schools; thus the establishment and support of these schools has fallen on Catholic charity exclusively. The communes can only give assistance to poor pupils in private schools as individuals.

A first, very serious, attack on the principle of freedom of teaching was made by the Law of 7 July, 1904, which formally declared that "teaching of every grade and every kind is forbidden in France to the congregations". The members of the authorized congregations, equally with the rest, fell under the disability thus created. Every Brother, every religious woman, who wished to continue the work of teaching was forthwith compelled to be secularized, and the courts remained, and still remain, competent to contest the legal value of such secularizations. A clause, the effect of which was transitory, was introduced empowering the Government, according to the needs of particular localities, to authorize for one or more years the continuance of *congréganiste* schools; but M. Combes immediately closed 14,404 out of 16,904 such schools, and it is decreed that in 1910 the last of the *congréganiste* schools shall have disappeared.

From time to time the Ministry publishes lists of *congréganiste* schools which must be closed definitively by the end of the school year, and thus the Government in power is the sole arbiter to accord or to refuse

them a few last years of existence. The bishops are seeking to maintain primary Catholic education or to reorganize it with secularized or lay teachers. In some dioceses a movement is on foot for the acquisition of teaching diplomas by the seminarists. Already in twenty-four dioceses there are diocesan organizations for free teaching—diocesan committees, composed of ecclesiastics and laymen, which maintain a strict control of all the private schools of their dioceses. These measures have been imperatively demanded in order to repair the losses suffered by free primary education, the number of pupils having fallen, according to statistics compiled in 1907 by M. Keller, from 1,600,000 to 1,000,000.

*Denominational Secondary Education.*—Statistics published by the Education Commission (*Commission d'Enseignement*) show that, out of a total of 162,110 pupils in the secondary schools for the year 1898, 50,793 belonged to the *lycées*, 33,949 to the colleges, 9725 to private establishments taught by laymen, and 67,643 to private establishments taught by ecclesiastics. To these figures must be added 23,497 boys in the *petits séminaires*. Thus, in the aggregate, the State was giving primary education to 84,742 pupils; the Church to 91,140.

The fundamental law on secondary education is still the Falloux Law of 15 March, 1850. Any Frenchman over twenty-five years of age, having the degree of Bachelor or a special diploma of qualification (*brevet de capacité*), may, after passing a term of five years in a teaching establishment, open a house of secondary education, subject to objections on moral or hygienic grounds, of which grounds the university councils are the judges. In contrast with the case of private primary education, Catholic establishments of secondary education may be subsidized by the communes or the departments.

A first serious stroke at the liberty of secondary education was delivered by the Law of 7 July, 1904, depriving the *congréganistes* of the right of teaching. Other projects, which the Government has already induced the Senate to accept, are now pending, and these would exact much more rigorous conditions as to pedagogic qualifications on the part of Catholic secondary teachers of either sex; the Catholic establishments would be subject to a compulsory inspection, bearing, as in the case of primary education, upon the conformity of the teaching with the Constitution and the law; the Government would reserve the right to close the establishment by decree. It may be foreseen that in the course of the year 1909 all or a part of these proposals will become law, and the effect will be disastrous, first, to Catholic girls' schools, where many of the teachers, whether laywomen or secularized *congréganistes*, will not immediately be in possession of the requisite diplomas. Such schools will thus be placed at a further disadvantage in competition with the *lycées*, colleges, and courses for young women organized by the State under the Law of 21 December, 1880, numbering as many as 104, with 8300 pupils, in 1883, and in 1906 numbering 171, with 32,500 pupils. Secondly, for the *petits séminaires* the results will be still more disastrous.

These institutions have hitherto existed under a particular statute, which it will be necessary here to consider. "Secondary ecclesiastical schools", as the *petits séminaires* were then called, were made by the decrees of 9 April, 1809, and 15 November, 1811, dependent on the University. There was to be only one secondary ecclesiastical school in each department, and its course was to be that of the *lycée* or college of the State. A warrant of Louis XVIII, dated 5 October, 1814, allowed a second *petit séminaire* in each department subject to the authorization of the head (*grand maître*) of the University of France; it also gave permission for these institutions to be established in country districts, that the pupils should be obliged to

assume the ecclesiastical habit after two years of studies, and that the teachers should be directly dependent on the bishops. The circular of 4 July, 1816, forbade the *petits séminaires* to receive externs, and this prohibition was confirmed by the ordinance of June, 1828, which limited the number of their pupils to 20,000. In this way the Government wished the *petits séminaires* to be reserved exclusively for the education of future priests, and to be kept from competing with the University in any sense whatever, and upon these conditions it exempted them from taxation and from the control of the University, and granted them the rights of legal personality. The Ordinance of 1828 was never formally abrogated, but in practice, since 1850, a certain number of *petits séminaires*, retaining certain privileges and immunities in consideration of their special mission, have received pupils in preparation not only for the priesthood, but also for a great variety of careers.

Legislative projects, the passage of which is now imminent, will be a source of at least temporary embarrassment to the *petits séminaires*, a certain number of which—those, namely, which were diocesan institutions—have disappeared in consequence of the Law of Separation. Statistics show that in 1906 Catholic secondary education possessed 104 fewer colleges and 22,223 fewer pupils than in 1898, and that the number of pupils in the *petits séminaires* had in eight years decreased by 8711.

*Denominational Higher Education.*—Until 1882 the State supported five faculties of theology: at Paris, Bordeaux, Aix, Rouen, and Lyons. These faculties had no regular pupils, but only attendants at the lectures delivered by their professors; the Church attached no canonical value to their degrees; the State did not make those degrees a condition for any ecclesiastical appointment. The faculties themselves were suppressed by the Ferry Ministry.

The Protestants still had two faculties of theology maintained by the State: that of Paris, for Calvinists and Lutherans, and that of Montauban, for Calvinists exclusively. The Separation Law of 1905 left these two faculties to be supported by the Protestants, and once detached from the university organizations, they have become free theological schools.

The university monopoly, abolished as to primary education by the Law of 1833, and as to secondary education by the Law of 1850, was also abolished for higher education by the Law of 12 July, 1875, which permitted any Frenchman, subject to certain easy conditions, to create establishments of independent higher education. In the period between 1875 and 1907 the Institut Catholique de Paris admitted twenty-nine doctors of theology, thirteen of canon law, eight of scholastic philosophy, one hundred and ninety-two of law, thirty-two of literature, ten of science. The first three of these degrees have been gained by candidates under tests of the institute itself; the others, from state boards (*jurys*). The institute is preparing to set up a medical course and one in the history of religion. The Institut Catholique de Lille has connected with itself a school of higher industrial and commercial instruction (see BAUNARD, LOUIS); the Institut Catholique d'Angers, one of agriculture. The Institut Catholique de Toulouse has but one faculty, that of theology; it is organizing lectures for the students of literature and of science who are following the courses of the state faculties.

*Laws Affecting the Applications and Effects of Religion in Civil Life.*—(a) The Sunday Rest.—The Revolution had abolished all institutions which formerly existed in connexion with the Sunday rest and had substituted the *décadi* (see above) for the Sunday. Under the Restoration the Law of 18 November, 1814, forbade all "exterior" labour on Sunday: a tradesman might not open his shop; by the letter of the law, he might work and cause others to work in his closed

shop. What the Restoration really aimed at was a public token of obedience to the precepts of religion. The Law of 12 July, 1880, on the contrary, permitted work on Sunday. The evil social effects of this law were soon perceived. Subtle discussions arose in the Chambers: should the weekly rest, which the labour organizations demanded, be a day fixed by legislation, or should it be Sunday? It was for some time feared that such a legislative prescription would look like a concession to denominationalism, but the decision of the Committee on Labour (*conseil supérieur du travail*) and of many labour unions was explicit in favour of the Sunday. On 10 July, 1906, a law was passed finally establishing Sunday as the weekly day of rest, and providing, moreover, numerous restrictions and exceptions the details of which were to be arranged by administrative regulations. An unconscious homage to the Divine law rendered by an unbelieving parliamentary majority, this enactment, on account of a certain temporary disturbance which it occasioned in the country's industry and commerce, and in the supply of commodities, was the object of unfortunate animadversions on the part of certain journals which were in other respects defenders of Catholic interests. The hostility manifested by a certain number of prominent Catholics towards the Sunday rest, and their co-operation with every attempt to restrict the application of the law, produced a regrettable effect on public opinion.

(b) Oaths.—The form of oath administered in courts of justice is not peculiar to any creed. It supposes a belief in God. The images of Christ have disappeared from the court rooms. Proposals are being considered by the Chambers to suppress the words "*devant Dieu et devant les hommes*" (before God and man) in the legal form of oath, or to authorize a demand on the part of any atheist to have the oath administered to him in a different form.

(c) Immunities.—Since the law made military service a universal obligation in France, three enactments have followed one another: that of 27 July, 1872, dispensing ecclesiastics from the obligation; that of 15 July, 1889, which fixed the term of active service for ordinary citizens at three years, and for priests at one; that of 21 March, 1905, fixing the term of active service at two years for priests as for others, and imposing upon them, up to the age of forty-five, all the series of obligations to which members of the reserve and of the territorial army are subject.

(d) Marriage.—Under the old regime parish priests officially registered births, deaths and marriages for the State. In 1787 Louis XVI accorded to the Protestants the same privilege, which, indeed, they had enjoyed under the Edict of Nantes, from 1595 to 1685. The Revolutionary laws and the Code Napoléon deprived the clergy of this status. Civil marriage was instituted, and the priest was forbidden to solemnize any marriage not previously contracted in the presence of a civil functionary. Immediately after the separation of Church and State (1905), the question was raised, whether this prohibition was still to be maintained; the Supreme Court of Appeals (*Cour de Cassation*) replied in the affirmative, and punished a priest who had blessed a marriage not contracted before the mayor. Certain courts have admitted that if, after a civil marriage, one of the two parties, contrary to previous engagements, should refuse to go to the church, this would constitute an injury to the other party so grave as to justify a suit for divorce; but this opinion is not unanimous. Catholics, for that matter, wish to abolish the law requiring the previous civil marriage.

Some of the impediments defined by the Church are not recognized by the State, such as, e. g., the impediment of spiritual relationship. One impediment recognized by the civil code (articles 148-150), but which the Council of Trent refused to make a canon-

cal impediment, in spite of the solicitations of Charles IX's ambassadors, is that which results from the refusal of parents' consent. The Law of 21 June, 1907, the chief advocate of which was the Abbé Lemire, considerably lessened the obligations imposed on adults with regard to parental consent, and the discrepancies in this respect between the state law and the church law have, in consequence, become less serious.

The Law of 20 September, 1792, admitted divorce, even by mutual consent, and abolished that form of separation which, while terminating cohabitation and community of possessions, maintains the indissolubility of the civil bond. The Civil Code of 1804, though imposing conditions more rigorous than those of the Law of 1792, maintained divorce, and at the same time re-established legal separation (*séparation de corps*). The Law of 8 May, 1816, abolished divorce and maintained separation. The Law of 27 July, 1884, re-established divorce on the grounds of the condemnation of one party to an afflictive and infamous punishment, of violence, cruelty, and grave injuries, of adultery on the part of either husband or wife; it did not admit divorce by mutual consent; it maintained separation and authorized the courts to transform into a divorce, upon the demand of either party and cause shown, at the end of three years, a separation which had been granted at the suit of either. This law has recently been aggravated by two enactments which permit the adulterous husband to contract marriage with his accomplice and, instead of merely permitting the courts to convert separation into divorce at the end of three years, declare this conversion to be of right upon the demand of either party. The annual proportion of divorces to population has increased, from 3.68 per 10,000 inhabitants in 1900, to 5.57 per 10,000 inhabitants in 1907.

(e) Interments and Cemeteries.—The Decree of 23 Prairial, Year XII, ordered that there should be distinctions of religious beliefs in regard to cemeteries. This decree was abrogated by the Law of 14 November, 1881, and since then a Protestant or a Jew may be buried in that part of the cemetery which had until then been reserved for Catholics. The Law of 15 November, 1887, on free interments, forbids any proceedings which may contravene the wishes of a deceased person who has, by "an authentic act", expressed a desire to be buried without religious ceremonies. To annul such an "act", the same normal conditions are required as for the revocation of a will, and in consequence of this law certain death-bed conversions, when the deceased has not had time to comply with the legal conditions of revocation, have been followed by non-religious burial.

The society founded in 1880 to promote cremation brought about, in 1886, the insertion of the word *incinération* in the law of free interments and, in 1889, the issue of an administrative order defining the conditions in which cremation might be practised. Between 1889 and 1904 the number of incinerations performed in the cemetery of Père Lachaise amounted to 3484.

The Decrees of 23 Prairial, Year XII, and of 18 May, 1806, assigned to the public establishments which had been constituted to administer the property and resources devoted to public worship (*fabriques* and *consistoires*) a monopoly of all undertaking, that is to say, all moneys received on account of funeral processions, burials or exhumations, draperies, and other objects used to enhance the solemnity of funeral processions. Most of the *fabriques*, in the important towns, exploited this monopoly through middlemen. Some years ago, attention was called in the Chambers to the fact that the profits derived from non-religious interments, as well as from religious, were being taken by the *fabriques*, and upon this pretext the Law of 28 December, 1904, laicized the business of funeral-

management, assigning the monopoly of it to the communes. Only the furniture used for the exterior or interior decorations of religious edifices could thenceforward be provided by the *fabriques*. But the Separation Law of 1905 supervened, and all such decorative furniture became the property of the *associations cultuelles* (see below). As no *association cultuelle* was formed for the Catholic religion, the material fell into the hands of the sequestrators of the *fabrique* property.

*The Law of Separation.*—"The Law of Separation of the Churches and the State" (*Loi de Séparation des Eglises et de l'Etat*) of 1905 proceeded from the principle that the State professes no religious belief. Regarded from the viewpoint of the life of the Church, it completely dissociated the State from the appointment of bishops and parish priests. Soon after the passage of the law all the vacant sees received titulars by direct nomination of Pius X. As to the annual revenue of the Church, the appropriation for public worship (*budget des cultes*), which in 1905 amounted to 42,324,933 francs, was suppressed. The departments and communes were forbidden to vote appropriations for public worship. The law grants, first, life pensions equivalent in each case to three-fourths of the former salary to ministers of religion who were not less than sixty years of age when the law was promulgated and had spent thirty years in ecclesiastical services remunerated by the State. Secondly, it grants life pensions equivalent to one-half the former salary to ministers of religion who were not less than forty-five years of age and had passed more than twenty years in ecclesiastical services remunerated by the State. It makes grants for periods of from four to eight years to ecclesiastics less than forty-five years of age who shall continue to discharge their functions. The law resulted, in the budget of 1907, in the elimination of the item of 37,441,800 francs (\$7,488,360) for salaries to ministers of religion and the inclusion of 29,563,871 francs (\$5,912,774) for the pensions and allowances of the first year, making a saving of about eight millions. As the allowances are to diminish progressively until the suppression is complete, at the end of eight years, and as the pensions are to cease with the lives of the pensioners, the appropriations on account of religious worship will decrease notably as year follows year.

With respect to the buildings which the Concordat had placed at the disposal of the Church, the law provided that the episcopal residences, for two years, the presbyteries and seminaries (*grands séminaires*), for five years, the churches, for an indefinite period, should be left at the disposal of the *associations cultuelles*, which will be discussed later on in this article. In regard to church property, this consisted of (a) the *mensæ episcopales* and *mensæ curiales* (see *MENSA*), which were composed of the possessions restored to the Church after the Concordat, together with the sum total of the donations made to bishoprics or parishes in the course of the intervening century; (b) the property of the parish *fabriques*, intended to meet all the expenses of public worship, and derived either from possessions restored to the Church after the Concordat or from gifts and legacies, and augmented by pews, collections, and funeral fees. The Law of Separation divided the property of the *mensæ* and the *fabriques* into three classes. The first of these classes consisted of property received from the State, and this the State resumed; as to the second, consisting of property not received from the State, and on the other hand burdened with eleemosynary or educational obligations, it was ruled that the representatives of the *fabriques* could give it to public establishments or to establishments of public utility of an eleemosynary or educational character, subject to the approbation of the prefect. Lastly, there was a third category which comprised property not derived from state grants and not burdened with any obligations or only with obliga-

tions connected with public worship. It was ruled that such property should pass into the hands of the *associations cultuelles*, and that if no such body appeared to receive it it should be assigned by decree to communal benevolent institutions within the territorial limits of the parish or diocese.

This brings us to the subject of the *associations cultuelles*. Under the Concordat the episcopal *mensa* and the parochial *fabrique* were public institutions. When religious worship ceased to be a department of the public service, the Chambers, in order to replace the institutions which had been suppressed, wished to call into existence certain private "moral persons", or associations. Without any previous understanding with the Holy See, the rupture with which was already complete, the Chambers decided that in each diocese and each parish associations for religious worship (*associations cultuelles*) could be created to receive as proprietors the property of the *mensa*, with the responsibility of taking care of it. The transfer of the property was to be effected by decisions of the former *fabriques* in favour of these new associations. The law imposed a certain minimum number of administrators on each association, the number varying from seven to twenty-five, according to the importance of the commune, and the administrators might be French or foreign, men or women, priests or laymen. The preparation of statutes for the associations was left entirely free. Very lively controversies arose. It was suggested that the application of this law would be followed by an influx of lay Catholics, members of the *associations cultuelles*, into the government of the Church. Some thought this anxiety excessive; for, as the law allowed a number of adjacent parishes to be administered by a single *association cultuelle*, it seems that it would have been, strictly speaking, possible for one *association*, composed of the bishop and twenty-four priests chosen by him, to receive both the property of the *mensa* and that of all the parishes of the diocese.

But other reasons for anxiety appeared when Articles 4 and 8 of the Law were carefully compared. Article 4 provided that these associations must, in their constitutions, "conform to the general rules of organization of public worship", and as a matter of fact, at Riom, in 1907, the court refused the use of the church to a schismatical priest who was supported by a schismatical *association cultuelle*. But Article 8 provided for the case in which several *associations cultuelles*, each with its own priest, should lay claim to the same church, and gave the Council of State the right to decide between them, "taking account of the circumstances of fact". Thus, while, according to Article 4, it appeared that the *cultuelle* recognized by, and in effective communion with, the hierarchy must naturally be the owner of the property of the *fabrique*, Article 8 left to the Council of State, a purely lay authority, the settlement of any dispute which might arise between a *cultuelle* faithful to the bishop and a schismatical *cultuelle*. Thus it belonged to the Council of State to pronounce upon the orthodoxy of any *association cultuelle* and its conformity with "the general rules of public worship" as provided by Article 4.

A general assembly of the episcopate, held 30 May, 1906, considered the question of the *associations cultuelles*, but the decisions reached were not divulged. Should such associations be formed according to the Law, or must they refuse to form any? In the month of March, twenty-three Catholic writers and members of the Chambers had expressed, in a confidential letter to the bishops, a hope that the *cultuelles* might be given a trial. The publication of this letter had stirred up a bitter controversy, and for some months the Catholics of France were seriously divided. Pius X, in the Encyclical "Gravissimo officii" (10 August, 1906), gave it as his judgment that this law, made without his assent, and which even purported to be made

against him, threatened to intrude lay authority into the natural operation of the ecclesiastical organization; the Encyclical prohibited the formation not only of *associations cultuelles*, but of any form of association whatsoever "so long as it should not be certainly and legally evident that the Divine constitution of the Church, the immutable rights of the Roman pontiff and of the bishops, such as their authority over the necessary property of the Church, particularly the sacred edifices, would, in the said associations, be irrevocably and fully secure".

The half-contradiction between Article 4 and Article 8 was not the only serious grievance which the Church could allege. The author of the law had furthermore restricted in a singularly parsimonious fashion the property rights of the future *associations cultuelles*. They were permitted to establish unlimited reserve funds, but they were to have the free disposal of only a portion equivalent to six times the mean annual expenditure, and the surplus was to be kept in the *Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations*, and employed exclusively in the acquisition or conservation of real and personal property for the use of religious worship. Moreover, the business transactions of all the *cultuelles* were to be under state inspection and control.

Thus the law on the one hand did not leave to the Church, legally represented by the *associations cultuelles*, the right of freely possessing the ecclesiastical patrimony, of increasing it at will, of disposing of it at will; and on the other hand it left to the jurisdiction of the State the right, in any case of conflicting claims, to accept or to reject the legitimate claims of any *cultuelle* which might be in communion with the hierarchy.

The interdict laid upon the *associations cultuelles* has had several juridical consequences. First, the third of the classes of *fabriques* property described above was placed under sequestration, to be assigned by the State to communal benevolent institutions, of which every commune possesses at least one—the free hospital and dispensary. Secondly, the suppressed *fabriques* were under regular legal obligations, e. g., *Messes* to be said as consideration for pious foundations. In the intention of the author of the law, the obligation of causing these *Messes* to be said would have fallen upon the *associations cultuelles*; as these have not been founded, are the communal institutions, which enjoy the revenues of the foundations, bound to fulfil these obligations? For two years the responses given to this question by the civil authority were hesitating. The Law of 15 April, 1908, laid it down that these institutions shall in nowise be bound to cause the *Messes* to be said in prospective consideration of which the foundations were established; that only the founders themselves or their heirs in direct line shall have the right to claim, within a period of six months, restitution of the capital of the said foundations, but that certain clerical benefit societies (the *mutualités sacerdotales*, organized to receive the funds of the old diocesan *caisses* for the support of superannuated priests) could receive incomes from these foundations and, in return, accept the obligation of the *Messes*. It appeared to the Holy See, however, that the constitution of these benefit societies did not adequately safeguard the rights of the bishops, and the French clergy were thenceforward forbidden to avail themselves of this law. As the right of recovery on account of non-fulfilment of the conditions has been allowed only to heirs in the direct line, the numberless pious foundations established by priests or other celibates are forever lost. And at the present writing no pious foundation is legally feasible in France, because there is in the Church no personality legally qualified to receive such a bequest. Hence the absolute impossibility, for any French Catholic, of securing to himself in perpetuity the celebration in his own parish church of a *Mass* for the repose of his soul.

Thirdly, the use of the churches was to be assigned to the *associations cultuelles*, on condition that the latter should keep up the buildings. The *cultuelles* not having been formed, would the State take possession of the churches? It dared not; or, rather, it did not wish to drive home upon the popular mind the effect of the separation. After a brief period of transition, during which ridiculous *procès-verbaux* were drawn up against priests who said *Mass*, the State left the religious edifices at the disposal of clergy and people, officially placing assemblies for religious worship in the same official category as ordinary public gatherings; it was sufficient for the religious authority to make, at the beginning of each year, a declaration in advance for all the gatherings for public worship to be held during the year. Rome forbade the Church of France to comply with this formality of an annual declaration, thus once more endeavouring to make the State understand that legislation regulating the life of the Catholic Church could not depend on the mere will of the State, and that ecclesiastical authority could not, even by a simple declaration, actively concur in any such legislation. Once more it was thought that the closing of the churches was imminent. Then came two new laws.

The Law of 2 January, 1907, permits the exercise of religious worship in the churches purely on sufferance and without any legal title. According to this new law, the clergy have only the actual use of the edifices, the maintenance of which is an obligation incumbent upon the proprietor—the State or the commune. But grave complications are to be expected. If the proprietor refuses the needful repairs, the church may be closed for the sake of public safety—unless, that is, the faithful tax themselves to pay for repairs. The Church, tolerated in her own buildings, has no recourse against any mayor who might order the bells to be tolled for a non-religious funeral. At one time it was believed that the priests would be able to rent the churches on lease, but, owing to the demands of ministerial orders, this last hope had to be abandoned. At last assemblages for religious worship were juridically classified as public meetings, and, as the Church refused to make the anticipatory declaration required by the Law of 1881, on public meetings, a law passed on 28 March, 1907, abolished this requirement in respect of all public meetings, those for religious worship included.

Such was the patchwork of expedients by which the Government, embarrassed by its own Law of 1905, and still refusing to negotiate with Rome, contrived what looked like a *modus vivendi*. The voter sees that the priest is still in the church, and that *Mass* is still said there, and this is all that is needed by the Government to convince the shallow multitude that the Church is not persecuted, and that if the conditions of its existence are not prosperous, the blame must be laid on the successive refusals of the pope—the refusal to permit the formation of *cultuelles*, the refusal to permit compliance with the law in the matter of declaring assemblies for public worship, the refusal to let priests form the *mutualités* approved by the State. All the evils of the situation are due to the fundamental error committed by the State at the very outset, when, wishing to reorganize the life of the Church in France, it broke with the Holy See instead of opening negotiations. Hence the impossibility of the Church actively co-operating in the execution of laws enacted by the civil authority in a purely one-sided fashion—laws which took the place of a concordat never regularly annulled. (See CONCORDAT OF 1801.)

*Civil Regulation of Public Worship.*—On this point the Law of 1905 contains two classes of provisions.

(a) Rules Relating to Religious Ceremonies.—While, under the Concordat, an administrative authorization was necessary for the opening of even a private chapel, it is now lawful to open places of worship



without any previous authorization. A mayor can prohibit processions in his commune simply on the pretext of avoiding public disorder; as a matter of fact, in most of the great cities of France processions do not take place. Mayors can even forbid the presence in funeral processions of priests wearing their vestments, but very few mayors have ever issued such an order. Both the parish priest and the mayor have authority to cause the bells to be rung. A ministerial circular dated 27 January, 1907, withholds from the mayor the right to have the bells rung for "civil baptisms" or for non-religious marriages or burials, but there is no penal sanction for the transgression of this order. It is now forbidden to erect or to affix any religious sign or emblem in public places or upon public monuments; but the existing emblems remain and private property may be decorated, even externally, with religious emblems.

(b) *Repression of Interference with Religious Worship.*—The law punishes with a fine of from 16 to 200 francs and imprisonment of from six days to two months anyone who by violence, threats, or any act which may be construed as pressure (*pression*) has attempted to influence an individual to exercise or to abstain from exercising any religious worship, or who, by disorderly conduct, interferes with the exercise of any such worship. It punishes, with a fine of from 500 to 3000 francs or imprisonment for from two months to one year, outrages or slanders against functionaries, if committed publicly in places of religious worship, and with from three months to two years imprisonment any preacher who shall incite his hearers to resist the laws.

*The Law of Separation and the Protestants and Jews.*—The Law of 1905 suppressed the special organic articles which regulated Protestant worship and the Decree of 1844 which had organized Jewish worship, recognized since 1806, and provided, since 1831, with state-paid rabbis. Before 1905 there had been a Reformed Church which was administered in each parish by a presbyteral council elected by the members of the denomination, and at the capital by a consistory to which all the presbyteral councils sent delegates, and which nominated pastors with the consent of the Government. This Church was very much divided in theology. It included: the Orthodox, who had carried, in the general synod of 1872, by 61 votes to 45, a declaration of faith involving as of necessity the acceptance of certain dogmas; the Liberals, who, in spite of their defeat in 1872, continued to claim for the pastor an unlimited freedom of teaching in his own church; a midway party (*centre droit*) who were nearer to the Liberals than to the Orthodox. The Law of 1905, in terminating the official existence of a Reformed Church, had this interesting result, that the theological divisions of the various groups openly expressed themselves in the formation of three distinct great organizations for the Reformed religion: (1) the Union Nationale des Eglises Réformées Évangéliques,

formed by the Orthodox at the Synod of Orléans (6 February, 1906), and requiring as a condition the acceptance of the Declaration of Faith of 1872; in this body the regional synods, in which the delegates of the presbyteral associations meet, and the national synods hold spiritual authority; (2) the Union des Eglises Réformées de France, formed by the *centre droit* at the Synod of Jarnac (June, 1907), with the like synodal organizations and with the hope, hardly justified so far, of receiving the adhesion of both the extreme parties; (3) the United Reformed Churches (*Eglises Réformées Unies*), a very vague grouping of independent presbyteral associations, leaving to each Church its autonomy, restricting the functions of the synods, and representing, in place of dogma, the negative tendencies called "liberal". In this new threefold

organization one feature, the consistory, disappeared.

The Lutheran Church has but sixty-seven parishes in France. It has grouped its *cultuelles* into one general association.

The Jewish denomination has formed the Union des Associations Cultuelles Israélites en France. The central consistory is composed of the grand rabbi, certain rabbis elected by the graduates of the Rabbinical School of France who are employed in educational or religious functions, and lay members elected for a term of eight years by the *associations cultuelles*. The rabbis are elected, subject to the approval of the consistory.

*Chaplaincies.*—The law authorizes the State, the departments, and the communes to pay salaries to chaplains in public institutions such as *lycées*, colleges, schools, hospitals, asylums, and prisons. In the Army the office of chaplain has not been

abolished, but it remains unoccupied. Since 1 January, 1906, no minister of religion has been a member of the staff of any military hospital; the local ministers of religion may enter these hospitals at the request of sick soldiers. A decree dated 6 February, 1907, abolished the naval chaplaincies, but certain ecclesiastics who formerly filled these posts will continue to discharge the functions proper to them. The State does not allow appropriations for the maintenance of chaplaincies in schools where there are no boarders. It is a curious fact that, while the laws forbid priests to enter primary schools, they have, up to the present, admitted to the secondary schools chaplains paid out of the public purse; the Government feared that if this guarantee of religious training were wanting parents would send their children to private schools. But a practice recently established in a certain number of *lycées* tends to relieve the State of the expense of chaplaincies by compelling parents who wish their children to receive religious instruction to pay an additional sum.

*Political Groups, the Press, and Intellectual and Social Organizations.*—Politically speaking, the Catholic group which receives the active sympathies of the Catholic press is that known as the Action Libérale Populaire, founded by M. Jacques Piou, a Member of



THE CATHEDRAL, BLOIS

the Chamber, on the basis indicated for Catholics by the instructions of Leo XIII. This association, which was legally incorporated 17 May, 1902, comprises 1400 committees and more than 200,000 adherents. It acts by means of lectures, publications, and congresses. In the Chamber elected in 1906 there were 77 deputies belonging to this association.

Catholic daily journalism is represented chiefly by "L'Univers", "La Croix", and the "Peuple Français." The former of these papers, founded 3 November, 1833, by the Abbé Migne, had Eugène Vuillot for its editor from 1839 on, and Louis Vuillot after 1844. Its adhesion to the political directions given by Leo XIII detached from the "Univers", in 1893, a group of editors who founded "La Vérité Française"; this split ended with the amalgamation of the "Univers" and the "Vérité", 19 January, 1907. In October, 1908, the "Univers", under the management of M. François Vuillot, acquired greater importance with an enlarged form. "The Good Press" (Maison de la Bonne Presse), founded in 1873 by the Augustinians of the Assumption, immediately after issued the "Pèlerin", a bulletin of pious enterprises and pilgrimages, and after 1883 a daily paper, "La Croix", which has been edited since 1 April, 1900, by M. Féron Vrau. About a hundred local "Croix" are connected with the Paris "Croix". The "Good Press" publishes "Questions Actuelles", "Cosmos", "Mois Littéraire", and many other periodicals, and with it is connected the "Presse Régionale", which maintains a certain number of provincial papers defending Catholic interests. Many independent papers, either Conservative or nominally Liberal, are reckoned as Catholic, although a certain number of them have misled Catholic opinion by their opposition to the programme of Leo XIII.

The leading Catholic review is "Le Correspondant", founded in 1829, formerly the organ of the Liberal Catholics, such as Montalembert and Falloux. Its policy is "to rally all defenders of the Catholic cause, whatever their origin, on the broad ground of liberty for all; to afford them a common centre where, laying aside differences that must be secondary in the view of Christians, each one can do his part, in letters, in science, in historical and philosophical studies, in social life, to win the victory for Christian ideas". Monarchist by its antecedents, with a public in which Monarchists form a large proportion, the "Correspondant" has had for its editor since May, 1904, M. Etienne Lamy, of the Académie Française, who was a Republican Member of the National Assembly of 1871, and who, in 1881, brought down upon himself the displeasure of the Republican electors by his sturdy opposition to the laws suppressing religious congregations.

The chief enterprises for the benefit of Catholic students in Paris are the Cercle Catholique du Luxembourg, which was founded in 1847, and in 1902 became the Association Générale des Etudiants Catholiques de Paris; the Olivaint and the Laennec lectures, established in 1875, the former for students in law and letters, the latter for medical students, by Fathers of the Society of Jesus; the Réunion des Etudiants founded in 1895 by the Marist Fathers, and of which Ferdinand Brunetière was president of the board of directors until his death. Besides these, the Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Française, founded in 1886, now (June, 1909) unites in one group nearly 100,000 young men, students, peasants, employees of various kinds, and labourers; it has 2400 groups in the provinces and holds annual congresses in which, for some years past, social questions have been actively discussed. It was at the congress held by this association at Besançon in 1898 that the conversion of Ferdinand Brunetière was made known in a very remarkable speech of the famous academicien. Since 1905 it has been publishing its "Annales", and since 1907 a journal, "La Vie Nouvelle."



The extremely original association of the "Sillon" (furrow), attractive to some, disquieting to others, was founded in 1894 in the crypt of the Stanislas college and became, in 1898, under the direction of M. Marc Sangnier, a focus of social, popular, and democratic action. M. Sangnier and his friends develop, in their *Cercles d'études*, and propagate, in public meetings of the most enthusiastic character, the twofold idea that democracy is the type of social organization which tends to the highest development of conscience and of civic responsibility in the individual, and that this organization needs Christianity for its realization. To be a *silloniste*, according to the adherents of the Sillon, it is not enough merely to profess a doctrine, but one must live a life more fully Christian and fraternal. The Sillon has held a national congress every year since 1902; that of 1909 brought together more than three thousand members. The character of the organization has exposed it to lively criticism; its reception has not been the same in all dioceses. But in spite of obstacles, the *sillonistes* continue their activity, often independently of, but never in opposition to, the hierarchy, carrying on their work of penetration in indifferent or hostile surroundings. They have a review, "Le Sillon", and a newspaper, "L'Eveil Démocratique", which in two years has gained 50,000.

Catholic undertakings for the benefit of the young people of the poorer classes have developed mightily of late years. In 1900 the "Commission des Patronages" drew up statistics according to which the Catholics had charge of 3588 protectories (*patronages*) and 32,574 institutions of various kinds giving Christian care to the young. In the city of Paris alone there were at that date 176 Catholic protectories, with 26,000 young girls under their care. The Gymnastic Federation of the Protectories of France, formed after the gymnastic festival which was held at the Vatican on 5 to 8 October, 1905, numbers to-day (June, 1909) 549 Catholic gymnastic societies and 60,000 young people.

The State carries on its fight against the Church on the field of post-academic education: in 1894 there were in France only 34 non-religious (*laïques*) protectories; in 1907 there were 2364 non-religious protectories, 1366 for boys and 998 for girls. To the political groups, the journalistic work, the good works for the benefit of the young, must be added the "Catholic social" undertakings, the earliest of which was the *Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers*, founded in 1871 by Count Albert de Mun, the chief result of which was the introduction by Catholics in the Legislature of a certain number of legislative projects on social questions. The last five years have seen in France the birth and development, through the initiative of M. Henri Lorin and the Lyons journal, the "Chronique du Sud-Est", of the institution known as the *semaines sociales*, a series of social courses which bring together a great many priests and Catholic lay people. This idea has been imitated in Catholic Spain and Italy. Lastly a body of Jesuits have begun a valuable collection of brochures and tracts, under the title "L'Action populaire", which forms a veritable reference library for those who wish to study social Catholicism and an inestimable source of information for those who wish to join actively in the movement.

*The Church in France during the First Three Years after the Law of Separation.*—On 16 December, 1905, a large number of bishops issued a request to the parish priests and members of the fabric committees (*fabriques*—see above) not to be present at the taking of inventories of church furniture prescribed by the Law of Separation except as mere witnesses and after making all reserves. A circular, dated 10 January, 1906, ordering the agents of the Department of Public Domains to open the tabernacles, intensified the feeling of indignation and, in consequence of an inter-









pellation, was implicitly disavowed, on 19 January, by M. Merlou, Minister of Finance. But the feeling lasted and, from the end of January to the end of March, expressed itself, in a certain number of churches, in violent outbreaks against the agents who came to take the inventories. The breaking open of locked doors, the cashiering of military officers who refused to lend the aid of their troops to these proceedings, the arrest and prosecution of persons taking part in Catholic demonstrations, and the mortal wounds inflicted on some of them in the departments of Nord and of Haute-Loire aggravated the public irritation. There was some hope among Catholics that the general elections, which were to take place in May, would result in defeat for the Government; but these hopes were not realized; the Opposition lost fifty seats in the balloting of 6-20 May.

The first general gathering of the bishops was held 30 May, 1906. The Encyclical "Gravissimo officii" (10 August, 1906), which rejected the *cultuelles*, received the absolute obedience of the Catholics. The attempt to form schismatical *cultuelles*, made by some priests and laymen in eighty localities, met with derision and contempt, and these isolated bodies of schismatics failed to obtain possession of the religious edifices even by appealing to the courts. The second and third general gatherings of the bishops (4-7 September, 1906, and 15 January, 1907) thanked Pius X for the Encyclical and discussed the organization of public worship, in accordance with a very definite programme for deliberation which the Holy See had sent to Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris. On 12 December, 1906, Mgr. Montagnini, who had remained in Paris as guardian of the pontifical archives, was expelled from France after a minute domiciliary search and the seizure of his papers. The Vatican protested in a circular dated 19 December. Various incidents in the application of the law—the expulsion of Cardinal Richard from his archiepiscopal residence (15 December, 1906), expulsions of seminarists from the seminaries, the employment of troops at Beaupréau and at Auray to enforce such an expulsion—called forth lively protests from the Catholic press, which saw, in all these episodes, the realization of the settled policy thus expounded by M. Viviani, Minister of Labour, in the Chamber of Deputies, 8 November, 1906: "Through our fathers, through our elders, through ourselves—all of us together—we have bound ourselves to a work of anticlericalism, to a work of irreligion. . . . We have extinguished in the firmament lights which shall not be rekindled. We have shown the toilers that heaven contained only chimeras."

Successive meetings of the bishops have organized the work of the *Denier du Clergé*. The organization is diocesan, not parochial. No individual is taxed; the subscriptions are entirely voluntary; but in many dioceses the diocesan budget fixes, without, however, imposing, the contribution which each parish ought to furnish. A commission of control, composed of priests and laymen, in many dioceses takes charge of the disbursement of the *Denier du Clergé*. If a parish contributes insufficiently, and that not from lack of means but from lack of goodwill, the bishop can withdraw its parish priest. Two penalties can be inflicted upon Catholics who culpably refuse to contribute to the support of religious worship: a diminution of pomp in the administration of the sacraments, and an increase, as affecting such persons, of incidental burdens.

The first results of the *Denier du Clergé* in the various dioceses are not as yet well ascertained; they seem to justify neither over-enthusiastic hopes nor over-pessimistic fears. An inter-diocesan fund (*caisse*) is beginning to do its work in aiding the poorer dioceses. In many communes the communal authority, having taken possession of the presbytery, has rented it to the parish priest for a certain sum, but the law declares that the lease, to be valid, must have been

ratified by the prefect. By this means the State has sought to prevent the communes from renting presbyteries too cheap. Of 32,093 presbyteries existing in France, 3643 were still occupied rent-free by the parish priests at the beginning of October, 1908. A circular of M. Briand, Minister of Justice, has animadverted on this fact as an abuse. It appears that in most of the dioceses a central committee, or diocesan bureau, composed of priests and laymen, is to be formed, with the episcopal authority for its centre, to combine the direction of all the organized work of the diocese. Subject to this committee there will be committees in the several *arrondissements*, cantons, and parishes. When consulted in May, 1907, Pius X preferred small parochial committees under the *curés* to the formation of parochial associations (which might be interpreted as an acceptance of the Law of 1901 on associations), with an unlimited number of members. The ecclesiastical seminaries, which the Law of Separation drove out of the buildings they were occupying, have been reconstituted in other homes under the title of "Ecoles Supérieures de Théologie."

At present one of the most serious preoccupations of the Church in France is the supply of priests. In 1878, when Mgr. Bougaud wrote his book, "Le grand péril de l'Eglise de France," there was a deficiency of 2467 priests in France. Père Dudon, who has studied the question of the supply of priests very profoundly, computes that in 1906, at the breaking of the Concordat, there was a deficiency of 3109, and the very insecurity of the position of the Church before the law furnishes ground for the fear that vocations will go on decreasing in frequency.

Geography.—RECLUS, *La France in Géographie universelle* (Paris, 1876), II; VIDAL DE LA BLACHE, *La France* (Paris, 1903); MICHELET, *Tableau de la France* in vol. II of the *Histoire* mentioned below; DUMAZET, *Voyage en France* (47 vols., Paris, 1894-1907); MARSHALL, *Cathedral Cities of France* (London, 1907).

General History.—MICHELET, *Histoire de France* (new ed., 17 vols., Paris, 1871-74—recommended by its truthfulness of historical colouring rather than exactness of detail, a picture rather than a narrative); MARTIN, *Histoire de France* (19 vols., Paris, 1855-60—conscientious research with anti-Catholic tendencies and somewhat out of date); cf. EPINOIS, *M. Henri Martin* (Paris, 1867); DARESTE, *Histoire de France* (8 vols., Paris, 1884-73—clear and judicious); BODLEY, *France* (2d ed., London, 1899); GALTON, *Church and State in France, 1300-1900* (London, 1907); KITCHIN, *A History of France* (Oxford, 1892-94). A group of specialists under the direction of LAVISSÉ have undertaken the publication of a *Histoire de France* of which the published volumes bring their subject down to the end of the reign of Louis XIV; this work—the contributors to which are men of learning, each following his own bent, though never violently—gives the last word of science at the present time. LOUIS BATIFFOL, *La Renaissance* (Paris, 1905), is the only volume which has yet appeared of a collection now being prepared under the title *Histoire de France pour tous*. ADAMS, *The Growth of the French Nation* (London, 1897).

No General History of the Church of France is really worthy to be recommended. The principal documents to consult are: *Gallia Christiana* (q. v.); JEAN, *Les archevêques et évêques de France de 1682 à 1801* (Paris, 1891); HANOTAUX ed., *Instructions des ambassadeurs de France auprès du Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1888); IMBART DE LA TOUR, *Archives de l'histoire religieuse de la France* (4 vols. have appeared); BAUNARD, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France* (Tours, 1901—dealing with the nineteenth century); *L'épiscopat français au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1907). On the Sources of the History of France the chief repertoires are: MONOD, *Bibliographie de l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1888); *Catalogue de l'histoire de France de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1855-82); LANGLOIS AND STEIN, *Les archives de l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1891); MOLINIER, *Les sources de l'histoire de France* (4 vols., Paris, 1901-04).

For bibliography of the French Revolution see REVOLUTION, FRANCE.

For France in the Nineteenth Century see NAPOLEON. Also CURRIER, *Constitutional and Organic Laws of France, 1875-1889* (Philadelphia, 1891); VIEL-CASTEL, *Histoire de la Restauration* (20 vols., Paris, and tr. London, 1888); THUREAU-DANGIN, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet* (Paris); DE LA GORCE, *Histoire du second Empire* (7 vols., Paris); OLLIVIER, *L'Empire libéral* (Paris, 1904-08—13 vols. have appeared); LAMY, *Etudes sur le second Empire* (Paris); HANOTAUX, *Histoire de la France contemporaine, 1870-1888* (4 vols., Paris, 1902-09); ZÉVOULT, *Histoire de la troisième République* (4 vols., Paris, 1900-05); COUBERTIN, *L'évolution française sous la troisième République* (tr., London, 1898); PARMELE, *The Evolution of an Empire* (New York, 1897). On the Religious History of France under the Third Republic: DEBIDOUR, *L'Eglise catholique et l'Etat sous la troisième République* (2 vols., Paris, 1906-08—very

anti-Catholic); LECANNET, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième République* (Paris, 1907—Catholic; brings the subject down to 1878); *Du toast à l'encyclique* (Paris, 1893); DABRY, *Les catholiques républicains* (Paris, 1893). For parochial statistics see the annuals *Le clergé français* and *La France ecclésiastique*.

On the Laws against Congregations and the Law of Separation. BRIAND, *La séparation* (2 vols., Paris, 1907 and 1909); *Speeches of WALDECK-ROUSSEAU and RIBOT*; DE MUN, *La loi des suspects* (2 vols., Paris, 1902); COMBES, *Une campagne laïque* (2 vols., Paris, 1902 and 1906). The Law on Associations has been discussed by TROUILLOT and CHAPSAL; that on Separation by RÉVILLE, with radical tendencies, and by TAUDIÈRE and LAMARZELLE, with Catholic tendencies. *La Revue d'organisation et de défense religieuse*, published by the Good Press since 1906, gives every day the state of the law in relation to Catholic interests.

On the Marriage Laws: SERMET, *La loi du 21 Juin 1907 sur le Mariage* (Toulouse, 1908).—On the Influence of Freemasonry: PRACHE, *La pétition contre la maçonnerie: rapport parlementaire* (Paris, 1905); GOYAU, *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France* (Paris, 1899). On the Religious Orders: *Mémoire pour la défense des congrégations religieuses* (Paris, 1880); KANNENGIESER, *France et Allemagne* (Paris, 1900). On the Missions and the Protectorate: PIOTET, *Les missions catholiques françaises* (6 vols., Paris, 1900-1903); ROUVIER, *Leon du pays* (Paris, 1898); REY, *La protection diplomatique et consulaire dans les échelles du Levant* (Paris, 1899); GOYAU, *Les nations apôtres. Vieille France, jeune Allemagne* (Paris, 1903); KANNENGIESER, *Les missions catholiques, France et Allemagne* (Paris, 1900). On France at Rome: LACROIX, *Mémoire historique sur les institutions de la France à Rome* (2d ed., Rome, 1892). On the School Situation: *Speeches of JULES FERRY*; PICHARD, *Nouveau code de l'instruction primaire* (18th ed., Paris, 1905); GOYAU, *L'école d'aujourd'hui* (2 vols., Paris, 1899 and 1906); LESCOTER, *La mentalité laïque à l'école* (Paris, 1906); DES ALLEUILS, *Histoire de l'enseignement libre* (Paris, 1898); *Bulletins de la société générale d'éducation et d'enseignement; Enquête sur la réforme de l'enseignement secondaire*, 2 vols., Paris, 1900—official; LAMARZELLE, *La crise universitaire* (Paris, 1900). On Charitable Institutions: *Paris charitable* (3d ed., Paris, 1904); *La France charitable* (Paris, 1899)—two collections of monographs published by the Office central des institutions charitables.—On Social Organizations the chief sources are collective reports on Catholic enterprises published at the Exposition of 1900, the *Guide annuaire social* (annual since 1905), and the *Manuel social pratique* (1909), published by the *Action populaire* of Reims, with the brochures issued by this last association.—On the Grouping of Religious Movements: FRAENZEL, *Vers l'union des catholiques* (Paris, 1907); *Guide d'action religieuse* (Paris, 1908). GEORGES GOYAU.

FRENCH LITERATURE.—*Origin and Formation of the French Language*.—When the Romans became masters of Gaul they imposed their language on that country together with their religion, their laws, their customs, and their culture. The Low Latin, which thus became universal throughout Gaul, was not slow in undergoing a change while passing through Celtic and Frankish throats, and in showing traces of climate and of racial genius. From this transformation arose a new tongue, the Romance, which was destined to gradually evolve itself into the French. The glossaries of Reichenau and of Cassel contain many translations of Latin and Germanic words into Romance; they date from the eighth century. The earliest texts in our possession belong to the ninth century, and are more valuable from an archaeological than from a literary standpoint. These are the formulas called "Les Serments de Strasbourg" (the oaths pronounced by the soldiers of Louis the German and of Charles the Bald, A. D. 842); the song or "Prose de Sainte Eulalie", an imitation of a Latin hymn of the Church (about A. D. 880); a portion of a "Homélie sur Jonas" discovered at Valenciennes, and written in a mixture of Latin and Romance, dating from the early part of the tenth century; "La Vie de Saint Léger", a bald narrative in verse, written in the latter part of the tenth century. The metamorphosis, under the action of influences now no longer traceable, of Low Latin into Romance did not proceed along the same lines everywhere in Gaul. From the Pyrenees to the Scheldt it varied with the varying localities, and gave rise to many dialects. These dialects may be grouped into two principal languages which are usually named from the word used as an affirmative in each: the Romance language of *oc* in the South: and the Romance language of *oïl* in the North. The *oïl* language comprised all the varieties of speech in use to the north of an imaginary line drawn from the estuary of the Gironde to the Alps, passing

through Limousin, Auvergne, and Dauphiny. In the twelfth century, the speech of the Ile-de-France began to take the lead over all the others, for the very good reason that it was the speech of the royal domain. Hereafter the French language possesses its form, and can give birth to a literature.

*In the Middle Ages*.—Epic Poetry.—In France, as everywhere else, literature began with poetry, and that epic. For many centuries this seems to have been the form natural to the French mind; and the abundance of the output is a striking proof of the breadth and power of the movement. To comprehend more clearly the great mass of epic works of this period, we distinguish three subject-matters, or three cycles: the French, or national, cycle; the Breton cycle; the antique cycle.

The origins of the French cycle go back to the first ages of Frankish domination. The Frankish chiefs all kept their singers, who celebrated their exploits in poems of heroic inspiration. These compositions, called *cantilènes*, were sung to the harp, either at their festivals or at the head of the army before a battle. This spontaneous growth of epic poetry goes on until the tenth century; but after the tenth century the inventive power of the poets—the *trouvères*, as they are called—is exhausted; they no longer compose new



MUSICIAN  
XIII Century MS. of "Bueve de Hanstone", Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

songs, but co-ordinate, above all amplify, and, finally, reduce to writing the songs left to them by their predecessors. By dint of this labour of arrangement and editing they compose the *chansons de geste* ("history songs", from the Latin *gesta*, "things done", "history"). Comparatively short, these *chansons de geste* are written in lines of six syllables which are made into couplets, or *laisses*, with assonances, or imperfect rhymes (such, e. g., as *perde* and *superbe*). Like the old *cantilènes*, they were intended to be sung by the *trouvère* at feasts or in battle. They are all connected with real historical episodes, which, however, are embellished, and often disfigured, with popular traditions and the fruits of the poet's own imagination. The most famous of these *chansons de geste*, the "Chanson de Roland", put into writing about the year 1080, and by an unknown author, is the *chef d'œuvre* of this national epic poetry. It admirably reflects the society of the time. With its scenes of carnage, its loud clash of blades, its heroic barons who sacrifice their lives for the emperor and die after commending their souls to God, its miraculous intervention of angels who receive the soul of the brave warrior, the "Chanson de Roland" places vividly before the imagination the France of the eleventh century, warlike, violent, still barbarous, but thoroughly animated by an ardent faith. The "Chanson de Roland" is the most widely known of the *chansons de geste*, but a multitude of them are extant, and they all contain great beauties. While some of them, centring upon Charlemagne ("Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne", "Aimeri de Narbonne", "Girard de Viane", etc.), celebrate the union

of France under the kingship and conflicts with external enemies, others are inspired by the struggles maintained by great feudal chiefs against the king ("Ogier le Danois", "Renaud de Montauban", "Gérard de Roussillon"), by the wars of vassals among themselves, and by historical memories belonging particularly to this or that province ("Raoul de Cambrai", the "Geste des Lorrains", "Auberi le Bourgoing"). The



LANDING OF THE KNIGHT OF THE SWAN  
XIV Century MS., Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

interesting element in all of them is, chiefly, their faithful portrayal of the feudal world, its virtues, and its asperities.

From the end of the twelfth century the success of the *chansons de geste* is counterbalanced by that of the romances of the Breton cycle. Here imagination roams at large, above all that kind of imagination which we call fantasy. The marvellous plays an important part. Manners are less violent, more delicate. Love, almost absent from the *chansons de geste*, holds a great place and utters itself in a style at once respectful and exalted. We find everywhere the impress of a twofold mysticism, that of chivalry and of religion. In other words, if the *chansons de geste* bear the stamp of the Germanic spirit, the Breton romances are inspired by the Celtic. The central figure is that of King Arthur, a character borrowed from history, the incarnation of the independence of the Breton race. Around him are his companions, the knights of the Round Table and Merlin the wizard. The Breton romances were intended to be read, not to be sung; they were written, moreover, in prose. In course of time Chrestien de Troyes, a poet rather facile and prolific than truly talented, put them into rhymed verse; between 1160 and 1180 he wrote "Perceval le Gallois", "Le Chevalier au lion", "Lancelot en la charrette", "Cligès", "Erec et Enide". In these romances Lancelot is the type of *l'amour courtois*—the "gentle" love which every knight must bear his lady.

As for the antique cycle, it is no more than a work of imitation. The clerics, observing the success of epic and narrative poetry, conceived the idea of throwing into the same form the traditions of antiquity. The "Roman d'Alexandre" and the "Roman de Troie", both written in the second half of the twelfth century, and amusing for their anachronisms and their baroque conceits, are, on the other hand, long, diffuse, and mediocre.

**Lyric Poetry.**—In these primitive periods of history the lines of division between various types of literature are not well defined. From the *cantilène* there sprang in turn the lyric poetry of the North. In these rough-hewn romances the poet relates in four or five couplets

of varied rhythm, but all ending with the same refrain, an adventure of war or of love; they are called *chansons de toile* (spinning songs) or *chansons de danse*, because women sang them either as they spun and chatted or as they danced *rondes*. Love nearly always plays the chief part in them—the love, successful or crossed, of a young girl for a *beau chevalier*, or perhaps a love crushed by the death of the beloved—such are the themes of the principal *chansons de toile* that have come down to us, "Belle Bremboure", "Belle Idoine", "Belle Aiglantine", "Belle Doette". But it was in Provence that lyric verse was to reach its fullest development. Subtle, learned, and somewhat artificial, Provençal poetry had for its only theme love—an idealized and quintessential love—*l'amour courtois*. On this common theme the troubadours embroidered variations of the utmost richness; the form which they employed, a very complex one, had given rise to manifold combinations of rhythms. The men of the North were dazzled when they came to know the Provençal poetry. Strangely enough, it did not spread directly from province to province within the borders of France, but by way of the Orient, from the Holy Land, during the Crusades, where Southern and Northern lords met each other. Soon a whole group of poets of the *oil* tongue in the North and East—Conon de Béthune, Gace Brulé, Blondel de Nesles, and especially Thiébaud, Count of Champagne—set to work to imitate the Provençal compositions.

**Bourgeois and Satirical Literature.**—The epic and the lyric were essentially aristocratic; they addressed themselves to an audience of barons and represented almost exclusively the manners and feelings of the upper classes in the feudal world. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, and after the emancipation of the communes, the *bourgeoisie* makes its appearance, and from that moment dates the origin and rise of a *bourgeoisie* literature. It begins with the *fabliaux*, little tales told in lines of eight syllables, pleasant stories intended only to amuse. The characters they introduce are people of humble or middling station—tradesmen, artisans, and their women-folk—who are put through all sorts of ridiculous adventures; their vices and oddities are ridiculed smartly and with some degree of malice—too often, also, with coarseness and indecency. These *fabliaux* are animated by the Gallic spirit of irony and banter, in contrast to the heroic, or "gentle" (*courtois*), spirit which inspires the epic and lyric works. Bourgeois and villagers find here a realistic picture of their existence and their manners, but freely caricatured so as to provoke laughter.

Combine the spirit of the *fabliaux* with memories of the *chanson de geste*, and we have the "Roman de Renart", a vast collection, formed early in the thirteenth century, of stories in verse thrown together with-



REYNARD THE FOX AS A MUSICIAN  
XIV Century MS. of "Roman de Renart", Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

out sequence or connexion. This work, which, it is believed, was preceded by another now lost, contains 30,000 lines. Enlarged by successive additions, the "Roman de Renart" is the work not only of several authors, but of a whole country and a whole epoch. What gives it unity, in spite of the diversity and incongruity of the stories of which it is made up, is that in all its parts the same hero appears again and again—Renart, the fox. The action round about Renart is carried on by many other characters, such as Ysengrin,

the wolf, Noble, the lion, Chantecler, the cock, pseudo-animals that mingle with their bearing and instincts as animals traits and feelings borrowed from humanity. Under pretext of relating an intrigue bristling with complications, in which Ysengrin and Renart are pitted against each other, the "Roman", a kind of parody of the *chansons de geste*, ridicules the nobles, feudal society, and feudal institutions.

Didactic Poetry.—Nobles and bourgeois, the two classes which, in the literature of the Middle Ages, speak with two accents so dissimilar, have one point of resemblance: the one class is as ignorant as the other. Only the clerics had any hold upon science—the little science which those times possessed. It had long remained shut up in Latin books composed in imitation of ancient models, but, beginning from the thirteenth century, the clerics conceived the idea of bringing the intellectual contents of these works within the domain of the vulgar tongue. This was the origin of didactic literature, in which the most important work is the "Roman de la Rose", an immense encyclopedic work produced by two authors with tendencies and mentalities in absolute mutual opposition, collaborating at an interval of forty years. The first 4000 lines of the "Roman de la Rose" were written about the year 1236 by Guillaume de Lorris, a charming versifier endowed with every attractive quality. In the design of Guillaume de Lorris, the work is another "Art of Love"; the author proposes to describe in it love and the effects of love, and to indicate the way of success for a lover. He personifies all the phases and varieties of love and of the other sentiments which attend it, and makes of them so many allegorical figures. Jealousy, Sadness, Reason, Fair Response (*Bel-Accueil*)—such are the abstractions to which Lorris lends a tenuous embodiment. With Jean de Meung, who wrote the continuation of the "Roman de la Rose", about 1275, the inspiration changes completely. Love is no longer the only subject. In a number of prolix discourses, aggregating 22,000 lines in length, the later author not only contrives to bring in a multitude of notions on physics and philosophy, but enters into a very severe criticism of contemporary social organization.

Prose and the Chroniclers.—Prose separates itself from poetry but slowly; when the epic outpouring has been exhausted history appears to take its place. It is the great movement of the Crusades that gives the impulse. Villehardouin, in his "Histoire de la Conquête de Constantinople" (1207), relates the events which he witnessed as a participant in the fourth crusade; he knows how to see and how to tell, with restraint and vigour, what he has seen and done. His chronicle is not, strictly speaking, history, but rather memoirs. Joinville attaches more importance to the moral element; the charm of his "Histoire de Saint Louis" (1309) is in the *bonhomie*, at once frank and deliberate, with which he sets forth the king's virtues and recounts his "chevaleries".

The great representative of history in the Middle Ages is Froissart (1337-1410); in him we have to deal with a veritable writer. Just when the feudal world was entering upon its period of decadence, and the chivalry of France had been decimated at Crécy and Agincourt, feudalism and chivalry find in Froissart their most marvellous portrayer. His work, "Chroniques de France, d'Angleterre, d'Espagne, de Bretagne, Gascogne, de Flandre et autres lieux", is the story of all the splendid feats of arms in the Hundred Years' War. Pitched battles, assaults, mere skirmishes, isolated raids, deeds of chivalric daring, single combats—he describes them with a picturesque effect and a distinction of style new in our literature. An aristocratic writer, he is above all attracted by the brilliant aspects of society—wealth, gallantry, chivalry. He scorns the *bourgeois* and the common people, and considers it quite natural that they should pay the cost of war.

In his work is nothing to recall the gloominess of the period; he has seen in it nothing but exploits and heroic adventure.

Froissart knew how to depict the outward semblance of an epoch. Philippe de Commines, on the other hand, the historian of Louis XI, is a connoisseur of souls; his viewpoint is from within. A minister of Louis XI, and then of Charles VIII, he is versed in affairs. He is much given, moreover, to analysis of character and the unravelling of events which have a political bearing. He goes back from effects to causes and is already rising to the conception of the general laws which govern history. One must not look for either brilliancy or relief in his style; but he has clearness, precision, solidity.

The Drama.—The fifteenth century would make but a sorry figure in the history of French literature had it not been that in this epoch there developed and flourished a literary form which had already been inchoate during the preceding centuries. Entirely original in foundation and style, that drama owes nothing to antiquity. It was the Church, the great power of those ages, which gave birth to it. For the masses in the Middle Ages the church was the home where, united in the same thoughts and the same consoling hopes, they spent that part of their lives which was the best, and so the longest offices of the Church were the most beloved by the people. Conformably with this feeling, the clergy interpolated in the offices representations of certain events in religious history. Such was the liturgical drama, which was presented more especially at the feasts of Christmas ("Les Pasteurs", "L'Epoux", "Les Prophètes") and Easter ("La Passion", "La Résurrection", "Les Pèlerins"). At first the liturgical drama was no more than a translation of the Bible into action and dialogue, but little by little it changed as it developed. The text became longer, verse took the place of prose, the vernacular supplanted Latin. The drama at the same time was tending to make for itself an independent existence and to come forth from the Church.

In the fourteenth century there appeared "Les Miracles de Notre-Dame", a stage presentment of a marvellous event brought about by the intervention of the Blessed Virgin. Thus was the drama making its way towards its completer form, that of the mysteries. A mystery is the exposition in dialogue of an historical incident taken from Holy Scripture or the lives of the saints. Mysteries may be grouped, according to their subjects, in three cycles: the Old Testament cycle ("Le Mystère du Viel Testament", in 50,000 lines), the New Testament cycle ("La Passion", composed by Arnoul Greban and presented in 1450), the cycle of the saints ("Les Actes des Apôtres", by Arnoul and Simon Greban). Metrically, the mystery is written in lines of eight syllables; the lyric passages were supposed to be sung. A prologue serves the purpose of stating the theme and bespeaking silence of the audience. The piece itself is divided into days, each day occupying as many lines as could be recited at one *séance*, and the whole ends with an invitation to prayer: "Chantons Te Deum laudamus".

The dramatic system of the mysteries contains certain thoroughly characteristic elements. First of all, the constant recourse to the marvellous: God, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints intervene in the action; later on abstract characters—Justice and Peace, Truth, Mercy—are added. Then the mingling of the tragic and the comic: side by side with scenes intended to excite deep emotion, the authors of mysteries present others which are mere buffoonery, and sometimes of the coarsest kind. This comic element is borrowed from scenes of modern life; for anachronism is rampant in the mysteries, contemporary questions are discussed, Christ and the saints are depicted as people of the fifteenth century. Lastly, not only does the action wander without restraint from place to place, but



occasionally it goes on in several different places at the same time. If the conception was original and interesting, the execution of it, unfortunately, was very mediocre. The authors of mysteries were not artists; they knew nothing of character-drawing, their characters are all of a piece, without individual traits. Above all, the style is deplorable, and but seldom escapes platitude and solecism. The fifteenth was, as a whole, the great century of the mysteries; they were then in perfect harmony with the ideas and sentiments of the period. In the next century, with the change of those ideas and sentiments, they were to enter upon their decadence and to disappear.

Did comedy too, in its turn, come forth from the Church? Can we connect it with the burlesque offices of the "Feast of Fools" and the "Feast of the Ass"?—Beyond doubt we cannot. But in the fourteenth century joyous bands of comrades organized themselves for their own common amusement—the "Basoche", a society of lawyers, and the "Sots" or the "Enfants sans souci". It was by these societies that comic pieces were composed and played throughout the fifteenth century. Farces, moralities, and follies (*soties*) were the kinds of compositions which they cultivated. The farce was a comic piece the only aim of which was to amuse; although it did not issue all complete from the *jabliau*, the farce bore a strong analogy to that form, and, as the themes were identical, the farce was often nothing more than a *jabliau* in action. The best specimen of the type is "La Farce de l'A vocat Pathelin" (1470), which presents a duel of wits between an advocate and a cloth-merchant, the one as thorough a rascal as the other. The morality, a comic piece with moral aims, is far inferior to the farce. Essentially pedantic, it constantly employs allegory, personifying the sentiments, defects, and good qualities of men, and sets them in opposition to each other on the stage. As for the folly (*sotie*), which may be called a dramatic pamphlet or squib, and belongs to the satiric drama, it was the special work of the "Enfants sans souci" and lasted but a short while.

The true literary distinction of the fifteenth century is to have given France a great poet—not the elegant, cold Charles d'Orléans, but that child of "poor and mean extraction" (*de pouvre et petite extrace*), that "mauvais garçon" who was François Villon. Insubordinate scholar, haunter of taverns, guilty of theft and even of assassination, the marvel is that he should have been able to evoke his grave and lofty poetry from that life of infamy. His chief collection, "Le Grand Testament" (1489), is dominated by that thought of death which, for the first time in France, finds its expression in the "Ballade des Dames du Temps jadis". Thus did the Christian Middle Ages utter through Villon what had been their essential preoccupation.

*The Renaissance and the Reformation.*—When the sixteenth century opens, literature in France may be regarded as exhausted and moribund. What had been lacking in the Middle Ages was the enthusiasm for form, the worship of art, combined with a language sufficiently supple and opulent. The Renaissance was about to bestow these gifts; it was to communicate the sense of beauty to the writers of that age by setting before them as models the great masterpieces of antiquity. Reversion to antiquity—this is the characteristic which dominates all the literature of the sixteenth century. The movement did not attain its effect directly, but through Italy, and as a sequel to the wars of Charles VIII. "The first contact with Italy", says Brunetiere, "was in truth a kind of revelation for us French. In the midst of the feudal barbarism of which the fifteenth century still bore the stamp, Italy presented the spectacle of an old civilization. She awed the foreigner by the ancient authority of her religion and all the pomp of wealth and of

the arts. Add to this the allurements of her climate and her manners. Italy of the Renaissance, invaded, devastated, trampled under foot by these men of the North, suddenly, like Greece of yore, took possession of the rude conquerors. They conceived the idea of another life, more free, more ornate—in one word, more 'human'—than that which they had been leading for five or six centuries; a confused feeling of the power of beauty twined itself into the souls of *gendarmes* and *lansquenets*, and it was then that the breath of the Renaissance, coming over the mountains with the armies of Charles VIII, of Louis XII, and of Francis I, completed in less than fifty years the dissipation of what little still survived of the medieval tradition."

If the language very quickly undergoes the modifications brought about by this new spirit, it is only little by little that the various forms of literature allow themselves to be penetrated by it. Such is the case with poetry.

The principal poet of the earlier half of the sixteenth century, Clément Marot (1497–1544), belongs, by his inspiration, to both the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Of the Middle Ages he has first of all his scholastic education and also an uncontrolled passion for allegories and for bizarre and complicated versification. In the best of his "Épîtres" he sacrifices to the worst of the faults held in honour by the fifteenth century: the taste for alliteration, for playing upon words, and for childish tricks of rhyme. On another side the influence of the Renaissance reveals itself in his work in many imitations of the Latins, Virgil, Catullus, Ovid. The "Épîtres", his masterpiece, are, besides, in a style of composition borrowed from the Latin. A court poet, attached to the personal suite of Marguerite de Valois, herself a humanist and a patroness of humanists, no man was more favourably situated for the effect of that influence. Marot is, in other respects, a very original poet; his "Épîtres" mark the appearance of a quality almost new in French literature—wit. The art of saying things prettily, of telling a story cleverly, of winning pardon for his mockeries by mocking at himself, was Marot's.

Græco-Latin imitation is really only an accidental feature in the work of Marot; with the poets who succeed him it becomes the very origin of their inspiration. For the poets who later formed the group called "La Pléiade" Joachim du Bellay furnished a programme in the "Deffence et Illustration de la langue française" (1549). To eschew the superannuated formulae and the "condiments" (*épiceries*) of the Middle Ages, to imitate without reserve everything that has come down to us from antiquity, to enrich the language by every means practicable—by borrowing from Greek, from Latin, from the vocabulary of the handicrafts—these are the principles which this author lays down in his work. And these are the principles which the chief of the "Pléiade", Pierre de Ronsard (1524–85), applies. Ronsard's ambition is to exercise his wits in all the styles of composition in which the Greeks and Romans excelled. After their example he



PERRIN D'ANGE COURT  
XIV Century MS., Vatican Library



composed odes, an epic work (the "Franciade", in which he aspires to do for France what Virgil, with the *Æneid*, did for Rome), and some eclogues. If he has utterly failed in his epic attempt, and if his abuse of erudition renders his odes very difficult to read, it must nevertheless be said that these works sparkle with beauties of the first order. Ronsard is not only, as was long ago said of him, the marvellous workman of little pieces, of sonnets and tiny odes; in brilliancy of imagination, in the gift for inventing new rhythms, he is one of the greatest poets known to French literature. Side by side with him Du Bellay, in his "Regrets", inaugurated *la poésie intime*, the lyricism of confidences, and Jodelle gave to the world "Cléopâtre" (1552), the first, in point of date, of the tragedies imitated from the antique, thus opening the way for Robert Garnier and Montchrestien.

At the same time that the Renaissance was bringing us the feeling for art, the Reformation was giving currency to new ideas and tendencies. The two inspirations commingled rendered possible the work of the two masters of sixteenth-century prose, Rabelais and Montaigne. In that prodigious nursery tale, in which he scatters buffooneries and indecencies by the handful, it would be a mistake to think that the author of "Gargantua" hides a thought and a symbol under very line of text. All the same, it is true that one must break the bone to find the "substantific marrow". Rabelais has a hatred of the Middle Ages, of its Scholasticism and its asceticism. For his part, he does not mistrust human nature; he believes it to be good and wants people to follow its law, which is instinct. His ideal is the abbey of Thelema, where the rule runs: Do as you please (*Fais ce que tu voudras*). "Nature is my gentle guide", says Montaigne on his part. This is one of the ideas which circulate in his essays, the first book of which appeared in 1580. In this sort of disjointed confession, Montaigne speaks above all of himself, his life, his tastes, his habits, his favourite reading. As he goes along he expounds his philosophy, which is a kind of scepticism, if you will, but applying exclusively to the things that belong to reason, for with Montaigne the Christian Faith remains intact. What makes Montaigne an original writer, and makes his part in French literature one of capital importance, is his having been the first to introduce into that literature, by his minute study of his own Ego, that psychological and moral observation of man which was to form the foundation of great works in the next century.

In a general way the Reformation produced a profound impression on the writers of the sixteenth century, giving them a freedom of movement and of thought unknown to their predecessors of the Middle Ages. On the other hand, multiplying theological discussions, controversies, and fierce polemics between Catholics and Protestants—dividing France into two parties—it gave birth to a whole literature of conflict. We will confine ourselves to the mention of Calvin and his "Institution de la religion chrétienne" (1541). As a theologian he need not concern us here; we need only say that, by the simplicity of his exposition, by the energy of his harsh and gloomy style, he effects an entrance into our literature for a whole range of subject-matters which had until then been reserved for Latin. Calvin was the teacher of the Reformation; Agrippa d'Aubigné was its soldier, but one who had taken the pen in hand. It was after long service in the field that he composed his "Tragiques", a versified work unlike any other, a medley of satire and epic. Here the author presents a picture of France devastated by wars of religion, and paints his adversaries in odious colours. Now and then hatred inspires him with fine utterances. After all these struggles and all this violence, the age could not but long for peace, could not but hold all these excesses in horror. Such a spirit inspires the "Satire Ménipée" (1594), a work,

part prose, part verse, which, with its irony, gives evidence that an epoch has come to its end, fatigued with its own struggles and ready for a great renovation.

*The Seventeenth Century; the Classical Age.*—The seventeenth century is the most noteworthy epoch in the history of French literature. The circumstances of the age, it is true, are peculiarly favourable for literary development. France is once more the strongest factor in European statecraft, her political influence is supreme, thanks to the wonderful achievements of her arms and the brilliant triumphs of her diplomacy. Conscious of her greatness, she ceases to be dependent on foreign literatures, and fashions new literary forms which she bids other countries copy. The internal peace which she enjoys favours disinterested study in the domains of art and literature, without the need of giving to her literary creations a social or political tendency. Authors are patronized by society and the court. Intellectual conditions are especially favourable; the national mind, steeped in the learning and culture of the classes, has become sufficiently strengthened to emancipate itself from the yoke of servile imitation. The language, capable henceforth of giving adequate expression to every shade of thought, has become clearly conscious of its power and is exclusively French in syntax and vocabulary. Such are the circumstances, such the elements, which combine to form the genesis of the classical literature of France. It does not, indeed, claim to have determined the extreme limits beyond which literary activity in France may not range; progress will continue throughout the ages to come. But in the works of that period may be seen the most complete and perfect presentation of the distinguishing qualities of the French race; the ideal counterpart, in miniature, of the most perfect form of French literature.

It is characterized, in the main, by a tendency which seeks the apotheosis of human reason in the realm of literary activity, and regards the expression of moral truth as the end of literary composition. Hence the fondness of the literature of the seventeenth century for general ideas and for the sentiments that are common to mankind, and its success in those kinds of literature which are based on the general study of the human heart. It reached perfection in dramatic literature, in sacred eloquence and in the study of morals. Hence the contempt of the seventeenth-century literature for all that is relative, individual, and mutable; in lyric poetry, which appeals primarily to the individual sentiment, in the description of material phenomena, and the external manifestations of nature, it falls short of success.

For thorough understanding of the development of French literature in the seventeenth century, we must consider it in three periods: (1) from the year 1600 to 1659, the period of preparation; (2) 1659–1688, the Golden Age of classicism; (3) 1688–1715, the period of transition between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

*First Period (1600–1659).*—With the followers of Ronsard and those poets who immediately succeeded him a kind of lassitude had seized upon poetry at the end of the sixteenth century; impoverished and spiritless, it handled only trifling subjects. Besides, having been long subject to the artistic domination of Italy, and having owed allegiance to Spain also since the intervention of the Spaniards in the days of the League, poetry had become infected with mannerisms, and suffered a considerable lowering of tone. A reform was necessary, and Malherbe, whose "Odes" appear between the years 1600 and 1628, undertook it. From the first he repudiated the idea of servile imitation of ancient classical authors; discrimination should be shown in borrowing from their writings, and imitation should be restricted to features likely to strengthen the thought. On the other hand, if the language of

the sixteenth century was copious, many of its terms were not of the purest; these Malherbe severely interdicted. With regard to prosody, he lays down the strictest rules. Malherbe's reform, therefore, aims at purifying the terminology of the language, and fixing set forms for prosody. Unluckily, it must be secured at a heavy price; subordinated unduly to inflexible rule, its freedom of movement impeded, lyric poetry is finally crushed out of life. Two centuries must elapse before it revives and shakes off the yoke of Malherbe. Nor was the rule of Malherbe established without resistance. Of the writers of that time, none were less disposed to submit to it than Mathurin Régnier (1579-1613), a poet who in many ways recalls the sixteenth century. His satires are one long protest against the theory so dear to Malherbe. An enemy to rule and constraint, Régnier again and again insists upon the absolute freedom of the poet; the poet must write as the spirit moves him; let every writer be what he is, is the only principle he accepts. A numerous group of poets shared Régnier's views, those known

pressions; they have helped to develop the taste for precision and subtilty in psychological analysis. They favoured also, though in an indirect way, that study of the human heart which was the grand theme of seventeenth century literature.

Authority also, as represented by Richelieu, enrolled itself in the crusade of reform and added its sanction to the new disciplinary laws. Under the patronage of the great minister, and by his inspiration, the French Academy was founded in the year 1635. In virtue of its origin and of its aims, the Academy exercised officially the same influence as the *salon*. It watched over the purity of the language and over its regular development. One of its members, Vaugelas, the great grammarian of that age, contributed in an especial way towards the achievement of this object. If the new ideal found its first expression in poetry, prose also was soon to share in the advantages of the reform. Balzac, in his "Lettres" (1624), created French prose. He is said to have furnished the rules of French prose composition; in fact it is his chief



EUSTACE DESCHAMPS PRESENTING CHARLES VI WITH HIS HISTORY  
Miniature of 1383

by the name of *les Grotesques*. Such are Saint-Amant, Théophile de Viau, the direct heirs of the *Pléiade*; and Scarron, whose poetry is the very incarnation of the burlesque form imported from Italy.

Malherbe would perhaps have been unable to combat this opposition, had not two other forces come to his assistance in checking the flood of licence that was spreading with Régnier and his associates. The first of these was the culture of French society. The rise of a cultured class and of its life of refinement, which took place toward the end of the reign of Henry IV, is one of the striking facts of the first half of the seventeenth century. A new institution, the *salon*, presided over by women, now makes its appearance; here men of the world meet literary men to discuss serious questions with women. The salon will prove of service to writers, though sometimes a hindrance or a lure to false paths, and the next two centuries of literature will show evidence of its influence. The first salon was that of the Marquise de Rambouillet; for more than twenty years people of superior intellect and culture were wont to gather there. By exacting from its guests refinement and elegant manners it contributed to chasten the language and to strip it of all low and grotesque words. It is in the salon that the over-refinement called *preciosité* budded and bloomed. However, the influence of the *Précieuses* was perhaps more harmless than some would have us believe. They have enriched the language with many clever ex-

merit to have taught his own age, along with the art of composition, what the greatest minds of the sixteenth century—what Rabelais and Montaigne—had not known: the rhythm, the flow, and the harmony of the period. In this way, he has fashioned the magnificent form, which the great prose writers of the last half of the seventeenth century will find at their disposal when they seek to give outward shape to the sublime conceptions of their minds.

At the same time, Voiture, one of the habitués of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, gave to French prose its raciness, its vigour and its ease of movement. Balzac and Voiture, of the great writers of that time, are masters of styles in the seventeenth century, but Descartes, whose "Discours de la Méthode" appeared in 1673, has left his mark deeply stamped on French classical literature. This could not be otherwise; the principles which gained distinction for him were the same as those invoked for the literary reform. But reason, whose sovereign authority Descartes proclaimed, and whose power he demonstrated, was the same reason whose absolutism Malherbe sought to establish in literature. The abstract tone, the surety of inference proceeding directly to the solution of one or two questions clearly laid down, permitting no chance thoughts to lead it away from the straight line, the determination to take up only one subject, mastering it completely, to simplify everything, to see in man only an abstract soul, without a body, and in

this soul not the phenomena, but the substance—these are at the same time Cartesian principles and literary peculiarities of the seventeenth century.

The craving for order and uniformity which made itself felt in every branch of literature seized the theatrical world and achieved the masterpieces of the classic drama. In 1629, Jean Mairet produced his "Sophonisbe", in which the unities are for the first time observed—unity of action, unity of time, unity of place. The plot turns upon one incident which is tragic without a trace of the comic element, the action does not extend beyond one day, and there is no change of scene. The framework of classical tragedy was created; what was needed was a writer of genius to fill in the structure. Corneille was this man. In the *merveille* of "Le Cid", he gave to the French stage its first masterpiece. Lofty sentiments, strong dialogue, a brilliant style, and rapid action, not exceeding twenty-four hours, were all combined in this play. While its subject was taken from modern history, Corneille, after the famous controversy on "Le Cid", stirred up by his jealous rivals, returned to subjects taken from Roman history in his later pieces, which date from 1640 to 1643, namely "Horace", "Cinna", and "Polyeucte". In these the plot becomes more and more complicated; the poet prefers perplexing and anomalous situations, and looks for variety and strangeness of incident to the neglect of the sentiments and the passions. The noble simplicity and serene beauty which characterized his great works are replaced by the riddles of "Héraclius" and the extravagances of "Attila".

Corneille's "Polyeucte" shows traces of the controversies on Divine Grace which at that time agitated the minds of men. Jansenism profoundly influenced the entire literature of the seventeenth century, giving rise, first and foremost, to one of its prose masterpieces, the "Lettres provinciales" (1656-67) of Pascal. In these the author champions the cause of his friends of Port-Royal against the Jesuits. They display all the qualities which it had taken sixty years of progress in literature to develop: clearness of exposition, beauty of form, elegance and distinction of style, a subtle wit, graceful irony, and geniality. Divested of all dull learning and all dialectic formalism, it placed within the reach of every serious mind the deepest theological questions. As far removed from the vigorous rhetoric of Balzac, as from the studied wit of Voiture, it embodied in prose the greatest effort to reach perfection that we meet with in the early part of the seventeenth century.

Second Period.—(1659-88); the Great Epoch.—Towards 1660 all the literary characteristics which we have seen gradually developing in the previous sixty years have taken definite form. This is now reinforced by the influence of the Court. After the short-lived trouble of the Fronde, one man embodies all the destinies of France: the king, Louis XIV, young, victorious, at the zenith of his glory. In literature, as in his government, the king will successfully carry out his taste for regularity, for harmony, and nobility. The influence of his strong personality will check the tendencies towards the caprice, eccentricity, and imaginative waywardness that characterized the preceding period.

Henceforth nothing is appreciated in literature but what is reasonable, natural, and harmoniously proportionate, and what depicts the universal in man. Then follow in succession all those masterpieces which realize this ideal, upheld by Boileau, the great law giver of classicism. Beginning in 1660, Boileau gave to the world his "Satires", his "Epistles", in which he shows himself a marvellous critic, unerring in his estimate of contemporary writers, and his "Art poétique" (1674), a literary code which held sway for more than a century. Seek the truth, be guided by reason, imitate nature—these are the principles which Boileau

never ceases to enjoin, and which his friends, Molière, Racine, La Fontaine, put into practice.

Molière, who, since the year 1653, had been playing in the provinces his first comedy, "L'Etourdi", produced the "Précieuses Ridicules", at Paris, in 1659, and until his death (1673) continued to produce play after play. To paint human life and to delineate character are the aims which Molière proposed to himself. Even his farces are full of points drawn from observation and study. In his great comedies it is clear that he rejects everything which is not based on a study of the heart. Molière is not concerned with plot and *déroulement*; each incident stands on its own merits; for him a comedy is but a succession of scenes whose aim is to place a character in the full light of day. Each of his characters is an exhaustive study of some particular failing or the comprehensive presentment of a whole type in a single physiognomy. Some of his best types are not characteristic of any one period, but of humanity in all ages—the hypocrite, the miser, the coquette. It is Molière's undying merit that we cannot observe in our experience any of these characteristics without being reminded of some of Molière's originals.

In 1667 Racine, after his first attempts, the "Thébaïde" and "Alexandre", reproduced his "Andromaque", which achieved a success no less marked than that of the "Cid"; after that, scarcely a year passed without the production of a new work. After bringing out the "Phèdre" in 1677, Racine withdrew from the stage, partly from a desire for rest and partly on account of religious scruples. The only dramas produced by him in this last period were "Esther" (1689) and "Athalie" (1691). His tragedies were a reaction against the heroic and romantic drama which had prevailed during the first part of the century. He places on the stage the representation of reality; his plays have their source in reason rather than in imagination. The result is a loss of apparent grandeur, on the one hand, but also, on the other hand, an increased moral range and a wider psychology. Again, instead of the complicated action of which Corneille is so fond, Racine substitutes "a simple action, burdened with little incident, which, as it gradually advances towards its end, is sustained only by the interests, the sentiments and the emotions of the characters" (preface to "Bérénice"). It is, accordingly, the study of character and emotion that we must look for in Racine. In "Britannicus" and in "Athalie" he has painted the passion of ambition; but it is love which dominates his tragedies. The vigour, the vehemence, with which Racine has analysed this passion show what a degree of audacity may coexist with that classic genius of which he himself is the best example.

In some points of detail, La Fontaine, whose "Fables" began to appear in 1668, differs from the other great classics. He has a weakness for the old authors of the sixteenth century and even for those of the Middle Ages, for the words and phrases of a bygone time, and certain popular expressions. But he is an utter classic in his correctness and appropriateness of expression, in the nice attention to details of composition displayed in his "Fables" (a charming *genre* which he himself created), and in the added perfection of nature as he paints it. The winged grace with which he skims over every theme, his talent for giving life and interest to the actors in his fables, his consummate skill in handling verse—all these qualities make him one of the great writers of the seventeenth century.

In this second period of the seventeenth century, indeed, all forms of literature bear their fine flower. In his "Maxims" (1665), the Duke de La Rochefoucauld displays a profound knowledge of human nature, and an almost perfect literary style. The "Lettres" of Madame de Sévigné, the first of which bears the date 1617, are marvels of wit, vivacity, and sprightliness.

In his "Mémoires" (completed in 1675) Cardinal de Retz furnishes us a model for this class of writing. In the "Princesse de Clèves" (1678) Madame de La Fayette created the psychological romance. Finally, it would be a misconception of the classical genius not to allow to religious inspiration a marked place in this period. The whole course of the seventeenth century was deeply permeated by the spirit of religion. Few of its writers escaped that influence; and those who did, also remained outside the general current and the philosophic movement of the century. Pulpit oratory, too, reached a high degree of excellence. The first years of the century had been, so to say, fragrant with the oratory of that most lovable of saints, François de Sales (1567-1622). He had, in 1602, preached the Lenten sermons before Henry IV at the Louvre, and ravished his hearers by the unction of his discourse, overflowing with a wealth of pleasing imagery. The religious revival was then universal; orders were founded or reformed. Among them the Oratorians, like the Jesuits, produced more than one remarkable and vigorous preacher. The Jansenists, in their turn, introduced into pulpit eloquence a sober style without any great wealth of fancy, without vivacity or brilliancy, but simple, grave, uniform. Thus, sacred eloquence, already flourishing before 1660, gradually rid itself of the defects from which it had suffered in the preceding period—the trivialities, the tawdry refinements, the abuse of profane learning. It was especially during the brilliant period extending from 1659 to 1688 that Christian eloquence reached its greatest power and perfection, when its two most illustrious representatives were Bossuet and Bourdaloue.

In 1659 Bossuet preached in Paris, at the Minims, his first course of Lenten sermons; during the next ten years his mighty voice was heard pouring forth eloquent sermons, panegyrics, and funeral orations. Animated, earnest, and familiar in his sermons, sublime in his funeral orations, simple and lucid in theological expositions, he always carried out the principle, embodied in a celebrated definition, "of employing the word only for the thought, and the thought for truth and virtue". Not only is he a magnificent orator, the greatest that ever occupied the pulpit in France, but he is also, perhaps, the writer who has had the most delicate appreciation of the French language. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that Bossuet, in his "Discourse on Universal History" (1681), did the work of a historian. He is, indeed, the only historian of the seventeenth century. In the art of investigating historical causes, he is a master of exceptional penetration, and his conclusions have been confirmed by the most recent discoveries of historical science. He founded the philosophy of history, and Montesquieu, in the following century, had but little to add to his work. Bourdaloue, who ascended the pulpit left vacant by Bossuet (1669), is a very different man. In Bourdaloue we do not find the abruptness and familiarity of Bossuet, but an unbroken evenness, a style always regular and symmetrical, above all a logician; he appeals to the reason, rather than to the imagination and the sensibilities.

From 1688 to 1715.—In the short space of eighteen years classical literature was in its glory. It resulted from the equilibrium between all the forces of society and all the faculties of the mind, an equilibrium not destined to last long. If, during the last years of the century, the great writers still living preserve their powers unimpaired to the end, we feel, nevertheless, that new forces are forming. In 1688, the king, aged and absorbed by the cares of his foreign policy, ceased to take his former interest in literature. Discipline becomes relaxed. The salon, which for a while had been eclipsed by the Court, gradually regained its ascendancy. Under its influence, preciousness, which had disappeared during the great period of classicism, began to revive. This becomes evident in a depart-

ment in which it would seem the *précieux* would have but little interest, that of sacred eloquence. Fléchier marks an inordinate propensity to wit and frivolities of language. Massillon, who is Fléchier's heir, lacks the fine equilibrium between thought and form which was found in Bossuet. He is a wonderful rhetorician who sacrifices too much to the adornments of style. Besides, the conception of style prevalent from 1659 to 1688 underwent a change. In the writers of the golden age the period was, perhaps, somewhat too long, but it was broad and spacious, effectively reproducing the movements of the thought; it was now replaced by a shorter phrase, more rapid and more incisive. This new style is that of the "Caractères" of La Bruyère (1688). The appearance of the "Caractères" marks, furthermore, a still more important change in taste. La Bruyère, unlike the great classics, does not give himself up to the general and abstract study of man; what he paints is not the man of all time, but the man of his own day, his looks, his vices, and his ridiculous traits. Picturesque details and outward peculiarities constitute the great attraction in the style of the "Caractères"; these, too, distinguish it from the works of the preceding period. The same artistic qualities are also found in Saint-Simon, who did not write his "Mémoires" until after 1722, the materials for which he had been collecting since 1696. He is a writer, however, who from many points of view is connected with the seventeenth century. Saint-Simon not only gives a moral portrait of the person dealt with in his "Mémoires", but by dint of violent colours, of contrasting touches, daring figures combined into a brutal, incorrect, passionate, and feverish style, he reproduces the physical man to the life. In dramatic literature comedy follows the same tendencies. After Molière, and after Regnard, who imitated him, the comedy of character comes to an end, and with Dancourt (1661-1725), the comedy of manners, which has its inspiration in the actual, replaces it. Lastly, Fénelon introduces into literature a spirit utterly foreign to the pure classics, so reverent of tradition—the spirit of novelty. Télémaque (1699), a romance imitated from antiquity, records the views of the author on government, foreshadows the eighteenth century, and its mania for reform.

*The Eighteenth Century.*—To do justice to the writers of the eighteenth century, we must change our point of view. In truth, the eighteenth century's conception of literature differed profoundly from that of the great writers of the time of Louis XIV. The eighteenth century, moreover, never rises above mediocrity when it attempts to follow in the footsteps of the seventeenth, but is always interesting when it breaks loose from it. To follow its literary development, we must divide it, like the preceding century, into three periods: (1) 1715-50; (2) 1750-89; (3) 1789-1800.

From 1715 to 1750.—After the death of Louis XIV, the tendencies which already manifested themselves in the last period of the seventeenth century become more marked. The classical ideal becomes more and more distorted and weakened. Consequently, all the great branches of literature which flourished by following this ideal either decay or are radically modified. The tragic vein in particular is completely exhausted. After Racine, there are no longer any great writers of tragedy, but only imitators, of whom the most brilliant is Voltaire, whose versatility fits him for every kind of literature. Comedy shows more vitality than tragedy. With Dancourt it had taken the direction of portrayal of manners in their most fleeting aspects, and the tendency betrays itself in Lesage (1668-1747). "Turcaret", which places on the stage not a character, but a condition in life—that of the financier, is a piece of direct, profound, and merciless observation. Applying the same methods to romantic literature, Lesage wrote "Gil Blas", which first appeared in 1715,

and in which, in spite of a peculiar method of narration, borrowed from Spain, the manners and the society of the time are drawn to the life. Thus "Gil Blas" inaugurates in French literature the romance of manners. The most original of the writers of comedy in this period, however, is Marivaux, who, between 1722 and 1740, produced his charming works, "La surprise de l'amour", "Le jeu de l'amour et du hasard", "Le Legs", "Les fausses confidences", etc. The utmost refinement in the analysis of love—a love that is timid and scrupulous—propriety in the settings of his works, a subtle wit bearing the stamp of good society, grace and delicacy of feeling—these are the distinguishing characteristics of Marivaux.

But if the great classical types are exhausted or fall to pieces in giving birth to new forms, literature is compensated by the enlargement of its domain in some directions, absorbing new sources of inspiration. Writers turn away from the consideration of man as a moral unit; on the other hand, they devote themselves to the study of man regarded as a product of the changing conditions of the State, political, social and religious. In fact, this new direction of literary activity is favoured by the birth of what has been called "the philosophic spirit". After the death of Louis XIV, the severe restraint imposed upon men's intellects was at an end. Respect for authority and for the social hierarchy, submission to the dictates of religion—these were things never questioned by any of the seventeenth-century writers. From the earliest years of the eighteenth century, on the contrary, an aggressive movement against every form of authority, spiritual as well as temporal, becomes perceptible. This two-fold disposition—curiosity about human idiosyncrasies as they vary with times, places, environments, and governments, and a spirit of unfettered criticism—is met with in Montesquieu, chronologically the first of the great writers of the eighteenth century. Montesquieu, indeed, does not manifest any destructive inclination in regard to government and religion; nevertheless, in the "Lettres persanes" (1721), there is a tone of satire previously unknown. Montesquieu shows himself the disciple of La Bruyère, but does not hesitate to discuss subjects from which his master would have been obliged to refrain: social problems, the royal power, the papacy. The "Lettres persanes" is a pamphlet rather than the work of a moralist. They make an epoch in the history of French literature, marking the first appearance of the political satire. But the two truly great works of Montesquieu are the "Considérations sur la grandeur et la décadence des Romains" (1734), and the "Esprit des Lois" (1748). In the "Considérations", Montesquieu, by undertaking to explain the succession of events by the power of ideas, the character of the people, the action and reaction of cause and effect, inaugurated an historical method unknown to his predecessors—certainly not to Bossuet, who was the most illustrious of them. From the "Considérations" the whole movement of modern historical study was to draw its inspiration later on. In the "Esprit des Lois", he studies how laws are evolved under the influences of government, climate, religion, and manners. On all these subjects, in spite of certain errors of detail, he threw a light that was altogether new.

With Montesquieu, jurisprudence, politics, and sociology made their entrance into literature. With Buffon, science has its turn. Already Fontenelle, in his "Entretiens sur la pluralité des Mondes", had popularized the most difficult astronomical theories. Buffon, in his "Histoire naturelle", the first volumes of which appeared in 1749, set forth the ideas of his time on geology and biological species in a style that is brilliant and highly coloured, but somewhat studied in its magnificence. No doubt Buffon's descriptions are written in a pompous, ambitious style ill suited to the severity of a scientific subject, and they are too often

interlarded with commonplaces. It is none the less true that in introducing natural history into literature he exercised a considerable influence; from Buffon, who set forth nature in its various aspects, a number of writers were to issue. The consequence of this broadening of literature was the loss of the purely speculative and disinterested character which it displayed in the seventeenth century, when the sole aim of the writer had been production of a beautiful work and the inculcation of certain moral truths. The writers of the eighteenth century, on the contrary, wish to spread in society the philosophical and scientific theories they have adopted, and this diffusion is effected in the salons. From the beginning of the century, the salons, formed from the debris of Louis XIV's court, had assumed a considerable importance. First, it was the little court of the Duchesse du Maine, at Sceaux, and the salon of the Marquise de Lambert, at Paris. Later on, other salons were opened, those of Mme Geoffrin, Mme du Deffand, Mlle de Lespinasse. These salons in their day represented public opinion, and authors wrote to influence the views of those who frequented them. Moderately perceptible in the first half of the century, this tendency of literature to become an instrument of propaganda and even of controversy, becomes bolder in the second.

From 1750 to 1789.—Voltaire is one of the first to mark the character of this period. Of the writers who flourished about the middle of the eighteenth century, the greatest glory surrounds Voltaire (1694–1778). The kind of intellectual sovereignty which he enjoyed, not only in France, but throughout Europe, is attributable to his great talent as a writer of prose as well as to his great versatility. There is no literary form—tragedy, comedy, epic poetry, tales in prose, history, criticism, or philosophy—in which he did not practise with more or less success. It has been said of him that he was only "second in every class", and again that he is the "first of mediocrities". Though paradoxically expressed, these verdicts are partial truths. In no branch of literature was Voltaire an originator in the full sense of the word. A man of varied gifts, living at a time when thought extended its domain in every direction and took hold of every novelty, he is the most accomplished and most brilliant of popularizers. In the early part of his career, from 1717 until 1750, he confines himself almost entirely to purely literary work; but after 1750, his writings assume the militant character which henceforth distinguishes French literature. In his historical works, such as the "Siècle de Louis Quatorze" (1751) and the "Essai sur les Mœurs" (1756), he becomes a controversialist, assailing in his narrative the Church, her institutions, and her influence on the course of events. Finally, the "Dictionnaire philosophique" (1764) and a number of treatises dealing both with philosophy and exegesis, which Voltaire gave to the world between 1763 and 1776, are wholly devoted to religious polemics. But, while Voltaire shows his hostility to religion, he attacks neither political authority nor the social hierarchy; he is conservative, not revolutionary, in this respect. With Diderot and the Encyclopedists, however, literature becomes frankly destructive of the established order of things. Like Voltaire, Diderot is one of the most prolific writers of the eighteenth century, producing in turn romances, philosophical treatises tending towards atheism, essays in art-criticism, dramas. But it is only in productiveness that Diderot can be compared with Voltaire, for he has none of Voltaire's admirable literary gifts. He is above all an improvisatore, and, with the exception of some pages that are remarkable for movement and colour, his work is confused and uneven. His principal production is the "Encyclopedia", to which the author devoted the greatest part of his life; the first two volumes appeared in 1751. The aim of this bulky publication was to give a summary of science, art, literature,



philosophy and politics, up to the middle of the eighteenth century. To bring this enterprise to a successful issue, Diderot, who reserved to himself the greatest part of the work, called to his assistance numerous collaborators, amongst whom were Voltaire, Buffon, Montesquieu, D'Alembert and Condillac. Jean-Jacques Rousseau was entrusted with the department of music. Despite the assistance of talents so diverse, the same spirit breathes throughout the work. In philosophy, the Encyclopedists seek to subvert the principles on which the existing institutions and the authority of dogma in religion were based. The Encyclopedia, therefore, which embodies all the opinions of that age, is a work of destruction. However that may be, its influence was considerable; it served as a

(1760), in his work on education, "Emile" (1762), lastly in the "Contrat social" (1762) which was to become the gospel of the Revolution.

From the publication of his first work, Rousseau won a success that was immediate and startling. This was because he brought qualities entirely novel or which had long been forgotten. With him eloquence returns to literature. Leaving aside his influence on the movement of politics, we must give him credit for all that the French literature of the nineteenth century owes to him. Rousseau, by causing a reaction against the philosophy of his time, prepared the revival of religious sentiment. It was he who, by signaling in his most beautiful pages the emotions awakened in him by certain landscapes, aroused in the popular



*Proheme de l'histoire de Jason extraite de  
plusieurs livres et presentee a noble et  
redoute prince, Philippe par la grace de  
Dieu Duc de bourgongne et de brabant etc*

RAOUL LE FÈVRE PRESENTING PHILIP THE GOOD WITH "JASON"  
XV Century MS., Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

rallying-point for the philosophers, and by acting on public opinion, as Diderot had intended, came to "change the common way of thinking".

The Encyclopedia wrought the ruin of society, but proposed nothing to take its place; Jean-Jacques Rousseau dreamed of effecting its re-constitution on a new plan. On certain points, Rousseau breaks with the *philosophes* and the Encyclopedists. Both of these believed in the sovereignty of reason, not, as was the case with the seventeenth-century writers, in reason subject to faith and controlled by it, but in reason absolute, universal, and refusing to admit what eludes its deductions—that is to say, the truths revealed by religion. They also believed in the omnipotence of science, in human progress and in civilization guided by reason and science. Rousseau, on the contrary, in his first notable work, "Discours sur les sciences et les arts" (1751), assails reason and science, and in a certain sense denies progress. On the other hand, in maintaining the natural goodness of man he approaches the *philosophes*. In his opinion, society has perverted man, who is by nature good and virtuous, has replaced primitive liberty with despotism, and brought inequality amongst men. Society, therefore, is evil; being so, it must be abolished, and men must return to the state of nature, that happiness may reign among them. This return to the natural state Rousseau preaches in his romance, "La nouvelle Héloïse"

imagination the feeling for nature. Rousseau, too, by his thoroughly plebeian manner of parading his personality and displaying his egotism, helped to develop that sentiment of individualism whence sprang the lyric poetry of the nineteenth century. He is also responsible for some of the most regrettable characteristics of nineteenth-century literature—for that melancholy and unrest which has been termed "the distemper of the age", and which was originally the distemper of the hypochondriac Jean-Jacques; for the revolt against society; for the belief that passion has rights of its own and dominates the lives of mortals as a fatal compulsion.

The close of the eighteenth century is from some points of view a time of regeneration, and forebodes a still more radical and complete transformation of literature in the immediate future. Some branches of literature that had been neglected in the course of the century receive new life and energy. Since Lesage's "Turcaret" and after Marivaux, comedy had hardly produced anything above the commonplace; it revives in the amusing "Barbier de Séville" (1775) of Beaumarchais, full of life and rapid movement. Beaumarchais owes much to his predecessors, to Molière, Regnard, and many others. His originality as a playwright consists in the political and social satire with which his comedies are filled. In this respect they are the children of the eighteenth century, essentially com-

bative. In the "Barbier de Séville" the impertinent Figaro rails at the privileges of the aristocracy. In the "Mariage de Figaro" the satire becomes more violent; the famous monologue of the fifth act is a bitter invective against the aristocracy, against the inequality of social conditions and the restrictions imposed on liberty of thought.

Finally, with André Chénier, lyric poetry revives, after the neglect of the eighteenth century, which had looked upon verse-writing as a mere diversion and a frivolous toying with syllables. By returning to ancient, and especially Greek, models, in his "Eclogues" and his "Elégies" (1785-91), Chénier begins by bringing into his poetry a new note; at the very outset he renews Ronsard's experiment; later on the Revolution affords him a more vigorous inspiration. In presence of the horrors of the Terror, stirred up by wrath and impelled by indignation, he composed his "Iambes" (1794). In recovering the sincerity of emotion and gravity of thought which were wanting to the versifiers of the eighteenth century (Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, Delille and even Voltaire), André Chénier restored to French poetry the true voice of the lyre.

From 1789 to 1800.—In the throes of the Revolution there is an abundance of writing, but these works, mere imitation of great writers who flourished during the century, are valueless; the sole author of note is Chénier (d. 1794). It is true that under the influence of events, a new literary *genre* arises, that of political eloquence. The isolated protestations of the States-General under the monarchy afforded no genuine opportunity for public speaking; it was in other modes, notably through the pulpit, that the eloquence for which a strictly appropriate platform was lacking must perforce manifest itself in that period. But the great Revolutionary assemblies favoured the development of remarkable oratorical gifts. The most famous among the orators—and he was one who really possessed genius—was Mirabeau. The blemishes of his style—a congeries of violent contrasts—the incoherency of his figures and the discordance of his shades of meaning—all these defects vanished in the mighty onrush of his eloquence, swept away in an overmastering current of oratorical inspiration.

*The Nineteenth Century.*—It is yet too early to attempt the task of determining the due place of the nineteenth century in the literary history of France; the men and the affairs of that century are still near to us, and in the study of literature a true perspective can be obtained only from a certain distance. A few general characteristics, however, may be taken as already fairly ascertained.

The nineteenth century was one of renaissance in literature: in it, following immediately upon great events, a great intellectual movement came into being, and at one definitely assignable moment there appeared a splendid efflorescence of genius; most of all, this movement was a renaissance because it rid itself of those theories, adopted by the preceding century, which had been the death of that century's impoverished literature. Imagination and feeling reappear in literature, and out of these qualities lyric poetry and the romance develop. At the same time the sciences, daily acquiring more importance, exercise a greater influence on thought, so that minds take a new mould.

We may distinguish three periods in the nineteenth century: the first, the period of preparation, is that of the First Empire; the second, that of intellectual efflorescence, extends from 1820 to 1850; lastly, the modern period, which seems to us in these days less brilliant because the works produced in it have not yet attained the prestige that comes with age.

From 1800 to 1820.—Chateaubriand is the great originator of nineteenth-century French literature; from him proceed nearly the whole line of nineteenth-century writers. In 1802 appeared his "Génie du Christianisme"; in this work Chateaubriand not only

defends Christianity, towards which the intellects of the eighteenth century had been vaguely hostile—not only shows that Christianity is the greatest source of inspiration to letters and the arts—but also sets forth certain literary theories of his own. He asserts the necessity of breaking with classical tradition, which has had its day and is exhausted, and of opening a new way for art. This is one of the great ideas developed by this author, and thenceforth all is over with Classicism. But Chateaubriand's work and his influence were not limited to this: constantly calling attention to the interest offered by the study of the Middle Ages, as he does in "Le Génie du Christianisme", he engages both history and poetry in new directions. On another side, where he displays his own personal sufferings in "René" (1805), he develops the sentiment of the *Ego*, already affirmed by Rousseau, from which modern lyricism springs. Lastly, in the many beautiful pages of "Les Martyrs" or of his descriptions of travels, he furnishes models of a magnificent prose style, full of colour, rhythmical, well fitted to reproduce the most brilliant aspects of nature and to express the deepest emotions of the heart.

Side by side with Chateaubriand, another great figure dominates this first period, that of Madame de Staël. Where Chateaubriand personifies the reaction against the eighteenth century, Mme de Staël, on the contrary, is the incarnation of eighteenth-century traditions. Hers is the school of the *Ideologues*, lineal representatives of the Encyclopedists. And yet in many respects she must be regarded as an innovator. In her book "De la Littérature", she lays the foundations of that modern literary criticism which aims to study each work in its own particular conditions of origin. In her "Considérations sur la Révolution française" (1818), she is the first to inquire into the causes of that great social effect, thus leading the way where many of the great historians of the nineteenth century are to follow. Lastly, in her principal work, "De l'Allemagne" (1810), she reveals to France a whole literature then unknown in that country, the influence of which is to make itself felt in the Romantic writers.

From 1820 to 1850.—In this period those literary ideas of which the germs had been in Chateaubriand found their fullest expression with the Romantic school. Almost all the writers whose works appeared between 1820 and 1850 were connected with this school. Its theories may best be defined as the opposite of the Classicist doctrine. The Classics were idealists; they held that art should above all be the representation of the beautiful; the Romantics were now about to claim from the municipality of literature a full license to give public representations of hideous and grotesque things.

The Classics hold that the reason is the ruling faculty in poetry; the Romantics protest in the name of imagination and fantasy. The Classics go to antiquity for the models of their art and the sources of their inspiration; the Romantics are inspired by contemporary foreign literatures, by Goethe, Schiller, and Byron; they will reach the point of swearing by the example of Shakespeare as men in the seventeenth century swore by the words of Aristotle. For pagan mythology they will substitute the Christian art of the Middle Ages, will extol the Gothic cathedral and put the troubadours in the place of the rhapsodists. The same system applies in respect to form: where the Classics prized clarity and precision above all things, the Romantics will seek rather glitter and colour and carry their taste for effect, for contrast, and for antithesis to the point of mania.

Though the Romantic doctrine had its manifestations in every form of literature, its first applications were in poetry. Lamartine, with the publication of his "Méditations poétiques" (1820), gave the signal for the movement, and presented the first monument of



thentic costuming. Lastly, Shakespeare, Goethe, and Schiller are the masters to imitate, not Corneille and Racine. This resounding preface was followed by a succession of works in which the authors endeavoured to apply its theories. There is "Henri III et sa Cour" (1829), by Alexandre Dumas, *père*, full of animation, but infantile in its psychology and written in a bad, melodramatic style; Alfred de Vigny contributes "Le More de Venise" (1829) and "La Maréchale d'Ancre" (1830); last comes Victor Hugo's own series of dramas in verse and prose, "Hernani" (1830), "Marion de Lorme" (1831), "Le roi s'amuse" (1832), "Ruy Blas" (1838), "Les Burgraves" (1843). These pieces are characterized by a wealth of extraordinary incident—by dark intrigues, duels, assassinations, poisonings, ambushes, abductions; their historical setting, above all, is a feast for the eyes. Solid foundation there is none; historical truth and logical action are utterly lacking. The dramas of Victor Hugo survive and still bear staging only because the author has lavished upon them all the resources of his astounding lyricism.

As for comedy, it was neglected by the Romantics—for Musset's delicious, and often profound, little pieces were not made to be acted. From 1820 to 1850 the comic stage was dominated by an author who was altogether outside of the Romantic movement, Scribe, a prolific writer of vaudevilles with no power of vital observation, but a great command of sustained plot.

The romance, which had been neglected by the great writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in this period takes a foremost place in literature. Here again we find the influence of Romanticism, though that influence clashes with other tendencies. In the historical romance, imitated from Walter Scott, it is supreme. Alfred de Vigny's "Cinq Mars" (1826) and Victor Hugo's "Notre-Dame de Paris" (1831) are distinctly Romantic in the local colour which their authors employ and the violently dramatic character of their plots. The same characteristics appear in the innumerable romances of Alexandre Dumas, *père*, which, although by no means strong in literary quality, give pleasure by their fecundity of invention (*Les Trois Mousquetaires*, 1844). Again, the romances of George Sand, at least those written in her first manner, are of the Romantic school by virtue of their lyrical exaltation of the *Ego*, their elaborate display of sentiment, and of passion exaggerated to the decree of paroxysm ("Indiana", 1832). Her heroines are possessed by the restlessness, the unsatisfied longings, the anguish of soul which René suffered. George Sand, however, was to abandon Romanticism at a later period, in her romances of country life ("La Mare au Diable", "François le Champi", etc., from 1844 to 1850), idealized pictures of peasant life and true masterpieces of their class.

But if George Sand's career was half finished before she parted with Romanticism, other writers in this department altogether escaped its influence, abiding by the traditions of the eighteenth century. Benjamin Constant, in "Adolphe", carries on the line of romances of psychological analysis. Stendhal, too, who inherited his ideas and his precise, dry style from the *philosophes* of the eighteenth century, is a subtle psychologist, sometimes penetrating, often affected. Little appreciated in his own day, he will exert a great influence in the second half of the nineteenth century. Mérimée very much resembles Stendhal; he excels in the art of fitting into the frame of a short novel a finished picture of his scene of action with clean-cut, vigorous indications of his characters. And Balzac, the great master of the romance in this period, owes almost nothing to Romanticism. A peer of the creative geniuses—the Shakespeares and Molières—Balzac could set in motion, in his "Comédie Humaine", an imaginary world of beings as truly living as the flesh-and-blood beings who people the actual world. Cer-

tain of his characters, while animated with an intensely individual life, present, at the same time, so universal a portraiture as to constitute veritable types corresponding to the great passions and sentiments of humanity.

Among the great branches of literature which were restored between 1820 and 1850 history and criticism must be reckoned. At the beginning of the nineteenth century history could hardly be said to exist. The philosophical tendencies which it had acquired from the eighteenth century were prejudicial to its exactitude, but what it lacked in a still more marked degree was the power of realizing the past—in other words, the power of imagination—combined with the critical spirit. Romanticism supplied it with the former of these requisites; the latter it borrowed from the sciences, which developed so rapidly in the first half of the nineteenth century and impressed the mind of that age with their vigorous methods. Of the historians of this period, some attach the greater importance to critical study and interpretation of facts, others devote themselves to reconstructing the features of the past, with all its colour and picturesque quality. To the former school belong Guizot, who traces the concatenation of facts, showing what causes—political, social, and religious—produced them; Thiers, who, in his "Le Consulat et l'Empire", lays bare Napoleon's policy and strategy with remarkable lucidity; Mignet, who excels in the art of singling out the essential features of an epoch. Augustin Thierry and Michelet belong to the other school. Thierry possessed in a rare degree the sense of historical verity, and his "Récits des Temps Mérovingiens" (1838) is the first example in French literature of a picturesque history which is at the same time founded upon exact erudition. Lastly, with Michelet history becomes in very truth a resurrection of the past. Powerfully imaginative, indeed a poet by instinct, Michelet rather conjures up history than relates it. His "Histoire de France" is a canvas upon which he has in marvellous fashion caused persons, feelings, and manners to live again.

Concurrently with history, and under the same influences, literary criticism puts on a new physiognomy. It is no longer theoretic; henceforth its principal concern is not to judge the merits of literary works, but to determine the conditions in which they have been elaborated. It is personified in Sainte-Beuve (1804-69), who traces a detailed biography and a careful portrait of each writer and, reconstructing his appearance and character in a thousand scrupulously verified particulars, seeks thus to explain his works.

Lastly, the religious renaissance which took place at the beginning of the century, after the revolutionary frenzy, and which, in profane literature, gave Chateaubriand and Lamartine their inspiration, had the effect of giving back its force and its brilliancy to sacred literature, so impoverished in the eighteenth century. Theological controversy reappeared with Lamennais, a remarkable writer with a violent imagination and a style characterized by its strong reliefs ("Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion", 1817; "Paroles d'un croyant", 1834). At the same time Père Lacordaire lifted the multitude out of itself with his fiery discourses, and imported into pulpit eloquence the burning lyricism of the Romantics.

From 1850 to the End of the Century.—This period seems confused to our present view, which, with its necessarily short focus, can hardly distinguish all the dominant tendencies. Still, speaking very generally, it may be said that the period was marked by a reaction against the lyricism of the Romantics, a return to the study of reality, and, lastly, the coming of Positivism, through the influence of Renan and Taine, two philosophers who acted powerfully upon most writers of their time.

In poetry these tendencies have expressed them-

selves in the theories and the works of the Parnassian poets, so called because the first collection of their verses appeared (in 1866) under the title "Parnasse contemporain". The Parnassian poetry is characterized, in the first place, by great striving after impersonality, the writer making it his object to avoid putting into his work anything of his own personal



MARIE DE FRANCE  
XIII Century MS., Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris

emotions; and next, anxious to be before all things an artist, the writer carries to an excess the effort to attain perfection of form. The chief of the Parnassian school was Leconte de l'Isle (1820-1894); he does not take himself as the theme of his "Poèmes antiques" (1853) or his "Poèmes barbares" (1862); his theme is the history of humanity. His work is at once learned, epical, and philosophical. Others belonging to the Parnassian school, though each with his own personality, are: J. M. de Hérédia (1842-1905), an immediate disciple of Leconte de l'Isle, who has managed to produce a complete picture of some epoch in each of the sonnets of his "Trophées" (1893); Sully-Prudhomme, both poet of the interior life and poet philosopher; François Coppée, whose true originality consists in being the poet of the common people and of their everyday life. In reaction against certain tendencies of the Parnassians there appeared in the last quarter of the nineteenth century the Symbolist poets, grouped around Paul Verlaine (1844-1896), who in some points of view recalls Villon, and Stéphane Mallarmé (1842-1898). It is as yet difficult to define the action and the degree of importance of these Symbolist poets, who, moreover, made a merit of being obscure. At present Parnassism and Symbolism seem to have been reconciled in the person of M. Henri de Régnier (b. 1864). We may mention, also, among the poets of to-day, M. Jean Richepin, a belated Romantic.

In the second half of the nineteenth century the romance developed to an extent even more considerable than in the first. It tends to engulf all the other literary forms and become itself the only department of literature. It is a convenient frame successively for historical pictures, studies of passion, pictures of manners, and moral theories. The same tendencies appear in it as we have already noted in the period from 1820 to 1850, with, however, this notable difference, that the realistic current becomes much stronger. This time the originator and master is Gustave Flaubert, author of one of the masterpieces of all romance, "Madame Bovary" (1857). The peculiar characteristic of Flaubert is his combination of the elements of Romanticism with those of Realism. For him the great Romantic masters—Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo—are the objects of a special cult; on another side, by his conception of art, Flaubert is a Realist. In the first place he does not admit the propriety of a

writer's putting himself into his work; the work must be objective, impersonal, impassive. In the second place he makes it his task to paint life as it is, or as he sees it, with whatever there may be in it of unloveliness and of vulgarity. This theory of the romance is in evidence in all his works, as much in a study of provincial bourgeois life, like "Madame Bovary", as in a picture of Paris life, like "L'Education sentimentale", or a reconstruction of a vanished civilization, like "Salammbô" (1862).

From Flaubert's example and from the misinterpretation of Positivist theories issued the Naturalistic school. This again was realism, but realism publishing far and wide its own scientific pretensions and seeking to assimilate the processes of literature to those of science. The leader, and the theorist, of Naturalism was Emile Zola (1840-1902), a writer whose gift was compounded of strength and triviality, and whose books ("Les Rougon-Macquart", a series of romances, from 1871 to 1893), are tainted with an unpardonable coarseness. To the Naturalistic school belong the Goncourt brothers, who have sought to express reality by the aid of a bizarre, tortured, and pedantic vocabulary, and Guy de Maupassant (1850-1893), whose powers of observation, his intensity of vision, and a robust style borrowed from the finest traditions place him among the best writers of this group. Alphonse Daudet (1840-97), another writer who aims to portray life as it is, nevertheless stands apart from Naturalism by virtue of his own peculiar qualities of sensibility, fancy, and irony. If he has painted Parisian life ("Le Nabab", 1879), he has none the less succeeded in describing the destinies of the lowly with a sympathetic tenderness.

In spite of the encroaching Realistic tendencies, the idealist and Romantic romance, in the manner of George Sand, survived with Octave Feuillet (1821-91), a dainty writer who embodies in a wonderful degree the type of the fashionable story-teller. However, after 1885, although Realism is still the inspiration of most French fiction, Naturalism, with its exaggerations, its deliberate determination to be coarse, its narrow and brutal aesthetics, loses ground and soon falls into disrepute. The traditions of the romance of psychological analysis reappear with M. Paul Bourget, who, following the example of Octave Feuillet, chooses fashionable life as the setting of his stories. In recent years M. Bourget has broadened his manner and attacked the great moral and social problems of the hour ("L'Étape", 1902; "Un divorce", 1904; "L'Ennemi", 1907). M. Edouard Rod, a Swiss by birth, has



HUNTER, MAIDEN, AND UNICORN  
XIII-XIV Century MS. of the Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc,  
Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

undertaken in his romances to deal with questions of conscience. On another side, by way of reaction against the crass dogmatism of Zola and his school, a certain number of writers, with a talent for playing upon fine shades of meaning and a very especial taste for crowding contrary ideas together, have taken a



delight in filling their romances with a subtle and penetrating irony. The master of this school is M. Anatole France. M. Maurice Barrès, who holds from Stendahl, was, in his earlier career, of the ironical school, but has more recently applied himself to demonstrating the influences of native soil and tradition ("Les Déracinés", 1897). Another class of story writers has exerted itself to increase the field of romance, which, with the Naturalists, had well nigh been shut up within the limits of Parisian life. Some, like M. Pierre Loti, marvellous at evoking the impression of far distant lands, have imported an exotic atmosphere; others have sought to reproduce with sympathetic fidelity the manners of their native provinces. This latter has been done for Anjou and the Vendée, with much elevation of thought and elegance of style, by M. Bazin (*La Terre qui meurt*).

The drama, which had produced nothing of any real value under the influence of Romanticism, passed through a period of great brilliancy after 1850. Most of the works produced since that date belong to the comedy of manners, often containing little of the comic, which derives its origin from the Romantic drama—to which it owes its ambition to reproduce "atmosphere"—and from the comedy of Scribe. The essential characteristic of the work of Scribe is the care which he brings to the contrivance of his scenes, the disposal of his action, and the preparation of his *dénouement*. This dexterity in managing a plot reappears in almost all the dramatic authors of the second half of the nineteenth century, with whom it is an important element of their art. Lastly, the influence of the romance makes itself felt; as the romance strives after exact portraiture of life and manners, so does the drama. To resume, the modern comedy of manners combines Scribe's theatrical technique with Balzac's observation.

The chief initiator of the dramatic movement of his time was Alexandre Dumas,  *fils* (1824-96). An extremely penetrating observer, he had at the same time the mental idiosyncrasy of a quasi-mystical moralist. At first his gift of observation dominates; in "*La Dame aux Camélias*" (1852), "*Question d'argent*" (1857), and "*Le père prodigue*" (1859), he depicts Parisian society. Then, from 1867 on, the moralist runs away with him and he creates a new type, the "problem play" (*pièce de thèse*), in which, in an exuberantly spirited dialogue of dazzling wit, he studies and discusses certain fundamental social questions ("*Les idées de Madame Aubray*", 1867). The work of the younger Dumas is often bizarre and irritating, that of Emile Augier (1820-89), who shares public favour with him, is more uniform. The dominant quality in Augier is good sense; he has devoted himself to painting bourgeois society, using methods almost identical with those of the Classics and, like them, creating general types. At the time when Naturalism was trying to obtain possession of the drama, as it had already taken possession of romance, Henri Becque (1837-99), who produced little besides, was the principal dramatist of that school ("*Les Corbeaux*", 1882). But the movement was short-lived; Naturalism in the drama soon ran to excesses which ruined its reputation. Dumas  *fils*, however, is still the master from whom the contemporary dramatists hold, and Edouard Pailleron, Henri Lavedan, Maurice Donnay, and Paul Hervieu all owe him much. It is to be noted that in the last years of the nineteenth century the French stage witnessed a revival of the heroic comedy in M. Edmond Rostand's "*Cyrano de Bergerac*" (1897).

We have already spoken of Renan and Taine in connexion with the general tendencies of this period; these two names belong also to the literature of history. Renan (1822-92), with his "*Origines du Christianisme*", opened the domain of literature to religious history, which before had belonged only to pure erudition.

Apart from the wavering scepticism and dilettantism in his work, his influence has been felt by a great number of writers. Taine (1828-93) inaugurated in history the method of "little facts" borrowed from the sciences. He classifies and arranges a mass of unimportant events, which serve him as documents of his epoch, and from these he gathers tendencies and laws (*Les Origines de la France Contemporaine*). Side by side with Renan and Taine we must place Fustel de Coulanges (1830-89), whose method is the scrupulous analysis of texts and, above all, the study of the laws of social change. Since these great masters, historical literature has risen to superb heights; among the most brilliant historians of our own day, it will suffice to mention MM. Albert Sorel, Albert Vandal, and Henry Houssaye.

Lastly, following Sainte-Beuve, some remarkable writers have raised criticism to the independent rank of a great department of literature. Here M. Brunetière (1849-1906) introduced the idea of evolution, showing how literary forms are born, develop, flourish, and then become dissolved and resolved into other forms. No one has pleaded the cause of tradition with greater warmth, and even violence, than M. Brunetière, and this same classical tradition is defended by M. Jules Lemaitre, under the fluctuating forms of a clever and ingenious criticism which has nothing of dilettantism but the appearance, and by M. Emile Faguet, in monographs remarkable for precise analysis and vigorous relief.

In conclusion, it may be asked: What stage of its development has French literature now reached? and what character is it likely to assume in the course of the twentieth century?—It would be vain to attempt a guess, but some of the influences which seem bound to affect it may be here indicated. First, science will increasingly impose on the writers of the future its vigorous discipline and methods. On the other hand, the fact that the study of Greek and Latin is losing ground in France cannot fail to have the most profound consequences in literature. Lastly, we seem, in these days, to be assisting at a social transformation, the shock of which will doubtless make itself felt in art and letters.

*Belgian Literature in the French Language.*—In the Middle Ages the literature in French which developed in the provinces of Hainault, Flanders, Brabant, and Liège had all the characteristics of the French literature of that time, except that it furnished neither works nor names of any mark. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there was the same poverty of literary output. In the eighteenth century, under the then universal influence of French literature, a *grand seigneur*, the Prince de Ligne (1735-1814), rivals in easy grace of style the French writers of his time—"the only foreigner", as Mme. de Staël says, "who has ever become a model in French literature, instead of being an imitator". But the true expansion of French Belgian literature—which, however, is never more than a reflection of French literature properly so called—dates from the formation of an independent Belgian kingdom. Charles de Coster (d. 1879), the earliest of the Belgian writers of the nineteenth century worthy of mention, brings out the very soul of Flanders in his legendary romance "*Tiel Uylenspiegel*", which in other respects reproduces the qualities and defects of the Romantics. From 1880, beginning with M. Camille Lemonnier, Naturalism reigns in Belgium. Naturalism, following the example set in France, is dethroned by Symbolism, about 1889. It may even be properly said that Symbolism developed in Belgium rather than in France; its principal representatives are M. Rodenbach, an exquisite poet who has depicted for us the fascination of Bruges (*Le Règne du silence*, *Bruges-la-Morte*), M. Verhaeren ("*Les Soirs*", 1887), and M. Maeterlinck, who has essayed to create a Symbolistic drama.

*Swiss Literature in the French Language.*—Swiss-French literature has produced great writers, but has not kept them; they have deserted their original country to seek naturalization in France. This was the case with J. J. Rousseau, Mme de Staël, and Benjamin Constant, who, though Swiss by origin, are thoroughly French writers. In the nineteenth century Swiss-French literature, above all, boasts of critics like Alexandre Vinet (1797–1847) and Edmond Schérer (1815–89), both distinguished by their tendency to emphasize moral interests, both, moreover, treating chiefly of French literature. In romance, likewise, M. Victor Cherbuliez (1829–1900), who excelled in the knack of weaving into the plot of a story current questions of art, science, and philosophy, and M. Edouard Rod are very decidedly French writers. The only truly Swiss author is Topfer (1799–1816), who has left some little masterpieces of romance at once sentimental and humorous, such as his “Histoire de M. Pencil” and his “Voyages et aventures du docteur Festus” (1849).

NISARD, *Histoire de la littérature française* (Brussels, 1879); BRUNETIÈRE, *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1897); ID., *Histoire de la littérature française classique* (Paris, only one volume has appeared); DOUMIC, *Histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1900); LANSON, *Histoire de la littérature française*; PARIS, *La Littérature française au Moyen-Âge; La poésie au Moyen-Âge*; PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Histoire du Théâtre français au Moyen-Âge*; SAINT-BEUVE, *Tableau de la littérature française au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle; Causeries du Lundi; Nouveaux Lundis*; BRUNETIÈRE, *Études critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1887—); ID., *Histoire et littérature* (Paris, 1884–86); ID., *Questions de critique* (Paris, 1889); ID., *Nouvelles questions de critiques* (Paris, 1890); ID., *Essais sur la littérature contemporaine* (Paris, 1892); ID., *Nouveaux essais de littérature contemporaine* (Paris, 1895); ID., *L'évolution de la poésie lyrique en France au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*; ID., *L'évolution des genres* (Paris, 1890—); ID., *Les époques du théâtre français; BOURGET, Essais de psychologie contemporaine; Nouveaux essais de psychologie contemporaine*; LEMAITRE, *Les Contemporains; Impressions du théâtre*; FAGUET, *Études littéraires sur le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle; Dix-septième siècle; Dix-huitième siècle; Dix-neuvième siècle; Politiques et moralistes du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*; DOUMIC, *Études sur la littérature française; Écrivains d'aujourd'hui* (Paris, 1896–1900); ID., *Portraits d'écrivains* (Paris, 1892); ID., *Les Jeunes* (Paris, —); ID., *Les hommes et les idées du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1904); ID., *De Scribe à Ibsen* (Paris, 1893); ID., *Essais sur le théâtre contemporain* (Paris, 1896).

English Works—SAINSBURY, *Short History of French Literature* (London, 1882); VAN LAUN, *Hist. of French Lit.* (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1876); HIRSCHFELD, *Geschichte der franz. Literatur* (Leipzig and Vienna, 1900).

RENÉ DOUMIC.

**Franceschini, Marc' Antonio**, Italian painter; b. at Bologna, 1648; d. there c. 1729; best known for the decorative works he carried out in Parma, Bologna, and Genoa, and for the designs executed for Clement XI for certain mosaics in St. Peter's. He may be regarded as a member of the Eclectic School and a follower of the Carracci, and his chief works consist of the Ranuzzi ceiling in Bologna, two fine pictures in the Bologna Gallery (Annunciation and the Holy Family) and one in the Servite convent depicting the founders of the order. Other less important churches in the same city are adorned with his works and there are five of his paintings at Vienna. He also decorated a church at Crema in 1716, and a few years later painted a fine picture of St. Thomas of Villanova giving alms to the poor, to be seen in the Augustinian church at Rimini. He is believed to have lived to a great age. Historians have stated that he visited Madrid, but the more general opinion is that he declined an invitation to that city, saying that he did not wish to leave his native country. He painted down to the very moment of his death, and on one of his pictures at Venice he declares that he was seventy-eight when he finished it, and on another in Genoa, representing Rebecca, that he was eighty. His drawing was very precise, colouring fresh and vivid, and his shadows were not so intense as those of his predecessors.

ZANOTTI, *Storia dell' Accademia di Bologna* (Bologna, 1739); IDEM, *Avvertimenti alla pittura* (Bologna, 1756).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Frances d'Amboise, BLESSED, Duchess of Brittany**, afterwards Carmelite nun; b. 1427; d. at Nantes, 4

Nov., 1485. The daughter of Louis d'Amboise, Viscount de Thouars, she was betrothed when only four years old, to Peter, second son of John V, Duke of Brittany, the marriage being solemnized when she had reached the age of fifteen. The union was, however, not very happy owing to the morose disposition of the husband who occasionally ill-treated his wife; but her gentleness gradually changed his heart, he assisted her in her works of charity and did penance for his former dissolute life. After his succession to the dukedom in 1450 her wholesome influence made itself felt in wider circles; she also intervened, not always successfully, in the never-ending family feuds. The duke died, leaving no legitimate heir, in 1457, after having borne testimony in his last will to the devotedness of his wife. The latter consecrated her life to God, but for several years she was unable to consummate the sacrifice by entering a convent. While being educated by her future mother-in-law she had early distinguished herself by almsdeeds and fervent devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. During her married life she devoted a large portion of her fortune to the foundation of a convent of Poor Clares at Nantes, which she would have joined had her strength allowed it; she also took part in the preliminaries of the canonization of St. Vincent Ferrer, became a benefactress of the Dominican convent at Nantes, and made the acquaintance of Blessed John Soreth, General of the Carmelites, who in 1452 had established the first community of Carmelite nuns. Some of these, coming from Liège, were received by Frances at Vannes (31 Oct., 1463) where they were entertained at the castle until the convent called “The Three Maries” was habitable. Having provided their dowries she entered the novitiate (25 March, 1468), making her profession the following year. After some time spent as infirmarian she was elected prioress for life (1473), and became by her splendid example the model of a true Carmelite nun, and, in a sense, the foundress of this branch of the order. The convent proving too small she obtained, not without litigation, a larger one at Nantes. She died in a holy ecstasy, and miracles were wrought at her tomb. During the Huguenot wars and the French Revolution her body had to be saved twice from profanation. Pius IX beatified her 16 July, 1863.

RICHARD, *Vie de la B. Françoise d'Amboise* (1865); *Acta SS.*, Nov., II, 520.

BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN.

**Frances of Rome, SAINT (BUSSA DI LEONI)**, one of the greatest mystics of the fifteenth century; b. at Rome, of a noble family, in 1384; d. there, 9 March, 1440. Her youthful desire was to enter religion, but at her father's wish she married, at the age of twelve, Lorenzo de' Ponziani. Among her children we know of Battista, who carried on the family name, Evangelista, a child of great gifts (d. 1411), and Agnes (d. 1413). Frances was remarkable for her charity to the poor, and for her zeal for souls. She won away many Roman ladies from a life of frivolity, and united them in an association of oblates attached to the White Benedictine monastery of Santa Maria Nuova; later they became the Benedictine Oblate Congregation of Tor di Specchi (25 March, 1433) which was approved by Eugene IV (4 July, 1433). Its members led the life of religious, but without strict cloister or formal vows, and gave themselves up to prayer and good works. With her husband's consent Frances practiced continency, and advanced in a life of contemplation. Her visions often assumed the form of dramas enacted for her by heavenly personages. She had the gift of miracles and ecstasy, as well as the bodily vision of her guardian angel, had revelations concerning purgatory and hell, and foretold the ending of the Western Schism. She could read the secrets of consciences and detect plots of diabolical origin. She was remarkable for her humility and detachment, her

obedience and patience, exemplified on the occasion of her husband's banishment, the captivity of Battista, her sons' death, and the loss of all her property.

On the death of her husband (1436) she retired among her oblates at Tor di Specchi, seeking admission for charity's sake, and was made superior. On the occasion of a visit to her son, she fell ill and died on the day she had already foretold. Her canonization was preceded by three processes (1440, 1443, 1451) and Paul V declared her a saint on 9 May, 1608, assigning 9 March as her feast day. Long before that, however, the faithful were wont to venerate her body in the church of Santa Maria Nuova in the Roman Forum, now known as the church of Santa Francesca Romana.

ARMELLINI, *Vita di S. Francesca Romana*, originally written in the Roman vernacular of the fifteenth century, with an appendix of three panegyrics in the same idiom, and edited by ARMELLINI from a codex in the archives of the Holy See (Rome, 1882); Acta SS., March, II; *Vita di S. Francesca Romana fondatrice* (Rome, 1675); FULLERTON, *Life of St. Frances of Rome* (London, 1855); other lives by PONZILEONE (Turin, 1874); RABORY (Paris, 1884); STELZER (Mainz, 1888); RAMBUTEAU (Paris, 1900); *Rivista Storica Benedettina* (1908), III, 9; PALAEZ, *Visioni di S. Francesca Romana in Archivio della Soc. Romana di storia patria* (1891), 365 sqq. (1892), 251 sqq. On the interesting (eighteenth century) church of Santa Maria Nuova (now Santa Francesca Romana, in the Roman Forum) see ARMELLINI, *Le Chiese di Roma* (Rome, 1891), 150-52; CHANDLER, *Pilgrim Walks in Rome* (London, s. d.); HARE, *Walks in Rome* (London, s. d.).

#### FRANCESCO PAOLI.

**Franchi**, AUSONIO, the pseudonym of CRISTOFORO BONAVINO, philosopher; b. 24 February, 1821, at Pegli, province of Genoa; d. 12 September, 1895, at Genoa. He entered the ecclesiastical state, and some time after his ordination to the priesthood, was appointed director of an institution for secondary education at Genoa. Soon, however, he became imbued with the doctrines of French positivism and German criticism. Doubts arose in his mind, followed by an internal struggle which he describes in his work on the philosophy of the Italian schools. At the same time, important political events were taking place in Italy, culminating in the revolution of 1848. Misled, as he later says of himself, by a political passion, and also by a kind of philosophical passion, Franchi abandoned the priest's habit and office in 1849, and assumed the name of Ausonio Franchi (i. e. free Italian), indicating thereby his break with his own past and his new aspirations. Henceforth all his talents were devoted to the cause of intellectual and political liberty. The dogmatic authority of the Church and the despotic authority of the State are the objects of his incessant attacks. Combining Kant's phenomenalism and Comte's positivism, he falls into a sort of relativism and agnosticism. For him, religious truth and reason, Catholicism and freedom, are irreconcilable, and Franchi does not hesitate in his choice.

In 1854 he founded the "Ragione", a religious, political, and social weekly which was a means of propagating these ideas. Terenzio Mamiani, then Minister of Education, appointed him professor of the history of philosophy in the University of Pavia (1860), and later (1863) in the University of Milan, where he remained until 1888. No work was published by him between 1872 and 1889. A change was again taking place in his mind, not now due to passion, but to the professor's more mature reflection. It led to the publication of Franchi's last work, in which he announces his return to the Church, criticizes his former works and arguments, and denounces the opinions and principles of his earlier writings. His works are: "Elementi di Grammatica generale applicati alle due lingue italiana e latina" (Genoa, 1848-49), under the name of Cristoforo Bonavino. Under the name of Ausonio Franchi he wrote "La Filosofia delle scuole italiane" (Capolago, 1852; "Appendice", Genoa, 1853); "La religione del secolo XIXo" (Lausanne, 1853); "Studi filosofici e religiosi: Del Sentimento" (Turin, 1854);


"Il Razionalismo del Popolo" (Geneva, 1856); "Lettere sulla Storia della Filosofia moderna: Bacone, Descartes, Spinoza, Malebranche" (Milan, 1863); "Sulla Teorica del Giudizio" (Milan, 1870); "La Caduta del Principato ecclesiastico e la Restaurazione dell' Impero Germanico" (Milan, 1871); "Saggi di critica e polemica" (Milan, 1871-72). He also edited "Appendice alle Memorie politiche di Felice Orsini" (Turin, 1858); "Epistolario di Giuseppe La Farina" (Milan, 1869); and "Scritti politici di Giuseppe La Farina" (Milan, 1870).

MOLINARI in *Nuova enciclopedia italiana* (6th ed., Turin, 1875-), Suppl. I, 1111; DE GUBERNATIS, *Dictionnaire international des écrivains du jour* (Florence, 1891), I, 356; MOONEY, *Ausonio Franchi: The Great Italian Philosopher's Noble Reputation in American Catholic Quarterly Review*, XV (1890), 325; *L'ultima critica di Ausonio Franchi in Civiltà Cattolica*, Series XIV, Vol. IV (1889), 5 sqq., 167 sqq., etc., and several other articles in the same review; MARIANO, *La philosophie contemporaine en Italie* (Paris, 1888); ANGELINI, *Ausonio Franchi* (Rome, 1897).

C. A. DUBRAY.

**Francia** (FRANCESCO RAIBOLINI), a famous Bolognese goldsmith, engraver, and artist, b. about 1450; d. in 1517. His family was one of the best in Bologna, and owned land at Zola Predosa. His father was a wood-carver, but Francesco entered the guild of goldsmiths (1482), and was elected its head in the following year. His master was one Duc, surnamed Francia, doubtless because of his native land, and Francesco adopted this surname, either through gratitude, or more probably as a valuable trade-mark. Like Pisanello, Verrocchio, Pollaiuolo, and Ghirlandajo, he is an example of what Italian art owes to close association with the minor arts. A gradation of the fine arts, the idea of greater or lesser dignity and rank, did not then exist and was to spring up only later, in the school of Michelangelo. This fact imparts to all the æsthetic manifestations of the classic period that unity and perfection of detail and life which imagination and taste impress on all things. The relations between the goldsmith's art and painting were then particularly close. In this way painting was enabled to rise above the vulgar demands of a pious *image* of the Giottoesque type, and the dry and pedantic learning of Voccello and Andrea del Castagno. Art, ornament, and beauty, which threatened to disappear, were thus restored to painting. This is why the "industrial" side of Francia's art, exemplified in his admirable medals, *nielli*, and enamels, his work as a jeweller, an armourer, and a type-caster, cannot be too strongly insisted on. He is known to have designed the italic type for the edition of Virgil published by Aldus Manutius (Venice, 1501). We know also that the invention of engraving is partly due to the art of *niello* in which Francia was a master. A few prints are ascribed to Francia; in the art of engraving he was the first master of Marcantonio Raimondo.

Circumstances, however, impelled Francia to become a painter. Very probably he received his first lessons from Francesco Cossa (d. at Bologna, 1485), but it was from Lorenzo Costa that he received his principal instruction. This artist, slightly younger than Francia, had recently won renown at Ferrara and returned in 1483 to Bologna, where he set up his studio in the house occupied by the goldsmith. More than one work (church of the Misericordia, Bentivoglio palace) resulted from their friendly collaboration. Certain peculiarities of Francia, his familiar scenic arrangements, the beautiful architecture, the carved thrones of his Madonnas, the little angelic musicians seated on steps, are touches of Ferrarese taste which proclaim the influence of Costa. In landscape Francia felt later the influence of Perugino (1446-1524), who, in 1497, was painting his "Virgo Gloriosa" at San Giovanni in Monte. These influences, however, should be acknowledged with all the reserve imposed in the case of an already mature man, who had long been an artist of repute when he began to paint. The earliest ex-



*Photo Brusa, Clément & Co.*

ST. GEORGE AND THE DRAGON  
FRANCIA, CORSINI GALLERY, ROME





tant works of Francia, e. g. the "Calvary" of the Archiginnasio of Bologna, the "Madonna" of Berlin, above all the remarkable "St. Stephen" of the Casino Borghese, are remarkable for a certain character of "dilettantism" (Burkhardt), for something so intentionally unique and original that one does not know with what to connect them in all the history of painting. We feel ourselves in the presence of a master who grasps with firmness his own ideas and is extremely personal in his tendencies, one who takes up a new craft only because it enables him to apply highly individual theories or express his intimate tastes. The early attempts were followed by a series of great works dated as follows: the *Felici neredos* (Bologna, 1494), that of the *Bentivoglio* (San Giacomo Maggiore, 1599), those of the *Scappi* and the *Manzuoli*, the great "Annunciation" (Pinacoteca of Bologna, 1500), and various others now in the museums of Berlin and St. Petersburg. It is always the same subject so beloved throughout the fifteenth century, the Virgin surrounded by various saints; even when styled an "Annunciation", the treatment remains the same. The composition is necessarily uniform, in deference to the law of symmetry. There is naturally no action, the painter's object being to produce with these motionless figures an effect of harmony and recollection. It is a calm and tranquil beauty that he seeks to reproduce. But within these limits no one, not even Giovanni Bellini, though his "Madonna of San Zaccaria" dates from 1505, achieved so much. The orderly disposition of his figures and his well-balanced lines, heightened often by an architectural background or by landscapes, produces an impression of profound peace. So much happiness could have but one legitimate expression, i. e. music. In other words the angels playing on the harp or the lute, whom Francia loved to introduce, interpret naturally the emotions awakened by the harmony of form. Let it be added, and in this he differs from Perugino, that with him lyricism never becomes mere formula. The inspiration of Francia seems inexhaustible; hence his ability to vary indefinitely, and always with success, the same theme. Francia was always too conscientious to reproduce in a commonplace way works which were the outcome, on his part, of a deep emotional life. In this artist the conventional never replaces true sentiment, as in Perugino during the last twenty-five years of his life.

The types of Francia, though extremely general in significance, are none the less markedly individual; his Sebastian has not the same features, the same piety, the same ecstasy as Bernard, nor is his figure of Augustine the same as that of Francis. In execution he displays admirable care in all details and is never negligent. The figures are irreproachably constructed, while the elegant ornamentation, the sculptures, embroideries, tiaras, and dalmatics betray the sharp and critical eye of the goldsmith and engraver. Of this we are reminded still more forcibly by his fondness for, and careful selection of, the best materials for his palette, and his taste for compact, thick, enameled painting, of itself a pleasure to the eye. Each picture of Francia has its own sonorous harmony; throughout his work we seem to hear, as it were, an orchestration of colour. We have here the principles of an entirely new art, altogether different from the ultra-intellectual preoccupations of the Florentine School. Horace had said that poetry was a kind of painting, *ut pictura poesis*; one might imagine that in turn Francia wished to prove that painting was a kind of music. It was the idea likely to arise in an ancient musical city immemorably famous for its singers and its lute-players. Only in his later pictures, however, e. g. the "Baptism of Christ" (Dresden, 1509), the "Deposition" (Turin, 1515), the "Sacra Conversazione" of Parma, above all in that of London (about 1516), does Francia display the full

measure of his genius. Several of his frescoes are known, e. g. the "Madonna del Terremuoto" (Bologna, 1505) and two charming pages from the life of St. Cecilia, her marriage and her burial, at San Giacomo Maggiore (1507). He is also the author of beautiful portraits (Pitti Palace, also the Uffizi, in Florence). No doubt his modesty, his quiet and retired life, spent entirely at Bologna, his avoidance of historical and mythological subjects, a mental temper which held him aloof from the great movement of the Renaissance and caused him to pursue so novel an occupation, suffice to explain the semi-obliteration of his fame. His contemporaries, nevertheless, considered him a man of no small importance. Raphael corresponded with him, though there is no proof that the letter and sonnet quoted by Malvasia are authentic. In 1508 he was named director of the mint of Bologna, and in 1514, master of all the artist corporations of the city. He was handsome, says his contemporary Seccadinari, very eloquent, well-informed, and distinguished. His influence, nevertheless, was confined to Bologna. He lived apart from the pagan and rationalistic movement of the fifteenth century, was an isolated man of great and noble gifts, original and pure in his use of them, in a word the most eminent personality in Northern Italian art previous to Titian and Correggio. He had two sons, Giacomo and Giulio, b. in 1485 and 1487.

VASARI, ed. MILANESI, III, 555; MALVASIA, *Felsina Pittrice* (Bologna, 1641); CALVI, *Memorie della vita di Fr. Rabolini detto il Francia* (Bologna, 1812); DUCHESNE, *Essai sur les Nielles* (Paris, 1812); REID, *The Engravings of Francia* (London, 1871); WILLIAMSON, *Francia* (London, 1901).

LOUIS GILLET.

**Francis I**, King of France; b. at Cognac, 12 September, 1494; d. at Rambouillet, 31 March, 1547. He was the son of Charles of Orléans, Count of Angoulême, and Louise of Savoy, and the husband of Claude of France, daughter of Louis XII. He succeeded to the throne 1 January, 1515, not as son-in-law, since the Salic Law did not permit succession through women, but as cousin of Louis XII, who had no male heir. His victory at Marignano (1515) over the Swiss who were defending Maximilian Sforza established the young king's reputation in Italy. He took advantage of this at "the interview of Bologna" to bring to a successful termination the efforts of his predecessors, Charles VII and Louis XI, to impose on Leo X the concordat which governed the organization of the French Church from that time till the end of the old regime (see FRANCE). This marked the beginning of a series of measures destined to establish in France the preponderance of the royal power. Francis I sought by every means, even by exceptional tribunals, to destroy among the nobles, both bishops and *seigneurs* (lords), the spirit of independence. The formula of royal edicts "car tel est notre bon plaisir" (because it is our good pleasure) dates from his reign. The death of Emperor Maximilian I (1519) led Francis I to dispute the imperial crown with Charles of Austria who had recently inherited the crown of Spain. The latter became emperor as Charles V. Surrounded on the south, north-east, and east by the states of Charles V, Francis I, immediately after his interview of the Field of the Cloth of Gold with Henry VIII of England (1520), began the struggle with the House of Austria which was to be prolonged, with occasional truces, until 1756. Four successive wars against Charles V filled the reign of King Francis. The first, famous for the exploits and death of Bayard, the "chevalier sans peur et sans reproche", the treason of the Constable de Bourbon, the defeat of Francis I at Pavia (1525), and his captivity, ended with the Treaty of Madrid (1526), by which he ceded Burgundy to Charles V. The second war, rendered necessary by the refusal of the deputies of Burgundy to become the subjects of the emperor, and marked by the alliance between Francis I

and the Italian princes, among them Pope Clement VII (League of Cognac, 1526), brought about the sack of Rome by the imperial troops under the command of the Constable of Bourbon (1527), and ended with the Peace of Cambrai (1529), in reality no more than a truce. After its conclusion Francis I, who had lost his wife, Claude of France, in 1524, wedded Eleanor of Austria, sister of Charles V. The third war, entered upon by Francis I after he had reorganized a permanent national army, and at the time when Charles V had undertaken an expedition against Tunis, was marked by the entrance of the French troops into Savoy and the entrance of the troops of Charles V into Provence (1536); it was brought to an end, thanks to the mediation of Pope Paul III, by the treaty of Aigues-Mortes. The fourth war, resulting from the ambitious designs of Francis I on Milan, was marked by the alliance of Charles V with Henry VIII, by the French victory of Ceresole (1544), and was ended by the Treaties of Crespy and Andres (1544 and 1546).

The history of no other reign has been so profoundly studied in modern times as that of Francis I. A series of recent works has brought out the originality and novelty of his political maxims. The struggle against the House of Austria made Francis I the ally of the Holy See during the pontificate of Clement VII, whose niece, Catherine, had married Henry II, the future King of France (see CATHERINE DE' MEDICI), but he could not prevail upon Clement VII to grant a divorce to Henry VIII of England. Impelled by the desire to menace Charles V not only on the frontiers but even in the interior of his territory, Francis I sent his agents into Germany, who fostered political and religious anarchy and favoured the political ascendancy of the Protestant princes. His policy in this respect was opposed to Catholic interests and even opposed to those of Christianity, for, after having in 1522 and 1523 sent Antonio Rincon to the King of Poland and the Voivode of Transylvania to urge them to threaten Charles V on the eastern frontier of the empire, Francis I thought of utilizing the Turks against the emperor. Before he had even thought of this alliance rumours spread throughout Germany held him responsible for the victories of the Mussulmans at Belgrade and Rhodes. Francis I entered into relations with the Sultan Soliman in 1526 through his agent Frangipani, and in 1528 through Antonio Rincon. The progress of the Turks in Central Europe between 1528 and 1532 injured the reputation of Francis I. He then secured the assistance of the Turks against Charles V in the Italian peninsula and in the Western Mediterranean. Then followed his negotiations with Barbarossa (1533-34), at that time master of all North Africa. In 1535 his ambassador Jean de la Forest was sent to Barbarossa to arrange for a campaign against the Genoese, and to the sultan to secure his alliance with Francis I in order to preserve the European balance of power. From these negotiations of Jean de la Forest date the abandonment by France of the medieval idea of *la Chrétienté*, or Christendom, and, on the other hand, her protection of the Christians in the East (see FRANCE).



FRANCIS I  
Jean Clouet, Louvre

Francis I played the part of a Mæcenas in the spread of the Renaissance in France. He invited from Italy the great artists Leonardo da Vinci, Rosso, Primaticcio, Benvenuto Cellini, and Andrea del Sarto. He began the present Louvre, built or decorated the châteaux of Fontainebleau and Chambord, and was patron of the poets Marot and du Bellay. His most valuable service to Humanism was the foundation of the Collège de France, intended originally for the teaching of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. He was also the founder of the Imprimerie Royale. While he permitted the development in intellectual circles of certain Protestant ideas simultaneously with Humanism, he was on the other hand, after 1534, quite hostile to the propagation of Protestantism among the common people, as is shown by his persecution (1545) of the Vaudois of Chabrières and Mérindol. The poems of Francis I, though interesting as historical documents, are mediocre work. His tomb and that of his wife, Claude of France, in St. Denis, were designed by Philibert Delorme, and executed by Pierre Bontemps.

CONTEMPORARY SOURCES:—*Catalogue des actes de François I<sup>er</sup>* (10 vols., Paris, 1887-1907); *Ordonnances du règne de François I<sup>er</sup>, 1515-1516* (Paris, 1902); CHAMPOLLION-FIGÉAC, *Captivité du Roi François I<sup>er</sup>* (Paris, 1847); *Poésies de François I<sup>er</sup>*, ed. CHAMPOLLION-FIGÉAC (Paris, 1847); *Journal de Louise de Savoie*, ed. GUICHENON (Paris, 1778); *Journal de Jean Barillon*, ed. VAISSIERE (Paris, 1897-99); *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris sous le règne de François I<sup>er</sup>*, ed. LALANNE (Paris, 1854); *Chronique du Roi François I<sup>er</sup>*, ed. GUIFFREY (Paris, 1864); *Mémoires de Martin du Bellay, de Fleurange, de Saulx de Tavannes, de Vieilleville; Histoire du gentil seigneur de Bayard*, ed. ROMAN (Paris, 1878); *Monluc, Commentaires*, ed. DE RUBLE (Paris, 1864-1872).

MODERN WORKS:—PAULIN PARIS, *Études sur le règne de François I<sup>er</sup>* (2 vols., Paris, 1885); MADELIN, *De Conventu Bononvensi* (Paris, 1901); MIGNET, *Rivalité de François I<sup>er</sup> et de Charles-Quint* (2 vols., Paris, 1878); HAMY, *Entrevue de François I<sup>er</sup> avec Henri VIII à Boulogne-Sur-Mer en 1532; Intervention de la France dans l'affaire du divorce* (Paris, 1898);

BOURRILLY, *La première ambassade d'Antonio Rincon en Orient* in *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* (1900-1901), II; IDEM, *L'ambassade de Laforest et Marillac à Constantinople* in *Rev. Hist.* (1901), LXXVI; IDEM, *Le règne de François I<sup>er</sup>* in *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* (1902-1903), IV; LEMONNIER, *La France sous Charles VIII, Louis XII et François I<sup>er</sup>* in *LAVISSE, Histoire de France* (Paris, 1903), V; URSTU, *La politique orientale de François I<sup>er</sup>* (Paris, 1908).

GEORGES GOYAU.

**Francis, CORD OF ST.** See CORD, CONFRATERNITIES OF THE.

**Francis, RULE OF SAINT.**—As known, St. Francis founded three orders and gave each of them a special rule (see FRANCIS OF ASSISI, SAINT). Here only the rule of the first order is to be considered, i. e. that of the Friars Minor, under the following headings: I. ORIGIN AND CONTENTS OF THE RULE; II. INTERPRETATION AND OBSERVANCE OF THE RULE.

I. ORIGIN AND CONTENTS OF THE RULE.—(1) *Origin.*—There is, as in so many other points in the life of St. Francis, not a small amount of doubt and controversy about the Rule of St. Francis. Whether St. Francis wrote several rules or one rule only, with several versions, whether he received it directly from heaven through revelation, or whether it was the fruit of long experience, whether he gave it the last touch or whether its definite form is due to the influence of others, all these

are questions which find different answers. However, in some cases, it is more a question of words than of facts. We may speak of three successive rules or of three successive versions of the same rule; that makes little difference, since the spirit in the three cases is the same. For clearness, we shall speak simply of the three rules, the first of which is of the year 1209, the second of 1221, the third of 1223; expounding more especially the one of 1223, as this is properly the Rule of St. Francis, the object of this article.

(a) The Rule of 1209.—This is the rule St. Francis presented to Innocent III for approval in the year 1209; its real text is not known. If, however, we regard the statements of Thomas of Celano (I Cel., i, 9 and 13, ed. d'Alençon, Rome, 1906) and St. Bonaventure (Legenda maior, c. iii), we are forced to conclude that this primitive rule was little more than some passages of the Gospel heard in 1208 in the chapel of Portiuncula. From which Gospel precisely these words were taken, we do not know. The following passages, Matt., xix, 21; Matt., xvi, 24; Luke, ix, 3, occurring in the second rule (i and xiv), are considered as a part of the original one of 1209. They enjoin apostolical life with all its renuncements and privations. The three vows of obedience, chastity, and poverty, essential to any religious order, and some practical rules of conduct were added. Thomas of Celano says in this regard (I Cel., i, 13): "Blessed Francis, seeing that the Lord God was daily increasing the number [of the brethren] for that very purpose, wrote down simply and in few words for himself and for his brethren, both present and future, a pattern and rule of life, using chiefly the language of the holy Gospel after whose perfection alone he yearned" [version of Ferrers Howell (London, 1908), p. 31]. St. Bonaventure (loc. cit.) and the so-called "Legend of the Three Companions" (viii) repeat almost the same words. The fact can otherwise be gathered from the description of the early state of the order, made by St. Francis himself in the "Testament": "And when the Lord gave me some brothers, no one showed me what I ought to do, but the Most High Himself revealed to me that I should live according to the form of the holy Gospel. And I caused it to be written in few words and simply, and the Lord Pope confirmed it for me" (version of Paschal Robinson). These last words of St. Francis refer to the oral approval of the original rule, given by Innocent III, 1209. Angelo Clareno, in his (not printed) "Exposition of the Rule", alleges that this rule was approved in the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215. But this is not certain; it is not even proved that St. Francis was in Rome at that time. Still, indirectly, Angelo Clareno is right, inasmuch as the prohibition of founding new orders, decreed at this council, was not applied to St. Francis's institute. Some letters of Honorius III, given 1219 (Bullarium Franciscanum, I, 2), may also be considered as a general approbation of the life and rule of the friars. The text of the primitive rule seems to have perished very early, since Hugo of Digne (Expositio in Regulam, Prologus and c. xii) in the middle of the thirteenth century, Ubertino of Casale (Arbor Vitæ, Bk. V, c. v, Venice, 1485, f. E. II, v., a) and Angelo Clareno (Expositio in Regulam, *passim*) in the beginning of the fourteenth century, quote constantly as the first rule, confirmed by Innocent III, the one written in 1221. However, endeavours of reconstruction have been made by Karl Müller (Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens und der Bussbruderschaften, Freiburg im Br., 1885, 185-188), and by H. Böhmer (Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi, Tübingen und Leipzig, 1904, 88-89). This first rule marks the stage of the order governed by St. Francis's personal authority, and it is quite natural that this first attempt could not be developed as later rules were. But to conclude hence that Francis did not intend to found an order properly so called, in other words, to write

any religious rule at all, is quite different. All that can be said is this, that St. Francis did not take as his model any monastic order, but simply the life of Christ and His Apostles, the Gospel itself.

(b) The Rule of 1221.—If we give credit to Jacques de Vitry, in a letter written at Genoa, 1216 (Böhmer, loc. cit., 98), and to the traditional "Legend of the Three Companions" (c. xiv), the rule of 1209 was successively improved at the annual general chapter at Portiuncula by new statutes, the fruit of ever-growing experience. Jacques de Vitry (loc. cit.) writes: "The men of this Religion with great fruit assemble every year at a determined place, that they may rejoice in the Lord and take their meals, and by the counsel of good men they make and promulgate holy statutes, which are confirmed by the Pope." Indeed Thomas of Celano records one such statute (II Cel., ii, 91): "He [Francis], for a general commonition in a certain Chapter, caused these words to be written: 'Let the Friars take care not to appear gloomy and sad like hypocrites, but let them be jovial and merry, showing that they rejoice in the Lord, and becomingly courteous.'" This passage is literally found in the rule of 1221, c. vii. The traditional "Legend of the Three Companions" says (c. xiv): "At Whitsuntide [every year] all the brethren assembled unto St. Mary and consulted how best they might observe the Rule. Moreover St. Francis gave unto them admonition, rebukes, and precepts, according as seemed good unto him by the counsel of the Lord." And c. ix: "For he [St. Francis] made divers Rules, and essayed them, before he made that which at the last he left unto the brethren" (translation of Salter, London, 1902, p. 88, 60). During the years 1219-1220 in the absence of the holy founder in the East, some events happened which determined Francis to recast his rule, in order to prevent similar troubles in the future. The only author who informs us well on this point is Jordanus of Giano in his Chronicle (Analecta Franciscana, I, iv sq.; ed. Böhmer, Paris, 1908, 9 sq.). The vicars left in charge of the brothers by St. Francis having made some innovations against the spirit of the rule, and St. Francis having heard of this, he immediately returned to Italy and with the help of Cardinal Ugolino repressed the disorders. Jordanus (ed. Böhmer, p. 15) then goes on: "And thus the disturbers with the help of the Lord being kept down, he [St. Francis] reformed the Order according to its statutes [*alias* institutions, *Instituta*]. And the blessed Francis seeing that brother Cæsarius [of Spire] was learned in holy letters, he charged him to embellish with texts of the Gospel the Rule which he himself had written with simple words." The narrative of Jordanus, precious though it be, is incomplete. "Speculum perfectionis" (ed. Sabatier, Paris, 1898, c. lxviii), Angelo Clareno (Felice Tocco, "Le due prime Tribolazioni dell' Ordine Franciscano", Rome, 1908, p. 36; Döllinger, "Sekten-geschichte", II, 440 sq.; and "Expositio in Regulam"), Bartholomew of Pisa (Liber Conformitatum fruct., XII, pars II, ed. Milan, 1510, f. cxxxv, v., a, Anal. Franc., IV (1906), 585) tell us that at some general chapter the ministers and custodes, *alias* the learned brethren, asked Cardinal Ugolino to use his friendship with St. Francis that he might introduce some organization into the order according to the Rules of St. Augustine, St. Benedict, and St. Bernard, and that they might receive some influence. St. Francis being questioned, answered that he was called to walk by the way of simplicity, and that he would always follow the folly of the Cross. The chapter at which this occurred was most likely the one of 1220.

The authority of the aforesaid sources may be contested, still, an allusion to those events may be seen in II Cel., ii, 141. At any rate in a Bull of Honorius III, Viterbo, 22 Sept., 1220 (Bull. Franc., I, 6), addressed "to the Priors or Custodes of the Friars Minor", one year of novitiate is introduced, in conformity with

other orders, after which no one may leave the order (c. ii of the rule of 1221). Furthermore we see in c. xviii of the second rule, that much authority is given to the ministers through the general chapter, which hitherto had been frequented by all the brothers, but now is reserved to the ministers. The second rule was probably published at the General Chapter of Portiuncula, 1221, where for the last time all the friars convened. It was certainly in use in the autumn of the same year, since the Friars in Germany held at Augsburg, Oct., 1221, a provincial chapter in accordance with c. xviii of this rule (See Jordanus, c. xxiii, *Analecta Franciscana*, i, 9; ed. Bohmer, p. 27). The second rule is called "*Regula prima*" by all older Franciscan writers, it being the first known in its text, or also "*Regula non bullata*", for it was never solemnly confirmed by a papal Bull. It has been preserved in many manuscripts and has been often printed, but there are some noteworthy discrepancies of text in chaps. x and xii. The following remarks may be added to characterize it. The rule of 1221 consists of twenty-three chapters, some of which are composed almost entirely of Scriptural texts; in others many admonitions are found and towards the end even prayers. The introductory words "Brother Francis . . . promises obedience and reverence to our Lord Pope Innocent" (d. 1216) show clearly that the second rule is only an enlarged version of the primitive one. In chaps. iv and xviii appears an organization, which at the time the first rule was written (1209) could not have existed, since St. Francis had then only twelve companions. Chap. vii, on Working and Serving, is almost certainly of the primitive rule, for its prohibition "not to be chamberlains, nor cellarers, nor overseers in the houses of those whom they serve", found scarcely, or only exceptionally, any application in 1221. The Life of Brother Giles (*Analecta Franciscana*, iii, 74 sq., and the introduction of Robinson's "The Golden Sayings of the Blessed Brother Giles", Philadelphia, 1907) may be read as an illustration of this chapter. It may appear strange that neither Thomas of Celano nor St. Bonaventure mentions this second rule, which certainly marked an important stage in the Franciscan Order. The reason thereof may be because it was composed in connexion with troubles arisen within the order, on which they preferred to keep silent.

(c) The Rule of 1223.—St. Bonaventure (*Leg. maj.*, c. iv) relates that when the order had greatly increased, St. Francis had a vision which determined him to reduce the rule to a more compendious form. (See also II Cel., ii, 159.) From St. Bonaventure (*loc. cit.*), "*Speculum perfectionis*" (c. i), and other sources we know that St. Francis, with Brother Leo and Brother Bonizo of Bologna (see, however, on the latter, Carmichael, "The two Companions" in *Franciscan Monthly*, ix (1904), n. 86, p. 34-37), went in 1223 to Fonte Colombo, a beautiful wood-covered hill near Rieti, where, fasting on bread and water, he caused the rule, the fruit of his prayers, to be written by the hand of Brother Leo, as the Holy Spirit dictated. Elias, to whom this rule was entrusted, after a few days declared that he had lost it, hence St. Francis had the rule rewritten. Spiritual sources give other rather dramatic circumstances, under which the new rule was communicated to the provincials, headed by Brother Elias. As the primary authorities on the life of St. Francis say nothing on the point, it may be supposed that those records served only to justify the Spirituals in their opposition to the rest of the order. The rule composed in 1223 was solemnly confirmed by the Bull "*Solet annuere*" of Honorius III, 29 Nov., 1223 (*Bull. Franc.*, I, 15), and, as St. Bonaventure (*Leg. maj.*, c. iv) and many other early Franciscan writers observe, by the Bull of the Highest Priest Jesus Christ, through the impression of the Stigmata, 14 Sept., 1224.

The rule of 1223 is the Franciscan Rule properly so

called, the rule which the Friars Minor still observe. It is named by Franciscan authors "*Regula bullata*" or "*Regula secunda*". The question has been put whether St. Francis was quite free in drawing up the definitive text of his rule. From what has been already said, it may be gathered that St. Francis successively developed his rule, adapting it to the circumstances; hence if all the particulars of the former rules are not found in the last one that is no reason to say St. Francis omitted them against his own will. Those who believe in an influence exercised on St. Francis in recasting the third rule appeal to the following points: Firstly, in a letter (*Opuscula S. Francisci*, Quaracchi, 1904, ep. iii, p. 108 sq.) which St. Francis wrote to a certain minister, perhaps to Elias, he proposes that at the next chapter of Whitsuntide a chapter of the rule should be written to the effect that if any brother has sinned venially and humbly owns it, they (the ministers or the priests) shall "have absolutely no power of enjoining other penance save only this: go and sin no more". Now in c. vii of the third rule only merciful treatment of sinning brothers in general is recommended. Secondly, Angelo Clareno (*Trib. i*, ed. Tocco, op. cit., p. 58, and "*Expositio in Reg.*") tells us that the dispositions of c. x in the third rule were much in favour of the friars, who resorted to their ministers for the pure observance of the rule, but Honorius III, seeing the inconvenience of such a large concession, modified those passages, before approving the rule. Thirdly, Gregory IX, in the Bull "*Quo elongati*" (1230), says that he knew the intention of St. Francis with regard to the rule, as he had assisted him when he wrote it and obtained its confirmation. Fourthly, in c. xiv of the second rule, is the passage of the evangelical prohibitions (Luke, ix, 3), which is not to be found in the last rule, and the reason thereof is indicated by Spiritual authorities, such as "*Speculum perfectionis*", c. iii, Angelo Clareno (*Trib. I*): "the Ministers caused it to be removed from the Rule". It is hard to say how far these assertions are true, since we have all this information, with the exception of that given by Gregory IX, from sources that are not quite free of suspicion. Carmichael (*Dublin Review*, 1904, CXXXIV, n. 269, p. 372 sq.) has with skill attacked all these arguments. Still some divergence of views may have existed on a few points. Another question connected with the former one is whether the rule was revealed to St. Francis. To put the question clearly we should ask, which of the three rules was revealed? Against the theory of the Spirituals it is more reasonable to say that St. Francis followed an inner light of grace when taking the texts of the Gospel as his rule of life in the years 1208-1209. Only of that first rule does St. Francis himself speak as revealed to him. (See the words of his Testament cited above.) Of course a special guidance of Providence must be admitted in a work of such importance as the definitive Rule of St. Francis.

(2) *Contents of the Rule*.—The rule is contained in the Bull "*Solet annuere*", and begins with these characteristic words: "The rule and life of the Minor Brothers is this, namely, to observe the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ by living in obedience, without property and in chastity." St. Francis promises obedience to Pope Honorius and his successors, the other brothers are to obey Brother Francis and his successors (c. i). Having thus laid the solid foundation of unity upon the Church, St. Francis gives particulars concerning reception, profession, and vestments of the brothers. They are forbidden to wear shoes, if not compelled through necessity (c. ii). Chapter the third prescribes for the clerics "the Divine Office according to the order of the holy Roman Church, with the exception of the Psalter; wherefore (or, as soon as) they may have breviaries". The lay-brothers have to say Paternosters, disposed according to the canonical hours. The brothers are to "fast

from the feast of All Saints until the Nativity of the Lord", during Lent, and every Friday. The forty days' fast (obligatory in the rule of 1221), which begins from Epiphany, is left free to the good will of the brothers. Beautiful exhortations follow on the behaviour of the brothers when they go through the world. They are forbidden to ride on horseback, unless compelled by manifest necessity or infirmity (c. iii). The next chapter "strictly enjoins on all the brothers that in no wise they receive coins or money, either themselves or through an interposed person". However, the ministers and custodes have to take the greatest care of their subjects through spiritual friends, according to places and times and other circumstances, saving always that, as has been said, they shall not "receive coins or money" (c. iv). To banish idleness and to provide for their support, St. Francis insists on the duty of working for "those brothers to whom the Lord has given the grace of working". But they must work in such a way that "they do not extinguish the spirit of prayer and devotion, to which all temporal things must be subservient". As a reward of their labour they may receive things needed, with the exception of coins or money (c. v). Of the highest importance is chapter vi. It contains the prescriptions of the most ideal poverty: "The brothers shall appropriate nothing to themselves, neither a house nor place nor anything. And as pilgrims and strangers in this world . . . let them go confidently in quest of alms." "This, my dearest brothers, is the height of the most sublime poverty, which has made you heirs and kings of the kingdom of heaven: poor in goods, but exalted in virtue . . ." Then follows an appeal for fraternal love and mutual confidence, "for if a mother nourishes and loves her carnal son, how much more earnestly ought one to love and nourish his spiritual brother!" (c. vi). The following chapter treats of penance to be inflicted on brothers who have sinned. In some cases they must recur to their ministers, who "should beware lest they be angry or troubled on account of the sins of others, because anger and trouble impede charity in themselves and in others" (c. vii).

Chapter viii charges all the brothers "always to have one of the brothers of this religion (order) as Minister General and servant of the whole brotherhood". At his death the provincial ministers and custodes must elect a successor in the Whitsun chapter. The general chapter, at which the provincial ministers are always bound to convene, is to be held every three years, or at a longer or shorter interval, where the general so wishes. After the Whitsun chapter, provincial chapters may be convoked by the ministers (c. viii). A special chapter on preachers follows next. The brothers are forbidden to preach in any diocese against the will of the bishop, and unless they are approved by the minister general. The brothers must preach "for the utility and edification of the people, announcing to them vices and virtues, punishment and glory . . ." (c. ix). "Of the admonition and correction of the Brothers" is the title of chapter x. The ministers "shall visit and admonish their brothers, and shall humbly and charitably correct them, not commanding them anything against their souls and our Rule. The brothers however who are subject must remember that, for God, they have renounced their own will." If any brother cannot observe the rule spiritually, he must recur to his minister, who is bound to receive him kindly (c. x). In chapter xi the brothers are forbidden to have suspicious intimacy with women, nor are they allowed to "enter monasteries of nuns, except those to whom special permission has been granted by the Apostolic See". Nor may they "be godfathers of men or women". The twelfth and last chapter treats of those who wish to go among the Saracens and other infidels, for which purpose they must obtain leave from their provincial ministers. The ministers are bound to ask of the

pope a cardinal-protector, "so that"—with these touching words St. Francis concludes his rule—"being always subject and submissive at the feet of the same holy Church, grounded in the Catholic faith, we may observe poverty and humility and the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, which we have firmly promised" (c. xii).

As may be seen from this short survey the Franciscan rule contains many commandments, tempered by the sweet exhortations of St. Francis. It is the tender voice of a loving father that speaks to his children through the rule. This rule has been praised in the highest terms by different authorities. First of all St. Francis himself had a high idea of it: "This Rule he declared to be for his brethren the book of life, the hope of salvation, the marrow of the Gospel, the way of perfection, the key of Paradise and the covenant of an eternal alliance . . ." (II Cel., ii, 158). Nicholas III (Exiit) speaks in the same way: "This Rule is founded on the words of the Gospel, it has its force from the example of Christ's life, it is confirmed by the words and deeds of the founders of the Church, the Apostles". Angelo Clareno (Expositio) calls it "the Rule of charity and piety", "the Rule of peace, truth and piety". "The Evangelical Rule" is a much-used expression for it in old Franciscan literature. The influence which the Rule of St. Francis has exercised for now seven hundred years is immeasurable. Millions have followed it, finding in it peace of heart, and the means of their own and other men's sanctification. Nor has the rule had less important effects in a more general way. Unlike all former rules, it established poverty not only for the individual members, but for the order as a whole. On this point St. Francis influenced even the Order of St. Dominic and many subsequent institutions. As early as the thirteenth century, Salimbene (ed. Holder-Egger, Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script., XXXII, 256) wrote: "Whoever wants to found a new congregation, always take something from the Order of blessed Francis." For the general influence of Franciscan poverty see Dubois, "St. Francis of Assisi, social reformer" (New York, 1906). The constitution of the order is likewise different from that of the monastic orders. It is strictly hierarchical, the convents being grouped into provinces which are governed by the provincials, who in turn are under the jurisdiction of the minister general, the head and ruler of the whole order.—The words of St. Francis (c. iii Reg.): "Let the clerics perform the Divine office according to the order of the holy Roman Church, with the exception of the Psalter", have had a singular result. Through adopting the shorter breviary of the papal Curia the Franciscans made this breviary popular, reformed it in many points and led to its being practically received by the whole secular clergy. (See Bäumer, "Geschichte des Breviers", Freiburg im Br., 1895, p. 318 sqq.; Batiffol, "Histoire du Bréviaire Romain", Paris, 1893, p. 142 sqq.) The principles concerning preaching as laid down by St. Francis in c. ix of his Rule contain the secret of the great Franciscan preachers, who have always been among the most successful and popular. Finally, chap. xii on missions amongst the infidels is a happy innovation in religious rules, as Angelo Clareno in his exposition wisely observed. There can be no doubt that the great impulse given to foreign missions in the thirteenth century is due to St. Francis, who was himself a missionary in the East and saw some of his brethren martyred for the Faith.

II. INTERPRETATION.—The ideal that St. Francis laid down in his rule is very high; the apostolical life was to be put in practice by his brethren, and indeed we see that St. Francis and his companions lived perfectly according to that standard. But the number of the friars rapidly increasing, and on the other hand, some being received into the order who had not the pure intentions and the great zeal of Francis, the rule



gave rise to many controversies, and, as a consequence, to many declarations and expositions. The first exposition of the rule was given by St. Francis himself in his Testament (1226). He puts there his own and his first disciples' life as an example to the brothers. Moreover he forbids them "to ask for any letter from the Roman Curia, either for a church or for any other place, whether under pretext of preaching, or on account of their bodily persecution". He enjoins also on all brothers "not to put glosses on the Rule", but as he had written it purely and simply, so ought they "understand it simply and purely and with holy operation observe it until the end." Nevertheless we have a great number of expositions of the rule, and it cannot be said that they are, in their greatest part, against the will of St. Francis. He himself had in his lifetime been humble enough to submit in everything to the decisions of the Church, and so he desired his sons to do. Even the Spirituals, who cleaved to the letter of the rule, as Olivi and Clareno, were not against reasonable expounding of the rule, and have written expositions thereof themselves. Besides, the decisions of the popes are *not dispensations*, but *authentic interpretations* of a rule, that binds only inasmuch as it is approved by the Church. To proceed with order, we shall firstly speak of the authentic interpretations, secondly of the private expositions.

(1) *Authentic Interpretations*.—These are the papal Constitutions on the rule. Doubts about the meaning and the observance of the rule having risen at the general chapter of Assisi (1230), a deputation of prominent men was sent to Gregory IX, to obtain a papal decision. On 28 September, 1230, the pope edited the Bull "Quo elongati" (Bull. Franc., I, 68), a document of capital importance for the future of the order. In this Bull the pope, claiming to know the intentions of the holy founder, since he had assisted him in the composition and approval of the rule, declares that for the tranquillity of conscience of the friars, the Testament of St. Francis has no binding power over them, as Francis, when making it, had no legislative power. Nor are the brothers bound to all the counsels of the Gospel, but only to those that are expressly mentioned in the rule, by way of precept or of prohibition. Dispositions are made with regard to money and property. The brothers may appoint a messenger (*nuntius*), who may receive money from benefactors and in the latter's name either spend it for the present needs of the friars, or confide it to a spiritual friend for imminent wants. The principle of absolute poverty is maintained for the individual friar and for the whole community; still the use of the necessary movable objects is granted them. These are some of the most striking dispositions of Gregory IX, whose principles of wise interpretation have remained fundamental for the order. Innocent IV, in the Bull "Ordinem vestrum", 14 Nov., 1245 (Bull. Franc., I, 400), confirmed the dispositions of his predecessor, but at the same time made more ample concessions, since he allowed the brothers to recur to the messenger or spiritual friend not only for things necessary, but also for things useful and convenient (*commoda*). The order, however, in two general chapters, at Metz, 1249, and at Narbonne, 1260, declined to receive this privilege, inasmuch as it goes farther than the concession of Gregory IX. In the same Bull Innocent IV declares that all things in the use of the friars belong to the Apostolic See, unless the donor has reserved the ownership to himself. A necessary consequence of this disposition was the institution of a procurator by the same pope through the Bull "Quanto studiosius", 19 Aug., 1247 (Bull. Franc., I, 487). This procurator was to act in the name of the Apostolic See as a civil party in the administration of the goods in use of the friars. The faculties of this procurator, or Apostolic syndic, were much enlarged by Martin IV through the Bull "Exultantes in Domino", 18 January, 1283 (Bull.

Franc., III, 501), especially in regard to lawsuits. The order received the disposition of Martin IV at the chapter of Milan, 1285, but warned at the same time against the multiplication of legal actions (see Ehrle, Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte, VI, 55).

The two most famous Constitutions on the Franciscan rule, which have been inserted in the text of canon law, and which are still in uncontested authority with the Friars Minor, are the Bulls "Exiit qui seminat" of Nicholas III, and "Exivi de Paradiso" of Clement V. The Constitution "Exiit" (c. iii, in VI, lib. V, tit. xii), prepared with the advice of eminent men in and outside the order, given at Soriano near Viterbo, 14 Aug., 1279, treats the whole rule both theoretically and practically. Nicholas III, against the enemies of the order, states that complete expropriation, in common as well as in particular, is licit, holy, and meritorious, it being taught by Christ Himself, although He, for the sake of the weak, sometimes took money. The brothers have the *moderate use* of things according to their rule. The proprietorship goes to the Holy See, unless the donor retains it. The question of the money is treated with special care. The employment of the messenger and spiritual friend is confirmed and explained. The friars have no right over the money, nor can they call to account an unfaithful messenger. Lest the great number of papal decisions should produce confusion, the pope declares that all former Bulls on the subject are abolished, if they are against the present one. However, this Constitution did not put an end to the questions moved by the more zealous brothers, called Spirituals. It was through their agitation at the papal court at Avignon (1309-1312) that Clement V gave the Constitution "Exivi", 6 May, 1312 (c. i, Clem., lib. V, tit. xi). Whilst Angelo Clareno, the head of the Spirituals, rejects all papal declarations on the rule, he speaks well of the Bull "Exivi", "which is among the others like a flying eagle, approaching nearest to the intention of the Founder" (Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte, II, 139). Clement V declares that the Friars Minor are bound to poverty (*usus pauper*) in those points on which the rule insists. Characteristic of this Bull is the casuistic manner in which the prescriptions of the rule are treated. It declares that St. Francis wished to oblige his brothers under mortal sin in all those cases in which he uses commanding words or equivalent expressions, some of which cases are specified. The Constitutions "Exiit" and "Exivi" have remained fundamental laws for the Franciscans, although they were in the most important point practically suppressed by John XXII, who in his Bull "Ad conditorem canonum", 8 Dec., 1322 (Bull. Franc., V, 233), renounced on behalf of the Apostolic See the proprietorship of the goods of which the order had the use, declaring (according to the Roman law) that in many things the use could not be distinguished from the property. Consequently he forbade the appointment of an Apostolic syndic. Martin V in "Amabiles fructus", 1 Nov., 1428 (Bull. Franc., VII, 712), restored the former state of things for the Observants.

(2) *Private Expositions*.—Only the earliest ones, which had influence on the development of the order, can be mentioned here. The most important is that of the Four Masters, edited at least six times in old collections of Franciscan texts, under the names of Monumenta, Speculum, Firmamentum (Brescia, 1502; Salamanca, 1506, 1511; Rouen, 1509; Paris, 1512; Venice, 1513). The chapter of the custodes at Montpellier, 1541, had ordered that the solution of some doubts about the rule should be asked for from each province. We know of two expositions of the rule drawn up on this occasion. Eccleston (c. xii, alias xiii, Analecta Francisc., I, 244) speaks of the short but severe exposition which the friars in England sent to the general, beseeching him by the blood of Jesus Christ to let the rule stand as it was given by St. Francis. Unfor-

unately, the text of this declaration has not been handed down. We have, however, that of the province of Paris, issued on the same occasion by four masters of theology, Alexander of Hales, Jean de la Rochelle, Robert of Bastia, and Richard of Cornwall. The custos Godfried figures only as an official person. This interesting exposition of the rule, and the most ancient, for it was written in the spring of 1242, is short and treats only some dubious points, in conformity with the Bull "Quo elongati" and two later decisions of Gregory IX (1240, 1241). Their method is casuistic. They propose doubts, resolve them, and sometimes leave the questions to the superiors, or invoke a decision of the pope, although they speak twice (c. ii, ix) of the possible danger for the pure observance of the rule, if too many papal privileges are obtained. The work of the Four Masters has had the same effect on subsequent private expositions as the Bull "Quo elongati" had on all following pontifical declarations. The most prolific writer on the Rule of St. Francis was St. Bonaventure, who was compelled to answer fierce adversaries, such as Guillaume de Saint-Amour and others. His treatises are found in the Quaracchi edition of his works, VIII, 1898 (see BONAVENTURE, SAINT). The standpoint of St. Bonaventure is observance of the rule as explained by the papal declarations and with wise accommodation to circumstances. He himself exercised great influence on the decretal "Exiit" of Nicholas III.

About the same time as St. Bonaventure, Hugo of Digne (d. about 1280) wrote several treatises on the rule. His exposition is found in the above-mentioned collections, for instance in the "Firmamentum" (Paris, 1512), IV, f. xxxiv, v. (Venice, 1513), III, f. xxxii, v. John of Wales (Gualensis) wrote before 1279 an exposition, edited in "Firmamentum" (Venice, 1513), III, f. xxviii, v. In his treatise "De Perfectione evangelica", John of Peckham has a special chapter (c. x) on the Franciscan rule, often quoted as an exposition, "Firmamentum", ed. 1512, IV, f. xciv, v; 1513, III, f. lxxii, r. David of Augsburg's sober explanation, written before the Bull "Exiit", is edited in great part by Lempp in "Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte", vol. XIX (Gotha, 1898-99), 15-46, 340-360. Another expositor of the Franciscan rule towards the end of the thirteenth century, was Pierre Johannis Olivi, who, besides a methodical exposition (Firmamentum, 1513, III, f. cvi, r.), wrote a great number of tracts relating especially to Franciscan poverty. These treatises, comprised under the name "De perfectione evangelica" are not yet printed in their entirety [see Ehrle, "Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte", III, 497, and Oliger, "Archivum Franciscanum Historicum" (1908), I, 617]. The theories of poverty taught by Olivi exercised great fascination over the Spirituals, especially over Angelo Clareno (d. 1337), whose exposition of the rule will shortly be published by the present writer. Of others who directly or indirectly exposed the rule, or particular points of it, we can only name the best known, according to the centuries in which they lived. Fourteenth century: Ubertino of Casale, Gundisalvus of Vallebona, Petrus Aureoli, Bartholomew of Pisa, Bartholo di Sassoferrato (a lawyer). Fifteenth century: St. Bernardine of Siena, St. John Capistran, Cristoforo di Varese (not published), Alessandro Ariosto (Serena Conscientia), Jean Perrin, Jean Philippi. Sixteenth century: Brendolinus, Gilbert Nicolai, Antonio de Cordova, Jerome of Politio (O. Cap.), Francis Gonzaga. Seventeenth century: Peter Marchant, Pedro of Navarre, Mattheucci, De Gubernatis. Eighteenth century: Kerkhove, Kazenberger (several times reedited in nineteenth century), Castelluccio, Viatora Coccoaleo (O. Cap.), Gabriello Angelo a Vincentia. Nineteenth century: Benoffi, O. M. Con. (Spirito della Regola de' Frati Minori, Rome, 1807; Fano, 1841) Alberto a Bulsano (Knoll, O. Cap.), Winkes, Maas, Hilarius

Parisiensis (O. Cap.), whose learned but extravagant work has been put on the Index of forbidden books. Finally, Bonaventure Dernoie (Medulla S. Evangelii per Christum dictata S. Francisco in sua seraphica Regula, Antwerp, 1657) and Ladislav de Poris (O. Cap.), Méditations sur la Règle des Frères Mineurs (Paris, 1898) have written voluminous works on the rule for purposes of preaching and pious meditation.

The Rule of St. Francis is observed to-day by the Friars Minor and the Capuchins without dispensations. Besides the rule, both have their own general constitutions. The Conventuals profess the rule "juxta Constitutiones Urbanas" (1628), in which all former papal declarations are declared not to be binding on the Conventuals, and in which their departure from the rule, especially with regard to poverty, is again sanctioned.


TEXTS:—The original of the Bull "Soleat annuere" is preserved as a relic in the sacristy of S. Francesco at Assisi. The text is also found in the registers of Honorius III, in the Vatican Archives. Fac-similes of both and also of "Exiit" and "Exivi" are published in "Seraphica Legislatoris Textus Originalis" (Rome, 1901). The texts alone: "Seraphica Legislatoris Textus Originalis" (Quaracchi, 1897). Critical editions of the rules, with introductions on their origin: *Opuscula S. P. Francisci* (Quaracchi, 1904); BÖRMER, *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi* (Tubingen, Leipzig, 1904). The papal decretals on the rule: *SBARALEA, Bullarium Franciscanum*, I-III (Rome, 1759-1765), V-VII (Rome, 1898-1904). English translations of the second and third rule: *Works of St. Francis of Assisi* (London, 1882), 25-63; critical edition: PASCHAL ROBINSON, *The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi* (Philadelphia, 1906), 25-74; DE LA WARR, *The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi* (London, 1907), 1-36.

LITERATURE:—CARMICHAEL, *The Origin of the Rule of St. Francis in Dublin Review*, CXXXIV, n. 289 (April, 1904), 357-385; MÜLLER, *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens und der Bussbruderschaften* (Freiburg im Br., 1885). A good corrective of Müller is EHRLÉ, *Controversen über die Anfänge des Minoritenordens in Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie* (1887), XI, 725-746; IDEM, *Die Spaltung des Franciscanerordens in die Communauté und die Spiritualen in Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1887), III, 554 sq.; SCHNÜRER, *Franz von Assisi* (Munich, 1905), 81-109; FISCHER, *Der heilige Franziskus von Assisi während der Jahre 1219-1221* (Freiburg, 1907). Very little has been written on the old expositors of the rule. See however: HILARIUS PARISIENSIS, *Regula Fratrum Minorum juxta Rom. Pontificum decreta et documenta Ordinis explanata* (Lyons, Paris, 1870), X-XXX. A list of all the expositors till the middle of the seventeenth century is given by SBARALEA, *Supplementum ad Scriptores Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1806), LXIX.

LIVARIUS OLIGER.

**Francis Borgia** (Span. FRANCISCO DE BORJA Y ARAGON), SAINT, b. 28 October, 1510, was the son of Juan Borgia, third Duke of Gandia, and of Juana of Aragon; d. 30 September, 1572. The future saint was unhappy in his ancestry. His grandfather, Juan Borgia, the second son of Alexander VI, was assassinated in Rome on 14 June, 1497, by an unknown hand, which his family always believed to be that of Cæsar Borgia. Rodrigo Borgia, elected pope in 1492 under the name of Alexander VI, had eight children. The eldest, Pedro Luis, had acquired in 1485 the hereditary Duchy of Gandia in the Kingdom of Valencia, which, at his death, passed to his brother Juan, who had married Maria Enriquez de Luna. Having been left a widow by the murder of her husband, Maria Enriquez withdrew to her duchy and devoted herself piously to the education of her two children, Juan and Isabel. After the marriage of her son in 1509, she followed the example of her daughter, who had entered the convent of Poor Clares in Gandia, and it was through these two women that sanctity entered the Borgia family, and in the House of Gandia was begun the work of reparation which Francis Borgia was to crown. Great-grandson of Alexander VI, on the paternal side, he was, on his mother's side, the great-grandson of the Catholic King Ferdinand of Aragon. This monarch had procured the appointment of his natural son, Alfonso, to the Archbishopric of Saragossa at the age of nine years. By Anna de Gurrea, Alfonso had two sons, who succeeded him in his archiepiscopal see, and two daughters, one of whom, Juana, married Duke Juan of Gandia and became the mother of our saint. By this marriage Juan had three sons and four daughters.

By a second, contracted in 1523, he had five sons and five daughters. The eldest of all and heir to the dukedom was Francis. Piously reared in a court which felt the influence of the two Poor Clares, the mother and sister of the reigning duke, Francis lost his own mother when he was but ten. In 1521, a sedition amongst the populace imperilled the child's life, and the position of the nobility. When the disturbance was suppressed, Francis was sent to Saragossa to continue his education at the court of his uncle, the archbishop, an ostentatious prelate who had never been consecrated nor even ordained priest. Although in this court the Spanish faith retained its fervour, it lapsed nevertheless into the inconsistencies permitted by the times, and Francis



ST FRANCIS BORGIA

could not disguise from himself the relation in which his grandmother stood to the dead archbishop, although he was much indebted to her for his early religious training. While at Saragossa Francis cultivated his mind and attracted the attention of his relatives by his fervour. They, being desirous of assuring the fortune of the heir of Gandia, sent him at the age of twelve to Tordesil-

las as page to the Infanta Catarina, the youngest child and companion in solitude of the unfortunate queen, Juana the Mad.

In 1525 the Infanta married King Juan III of Portugal, and Francis returned to Saragossa to complete his education. At last, in 1528, the court of Charles V was opened to him, and the most brilliant future awaited him. On the way to Valladolid, while passing, brilliantly escorted, through Alcalá de Henares, Francis encountered a poor man whom the servants of the Inquisition were leading to prison. It was Ignatius of Loyola. The young nobleman exchanged a glance of emotion with the prisoner, little dreaming that one day they should be united by the closest ties. The emperor and empress welcomed Borgia less as a subject than as a kinsman. He was seventeen, endowed with every charm, accompanied by a magnificent train of followers, and, after the emperor, his presence was the most gallant and knightly at court. In 1529, at the desire of the empress, Charles V gave him in marriage the hand of Eleanor de Castro, at the same time making him Marquess of Lombay, master of the hounds, and equerry to the empress, and appointing Eleanor *Camarera Mayor*. The newly-created Marquess of Lombay enjoyed a privileged station. Whenever the emperor was travelling or conducting a campaign, he confided to the young equerry the care of the empress, and on his return to Spain treated him as a confidant and friend. In 1535, Charles V led the expedition against Tunis unaccompanied by Borgia, but in the following year the favourite followed his sovereign on the unfortunate campaign in Provence. Besides the virtues which made him the model of the court and the personal attractions which made him its ornament, the Marquess of Lombay possessed a cultivated musical taste. He delighted above all in ecclesiastical compositions, and these display a remarkable contrapuntal style and bear witness to the skill of the composer, justifying indeed the assertion that, in the sixteenth century and prior to Palestrina, Borgia was one of the chief restorers of sacred music.

In 1538, at Toledo, an eighth child was born to the Marquess of Lombay, and on 1 May of the next year the Empress Isabella died. The equerry was commissioned to convey her remains to Granada, where they were interred on 17 May. The death of the empress caused the first break in the brilliant career of the Marquess and Marchioness of Lombay. It detached them from the court and taught the nobleman the vanity of life and of its grandeurs. Blessed John of Avila preached the funeral sermon, and Francis, having made known to him his desire of reforming his life, returned to Toledo resolved to become a perfect Christian. On 26 June, 1539, Charles V named Borgia Viceroy of Catalonia, and the importance of the charge tested the sterling qualities of the courtier. Precise instructions determined his course of action. He was to reform the administration of justice, put the finances in order, fortify the city of Barcelona, and repress outlawry. On his arrival at the viceregal city, on 23 August, he at once proceeded, with an energy which no opposition could daunt, to build the ramparts, rid the country of the brigands who terrorized it, reform the monasteries, and develop learning. During his vice-regency he showed himself an inflexible justiciary, and above all an exemplary Christian. But a series of grievous trials were destined to develop in him the work of sanctification begun at Granada. In 1543 he became, by the death of his father, Duke of Gandia, and was named by the emperor master of the household of Prince Philip of Spain, who was betrothed to the Princess of Portugal. This appointment seemed to indicate Francis as the chief minister of the future reign, but by God's permission the sovereigns of Portugal opposed the appointment. Francis then retired to his Duchy of Gandia, and for three years awaited the termination of the displeasure which barred him from court. He profited by this leisure to reorganize his duchy, to found a university in which he himself took the degree of Doctor of Theology, and to attain to a still higher degree of virtue. In 1546 his wife died. The duke had invited the Jesuits to Gandia and become their protector and disciple, and even at that time their model. But he desired still more, and on 1 February, 1548, became one of them by the pronouncement of the solemn vows of religion, although authorized by the pope to remain in the world, until he should have fulfilled his obligations towards his children and his estates—his obligations as father and as ruler.

On 31 August, 1550, the Duke of Gandia left his estates to see them no more. On 23 October he arrived at Rome, threw himself at the feet of St. Ignatius, and edified by his rare humility those especially who recalled the ancient power of the Borgias. Quick to conceive great projects, he even then urged St. Ignatius to found the Roman College. On 4 February, 1551, he left Rome, without making known his intention of departure. On 4 April, he reached Azpeitia in Guipuzcoa, and chose as his abode the hermitage of Santa Magdalena near Oñate. Charles V having permitted him to relinquish his possessions, he abdicated in favour of his eldest son, was ordained priest 23 May, and at once began to deliver a series of sermons in Guipuzcoa which revived the faith of the country. Nothing was talked of throughout Spain but this change of life, and Oñate became the object of incessant pilgrimage. The neophyte was obliged to tear himself from prayer in order to preach in the cities which called him, and which his burning words, his example, and even his mere appearance, stirred profoundly. In 1553 he was invited to visit Portugal. The court received him as a messenger from God and vowed to him, thenceforth, a veneration which it has always preserved. On his return from this journey, Francis learned that, at the request of the emperor, Pope Julius III was willing to bestow on him the cardinalate. St. Ignatius prevailed upon the pope to reconsider this decision, but two

years later the project was renewed and Borgia anxiously inquired whether he might in conscience oppose a desire of the pope. St. Ignatius again relieved his embarrassment by requesting him to pronounce the solemn vows of profession, by which he engaged not to accept any dignities save at the formal command of the pope. Thenceforth the saint was reassured. Pius IV and Pius V loved him too well to impose upon him a dignity which would have caused him distress. Gregory XIII, it is true, appeared resolved, in 1572, to overcome his reluctance, but on this occasion death saved him from the elevation he had so long feared.

On 10 June, 1554, St. Ignatius named Francis Borgia commissary-general of the Society in Spain. Two years later he confided to him the care of the missions of the East and West Indies, that is to say of all the missions of the Society. To do this was to entrust to a recruit the future of his order in the peninsula, but in this choice the founder displayed his rare knowledge of men, for within seven years Francis was to transform the provinces confided to him. He found them poor in subjects, containing but few houses, and those scarcely known. He left them strengthened by his influence and rich in disciples drawn from the highest grades of society. These latter, whom his example had done so much to attract, were assembled chiefly in his novitiate at Simancas, and were sufficient for numerous foundations. Everything aided Borgia—his name, his sanctity, his eager power of initiative, and his influence with the Princess Juana, who governed Castile in the absence of her brother Philip. On 22 April, 1555, Queen Juana the Mad died at Tordesillas, attended by Borgia. To the saint's presence has been ascribed the serenity enjoyed by the queen in her last moments. The veneration which he inspired was thereby increased, and furthermore his extreme austerity, the care which he lavished on the poor in the hospitals, the marvellous graces with which God surrounded his apostolate contributed to augment a renown by which he profited to further God's work. In 1565 and 1566 he founded the missions of Florida, New Spain, and Peru, thus extending even to the New World the effects of his insatiable zeal.

In December, 1556, and three other times, Charles V shut himself up at Yuste. He at once summoned thither his old favourite, whose example had done so much to inspire him with the desire to abdicate. In the following month of August, he sent him to Lisbon to deal with various questions concerning the succession of Juan III. When the emperor died, 21 September, 1558, Borgia was unable to be present at his bedside, but he was one of the testamentary executors appointed by the monarch, and it was he who, at the solemn services at Valladolid, pronounced the eulogy of the deceased sovereign. A trial was to close this period of success. In 1559 Philip II returned to reign in Spain. Prejudiced for various reasons (and his prejudice was fomented by many who were envious of Borgia, some of whose interpolated works had been recently condemned by the Inquisition), Philip seemed to have forgotten his old friendship for the Marquess of Lombay, and he manifested towards him a displeasure which increased when he learned that the saint had gone to Lisbon. Indifferent to this storm, Francis continued for two years in Portugal his preaching and his foundations, and then, at the request of Pope Pius IV, went to Rome in 1561. But storms have their providential mission. It may be questioned whether but for the disgrace of 1543 the Duke of Gandia would have become a religious, and whether, but for the trial which took him away from Spain, he would have accomplished the work which awaited him in Italy. At Rome it was not long before he won the veneration of the public. Cardinals Otho Truchsess, Archbishop of Augsburg, Stanislaus Hosius, and Alexander Farnese evinced towards him a sincere friendship. Two men above all rejoiced at his coming. They were Michael

Ghisleri, the future Pope Pius V, and Charles Borromeo, whom Borgia's example aided to become a saint.

On 16 February, 1564, Francis Borgia was named assistant general in Spain and Portugal, and on 20 January, 1565, was elected vicar-general of the Society of Jesus. He was elected general 2 July, 1565, by thirty-one votes out of thirty-nine, to succeed Father James Laynez. Although much weakened by his austerities, worn by attacks of gout and an affection of the stomach, the new general still possessed much strength, which, added to his abundant store of initiative, his daring in the conception and execution of vast designs, and the influence which he exercised over the Christian princes and at Rome, made him for the Society at once the exemplary model and the providential head. In Spain he had had other cares in addition to those of government. Henceforth he was to be only the general. The preacher was silent. The director of souls ceased to exercise his activity, except through his correspondence, which, it is true, was immense and which carried throughout the entire world light and strength to kings, bishops and apostles, to nearly all who in his day served the Catholic cause. His chief anxiety being to strengthen and develop his order, he sent visitors to all the provinces of Europe, to Brazil, India, and Japan. The instructions, with which he furnished them were models of prudence, kindness, and breadth of mind. For the missionaries as well as for the fathers delegated by the pope to the Diet of Augsburg, for the confessors of princes and the professors of colleges he mapped out wide and secure paths. While too much a man of duty to permit relaxation or abuse, he attracted chiefly by his kindness, and won souls to good by his example. The edition of the rules, at which he laboured incessantly, was completed in 1567. He published them at Rome, dispatched them (throughout the Society), and strongly urged their observance. The text of those now in force was edited after his death, in 1580, but it differs little from that issued by Borgia, to whom the Society owes the chief edition of its rules as well as that of the Spiritual Exercises, of which he had borne the expense in 1548. In order to ensure the spiritual and intellectual formation of the young religious and the apostolic character of the whole order, it became necessary to take other measures. The task of Borgia was to establish, first at Rome, then in all the provinces, wisely regulated novitiates and flourishing houses of study, and to develop the cultivation of the interior life by establishing in all of these the custom of a daily hour of prayer.

He completed at Rome the house and church of S. Andrea in Quirinale, in 1567. Illustrious novices flocked thither, among them Stanislaus Kostka (d. 1568), and the future martyr Rudolph Acquaviva. Since his first journey to Rome, Borgia had been preoccupied with the idea of founding a Roman college, and while in Spain had generously supported the project. In 1567, he built the church of the college, assured it even then an income of six thousand ducats, and at the same time drew up the rule of studies, which, in 1583, inspired the compilers of the *Ratio Studiorum* of the Society. Being a man of prayer as well as of action, the saintly general, despite overwhelming occupations, did not permit his soul to be distracted from continual contemplation. Strengthened by so vigilant and holy an administration the Society could not but develop. Spain and Portugal numbered many foundations; in Italy Borgia created the Roman province, and founded several colleges in Piedmont. France and the Northern province, however, were the chief field of his triumphs. His relations with the Cardinal de Lorraine and his influence with the French Court made it possible for him to put an end to numerous misunderstandings, to secure the revocation of several hostile edicts, and to found eight colleges in France. In Flanders

and Bohemia, in the Tyrol and in Germany, he maintained and multiplied important foundations. The province of Poland was entirely his work. At Rome everything was transformed under his hands. He had built S. Andrea and the church of the Roman college. He assisted generously in the building of the Gesù, and although the official founder of that church was Cardinal Farnese, and the Roman College has taken the name of one of its greatest benefactors, Gregory XIII, Borgia contributed more than anyone towards these foundations. During the seven years of his government, Borgia had introduced so many reforms into his order as to deserve to be called its second founder. Three saints of this epoch laboured incessantly to further the renaissance of Catholicism. They were St. Francis Borgia, St. Pius V, and St. Charles Borromeo.

The pontificate of Pius V and the generalship of Borgia began within an interval of a few months and ended at almost the same time. The saintly pope had entire confidence in the saintly general, who conformed with intelligent devotion to every desire of the pontiff. It was he who inspired the pope with the idea of demanding from the Universities of Perugia and Bologna, and eventually from all the Catholic universities, a profession of the Catholic faith. It was also he who, in 1568, desired the pope to appoint a commission of cardinals charged with promoting the conversion of infidels and heretics, which was the germ of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, established later by Gregory XV, in 1622. A pestilential fever invaded Rome in 1566, and Borgia organized methods of relief, established ambulances, and distributed forty of his religious to such purpose that the same fever having broken out two years later it was to Borgia that the pope at once confided the task of safeguarding the city.

Francis Borgia had always greatly loved the foreign missions. He reformed those of India and the Far East and created those of America. Within a few years, he had the glory of numbering among his sons sixty-six martyrs, the most illustrious of whom were the fifty-three missionaries of Brazil who with their superior, Ignacio Azevedo, were massacred by Huguenot corsairs. It remained for Francis to terminate his beautiful life with a splendid act of obedience to the pope and devotion to the Church.

On 7 June, 1571, Pius V requested him to accompany his nephew, Cardinal Bonelli, on an embassy to Spain and Portugal. Francis was then recovering from a severe illness; it was feared that he had not the strength to bear fatigue, and he himself felt that such a journey would cost him his life, but he gave it generously. Spain welcomed him with transports. The old distrust of Philip II was forgotten. Barcelona and Valencia hastened to meet their former viceroy and saintly duke. The crowds in the streets cried: "Where is the saint?" They found him emaciated by penance. Wherever he went, he reconciled differences and soothed discord. At Madrid, Philip II received him with open arms, the Inquisition approved and recommended his genuine works. The reparation was complete, and it seemed as though God wished by this journey to give Spain to understand for the last time this living sermon, the sight of a saint. Gandia ardently desired to behold its holy duke, but he would never consent to return thither. The embassy to Lisbon was no less consoling to Borgia. Among other happy results he prevailed upon the king, Don Sebastian, to ask in marriage the hand of Marguerite of Valois, the sister of Charles IX. This was the desire of St. Pius V, but this project, being formulated too late, was frustrated by the Queen of Navarre, who had meanwhile secured the hand of Marguerite for her son. An order from the pope expressed his wish that the embassy should also reach the French court. The winter promised to be severe and was destined to prove fatal to Borgia. Still more


grievous to him was to be the spectacle of the devastation which heresy had caused in that country, and which struck sorrow to the heart of the saint. At Blois, Charles IX and Catherine de' Medici accorded Borgia the reception due to a Spanish grandee, but to the cardinal legate as well as to him they gave only fair words in which there was little sincerity. On 25 February they left Blois. By the time they reached Lyons, Borgia's lungs were already affected. Under these conditions the passage of Mt. Cenis over snow-covered roads was extremely painful. By exerting all his strength the invalid reached Turin. On the way the people came out of the villages crying: "We wish to see the saint". Advised of his cousin's condition, Alfonso of Este, Duke of Ferrara, sent to Alexandria and had him brought to his ducal city, where he remained from 19 April until 3 September. His recovery was despaired of and it was said that he would not survive the autumn. Wishing to die either at Loretto or at Rome, he departed in a litter on 3 September, spent eight days at Loretto, and then, despite the sufferings caused by the slightest jolt, ordered his bearers to push forward with the utmost speed for Rome. It was expected that any instant might see the end of this agony. They reached the "Porta del Popolo" on 28 September. The dying man halted his litter and thanked God that he had been able to accomplish this act of obedience. He was borne to his cell which was soon invaded by cardinals and prelates. For two days Francis Borgia, fully conscious, awaited death, receiving those who visited him and blessing through his younger brother, Thomas Borgia, all his children and grandchildren. Shortly after midnight on 30 September, his beautiful life came to a peaceful and painless close. In the Catholic Church he had been one of the most striking examples of the conversion of souls after the Renaissance, and for the Society of Jesus he had been the protector chosen by Providence to whom, after St. Ignatius, it owes most.

In 1607 the Duke of Lerma, minister of Philip III and grandson of the holy religious, having seen his granddaughter miraculously cured through the intercession of Francis, caused the process for his canonization to be begun. The ordinary process, begun at once in several cities, was followed, in 1617, by the Apostolic process. In 1617 Madrid received the remains of the saint. In 1624 the Congregation of Rites announced that his beatification and canonization might be proceeded with. The beatification was celebrated at Madrid with incomparable splendour. Urban VIII having decreed, in 1631, that a Blessed might not be canonized without a new procedure, a new process was begun. It was reserved for Clement X to sign the Bull of canonization of St. Francis Borgia, on 20 June, 1670. Spared from the decree of Joseph Bonaparte who, in 1809, ordered the confiscation of all shrines and precious objects, the silver shrine containing the remains of the saint, after various vicissitudes, was removed, in 1901, to the church of the Society at Madrid, where it is honoured at the present time.

It is with good reason that Spain and the Church venerate in St. Francis Borgia a great man and a great saint. The highest nobles of Spain are proud of their descent from, or their connexion with him. By his penitent and apostolic life he repaired the sins of his family and rendered glorious a name, which but for him, would have remained a source of humiliation for the Church. His feast is celebrated 10 October.

Sources: Archives of Osuna (Madrid), of Simancas; National Archives of Paris; Archives of the Society of Jesus: *Regeste du généralat de Laynez et de Borgia*, etc. Literature: *Monumenta historica S.J.* (Madrid): *Mon. Borgiana*; *Chronicon Polancii*; *Epistolæ Mixtæ*; *Quadrimestres*; *Epistolæ Patris Nadal*, etc.; *Epistolæ et instructiones S. Ignatii*; ORLANDINI and SACCHINI, *Historia Societatis Jesu*; ALCAZAR, *Chrono-historia de la provincia de Toledo*; *Lives of the saint* by VASQUEZ (1586; manuscript, still unedited); RIBADENEYRA (1592); NIEREMBERG (1643); BARTOLI (1681); CIENFUEGOS (1702); *Acta SS.*, Oct., V; ASTRAIN, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, I





THE VIRGIN WITH ST. FRANCIS BORGIA AND ST. STANISLAUS KOSTKA  
L. DEFERRARI, S. LORENZO, GENOA



and II (1902, 1905); BÉTHENCOURT, *Historia genealógica y heráldica de la monarquía española* (Madrid, 1902), IV, *Gandía, Casa de Borja*; *Boletín de la Academia de la Historia* (Madrid), passim; SUAU, *S. François de Borgia in Les Saints* (Paris, 1905); IDEM, *Histoire de S. François de Borgia* (Paris, 1909).

PIERRE SUAU.

**Franciscan Brothers.** See **THIRD ORDER REGULAR.**

**Franciscan Order**, a term commonly used to designate the members of the various foundations of religious, whether men or women, professing to observe the Rule of St. Francis of Assisi in some one of its several forms. The aim of the present article is to indicate briefly the origin and relationship of these different foundations. It is customary to say that St. Francis founded three orders, as we read in the Office for 4 Oct.: "Tres ordines hic ordinat: primumque Fratrum nominat Minorum: pauperumque fit Dominarum medius: sed Pœnitentium tertius sexum capit utrumque" (Brev. Rom. Serap., in Solem. S. P. Fran., ant. 3, ad Laudes). These three orders, viz. the Friars Minor, the Poor Ladies or Clares, and the Brothers and Sisters of Penance, are generally referred to as the First, Second, and Third Orders of St. Francis.

The existence of the Friars Minor or first order properly dates from 1209, in which year St. Francis obtained from Innocent III an unwritten approbation of the simple rule he had composed for the guidance of his first companions. This rule has not come down to us in its original form; it was subsequently rewritten by the saint and solemnly confirmed by Honorius III, 29 Nov., 1223 (Litt. "Solet Annuere"). This second rule, as it is usually called, of the Friars Minor is the one at present professed throughout the whole First Order of St. Francis (see FRANCIS, RULE OF SAINT).

The foundation of the Poor Ladies or second order may be said to have been laid in 1212. In that year St. Clare (q. v.), who had besought St. Francis to be allowed to embrace the new manner of life he had instituted, was established by him at St. Damian's near Assisi, together with several other pious maidens who had joined her. It is erroneous to suppose that St. Francis ever drew up a formal rule for these Poor Ladies, and no mention of such a document is found in any of the early authorities. The rule imposed upon the Poor Ladies at St. Damian's about 1219 by Cardinal Ugolino, afterwards Gregory IX, was recast by St. Clare towards the end of her life, with the assistance of Cardinal Rinaldo, afterwards Alexander IV, and in this revised form was approved by Innocent IV, 9 Aug., 1253 (Litt. "Solet Annuere"). (See POOR CLARES.)

Tradition assigns the year 1221 as the date of the foundation of the Brothers and Sisters of Penance, now known as tertiaries. This third order was devised by St. Francis as a sort of middle state between the cloister and the world for those who, wishing to follow in the saint's footsteps, were debarred by marriage or other ties from entering either the first or second order. There has been some difference of opinion as to how far the saint composed a rule for these tertiaries. It is generally admitted, however, that the rule approved by Nicholas IV, 18 Aug., 1289 (Litt. "Supra Montem") does not represent the original rule of the third order.

Some recent writers have tried to show that the third order, as we now call it, was really the starting-point of the whole Franciscan Order. They assert that the Second and Third Orders of St. Francis were not added to the First, but that the three branches, the Friars Minor, Poor Ladies, and Brothers and Sisters of Penance, grew out of the lay confraternity of penance which was St. Francis's first and original intention, and were separated from it into different groups by Cardinal Ugolino, the protector of the order, during St. Francis's absence in the East (1219-21). This interesting, if somewhat arbitrary, theory is not with-

out importance for the early history of all three orders, but it is not yet sufficiently proven to preclude the more usual account given above, according to which the Franciscan Order developed into three distinct branches, namely, the first, second, and third orders, by process of addition and not by process of division, and this is still the view generally received.

Coming next to the present organization of the Franciscan Order, the Friars Minor, or first order, now comprises three separate bodies, namely: the Friars Minor properly so called, or parent stem, founded, as has been said, in 1209, the Friars Minor Conventuals, and the Friars Minor Capuchins, which grew out of the parent stem, and were constituted independent orders in 1517 and 1619 respectively. All three orders profess the rule of the Friars Minor approved by Honorius III in 1223, but each one has its particular constitutions and its own minister general (see CAPUCHIN FRIARS MINOR; CONVENTUALS, ORDER OF FRIARS MINOR). The various lesser foundations of Franciscan friars following the rule of the first order, which once enjoyed a separate or quasi-separate existence, are now either extinct, like the Clareni, Coletani, and Celestines, or have become amalgamated with the Friars Minor, as in the case of the Observants, Reformati, Recollects, Alcantarines, etc. (On all these lesser foundations, now extinct, see FRIARS MINOR).

As regards the Second Order, of Poor Ladies, now commonly called Poor Clares, this order includes all the different monasteries of cloistered nuns professing the Rule of St. Clare approved by Innocent IV in 1253, whether they observe the same in all its original strictness or according to the dispensations granted by Urban IV, 18 Oct., 1263 (Litt. "Beata Clara") or the constitutions drawn up by St. Colette (d. 1447) and approved by Pius II, 18 March, 1458 (Litt. "Etsi"). (See POOR CLARES.) The Sisters of the Annunciation and the Conceptionists are in some sense offshoots of the second order, but they now follow different rules from that of the Poor Ladies (see ANNUNCIATION, THE ORDERS OF THE; I. ANNUNCIADES; CONCEPTIONISTS).

In connexion with the Brothers and Sisters of Penance or Third Order of St. Francis, it is necessary to distinguish between the third order secular and the third order regular. The third order secular was founded, as we have seen, by St. Francis about 1221 and embraces devout persons of both sexes living in the world and following a rule of life approved by Nicholas IV in 1289, and modified by Leo XIII, 30 May, 1883 (Constit. "Misericors"). It includes not only members who form part of local fraternities, but also isolated tertiaries, hermits, pilgrims, etc. (See THIRD ORDER SECULAR.) The early history of the third order regular is uncertain and is susceptible of controversy. Some attribute its foundation to St. Elizabeth of Hungary (q. v.) in 1228, others to Blessed Angelina of Marsciano in 1395. The latter is said to have established at Poligno the first Franciscan monastery of enclosed tertiary nuns in Italy. It is certain that early in the fifteenth century tertiary communities of men and women existed in different parts of Europe and that the Italian friars of the third order regular were recognized as a mendicant order by the Holy See. Since about 1458 the latter body has been governed by its own minister general and its members take solemn vows. (See THIRD ORDER REGULAR.)

In addition to this third order regular, properly so called, and quite independently of it, a very large number of Franciscan tertiary congregations, both of men and women, have been founded, more especially since the beginning of the nineteenth century. These new foundations have taken as a basis of their institutes a special rule for members of the third order living in community approved by Leo X, 20 Jan., 1521 (Bull. "Inter"), although this rule is greatly modified

by their particular constitutions which, for the rest, differ widely according to the end of each foundation. These various congregations of regular tertiaries are either autonomous or under episcopal jurisdiction, and for the most part they are Franciscan in name only, not a few of them having abandoned the habit and even the traditional cord of the order.

For the vexed question of the origin and evolution of the three orders, see MÜLLER, *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens und der Bussbruderschaften* (Freiburg, 1885), 33 sqq.; EHRLICH in *Zeitschr. f. k. Theol.*, XI, 743 sqq.; MANDONNET, *Les règles et le gouvernement de l'Ordre de Penitencia au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* in *Opuscules de critique historique*, vol. I, fasc. IV (Paris, 1902); LEMMENS in *Rom. Quartalschrift*, XVI, 93 sqq.; VAN OETROY in *Analecta Bollandiana*, XVIII, 294 sqq., XXIV, 415 sqq.; D'ALENCON in *Études Franciscaines*, II, 646 sq.; GÖRZ in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXIII, 97-107. The rules of the three orders are printed in *Seraphica Legislatiois Textus Originalis* (Quaracchi, 1897). A general conspectus of the Franciscan Order and its various branches is given in HOLZAPFEL, *Manuale Historie O.F.M.* (Freiburg, 1909); HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1907), II, 307-533; also PATREM, *Tableau synoptique de tout l'Ordre Séraphique* (Paris, 1879); and CUSACK, *St. Francis and the Franciscans* (New York, 1867).

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

**Francis Caracciolo**, SAINT, co-founder with John Augustine Adorno of the Congregation of the Minor Clerks Regular; b. in Villa Santa Maria, in the Abruzzo (Italy), 13 October, 1563; d. at Agnone, 4 June, 1608. He belonged to the Pisuquizio branch of the Caracciolo and received in baptism the name of Ascanio. From his infancy he was remarkable for his gentleness and uprightness. Having been cured of leprosy at the age of twenty-two he vowed himself to an ecclesiastical life, and distributing his goods to the poor, went to Naples in 1585 to study theology. In 1587 he was ordained priest and joined the confraternity of the *Bianchi della Giustizia* (The white robes of Justice), whose object was to assist condemned criminals to die holy deaths. A letter from Giovanni Agostino Adorno to another Ascanio Caracciolo, begging him to take part in founding a new religious institute, having been delivered by mistake to our saint, he saw in the circumstance an evidence of the Divine Will towards him (1588). He assisted in drawing up rules for the new congregation, which was approved by Sixtus V, 1 July, 1588, and confirmed by Gregory XIV, 18 February, 1591, and by Clement VIII, 1 June, 1592.

The congregation is both contemplative and active, and to the three usual vows a fourth is added, namely, that its members must not aspire to ecclesiastical dignities outside the order nor seek them within it. Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament is kept up by rotation, and mortification is continually practised. The motto of the order "Ad maiorem Dei Resurgentis gloriam" was chosen from the fact that Francis and Adorno made their profession at Naples on Low Sunday, 9 April, 1589. In spite of his refusal he was chosen general, 9 March, 1593, in the first house of the congregation in Naples, called St. Mary Major's or Pietrasanta, given to them by Sixtus V. He made three journeys into Spain to establish foundations under the protection of Philip II and Philip III. He opened the house of the Holy Ghost at Madrid on 20 January, 1599, that of Our Lady of the Annunciation at Valladolid on 9 September, 1601, and that of St. Joseph at Alcalá sometime in 1601, for teaching science: In Rome he obtained possession of St. Leonard's church, which he afterwards exchanged for that of St. Agnes in the Piazza Navona (18 September, 1598), and later he secured for the institute the church of San Lorenzo in Lucina (11 June, 1606), which was made over to him by a bull of Pope Paul V, and which was, however, annulled by the Bull "Susceptum" of Pope Pius X (9 November, 1906).

St. Francis Caracciolo was the author of a valuable work, "Le sette stazioni sopra la Passione di N. S. Gesù Christo", which was printed in Rome in 1710. He loved the poor. Like St. Thomas Aquinas, a rela-

tive on his mother's side, his purity was angelic. Pope Paul V desired to confer an important bishopric on him, but he steadfastly refused it. His frequent motto was "Zelus domus tuæ comedit me". Invited by the Oratorians at Agnone in the Abruzzo to convert their house into a college for his congregation, he fell ill during the negotiations and died there on the vigil of Corpus Christi. He was beatified by Pope Clement XIV on 4 June, 1769, and canonized by Pope Pius VII on 24 May, 1807. In 1838 he was chosen as patron of the city of Naples, where his body lies. At first he was buried in St. Mary Major's, but his remains were afterwards translated to the church of Monteverginella, which was given in exchange to the Minor Clerks Regular (1823) after their suppression at the time of the French Revolution. St. Francis is no longer venerated there with the old fervour and devotion.

CANDIDA-GONZAGA, *Memorie delle Famiglie nobili delle province meridionali d'Italia* (Naples, 1876), III; *Memorie della Famiglia Caracciolo del Conte Francesco dei principi Caracciolo* (Naples, 1893-97); which give the history of his family. Lives of the saint by VIVES (Naples, 1654); PISTELLI (Rome, 1700); CENCELLI (Naples, 1769); FERRANTE (Naples, 1862); TAGLIATATELA, *Terzo centenario di S. Francesco Caracciolo* (Naples, 1908). For the history of the order see TAPIA, *De religiosius rebus* (Naples, 1594); PISTELLI, *Notizia storica della religione de PP. Chierici Regolari Minori* (Rome, 1710).

FRANCESCO PAOLI.

**Francis de Geronimo** (GIROLAMO, HIERONYMO), SAINT, b. 17 December, 1642; d. 11 May, 1716. His birthplace was Grottaglie, a small town in Apulia, situated about five or six leagues from Taranto. At the age of sixteen he entered the college of Taranto, which was under the care of the Society of Jesus. He studied humanities and philosophy there; and was so successful that his bishop sent him to Naples to attend lectures in theology and canon law at the celebrated college of Gesu Vecchio, which at that time rivalled the greatest universities in Europe. He was ordained there, 18 March, 1666. After spending four years in charge of the pupils at the college of nobles in Naples, where the students surnamed him the holy prefect, *il santo prefetto*, he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus, 1 July, 1670. At the end of his first year's probation he was sent with an experienced missionary to get his first lessons in the art of preaching in the neighbourhood of Otranto. A new term of four years spent labouring in the towns and villages at missionary work revealed so clearly to his superiors his wonderful gift of preaching that, after allowing him to complete his theological studies, they determined to devote him to that work, and sent him to reside at the Gesù Nuovo, the residence of the professed fathers at Naples. Francis would fain have gone and laboured, perhaps even laid down his life, as he often said, amidst the barbarous and idolatrous nations of the Far East. He wrote frequently to his superiors, begging them to grant him that great favour. Finally they told him to abandon the idea altogether, and to concentrate all his zeal and energy on the city and Kingdom of Naples. Francis understood this to be the will of God, and insisted no more. Naples thus became for forty years, from 1676 till his death, the centre of his apostolic labours.

He first devoted himself to stirring up the religious enthusiasm of a congregation of workmen, called the "Oratorio della Missione", established at the professed house in Naples. The main object of this association was to provide the missionary father with devoted helpers amidst the thousand difficulties that would suddenly arise in the course of his work. Encouraged by the enthusiastic sermons of the director, these good people became zealous co-operators. One remarkable feature of their work was the multitude of sinners they brought to the feet of Francis. In the notes which he sent his superiors concerning his favourite missionary work, the saint takes great

pleasure in speaking of the fervour that animated the members of his dear "Oratory". Nor did their devoted director overlook the material needs of those who assisted him in the good work. In the Oratory he succeeded in establishing a *mont de piété*. The capital was increased by the gifts of the associate. Thanks to this institute, they could have each day, in case of illness, a sum of four carlines (about one-third of a dollar); should death visit any of the members a respectable funeral was accorded them, costing the institute eighteen ducats; and they had the further privilege, which was much sought after, of being interred in the church of the Gesù Nuovo (see Brevi notizie, pp. 131-6). He established also in the Gesù one of the most important and beneficial works of the professed house in Naples, the general Communion on the third Sunday of each month (Brevi notizie, 126). He was an indefatigable preacher, and often spoke forty times in one day, choosing those streets which he knew to be the centre of some secret scandal. His short, energetic, and eloquent sermons touched the guilty consciences of his hearers and worked miraculous conversions. The rest of the week, not given over to labour in the city, was spent visiting the environs of Naples; on some occasions passing through no less than fifty hamlets in a day, he preached in the streets, the public squares, and the churches. The following Sunday he would have the consolation of seeing at the Sacred Table crowds of 11,000, 12,000 or even 13,000 persons; according to his biographers there were ordinarily 15,000 men present at the monthly general Communion.

But his work *par excellence* was to give missions in the open air and in the low quarters of the city of Naples. His tall figure, ample brow, large dark eyes and aquiline nose, sunken cheeks, pallid countenance, and looks that spoke of his ascetic austerities produced a wonderful impression. The people crushed forward to meet him, to see him, to kiss his hand, and to touch his garments. When he exhorted sinners to repentance he seemed to acquire a power that was more than natural, and his feeble voice became resonant and awe-inspiring. "He is a lamb, when he talks", the people said, "but a lion when he preaches". Like the ideal popular preacher he was, when in presence of an audience as fickle and impressionable as the Neapolitans, Francis left nothing undone that could strike their imaginations. At one time he would bring a skull into the pulpit, and showing it to his hearers would drive home the lesson he wished to impart; at another, stopping suddenly in the middle of his discourse, he would uncover his shoulders and scourge himself with an iron chain till he bled. The effect was irresistible; young men of evil lives would rush forward and follow the example of the preacher, confessing their sins aloud; and abandoned women would cast themselves before the crucifix, and cut off their long hair, giving expression to their bitter sorrow and repentance. This apostolic labour in union with the cruel penance and the ardent spirit of prayer of the saint worked wonderful results amidst the slaves of vice and crime. Thus the two refuges in Naples contained in a short time over 250 penitents each; and in the Asylum of the Holy Ghost he sheltered for a while 190 children of these unfortunates, preserving them thereby from the danger of afterwards following the shameful trade of their mothers. He had the consolation of seeing twenty-two of them embrace the religious life. So also he changed the royal convict ships, which were sinks of iniquity, into refuges of Christian peace and resignation; and he tells us further that he brought many Turkish and Moorish slaves to the true faith, and made use of the pompous ceremonials at their baptism to strike the hearts and imaginations of the spectators (Brevi notizie, 121-6).

Whatever time was unoccupied by his town missions he devoted to giving country or village missions of

four, eight, or ten days, but never more; here and there he gave a retreat to a religious community, but in order to save his time he would not hear their confessions [cf. *Recueil de lettres per le Nozze Malvezzi Hercolani* (1876), p. 28]. To consolidate the good work, he tried to establish everywhere an association of St. Francis Xavier, his patron and model; or else a congregation of the Blessed Virgin. For twenty-two years he preached her praises every Tuesday in the Neapolitan church, known by the name of St. Mary of Constantinople. Although engaged in such active exterior work, St. Francis had a mystical soul. He was often seen walking through the streets of Naples with a look of ecstasy on his face and tears streaming from his eyes; his companion had constantly to call his attention to the people who saluted him, so that Francis finally decided to walk bare-headed in public. He had the reputation at Naples of being a great miracle worker; and his biographers, as those who testified during the process of his canonization, did not hesitate to attribute to him a host of wonders and cures of all kinds. His obsequies were, for the Neapolitans, the occasion of a triumphant procession; and had it not been for the intervention of the Swiss guard, the zeal of his followers might have exposed the remains to the risk of desecration. In all the streets and squares of Naples, in every part of the suburbs, in the smallest neighbouring hamlets, every one spoke of the holiness, zeal, eloquence, and inexhaustible charity of the deceased missionary. The ecclesiastical authorities soon recognized that his cause of beatification should be begun. On 2 May, 1758, Benedict XIV declared that Francis de Geronimo had practised the theological and cardinal virtues in an heroic degree. He would have been beatified soon afterwards only for the storm that assailed the Society of Jesus about this time and ended in its suppression. Pius VII could not proceed with the beatification till 2 May, 1806; and Gregory XVI canonized the saint solemnly on 26 May, 1839.

St. Francis de Geronimo wrote little. Some of his letters have been collected by his biographers and inserted in their works; for his writings, cf. Sommer-vogel, "Bibl. de la Comp. de Jésus", new ed., III, col. 1358. We must mention by itself the account that he wrote to his superiors of the fifteen most laborious years of his ministry, which has furnished the materials for the most striking details of this sketch. The work dates from October, 1693. The saint modestly calls it "Brevi notizie delle cose di gloria di Dio accadute negli exercizi delle sacre missioni di Napoli da quindici anni in qua, quanto sic potuto richiamare in memoria". Boero published it in "S. Francesco di Girolamo e le sue Missioni dentro e fuori di Napoli", p. 67-181 (Florence, 1882). The archives of the Society of Jesus contain a voluminous collection of his sermons, or rather developed plans of his sermons. It is well to recall this proof of the care he took in preparing himself for the ministry of the pulpit, for his biographers are wont to dwell on the fact that his eloquent discourses were extemporaneous.

Among his chief biographers the following are worthy of particular mention: SRADJOTTI, who lived twenty-five years with the saint in the professed house at Naples and had been his superior; he wrote his life in 1719, just three years after death of Francis. Six years later, in 1725, a new life appeared, written by a very remarkable Jesuit, BAGNATI. He lived with St. Francis for the last fifteen years of his life and was his ordinary confessor. The most popular biography is that written by DE BONIS, who composed his work at the time the process of beatification of the saint was being drawn up. Worthy of note, also, is the *Summarium de virtutibus ven. P. Francis de Hieronymo* (1751). It is a work to be used with caution; the postulator of the saint's cause, MUZZARELLI, extracted from it a great number of important facts relating to the labours and miracles of the saint, *Raccolta di avvenimenti singolari e documenti autentici spettanti alla vita del B. Francesco di Geronimo* (Rome, 1806). Lastly, the *Histoire de S. François de Geronimo*, ed. BACH (MERZ, 1851), is the most complete work on the subject, but strives too much after the edification of the reader. C. CARAYON, *Bibliographie historique de la Compagnie de Jésus*, nn. 1861-89 (Paris, 1864).

FRANCIS VAN OETROY.



**Francis de Sales**, SAINT, Bishop of Geneva, Doctor of the Universal Church; b. at Thorens, in the Duchy of Savoy, 21 August, 1567; d. at Lyons, 28 December, 1622. His father, François de Sales de Boisy, and his mother, Françoise de Sionnaz, belonged to old Savoyard aristocratic families. The future saint was the eldest of six brothers. His father intended him for the magistracy and sent him at an early age to the colleges of La Roche and Annecy. From 1583 till 1588 he studied rhetoric and humanities at the college of Clermont, Paris, under the care of the Jesuits. While there he began a course of theology. After a terrible and prolonged temptation to despair, caused by the discussions of the theologians of the day on the question of predestination, from which he was suddenly freed as he knelt before a miraculous image of Our Lady at St. Etienne-des-Grès, he made a vow of chastity and consecrated himself to the Blessed Virgin Mary. In 1588 he studied law at Padua, where the Jesuit Father Possevin was his spiritual director. He received his diploma of doctorate from the famous Panciroli in 1592. Having been admitted as a lawyer before the senate of Chambéry, he was about to be appointed senator. His father had selected one of the noblest heiresses of Savoy to be the partner of his future life, but Francis declared his intention of embracing the ecclesiastical life. A sharp struggle ensued. His father would not consent to see his expectations thwarted. Then Claude de Granier, Bishop of Geneva, obtained for Francis, on his own initiative, the position of Provost of the Chapter of Geneva, a post in the patronage of the pope. It was the highest office in the diocese, M. de Boisy yielded and Francis received Holy orders (1593).

From the time of the Reformation the seat of the Bishopric of Geneva had been fixed at Annecy. There with apostolic zeal, the new provost devoted himself to preaching, hearing confessions, and the other work of his ministry. In the following year (1594) he volunteered to evangelize Le Chablais, where the Genevans had imposed the Reformed Faith, and which had just been restored to the Duchy of Savoy. He made his headquarters in the fortress of Allinges. Risking his life, he journeyed through the entire district, preaching constantly; by dint of zeal, learning, kindness, and holiness he at last obtained a hearing. He then settled in Thonon, the chief town. He confuted the preachers sent by Geneva to oppose him; he converted the syndic and several prominent Calvinists. At the request of the pope, Clement VIII, he went to Geneva to interview Theodore Beza, who was called the Patriarch of the Reformation. The latter received him kindly and seemed for a while shaken, but had not the courage to take the final steps. A large part of the inhabitants of Le Chablais returned to the true fold (1597 and 1598). Claude de Granier then chose Francis as his coadjutor, in spite of his refusal, and sent him to Rome (1599).

Pope Clement VIII ratified the choice; but he wished to examine the candidate personally, in presence of the Sacred College. The improvised examination was a triumph for Francis. "Drink, my son," said the Pope to him. "from your cistern, and from your living wellspring; may your waters issue forth, and may they become public fountains where the world may quench its thirst." The prophecy was to be realized. On his return from Rome the religious affairs of the territory of Gex, a dependency of France, necessitated his going to Paris. There the coadjutor formed an intimate friendship with Cardinal de Bérulle, Antoine Deshayes, secretary of Henry IV, and Henry IV himself, who wished "to make a third in this fair friendship" (*être de tiers dans cette belle amitié*). The king made him preach the Lent at Court, and wished to keep him in France. He urged him to continue, by his sermons and writings, to teach

those souls that had to live in the world how to have confidence in God, and how to be genuinely and truly pious—graces of which he saw the great necessity.

On the death of Claude de Granier, Francis was consecrated Bishop of Geneva (1602). His first step was to institute catechetical instructions for the faithful, both young and old. He made prudent regulations for the guidance of his clergy. He carefully visited the parishes scattered through the rugged mountains of his diocese. He reformed the religious communities. His goodness, patience, and mildness became proverbial. He had an intense love for the poor, especially those who were of respectable family. His food was plain, his dress and his household simple. He completely dispensed with superfluities and lived with the greatest economy, in order to be able to provide more abundantly for the wants of the needy. He heard confessions, gave advice, and preached incessantly. He wrote innumerable letters (mainly letters of direction) and found time to publish the numerous works mentioned below. Together with St. Jane Frances de Chantal, he founded (1607) the Institute of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin, for young girls and widows who, feeling themselves called to the religious life, have not sufficient strength, or lack inclination, for the corporal austerities of the great orders. His zeal extended beyond the limits of his own diocese. He delivered the Lent and Advent discourses which are still famous—those at Dijon (1604), where he first met the Baroness de Chantal; at Chambéry (1606); at Grenoble (1616, 1617, 1618), where he converted the Maréchal de Lesdiguières. During his last stay in Paris (November, 1618, to September, 1619) he had to go into the pulpit each day to satisfy the pious wishes of those who thronged to hear him. "Never," said they, "have such holy, such apostolic sermons been preached." He came into contact here with all the distinguished ecclesiastics of the day, and in particular with St. Vincent de Paul. His friends tried energetically to induce him to remain in France, offering him first the wealthy Abbey of Ste. Geneviève and then the coadjutor-bishopric of Paris, but he refused all to return to Annecy.

In 1622 he had to accompany the Court of Savoy into France. At Lyons he insisted on occupying a small, poorly furnished room in a house belonging to the gardener of the Visitation Convent. There, on 27 December, he was seized with apoplexy. He received the last sacraments and made his profession of faith, repeating constantly the words: "God's will be done! Jesus, my God and my all!" He died next day, in the fifty-sixth year of his age. Immense crowds flocked to visit his remains, which the people of Lyons were anxious to keep in their city. With much difficulty his body was brought back to Annecy, but his heart was left at Lyons. A great number of wonderful favours have been obtained at his tomb in the Visitation Convent of Annecy. His heart, at the time of the French Revolution, was carried by the Visitation nuns from Lyons to Venice, where it is venerated to-day. St. Francis de Sales was beatified in 1661, and canonized by Alexander VII in 1665; he was proclaimed Doctor of the Universal Church by Pope Pius IX, in 1877.

The following is a list of the principal works of the holy Doctor: (1) "Controversies", leaflets which the zealous missionary scattered among the inhabitants of Le Chablais in the beginning, when these people did not venture to come and hear him preach. They form a complete proof of the Catholic Faith. In the first part, the author defends the authority of the Church, and in the second and third parts, the rules of faith, which were not observed by the heretical ministers. The primacy of St. Peter is amply vindicated. (2) "Defense of the Standard of the Cross", a demonstration of the virtue (a) of the True Cross;



ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI  
CONTEMPORARY PICTURE IN THE SACRO SPECO, SUBIACO



(b), of the Crucifix; (c) of the Sign of the Cross; (d), an explanation of the Veneration of the Cross. (3) "An Introduction to the Devout Life", a work intended to lead "Philothea", the soul living in the world, into the paths of devotion, that is to say, of true and solid piety. Every one should strive to become pious, and "it is an error, it is even a heresy", to hold that piety is incompatible with any state of life. In the first part the author helps the soul to free itself from all inclination to, or affection for, sin; in the second, he teaches it how to be united to God by prayer and the sacraments; in the third, he exercises it in the practice of virtue; in the fourth, he strengthens it against temptation; in the fifth, he teaches it how to form its resolutions and to persevere. The "Introduction", which is a masterpiece of psychology, practical morality, and common sense, was translated into nearly every language even in the lifetime of the author, and it has since gone through innumerable editions. (4) "Treatise on the Love of God", an authoritative work which reflects perfectly the mind and heart of Francis de Sales as a great genius and a great saint. It contains twelve books. The first four give us a history, or rather explain the theory, of Divine love, its birth in the soul, its growth, its perfection, and its decay and annihilation; the fifth book shows that this love is twofold—the love of complacency and the love of benevolence; the sixth and seventh treat of *affection* love, which is practised in prayer; the eighth and ninth deal with *effective* love, that is, with conformity to the will of God, and submission to His good pleasure. The last three resume what has preceded and teach how to apply practically the lessons taught therein. (5) "Spiritual Conferences"; familiar conversations on religious virtues addressed to the sisters of the Visitation and collected by them. We find in them that practical common sense, keenness of perception, and delicacy of feeling which were characteristic of the kind-hearted and energetic Saint. (6) "Sermons".—These are divided into two classes: those composed previously to his consecration as bishop, and which he himself wrote out in full; and the discourses he delivered when a bishop, of which, as a rule, only outlines and synopses have been preserved. Some of the latter, however, were taken down *in extenso* by his hearers. Pius IX, in his Bull proclaiming him Doctor of the Church, calls the Saint "The Master and Restorer of Sacred Eloquence". He is one of those who at the beginning of the seventeenth century formed the beautiful French language; he foreshadows and prepares the way for the great sacred orators about to appear. He speaks simply, naturally, and from his heart. To speak well we need only love well, was his maxim. His mind was imbued with the Holy Writings, which he comments, and explains, and applies practically with no less accuracy than grace. (7) "Letters", mostly letters of direction, in which the minister of God effaces himself and teaches the soul to listen to God, the only true director. The advice given is suited to all the circumstances and necessities of life and to all persons of good will. While trying to efface his own personality in these letters, the saint makes himself known to us and unconsciously discovers to us the treasures of his soul. (8) A large number of very precious treatises or opuscula.

Migne (5 vols., quarto) and Vivès (12 vols., octavo, Paris) have edited the works of St. Francis de Sales. But the edition which we may call definitive was published at Annecy in 1892, by the English Benedictine, Dom Mackey: a work remarkable for its typographical execution, the brilliant criticism that settles the text, the large quantity of hitherto unedited matter, and the interesting study accompanying each volume. Dom Mackey published twelve volumes. Father Navatel, S.J., is continuing the work. We may give here a brief résumé of the spiritual teaching

contained in these works, of which the Church has said: "The writings of Francis de Sales, filled with celestial doctrine are a bright light in the Church, pointing out to souls an easy and safe way to arrive at the perfection of a Christian life." (Breviarium Romanum, 29 January, lect. VI.)

There are two elements in the spiritual life: first, a struggle against our lower nature; secondly, union of our wills with God, in other words, penance and love. St. Francis de Sales looks chiefly to love. Not that he neglects penance, which is absolutely necessary, but he wishes it to be practised from a motive of love. He requires mortification of the senses, but he relies first on mortification of the mind, the will, and the heart. This interior mortification he requires to be unceasing and always accompanied by love. The end to be realized is a life of loving, simple, generous, and constant fidelity to the will of God, which is nothing else than our present duty. The model proposed is Christ, whom we must ever keep before our eyes. "You will study His countenance, and perform your actions as He did" (Introd., 2nd part, ch. i). The practical means of arriving at this perfection are: remembrance of the presence of God, filial prayer, a right intention in all our actions, and frequent recourse to God by pious and confiding ejaculations and interior aspirations.

Besides the Institute of the Visitation, which he founded, the nineteenth century has seen associations of the secular clergy and of pious laymen, and several religious congregations, formed under the patronage of the holy Doctor. Among them we may mention the Missionaries of St. Francis de Sales, of Annecy; the Salesians, founded at Turin by the Venerable Don Bosco, specially devoted to the Christian and technical education of the children of the poorer classes; the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, established at Troyes (France) by Father Brisson, who try to realize in the religious and priestly life the spirit of the holy Doctor, such as we have described it, and such as he bequeathed it to the nuns of the Visitation.

MACKEY, *Œuvres de St François de Sales* (Annecy, 1892—); CHARLES-AUGUSTE DE SALES, *Histoire du Bienheureux François de Sales* (2nd ed., Paris, 1885); CAMUS, *Esprit de S. François de Sales* (2d ed., Paris, 1833); and in *Collection S. Honoré d'Eylau* (Paris, 1904); *Vie de S. François de Sales* by HAMON (Paris); PÉRENNEZ (Paris); DE MARGERIE (Paris); STROWSKI, *St François de Sales* (Paris); *Annales Salesiennes in Revue Mensuelle* (Paris, 1906, etc.). MACKEY has given an English translation of the *Letters to Persons in the World*, and of the *Letters to Persons in Religion* (London); he has also published noteworthy articles on *St. Francis de Sales as an Orator* (London) and *St. Francis de Sales as a Director in Am. Ecc. Rev.* (1898).

RAPHAËL PERNIN.

**Francis of Assisi**, SAINT, founder of the Franciscan Order, b. at Assisi in Umbria, in 1181 or 1182—the exact year is uncertain; d. there, 3 October, 1226. His father, Pietro Bernardone, was a wealthy Assisian cloth merchant. Of his mother, Pica, little is known, but she is said to have belonged to a noble family of Provence. Francis was one of several children. The legend that he was born in a stable dates from the fifteenth century only, and appears to have originated in the desire of certain writers to make his life resemble that of Christ. At baptism the saint received the name of Giovanni, which his father afterwards altered to Francesco, through fondness it would seem for France, whither business had led him at the time of his son's birth. In any case, since the child was named in infancy, the change can hardly have had anything to do with his aptitude for learning French, as some have thought. Francis received some elementary instruction from the priests of St. George's at Assisi, though he learned more perhaps in the school of the Troubadours, who were just then making for refinement in Italy. However this may be, he was not very studious, and his literary education remained incomplete. Although associated with his father in trade, he showed little liking for a merchant's career,

and his parents seem to have indulged his every whim. Thomas of Celano, his first biographer, speaks in very severe terms of Francis's youth. Certain it is that the saint's early life gave no presage of the golden years that were to come. No one loved pleasure more than Francis; he had a ready wit, sang merrily, delighted in fine clothes and showy display. Handsome, gay, gallant, and courteous, he soon became the prime favourite among the young nobles of Assisi, the foremost in every feat of arms, the leader of the civil revels, the very king of frolic. But even at this time Francis showed an instinctive sympathy with the poor, and though he spent money lavishly, it still flowed in such channels as to attest a princely magnanimity of spirit. When about twenty, Francis went out with the townsmen to fight the Perugians in one of the petty skirmishes so frequent at that time between the rival cities. The Assisians were defeated on this occasion, and Francis, being among those taken prisoners, was held captive for more than a year in Perugia. A low fever which he there contracted appears to have turned his thoughts to the things of eternity; at least the emptiness of the life he had been leading came to him during that long illness. With returning health, however, Francis's eagerness after glory reawakened and his fancy wandered in search of victories; at length he resolved to embrace a military career, and circumstances seemed to favour his aspirations. A knight of Assisi was about to join "the gentle count", Walter of Brienne, who was then in arms in the Neapolitan States against the emperor, and Francis arranged to accompany him. His biographers tell us that the night before Francis set forth he had a strange dream, in which he saw a vast hall hung with armour all marked with the Cross. "These", said a voice, "are for you and your soldiers". "I know I shall be a great prince", exclaimed Francis exultingly, as he started for Apulia. But a second illness arrested his course at Spoleto. There, we are told, Francis had another dream in which the same voice bade him turn back to Assisi. He did so at once. This was in 1205.

Although Francis still joined at times in the noisy revels of his former comrades, his changed demeanour plainly showed that his heart was no longer with them; a yearning for the life of the spirit had already possessed it. His companions twitted Francis on his absent-mindedness and asked if he were minded to be married. "Yes", he replied, "I am about to take a wife of surpassing fairness." She was none other than that Lady Poverty whom Dante and Giotto have wedded to his name, and whom even now he had begun to love. After a short period of uncertainty he began to seek in prayer and solitude the answer to his call; he had already given up his gay attire and wasteful ways. One day, while crossing the Umbrian plain on horseback, Francis unexpectedly drew near a poor leper. The sudden appearance of this repulsive object filled him with disgust and he instinctively retreated, but presently controlling his natural aversion he dismounted, embraced the unfortunate man, and gave him all the money he had. About the same time Francis made a pilgrimage to Rome. Pained at the miserly offerings he saw at the tomb of St. Peter, he emptied his purse thereon. Then, as if put to his fastidious nature to the test, he exchanged clothes with a tattered mendicant and stood for the rest of the day fasting among the horde of beggars at the door of the basilica. Not long after his return to Assisi, whilst Francis was praying before an ancient crucifix in the forsaken wayside chapel of St. Damian's below the town, he heard a voice saying: "Go, Francis, and repair my house, which as you see is falling into ruin." Taking this behest literally, as referring to the ruinous church wherein he knelt, Francis went to his father's shop, impulsively bundled together a load of coloured drapery, and mounting his horse hastened to Foligno, then a mart of some importance, and there sold both

horse and stuff to procure the money needful for the restoration of St. Damian's. When, however, the poor priest who officiated there refused to receive the gold thus gotten, Francis flung it from him disdainfully. The elder Bernardone, a most niggardly man, was incensed beyond measure at his son's conduct, and Francis, to avert his father's wrath, hid himself in a cave near St. Damian's for a whole month. When he emerged from this place of concealment and returned to the town, emaciated with hunger and squalid with dirt, Francis was followed by a hooting rabble, pelted with mud and stones, and otherwise mocked as a madman. Finally, he was dragged home by his father, beaten, bound, and locked in a dark closet. Freed by his mother during Bernardone's absence, Francis returned at once to St. Damian's, where he found a shelter with the officiating priest, but he was soon after cited before the city consuls by his father. The latter, not content with having recovered the scattered gold from St. Damian's, sought also to force his son to forego his inheritance. This Francis was only too eager to do; he declared, however, that since he had entered the service of God he was no longer under civil jurisdiction. Having therefore been taken before the bishop, Francis stripped himself of the very clothes he wore, and gave them to his father, saying: "Hitherto I have called you my father on earth; henceforth I desire to say only 'Our Father who art in Heaven.'" Then and there, as Dante sings, were solemnized Francis's nuptials with his beloved spouse, the Lady Poverty, under which name, in the mystical language afterwards so familiar to him, he comprehended the total surrender of all worldly goods, honours, and privileges. And now Francis wandered forth into the hills behind Assisi, improvising hymns of praise as he went. "I am the herald of the great King", he declared in answer to some robbers, who thereupon despoiled him of all he had and threw him scornfully in a snow drift. Naked and half frozen, Francis crawled to a neighbouring monastery and there worked for a time as a scullion. At Gubbio, whither he went next, Francis obtained from a friend the cloak, girdle, and staff of a pilgrim as an alms. Returning to Assisi, he traversed the city begging stones for the restoration of St. Damian's. These he carried to the old chapel, set in place himself, and so at length rebuilt it. In the same way Francis afterwards restored two other deserted chapels, St. Peter's, some distance from the city, and St. Mary of the Angels, in the plain below it, at a spot called the Porziuncola. Meantime he redoubled his zeal in works of charity, more especially in nursing the lepers.

On a certain morning in 1208, probably 24 February, Francis was hearing Mass in the chapel of St. Mary of the Angels, near which he had then built himself a hut; the Gospel of the day told how the disciples of Christ were to possess neither gold nor silver, nor scrip for their journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff, and that they were to exhort sinners to repentance and announce the Kingdom of God. Francis took these words as if spoken directly to himself, and so soon as Mass was over threw away the poor fragment left him of the world's goods, his shoes, cloak, pilgrim staff, and empty wallet. At last he had found his vocation. Having obtained a coarse woollen tunic of "beast colour", the dress then worn by the poorest Umbrian peasants, and tied it round him with a knotted rope, Francis went forth at once exhorting the people of the country-side to penance, brotherly love, and peace. The Assisians had already ceased to scoff at Francis; they now paused in wonderment; his example even drew others to him. Bernard of Quintavalle, a magnate of the town, was the first to join Francis, and he was soon followed by Peter of Cattaneo, a well-known canon of the cathedral. In the true spirit of religious enthusiasm, Francis repaired to the church of St. Nicholas and sought to



learn God's will in their regard by thrice opening at random the book of the Gospels on the altar. Each time it opened at passages where Christ told His disciples to leave all things and follow Him. "This shall be our rule of life", exclaimed Francis, and led his companions to the public square, where they forthwith gave away all their belongings to the poor. After this they procured rough habits like that of Francis, and built themselves small huts near his at the Porziuncola. A few days later Giles, afterwards the great ecstatic and sayer of "good words", became the third follower of Francis. The little band divided and went about, two and two, making such an impression by their words and behaviour that before long several other disciples grouped themselves round Francis eager to share his poverty, among them being Sabatinus, *vir bonus et iustus*, Moricus, who had belonged to the Crucigeri, John of Capella, who afterwards fell away, Philip "the Long", and four others of whom we know only the names. When the number of his companions had increased to eleven, Francis found it expedient to draw up a written rule for them. This first rule, as it is called, of the Friars Minor has not come down to us in its original form, but it appears to have been very short and simple, a mere informal adaptation of the Gospel precepts already selected by Francis for the guidance of his first companions, and which he desired to practise in all their perfection. When this rule was ready the Penitents of Assisi, as Francis and his followers styled themselves, set out for Rome to seek the approval of the Holy See, although as yet no such approbation was obligatory. There are differing accounts of Francis's reception by Innocent III. It seems, however, that Guido, Bishop of Assisi, who was then in Rome, commended Francis to Cardinal John of St. Paul, and that at the instance of the latter, the pope recalled the saint whose first overtures he had, as it appears, somewhat rudely rejected. Moreover, in spite of the sinister predictions of others in the Sacred College, who regarded the mode of life proposed by Francis as unsafe and impracticable, Innocent, moved it is said by a dream in which he beheld the Poor Man of Assisi upholding the tottering Lateran, gave a verbal sanction to the rule submitted by Francis and granted the saint and his companions leave to preach repentance everywhere. Before leaving Rome they all received the ecclesiastical tonsure, Francis himself being ordained deacon later on.

After their return to Assisi, the Friars Minor, for thus Francis had named his brethren—either after the *minores*, or lower classes, as some think, or as others believe, with reference to the Gospel (Matt., xxv, 40-45), and as a perpetual reminder of their humility—found shelter in a deserted hut at Rivo Torto in the plain below the city, but were forced to abandon this poor abode by a rough peasant who drove in his ass upon

them. About 1211 they obtained a permanent foothold near Assisi, through the generosity of the Benedictines of Monte Subasio, who gave them the little chapel of St. Mary of the Angels or the Porziuncola. Adjoining this humble sanctuary, already dear to Francis, the first Franciscan convent was formed by the erection of a few small huts or cells of wattle, straw, and mud, and enclosed by a hedge. From this settlement, which became the cradle of the Franciscan Order (*Caput et Mater Ordinis*) and the central spot in the life of Francis, the Friars Minor went forth two by two exhorting the people of the surrounding country. Like children "careless of the day", they wandered from place to place singing in their joy, and calling

themselves the Lord's minstrels. The wide world was their cloister; sleeping in haylofts, grottos, or church porches, they toiled with the labourers in the fields, and when none gave them work they would beg. In a short while Francis and his companions gained an immense influence, and men of different grades of life and ways of thought flocked to the order. Among the new recruits made about this time by Francis were the famous Three Companions, who afterwards wrote his life, namely: Angelus Tancredi, a noble cavalier; Leo, the saint's secretary and confessor; and Rufinus, a cousin of St. Clare; besides Juniper, "the renowned jester of the Lord".

During the Lent of 1212, a new joy, great as it was unexpected, came to Francis. Clare, a young heiress of Assisi, moved by the saint's preaching at the church of St. George, sought him out, and begged to be allowed to embrace the new manner of life he had founded. By his advice, Clare, who was then but eighteen, secretly left her father's house on the night

following Palm Sunday, and with two companions went to the Porziuncola, where the friars met her in procession, carrying lighted torches. Then Francis, having cut off her hair, clothed her in the Minorite habit and thus received her to a life of poverty, penance, and seclusion. Clare stayed provisionally with some Benedictine nuns near Assisi, until Francis could provide a suitable retreat for her, and for St. Agnes, her sister, and the other pious maidens who had joined her. He eventually established them at St. Damian's, in a dwelling adjoining the chapel he had rebuilt with his own hands, which was now given to the saint by the Benedictines as a domicile for his spiritual daughters, and which thus became the first monastery of the Second Franciscan Order of Poor Ladies, now known as Poor Clares (see CLARE OF ASSISI, SAINT; POOR CLARES).

In the autumn of the same year (1212) Francis's burning desire for the conversion of the Saracens led him to embark for Syria, but having been shipwrecked on the coast of Slavonia, he had to return to Ancona. The following spring he devoted to evangelizing Central Italy. About this time (1213) Francis



ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI  
Della Robbia, in the cell where St. Francis died, S. Maria degli Angeli, near Assisi

received from Count Orlando of Chiusi the mountain of La Verna, an isolated peak among the Tuscan Apennines, rising some 4000 feet above the valley of the Casentino, as a retreat, "especially favourable for contemplation", to which he might retire from time to time for prayer and rest. For Francis never altogether separated the contemplative from the active life, as the several little hermitages associated with his memory, and the quaint regulations he wrote for those living in them bear witness. At one time, indeed, a strong desire to give himself wholly to a life of contemplation seems to have possessed the saint. During the next year (1214) Francis set out for Morocco, in another attempt to reach the infidels and, if needs be, to shed his blood for the Gospel, but while yet in Spain was overtaken by so severe an illness that he was compelled to turn back to Italy once more.

Authentic details are unfortunately lacking of Francis's journey to Spain and sojourn there. It probably took place in the winter of 1214-1215. After his return to Umbria he received several noble and learned men into the order, including his future biographer, Thomas of Celano. The next eighteen months comprise, perhaps, the most obscure period of the saint's life. That he took part in the Lateran Council of 1215 may well be, but it is not certain; we know from Eccleston, however, that Francis was present at the death of Innocent III, which took place at Perugia, in July, 1216. Shortly afterwards, i. e. very early in the pontificate of Honorius III, is placed the concession of the famous Porziuncola Indulgence. It is related that once, while Francis was praying at the Porziuncola, Christ appeared to him and offered him whatever favour he might desire. The salvation of souls was ever the burden of Francis's prayers, and wishing, moreover, to make his beloved Porziuncola a sanctuary where many might be saved, he begged a plenary Indulgence for all who, having confessed their sins, should visit the little chapel. Our Lord acceded to this request on condition that the pope should ratify the Indulgence. Francis thereupon set out for Perugia, with Brother Masseo, to find Honorius III. The latter, notwithstanding some opposition from the Curia at such an unheard-of favour, granted the Indulgence, restricting it, however, to one day yearly. He subsequently fixed 2 August in perpetuity, as the day for gaining this Porziuncola Indulgence, commonly known in Italy as *il perdono d'Assisi*. Such is the traditional account. The fact that there is no record of this Indulgence in either the papal or diocesan archives and no allusion to it in the earliest biographies of Francis or other contemporary documents has led some writers to reject the whole story. This *argumentum ex silentio* has, however, been met by M. Paul Sabatier, who in his critical edition of the "Tractatus de Indulgentia" of Fra Bartholi (see BARTHOLI, FRANCESCO DELLA ROSSA) has adduced all the really credible evidence in its favour. But even those who regard the granting of this Indulgence as traditionally believed to be an established fact of history, admit that its early history is uncertain. (See PORTUNCULA.)

The first general chapter of the Friars Minor was held in May, 1217, at Porziuncola, the order being divided into provinces, and an apportionment made of the Christian world into so many Franciscan missions. Tuscany, Lombardy, Provence, Spain, and Germany were assigned to five of Francis's principal followers; for himself the saint reserved France, and he actually set out for that kingdom, but on arriving at Florence, was dissuaded from going further by Cardinal Ugolino, who had been made protector of the order in 1216. He therefore sent in his stead Brother Pacificus, who in the world had been renowned as a poet, together with Brother Agnellus, who later on established the Friars Minor in England. Although success came indeed to Francis and his friars, with it came also oppo-

sition, and it was with a view to allaying any prejudices the Curia might have imbibed against their methods that Francis, at the instance of Cardinal Ugolino, went to Rome and preached before the pope and cardinals in the Lateran. This visit to the Eternal City, which took place 1217-18, was apparently the occasion of Francis's memorable meeting with St. Dominic. The year 1218 Francis devoted to missionary tours in Italy, which were a continual triumph for him. He usually preached out of doors, in the market-places, from church steps, from the walls of castle court-yards. Allured by the magic spell of his presence, admiring crowds, unused for the rest to anything like popular preaching in the vernacular, followed Francis from place to place hanging on his lips; church bells rang at his approach; processions of clergy and people advanced to meet him with music and singing; they brought the sick to him to bless and heal, and kissed the very ground on which he trod, and even sought to cut away pieces of his tunic. The extraordinary enthusiasm with which the saint was everywhere welcomed was equalled only by the immediate and visible result of his preaching. His exhortations of the people, for sermons they can hardly be called, short, homely, affectionate, and pathetic, touched even the hardest and most frivolous, and Francis became in sooth a very conqueror of souls. Thus it happened, on one occasion, while the saint was preaching at Camara, a small village near Assisi, that the whole congregation were so moved by his "words of spirit and life" that they presented themselves to him in a body and begged to be admitted into his order. It was to accede, so far as might be, to like requests that Francis devised his Third Order, as it is now called, of the Brothers and Sisters of Penance, which he intended as a sort of a middle state between the world and the cloister for those who could not leave their home or desert their wonted avocations in order to enter either the First Order of Friars Minor or the Second Order of Poor Ladies. That Francis prescribed particular duties for these tertiaries is beyond question. They were not to carry arms, or take oaths, or engage in lawsuits, etc. It is also said that he drew up a formal rule for them, but it is clear that the rule, confirmed by Nicholas IV in 1289, does not, at least in the form in which it has come down to us, represent the original rule of the Brothers and Sisters of Penance. In any event, it is customary to assign 1221 as the year of the foundation of this third order, but the date is not certain.

At the second general chapter (May, 1219) Francis, bent on realizing his project of evangelizing the infidels, assigned a separate mission to each of his foremost disciples, himself selecting the seat of war between the crusaders and the Saracens. With eleven companions, including Brother Illuminato and Peter of Cattaneo, Francis set sail from Ancona on 21 June, for Saint-Jean d'Acre, and he was present at the siege and taking of Damietta. After preaching there to the assembled Christian forces, Francis fearlessly passed over to the infidel camp, where he was taken prisoner and led before the sultan. According to the testimony of Jacques de Vitry, who was with the crusaders at Damietta, the sultan received Francis with courtesy, but beyond obtaining a promise from this ruler of more indulgent treatment for the Christian captives, the saint's preaching seems to have effected little. Before returning to Europe, the saint is believed to have visited Palestine and there obtained for the friars the foothold they still retain as guardians of the holy places. What is certain is that Francis was compelled to hasten back to Italy because of various troubles that had arisen there during his absence. News had reached him in the East that Matthew of Narni and Gregory of Naples, the two vicars-general whom he had left in charge of the order, had summoned a chapter which, among other innovations, sought to impose

new fasts upon the friars, more severe than the rule required. Moreover, Cardinal Ugolino had conferred on the Poor Ladies a written rule which was practically that of the Benedictine nuns, and Brother Philip, whom Francis had charged with their interests, had accepted it. To make matters worse, John of Capella, one of the saint's first companions, had assembled a large number of lepers, both men and women, with a view to forming them into a new religious order, and had set out for Rome to seek approval for the rule he had drawn up for these unfortunates. Finally a rumour had been spread abroad that Francis was dead, so that when the saint returned to Italy with Brother Elias—he appears to have arrived at Venice in July, 1220—a general feeling of unrest prevailed among the friars. Apart from these difficulties, the order was then passing through a period of transition. It had become evident that the simple, familiar, and unceremonious ways which had marked the Francis-


can movement at its beginning were gradually disappearing, and that the heroic poverty practised by Francis and his companions at the outset became less easy as the friars with amazing rapidity increased in number. And this Francis could not help seeing on his return. Cardinal Ugolino had already undertaken the task "of reconciling inspirations so unstudied and so free with an order of things they had outgrown". This remarkable man, who afterwards ascended the papal throne as Gregory IX, was deeply attached to Francis, whom he venerated as a saint and also, some writers tell us, managed as an enthusiast. That Cardinal Ugolino had no small share in bringing Francis's lofty ideals "within range and compass" seems beyond dispute, and it is not difficult to recognize his hand in the important changes made in the organization of the order in the so-called Chapter of Mats. At this famous assembly, held at Porziuncola at Whitsuntide, 1220 or 1221 (there is seemingly much room for doubt as to the exact date and number of the early chapters), about 5000 friars are said to have been present, besides some 500 applicants for admission to the order. Huts of wattle and mud afforded shelter for this multitude. Francis had purposely made no provision for them, but the charity of the neighbouring towns supplied them with food, while knights and nobles waited upon them gladly. It was on this occasion that Francis, harassed no doubt and disheartened at the tendency betrayed by a large number of the friars to relax the rigours of the rule, according to the promptings of human prudence, and feeling, perhaps, unfitted for a place which now called largely for organizing abilities, relinquished his position as general of the order in favour of Peter of Cattaneo. But the latter died in less than a year, being succeeded as vicar-general by the unhappy Brother Elias (see ELIAS OF CORTONA), who continued in that office until the death of Francis. The saint, meanwhile, during the few years that remained to him, sought to impress on the friars by the silent teaching of personal example of what sort he would fain have them to be. Already, while passing through Bologna on his return from the East, Francis had refused to enter the convent there because he had heard it called the "House of the

Friars" and because a *studium* had been instituted there. He moreover bade all the friars, even those who were ill, quit it at once, and it was only some time after, when Cardinal Ugolino had publicly declared the house to be his own property, that Francis suffered his brethren to re-enter it. Yet strong and definite as the saint's convictions were, and determinedly as his line was taken, he was never a slave to a theory in regard to the observance of poverty or anything else; about him, indeed, there was nothing narrow or fanatical. As for his attitude towards study, Francis desiderated for his friars only such theological knowledge as was conformable to the mission of the order, which was before all else a mission of example. Hence he regarded the accumulation of books as being at variance with the poverty his friars professed, and he resisted the eager desire for mere book-learning, so prevalent in his time, in so far as it struck at the roots of that simplicity which entered so largely into the essence of his life and ideal and threatened to stifle the spirit of prayer, which he accounted preferable to all the rest.

In 1221, so some writers tell us, Francis drew up a new rule for the Friars Minor. Others regard this so-called Rule of 1221 not as a new rule, but as the first one which Innocent III had orally approved; not, indeed, its original form, which we do not possess, but with such additions and modifications as it had suffered during the course of twelve years. However this may be, the composition called by some the Rule of 1221 is very unlike any conventional rule ever made. It was too lengthy and unprecise to become a formal rule, and two years later Francis retired to Fonte Colombo, a hermitage near Rieti, and rewrote the rule in more compendious form. This revised draft he entrusted to Brother Elias, who not long after declared he had lost it

through negligence. Francis thereupon returned to the solitude of Fonte Colombo, and recast the rule on the same lines as before, its twenty-three chapters being reduced to twelve and some of its precepts being modified in certain details at the instance of Cardinal Ugolino. In this form the rule was solemnly approved by Honorius III, 29 November, 1223 (Litt. "Solet annuere"). This Second Rule, as it is usually called, or *Regula Bullata* of the Friars Minor, is the one ever since professed throughout the First Order of St. Francis (see FRANCIS, RULE OF SAINT). It is based on the three vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity, special stress however being laid on poverty, which Francis sought to make the special characteristic of his order, and which became the sign to be contradicted. This vow of absolute poverty in the first and second orders and the reconciliation of the religious with the secular state in the Third Order of Penance are the chief novelties introduced by Francis in monastic regulation.

It was during Christmastide of this year (1223) that the saint conceived the idea of celebrating the Nativity "in a new manner", by reproducing in a church at Greccio the *præsepio* of Bethlehem, and he has thus come to be regarded as having inaugurated the popular devotion of the Crib. Christmas appears indeed to have been the favourite feast of Francis, and he wished to persuade the emperor to make a special law that




ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI  
Cinabue, S. Francesco, Assisi

men should then provide well for the birds and the beasts, as well as for the poor, so that all might have occasion to rejoice in the Lord.

Early in August, 1224, Francis retired with three companions to "that rugged rock 'twixt Tiber and Arno", as Dante called La Verna, there to keep a forty days fast in preparation for Michaelmas. During this retreat the sufferings of Christ became more than ever the burden of his meditations; into few souls, perhaps, had the full meaning of the Passion so deeply entered. It was on or about the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September) while praying on the mountain-side, that he beheld the marvellous vision of the seraph, as a sequel of which there appeared on his body the

visible marks of the five wounds of the Crucified which, says an early writer, had long since been impressed upon his heart. Brother Leo, who was with St. Francis when he received the stigmata, has left us in his note to the saint's autograph blessing, preserved at Assisi, a clear and simple account of the miracle, which for the rest is better attested than many another historical fact. The saint's right side is described as bearing an open wound which looked as if made by a lance, while through his hands and feet were black nails of flesh, the points of which were bent backward. After the reception of the stigmata, Francis suffered increasing pains throughout his frail body, already broken by continual mortification. For, condescending as the saint always was to the weaknesses of others, he was ever so unsparring towards himself that at the last he felt constrained to ask pardon of "Brother Ass", as he called his body, for having treated it so harshly. Worn out, moreover, as Francis now was by eighteen years of unrelenting toil, his strength gave way completely, and at times his eyesight so far failed him that he was almost wholly blind. During an access of anguish, Francis paid a last visit to St. Clare at St. Damian's, and it was in a little hut of reeds, made for him in the garden there, that the saint composed that "Canticle of the Sun", in which his poetic genius expands itself so gloriously. This was in September, 1225. Not long afterwards Francis, at the urgent instance of Brother Elias, underwent an unsuccessful operation for the eyes, at Rieti. He seems to have passed the winter 1225-26 at Siena, whither he had been taken for further medical treatment. In April, 1226, during an interval of improvement, Francis was moved to Cortona, and it is believed to have been while resting at the hermitage of the Celle there, that the saint dictated his testament, which he describes as a "reminder, a warning, and an exhortation". In this touching document Francis, writing from the fullness of his heart, urges anew with the simple eloquence, the few, but clearly defined, principles that were to

guide his followers, implicit obedience to superiors as holding the place of God, literal observance of the rule "without gloss", especially as regards poverty, and the duty of manual labour, being solemnly enjoined on all the friars. Meanwhile alarming dropsical symptoms had developed, and it was in a dying condition that Francis set out for Assisi. A roundabout route was taken by the little caravan that escorted him, for it was feared to follow the direct road lest the saucy Perugians should attempt to carry Francis off by force so that he might die in their city, which would thus enter into possession of his coveted relics. It was therefore under a strong guard that Francis, in July, 1226, was finally borne in safety to the bishop's palace



INTERIOR OF THE CHAPEL OF THE PORZIUNCOLA NEAR ASSISI

in his native city amid the enthusiastic rejoicings of the entire populace. In the early autumn Francis, feeling the hand of death upon him, was carried to his beloved Porziuncola, that he might breathe his last sigh where his vocation had been revealed to him and whence his order had struggled into sight. On the way thither he asked to be set down, and with painful effort he invoked a beautiful blessing on Assisi, which, however, his own eyes could no longer discern. The saint's last days were passed at the Porziuncola in a tiny hut, near the chapel, that served as an infirmary. The arrival there about this time of the Lady Jacoba of Settesoli, who had come with her two sons and a great retinue to bid Francis farewell, caused some consternation, since women were forbidden to enter the friary. But Francis,

in his tender gratitude to this Roman noblewoman, who had been such a special benefactor of his order, made an exception in her favour, and "Brother Jacoba", as Francis had named her on account of her fortitude, remained to the last. On the eve of his death, the saint, in imitation of his Divine Master, had bread brought to him and broken. This he distributed among those present, blessing Bernard of Quintavalle, his first companion, Elias, his vicar, and all the others in order. "I have done my part," he said next, "may Christ teach you to do yours." Then wishing to give a last token of detachment and to show he had no longer anything in common with the world, Francis removed his poor habit and lay down on the bare ground, covered with a borrowed cloth, rejoicing that he was able to keep faith with his Lady Poverty to the end. After a while he asked to have read to him the Passion according to St. John, and then in faltering tones he himself intoned Psalm cxli. At the concluding verse, "Bring my soul out of prison", Francis was led away from earth by "Sister Death", in whose praise he had shortly before added a new strophe to his "Canticle of the Sun". It was Saturday evening, 3 October, 1226, Francis being then in the forty-fifth

year of his age, and the twentieth from his perfect conversion to Christ.

The saint had, in his humility, it is said, expressed a wish to be buried on the Colle d' Inferno, a despoiled hill without Assisi, where criminals were executed. However this may be, his body was, on 4 October, borne in triumphant procession to the city, a halt being made at St. Damian's, that St. Clare and her companions might venerate the sacred stigmata now visible to all, and it was placed provisionally in the church of St. George (now within the enclosure of the monastery of St. Clare), where the saint had learned to read and had first preached. Many miracles are recorded to have taken place at his tomb. Francis was solemnly canonized at St. George's by Gregory IX, 16 July, 1228. On the day following the pope laid the first stone of the great double church of St. Francis, erected in honour of the new saint, and thither on 25 May, 1230, Francis's remains were secretly transferred by Brother Elias and buried far down under the high altar in the lower church. Here, after lying hidden for six centuries, like that of St. Clare's, Francis's coffin was found, 12 December, 1818, as a result of a toilsome search lasting fifty-two nights. This discovery of the saint's body is commemorated in the order by a special office on 12 December, and that of his translation by another on 25 May. His feast is kept throughout the Church on 4 October, and the impression of the stigmata on his body is celebrated on 17 September.

It has been said with pardonable warmth that Francis entered into glory in his lifetime, and that he is the one saint whom all succeeding generations have agreed in canonizing. Certain it is that those also who care little about the order he founded, and who have but scant sympathy with the Church to which he ever gave his devout allegiance, even those who know not Christianity to be Divine, find themselves, instinctively as it were, looking across the ages for guidance to the wonderful Umbrian Poverello, and invoking his name in grateful remembrance. This unique position Francis doubtless owes in no small measure to his singularly lovable and winsome personality. Few saints ever exhaled "the good odour of Christ" to such a degree as he. There was about Francis, moreover, a chivalry and a poetry which gave to his other-worldliness a quite romantic charm and beauty. Other saints have seemed entirely dead to the world around them, but Francis was ever thoroughly in touch with the spirit of the age. He delighted in the songs of Provence, rejoiced in the new-born freedom of his native city, and cherished what Dante calls the pleasant sound of his dear land. And this exquisite human element in Francis's character was the key to that far-reaching, all-embracing sympathy, which may be almost called his characteristic gift. In his heart, as an old chronicler puts it, the whole world found refuge, the poor, the sick and the fallen being the objects of his solicitude in a more special manner. Heedless as Francis ever was of the world's judgments in his own regard, it was always his constant care to respect the opinions of all and to wound the feelings of none. Wherefore he admonishes the friars to use only low and mean tables, so that "if a beggar were to come to sit down near them he might believe that he was but with his equals and need not blush on account of his poverty". One night, we are told, the friary was aroused by the cry "I am dying!". "Who are you", exclaimed Francis arising, "and why are you dying?" "I am dying of hunger", answered the voice of one who had been too prone to fasting. Whereupon Francis had a table laid out and sat down beside the famished friar, and lest the latter might be ashamed to eat alone, ordered all the other brethren to join in the repast. Francis's devotedness in consoling the afflicted made him so condescending that he shrank not from abiding with the lepers in their loathly

lazar-houses and from eating with them out of the same platter. But above all it is his dealings with the erring that reveal the truly Christian spirit of his charity. "Saintlier than any of the saints", writes Celano, "among sinners he was as one of themselves". Writing to a certain minister in the order, Francis says: "Should there be a brother anywhere in the world who has sinned, no matter how great soever his fault may be, let him not go away after he has once seen thy face without showing pity towards him; and if he seek not mercy, ask him if he does not desire it. And by this I will know if you love God and me." Again, to medieval notions of justice the evil-doer was beyond the law and there was no need to keep faith with him. But according to Francis, not only was justice due even to evil-doers, but justice must be preceded by courtesy as by a herald. Courtesy, indeed, in the saint's quaint concept, was the younger sister of charity and one of the qualities of God Himself, Who "of His courtesy", he declares, "gives His sun and His rain to the just and the unjust". This habit of courtesy Francis ever sought to enjoin on his



ST. FRANCIS PREACHING BEFORE HONORIUS IV  
Giotto, S. Francesco, Assisi

disciples. "Whoever may come to us", he writes, "whether a friend or a foe, a thief or a robber, let him be kindly received", and the feast which he spread for the starving brigands in the forest at Monte Casale sufficed to show that "as he taught so he wrought". The very animals found in Francis a tender friend and protector; thus we find him pleading with the people of Gubbio to feed the fierce wolf that had ravished their flocks, because through hunger "Brother Wolf" had done this wrong. And the early legends have left us many an idyllic picture of how beasts and birds alike susceptible to the charm of Francis's gentle ways, entered into loving companionship with him; how the hunted leveret sought to attract his notice; how the half-frozen bees crawled towards him in winter to be fed; how the wild falcon fluttered around him; how the nightingale sang with him in sweetest content in the ilex grove at the Carceri, and how his "little brethren the birds" listened so devoutly to his sermon by the roadside near Bevagna that Francis chided himself for not having thought of preaching to them before. Francis's love of nature also stands out in bold relief in the world he moved in. He delighted to commune with the wild flowers, the crystal spring, and the friendly fire, and to greet the sun as it rose upon the fair Umbrian vale. In this respect, indeed, St. Francis's "gift of sympathy" seems to have been wider even than St. Paul's, for we find no




evidence in the great Apostle of a love for nature or for animals.

Hardly less engaging than his boundless sense of fellow-feeling was Francis's downright sincerity and artless simplicity. "Dearly beloved," he once began a sermon following upon a severe illness, "I have to confess to God and you that during this Lent I have eaten cakes made with lard." And when the guardian insisted for the sake of warmth upon Francis having a fox skin sewn under his worn-out tunic, the saint consented only upon condition that another skin of the same size be sewn outside. For it was his singular study never to hide from men that which was known to God. "What a man is in the sight of God," he was wont to repeat, "so much he is and no more"—a saying which passed into the "Imitation", and has been often quoted. Another winning trait of Francis which inspires the deepest affection was his unswerving directness of purpose and unfaltering following after an ideal. "His dearest desire so long as he lived"; Celano tells us, "was ever to seek among wise and simple, perfect and imperfect, the means to walk in the way of truth." To Francis love was the truest of all truths; hence his deep sense of personal responsibility towards his fellows. The love of Christ and Him Crucified permeated the whole life and character of Francis, and he placed the chief hope of redemption and redress for a suffering humanity in the literal imitation of his Divine Master. The saint imitated the example of Christ as literally as it was in him to do so; barefoot, and in absolute poverty, he proclaimed the reign of love. This heroic imitation of Christ's poverty was perhaps the distinctive mark of Francis's vocation, and he was undoubtedly, as Bossuet expresses it, the most ardent, enthusiastic, and desperate lover of poverty the world has yet seen. After money Francis most detested discord and divisions. Peace, therefore, became his watchword, and the pathetic reconciliation he effected in his last days between the Bishop and Potestà of Assisi is but one instance out of many of his power to quell the storms of passion and restore tranquillity to hearts torn asunder by civil strife. The duty of a servant of God, Francis declared, was to lift up the hearts of men and move them to spiritual gladness. Hence it was not "from monastic stalls or with the careful irresponsibility of the enclosed student" that the saint and his followers addressed the people: "they dwelt among them and grappled with the evils of the system under which the people groaned". They worked in return for their fare, doing for the lowest the most menial labour, and speaking to the poorest words of hope such as the world had not heard for many a day. In this wise Francis bridged the chasm between an aristocratic clergy and the common people, and though he taught no new doctrine, he so far repopularized the old one given on the Mount that the Gospel took on a new life and called forth a new love.

Such in briefest outline are some of the salient features which render the figure of Francis one of such supreme attraction that all manner of men feel themselves drawn towards him, with a sense of personal attachment. Few, however, of those who feel the charm of Francis's personality may follow the saint to his lonely height of rapt communion with God. For, however engaging a "minstrel of the Lord", Francis was none the less a profound mystic in the truest sense of the word. The whole world was to him one luminous ladder, mounting upon the rungs of which he approached and beheld God. It is very misleading, however, to portray Francis as living "at a height where dogma ceases to exist", and still further from the truth to represent the trend of his teaching as one in which orthodoxy was made subservient to "humanitarianism". A very cursory inquiry into Francis's religious belief suffices to show that it embraced the entire Catholic dogma, nothing more or less. If then

the saint's sermons were on the whole moral rather than doctrinal, it was because he preached to meet the wants of his day, and those whom he addressed had not strayed from dogmatic truth; they were still "hearers", if not "doers", of the Word. For this reason Francis set aside all questions more theoretical than practical, and returned to the Gospel. Again, to see in Francis only the loving friend of all God's creatures, the joyous singer of nature, is to overlook altogether that aspect of his work which is the explanation of all the rest—its supernatural side. Few lives have been more wholly imbued with the supernatural, as even Renan admits. Nowhere, perhaps, can there be found a keener insight into the innermost world of spirit, yet so closely were the supernatural and the natural blended in Francis, that his very asceticism was often clothed in the guise of romance, as witness his wooing the Lady Poverty, in a sense that almost ceased to be figurative. For Francis's singularly vivid imagination was impregnate with the imagery of the *chansons de geste*, and owing to his markedly dramatic tendency, he delighted in suiting his action to his thought. So, too, the saint's native turn for the picturesque led him to unite religion and nature. He found in all created things, however trivial, some reflection of the Divine perfection, and he loved to admire in them the beauty, power, wisdom, and goodness of their Creator. And so it came to pass that he saw sermons even in stones, and good in everything. Moreover, Francis's simple, childlike nature fastened on the thought, that if all are from one Father then all are real kin. Hence his custom of claiming brotherhood with all manner of animate and inanimate objects. The personification, therefore, of the elements in the "Canticle of the Sun" is something more than a mere literary figure. Francis's love of creatures was not simply the offspring of a soft or sentimental disposition; it arose rather from that deep and abiding sense of the presence of God, which underlay all he said and did. Even so, Francis's habitual cheerfulness was not that of a careless nature, or of one untouched by sorrow. None witnessed Francis's hidden struggles, his long agonies of tears, or his secret wrestlings in prayer. And if we meet him making dumb-show of music, by playing a couple of sticks like a violin to give vent to his glee, we also find him heart-sore with foreboding at the dire dissensions in the order, which threatened to make shipwreck of his ideal. Nor were temptations or other weakening maladies of the soul wanting to the saint at any time. Francis's lightness had its source in that entire surrender of everything present and passing, in which he had found the interior liberty of the children of God; it drew its strength from his intimate union with Jesus in the Holy Communion. The mystery of the Holy Eucharist, being an extension of the Passion, held a preponderant place in the life of Francis, and he had nothing more at heart than all that concerned the cultus of the Blessed Sacrament. Hence we not only hear of Francis conjuring the clergy to show befitting respect for everything connected with the Sacrifice of the Mass, but we also see him sweeping out poor churches, questing sacred vessels for them, and providing them with altar-breads made by himself. So great, indeed, was Francis's reverence for the priesthood, because of its relation to the Adorable Sacrament, that in his humility he never dared to aspire to that dignity. Humility was, no doubt, the saint's ruling virtue. The idol of an enthusiastic popular devotion, he ever truly believed himself less than the least. Equally admirable was Francis's prompt and docile obedience to the voice of grace within him, even in the early days of his ill-defined ambition, when the spirit of interpretation failed him. Later on, the saint, with as clear a sense of his message as any prophet ever had, yielded ungrudging submission to what constituted ecclesiastical authority. No reformer, moreover, was ever



# ASSISI

CHURCH AND CONVENT OF SAN FRANCESCO

CATHEDRAL OF SAN RUFINO WITH VIEW OF TOWN



less aggressive than Francis. His apostolate embodied the very noblest spirit of reform; he strove to correct abuses by holding up an ideal. He stretched out his arms in yearning towards those who longed for the "better gifts". The others he left alone.

And thus, without strife or schism, God's Poor Little Man of Assisi became the means of renewing the youth of the Church and of initiating the most potent and popular religious movement since the beginnings of Christianity. No doubt this movement had its social as well as its religious side. That the Third Order of St. Francis went far towards re-Christianizing medieval society is a matter of history. However, Francis's foremost aim was a religious one. To rekindle the love of God in the world and reanimate the life of the spirit in the hearts of men—such was his mission. But because St. Francis sought first the Kingdom of God and His justice, many other things were added unto him. And his own exquisite Franciscan spirit, as it is called, passing out into the wide world, became an abiding source of inspiration. Perhaps it savours of exaggeration to say, as has been said, that "all the threads of civilization in the subsequent centuries seem to hark back to Francis", and that since his day "the character of the whole Roman Church is visibly Umbrian". It would be difficult, none the less, to overestimate the effect produced by Francis upon the mind of his time, or the quickening power he wielded on the generations which have succeeded him. To mention two aspects only of his all-pervading influence, Francis must surely be reckoned among those to whom the world of art and letters is deeply indebted. *Prose*, as Arnold observes, could not satisfy the saint's ardent soul, so he made poetry. He was, indeed, too little versed in

the laws of composition to advance far in that direction. But his was the first cry of a nascent poetry which found its highest expression in the "Divine Comedy"; wherefore Francis has been styled the precursor of Dante. What the saint did was to teach a people "accustomed to the artificial versification of courtly Latin and Provençal poets, the use of their native tongue in simple spontaneous hymns, which became even more popular with the *Laudi* and *Cantici* of his poet-follower Jacopone of Todi". In so far, moreover, as Francis's *representatio*, as Salimbene calls it, of the stable at Bethlehem is the first mystery-play we hear of in Italy, he is said to have borne a part in the revival of the drama. However this may be, if Francis's love of song called forth the beginnings of Italian verse, his life no less brought about the birth of Italian art. His story, says Ruskin, became a passionate tradition painted everywhere with delight. Full of colour, dramatic possibilities, and human interest, the early Franciscan legend afforded the most popular material for painters since the life of Christ. No sooner, indeed, did Francis's figure make an appearance in art than it became at

once a favourite subject, especially with the mystical Umbrian School. So true is this that it has been said we might by following his familiar figure "construct a history of Christian art, from the predecessors of Cimabue down to Guido Reni, Rubens, and Van Dyck".

Probably the oldest likeness of Francis that has come down to us is that preserved in the *Sacro Speco* at Subiaco. It is said that it was painted by a Benedictine monk during the saint's visit there, which may have been in 1218. The absence of the stigmata, halo, and title of saint in this fresco form its chief claim to be considered a contemporary picture; it is not, however, a real portrait in the modern sense of the word, and we are dependent for the traditional presentation of Francis rather on artists' ideals, like the Della Robbia statue at the Porziuncola, which is surely

the saint's *vera effigies*, as no Byzantine so-called portrait can ever be, and the graphic description of Francis given by Celano (*Vita Prima*, c. lxxxiii). Of less than middle height, we are told, and frail in form, Francis had a long yet cheerful face and soft but strong voice, small brilliant black eyes, dark brown hair, and a sparse beard. His person was in no way imposing, yet there was about the saint a delicacy, grace, and distinction which made him most attractive.

The literary materials for the history of St. Francis are more than usually copious and authentic. There are indeed few if any medieval lives more thoroughly documented. We have in the first place the saint's own writings. These are not voluminous and were never written with a view to setting forth his ideas systematically, yet they bear the stamp of his personality and are marked by the same unvarying features of his preaching. A few

leading thoughts taken "from the words of the Lord" seemed to him all sufficing, and these he repeats again and again, adapting them to the needs of the different persons whom he addresses. Short, simple, and informal, Francis's writings breathe the unstudied love of the Gospel and enforce the same practical morality, while they abound in allegories and personification and reveal an intimate interweaving of Biblical phraseology. Not all the saint's writings have come down to us, and not a few of these formerly attributed to him are now with greater likelihood ascribed to others. The extant and authentic *opuscula* of Francis comprise, besides the rule of the Friars Minor and some fragments of the other Seraphic legislation, several letters, including one addressed "to all the Christians who dwell in the whole world", a series of spiritual counsels addressed to his disciples, the "Laudes Creaturarum" or "Canticle of the Sun", and some lesser praises, an Office of the Passion compiled for his own use, and a few other orisons which show us Francis even as Celano saw him, "not so much a man's praying as prayer itself". In addition to the saint's writings the sources of the history of Francis include a



ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI  
Murillo, Palazzo Bianco, Genoa

number of early papal Bulls and some other diplomatic documents, as they are called, bearing upon his life and work. Then come the biographies properly so called. These include the lives written 1229-1247 by Thomas of Celano, one of Francis's followers; a joint narrative of his life compiled by Leo, Rufinus, and Angelus, intimate companions of the saint, in 1246; and the celebrated legend of St. Bonaventure, which appeared about 1263; besides a somewhat more polemic legend called the "Speculum Perfectionis", attributed to Brother Leo, the date of which is a matter of controversy. There are also several important thirteenth-century chronicles of the order, like those of Jordan, Eccleston, and Bernard of Besse, and not a few later works, such as the "Chronica XXIV. Generalium" and the "Liber de Conformitate", which are in some sort a continuation of them. It is upon these works that all the later biographies of Francis's life are based.

Recent years have witnessed a truly remarkable upgrowth of interest in the life and work of St. Francis, more especially among non-Catholics, and Assisi has become in consequence the goal of a new race of pilgrims. This interest, for the most part literary and academic, is centred mainly in the study of the primitive documents relating to the saint's history and the beginnings of the Franciscan Order. Although inaugurated some years earlier, this movement received its greatest impulse from the publication in 1894 of Paul Sabatier's "Vie de S. François", a work which was almost simultaneously crowned by the French Academy and placed upon the Index. In spite of the author's entire lack of sympathy with the saint's religious standpoint, his biography of Francis bespeaks vast erudition, deep research, and rare critical insight, and it has opened up a new era in the study of Franciscan sources. To further this study an International Society of Franciscan Studies was founded at Assisi in 1902, the aim of which is to collect a complete library of works on Franciscan history and to compile a catalogue of scattered Franciscan manuscripts; several periodicals, devoted to Franciscan documents and discussions exclusively, have moreover been established in different countries. Although a large literature has grown up around the figure of the *Poverello* within a short time, nothing new of essential value has been added to what was already known of the saint. The energetic research work of recent years has resulted in the recovery of several important early texts, and has called forth many really fine critical studies dealing with the sources, but the most welcome feature of the modern interest in Franciscan origins has been the careful re-editing and translating of Francis's own writings and of nearly all the contemporary manuscript authorities bearing on his life. Not a few of the controverted questions connected therewith are of considerable import, even to those not especially students of the Franciscan legend, but they could not be made intelligible within the limits of the present article. It must suffice, moreover, to indicate only some of the chief works on the life of St. Francis.

The writings of St. Francis have been published in "Opuscula S. P. Francisci Assisiensis" (Quaracchi, 1904); Bohmer, "Analecten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi" (Tubingen, 1904); U. d'Alençon, "Les Opuscles de S. François d'Assise" (Paris, 1905); Robinson, "The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi" (Philadelphia, 1906).

The text of the different rules is given in *Seraphicæ Legislationis Textus originales* (Quaracchi, 1897); see also CARMICHAEL, *The Origin of the Rule of St. Francis in Dublin Review*, CXXXIV (1904), 357-85. The early Bulls are found in *Bullar Franciscanum*, ed. SBARALEA, I (Rome, 1759), passim. For the early legends or lives of St. Francis: *S. Francisci Assisi vita et miracula*, etc., auctore Fr. Thoma de Celano, ed. E. d'ALENÇON (Rome, 1906); tr. FERRERS-HOWELL, *The Lives of St. Francis by Thos. of Celano* (London, 1908); *Trium Sociorum S. Francisci Legenda*, ed. FALOCI (Foligno, 1898); SALTER, *The Legend of St. Francis by the Three Companions* (London, 1902); St. BONAVENTURE, *Legenda Duæ de Vitâ S. Francisci* (Quaracchi,

1898); tr. SALTER, *The Life of St. Francis by St. Bonaventure* (London, 1904); *Speculum Perfectionis*, ed. SABATIER (Paris, 1898); tr. EVANS, *The Mirror of Perfection* (London, 1898); and DE LA WARR (London, 1902). For the contemporary chronicles see: *Chronica fr. Jordani*, ed. BOHMER (Paris, 1908); ECCLESTON, *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam in Analacta Franciscana*, I (Quaracchi, 1885), 217-57; tr. CUTHBERT, *The Friars and How They Came to England* (London, 1903); BESSE, *Liber de Laudibus*, ed. FELDER (Rome and Quaracchi, 1897); *Actus B. Francisci et Sociorum ejus*, ed. SABATIER (Paris, 1902); see also *Chron. XXIV. Generalium in Analact. Franc.*, III (Quaracchi, 1897), 1-574; BARTH. PISANUS, *De Conformitate vitæ B. P. Francisci ad vitam D. N. Jesu Christi in Anal. Franc.*, IV (Quaracchi, 1906); WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, I-II (Rome, 1731-1732), passim; IDEM, *Scriptores Ord. Minor.*, ed. NARDECCHIA (Rome, 1906), 77-78; SUYSKENS in *Acta SS.*, II, Oct., *Comm. Prop.*, 545 sqq.

Modern biographies. (1) By Catholics. CHALIPPE, *Vie de S. François* (Paris, 1728); tr. ORATORIAN (New York, 1899); PAPINI, *Storia di S. Francesco* (Foligno, 1825-27); CHAVIN, *Vita de S. François* (Paris, 1841). PANFILO, *Storia Compendiosa di S. Francesco* (Rome, 1874-76); Eng. adaptation by CUSACK, *St. Francis and the Franciscans* (New York, 1867). LE MONNIER, *Histoire de S. François* (Paris, 1889); tr. by a TERTIARY (London, 1894); CHRISTEN, *Leben des heiligen Franciscus* (Innsbruck, 1899); de CHÉRANCE, *S. François* (7th ed., Paris, 1900); tr. O'CONNOR (3rd ed., London, 1901); BAZAN, *S. Francesco de Assis* (new ed., Madrid, 1903). TARDUCCI, *Vita di S. Francesco* (Mantua, 1904); SCHNÜRRER, *Franz von Assisi* (Munich, 1905); JØRGENSEN, *Den hellige Frans af Assisi* (Copenhagen, 1907). By Non-Catholics: VOGT, *Der hl. Franz von Assisi* (Tubingen, 1840); HASE, *Franz von Assisi* (Leipzig, 1858; new ed., 1892); OLIPHANT, *Francis of Assisi* (London, 1871); SABATIER, *Vie de S. François* (Paris, 1894); tr. HOUGHTON (New York, 1894); KNOX-LITTLE, *St. Francis of Assisi* (London, 1897; new ed., 1904); STODDART, *Francis of Assisi* (London, 1903). What may be called the temperament of the early Franciscan movement is reflected in the *Sacrum Commmercium B. Francisci cum Dominâ Paupertate*, ed. E. d'ALENÇON (Rome, 1900); tr. CARMICHAEL, *The Lady Poverty* (London, 1901); and in the *Fioretti di S. Francesco*. The best Italian version of the latter is that of CESARE (Verona, 1822), which has been often reprinted; Latin text ed. SABATIER, *Florum S. Francisci* (Paris, 1902); there are several English translations of the *Fioretti*, e. g. *The Little Flower of St. Francis*, ed. ARNOLD (London, 1908). For the influence of St. Francis on early Italian poetry: OZANAM, *Les Poètes Franciscains en Italie* (6th ed., Paris, 1882), though some of the statements it contains may now need revision. THODE's, *Franz von Assisi und die Anfänge der Kunst der Renaissance in Italien* (new ed., Berlin, 1905) may be regarded, in spite of its defects from a theological standpoint, as an authority as to Francis's artistic influence. See also SALTER, *Franciscan Legends in Italian Art* (London, 1905), and WENDELKE, *On the Authentic Portraiture of St. Francis* (London, 1897). On the topography of S. Francis's life: GÖFF, *Assisi of St. Francis* (London, 1908); CAVANNA, *L'Umbria Serafica illustrata parallela alla vita di S. Francesco* (Assisi, 1909). See also DUFF GORDON, *The Story of Assisi* (London, 1900), c. ii and passim; de SELINCOURT, *Homes of the First Franciscans* (London, 1905); JØRGENSEN, *Pilgrim Walks in Franciscan Italy* (London, 1908). The chronology of St. Francis's life is dealt with by PATREM, *Appunti critici sulla Cronologia della vita di S. Francesco in Miscell. Franciscana* (Foligno, 1902), I, fasc. III; FISHER, *Der heilige Franziskus während der Jahre 1219-1221* (Fribourg, 1907); ROBINSON, *Chronological Difficulties in the Life of S. Francis in Archivum Francisc. Histor.* (Quaracchi, 1908), fasc. I, 23 sqq. For social aspect of Francis's life: DUBOIS, *St. Francis of Assisi Social Reformer* (New York, 1905); also CUTHBERT, *St. Francis and Modern Society in Cath. World* (June, 1908), 299-314.

On the sources of the history of St. Francis, the recent research movement, and its results: LITTLE, *The Sources of the History of St. Francis in Eng. Hist. Rev.* (Oct., 1902), 643-677; *Franciscan Literature in Edinburgh Rev.* (Jan., 1904), 150 sqq.; DE KERVAIL, *Les Sources de l'Histoire de S. François in Bulletin Critique* (Florence, 1905), three articles; FIERENS, *La questione Franciscana in Rev. d'Hist. Ecclési.* (15 Jan., 1907), sqq. For an admirable up-to-date biographical sketch of Francis see GRATIEN, *S. François d'Assise in Etudes Franciscaines* (Paris, Oct., 1907, 359-482). A synopsis of the principal books dealing with the life and work of Francis is given by ROBINSON, *A Short Introduction to Franciscan Literature* (New York, 1907). Further bibliographical references of St. Francis are to be found in CHEVALIER, *Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age* (new ed., Paris, 1905), I, 1560-1571; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, 353; and under articles, FRANCIS, RULE OF SAINT; FRANCISCANS; ASSISI; PORTUNCULA; STIGMATA; etc.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

**Francis of Fabriano**, BLESSED, priest of the Order of Friars Minor; b. 2 Sept., 1251; d. 22 April, 1322. His birth and childhood were remarkable for evident signs of future sanctity. He was also gifted with rare talents. Having successfully completed the study of humanities and of philosophy, he asked for admission at a neighbouring Franciscan convent, in 1267. Under the guidance of able masters he made rapid progress in religious perfection. Subsequently he applied him-




self to the study of theology, and devoted the remainder of his life to missionary labours in his native town and vicinity. As missionary Blessed Francis has become a shining example to the preachers of the Seraphic Order. He was a man of prayer and untiring study. In accordance with the words of the rule, "Ut sint examinata et casta eorum eloquia", he was deeply convinced that the friars must announce to the faithful only well-grounded and authentic doctrine, in unambiguous and carefully sifted language. Ever mindful of this principle, Francis logically took a further step which has signalized him as a far-sighted and truly progressive member of his order. As a consequence of the extensive proportions theological studies had assumed since the time of St. Francis, the humble collections of biblical and patristic works, which were found in the early Franciscan communities, no longer met the demands of the student and preacher. Hence, Francis, heedless of any disapproving voice, promptly purchased with his father's money a handsome library, the first on an extended scale established in the order. He loved to call it the "best workshop in the convent" and its catalogue, mentioned by Wadding, contains numerous works of the Fathers, the masters of theology, biblical commentators, philosophers, mathematicians, and preachers, which shows that Francis was indeed, in this respect, quite abreast of his time. No wonder, then, that we find all his biographers in accord with Mark of Lisbon, who styles him a "most learned man and renowned preacher". Of the writings of Francis Venimbeni little has been published. His "*Chronica Marchia et Fabriani*", his "*De veritate et excellentia Indulgentia S. Mariae de Portiuncula*", and the "*Opusculum de serie et gestis Ministrorum Generalium*", all three probably forming one extensive chronicle, have unfortunately disappeared, save a few precious fragments bearing on the most salient questions of early Franciscan history. Besides several treatises of a philosophical, ascetical, and didactic character, he wrote an "*Ars Prædicantium*", numerous "Sermons", and a beautiful elegy on the death of St. Bonaventure. Despite his literary pursuits and manifold missionary occupations Francis found ample time for ascetical practices and works of an all-embracing charity. God testified to the sanctity of His servant by many signs and miracles. His cult was approved by Pius VI in 1775.

The biography of Blessed Francis was written by his nephew, DOMINIC FESSI, and other contemporary writers. WADDING has collected and utilized their accounts for his *Annals*. PULIGNANI, *Miscell. Francesc.*, X, 69 sq., enumerates the more recent biographers of F., and recommends especially two books by LUIGI TASSO: *Discorso laudatorio del B. Francesco Venimbeni da Fabriano* (Fabriano, 1881), and *Vita del B. Francesco da Fabriano dell'ordine dei Minori* (Fabriano, 1893). The latter contains a brief treatise by Francis, and his elegy on St. Bonaventure. Extracts from his *Chronicle* have been edited by PULIGNANI, *op. cit.*, 69-72.—*Cf.* DE CIART, *L'Auréole Séraph.*, tr. *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1882—), II, 171-175; WADDING, *Annales* (Rome, 1731—), III, 244, 245, IV, 276-278, 400, VI, 377-385;

IDEM, *Scriptores* (Rome, 1650), 115; SHARALEA, *Supplementum* (Rome, 1806), 252; *Acta SS.* (Venice, 1734—), April, III, 88-94. THOMAS PLASSMANN.

**Francis of Paula**, SAINT, founder of the Order of Minims; b. in 1416, at Paula, in Calabria, Italy; d. 2 April, 1507, at Plessis, France. His parents were remarkable for the holiness of their lives. Remaining childless for some years after their marriage they had recourse to prayer, especially commending themselves to the intercession of St. Francis of Assisi. Three children were eventually born to them, the eldest of whom was Francis. When still in the cradle he suffered from a swelling which endangered the sight of one of his eyes. His parents again had recourse to St. Francis of Assisi, and made a vow that their son should pass an entire year in the "little habit" of St.



ST. FRANCIS OF PAULA  
Murillo, Museo del Prado, Madrid

Francis in one of the convents of his order, a not uncommon practice in the Middle Ages. The child was immediately cured. From his early years Francis showed signs of extraordinary sanctity, and at the age of thirteen, being admonished by a vision of a Franciscan friar, he entered a convent of the Franciscan Order in order to fulfil the vow made by his parents. Here he gave great edification by his love of prayer and mortification, his profound humility, and his prompt obedience. At the completion of the year he went with his parents on a pilgrimage to Assisi, Rome, and other places of devotion. Returning to Paula he selected a retired spot on his father's estate, and there lived in solitude; but later on he found a more retired dwelling in a cave on the sea coast. Here he remained alone for about six years giving himself to prayer and mortification.

In 1435 two companions joined him in his retreat, and to accommodate them Francis caused three cells and a chapel to be built: in this way the new order was begun. The number of his disciples gradually increased, and about 1454, with the permission of Pyrrhus, Archbishop of Cosenza, Francis built a large monastery and church. The building of this monastery was the occasion of a great outburst of enthusiasm and devotion on the part of the people towards Francis: even the nobles carried stones and joined in the work. Their devotion was increased by the many miracles which the saint wrought in answer to their prayers. The rule of life adopted by Francis and his religious was one of extraordinary severity. They observed perpetual abstinence and lived in great poverty, but the distinguishing mark of the order was humility. They were to seek to live unknown and hidden from the world. To express this character which he would have his disciples cultivate, Francis eventually obtained from the Holy See that they should be styled Minims, the least of all religious. In 1474 Sixtus IV gave him permission to write a rule for his community, and to assume the title of Hermits of St. Francis: this rule was formally approved by Alexander VI, who, however, changed their title into that of Minims. After the approbation of the order,

Francis founded several new monasteries in Calabria and Sicily. He also established convents of nuns, and a third order for people living in the world, after the example of St. Francis of Assisi.

He had an extraordinary gift of prophecy: thus he foretold the capture of Otranto by the Turks in 1480, and its subsequent recovery by the King of Naples. Also he was gifted with discernment of consciences. He was no respecter of persons of whatever rank or position. He rebuked the King of Naples for his ill-doing and in consequence suffered much persecution. When Louis XI was in his last illness he sent an embassy to Calabria to beg the saint to visit him. Francis refused to come nor could he be prevailed upon until the pope ordered him to go. He then went to the king at Plessis-les-Tours, and was with him at his death. Charles VIII, Louis's successor, much admired the saint and during his reign kept him near the court and frequently consulted him. This king built a monastery for Minims at Plessis and another at Rome on the Pincian Hill. The regard in which Charles VIII held the saint was shared by Louis XII, who succeeded to the throne in 1498. Francis was now anxious to return to Italy, but the king would not permit him, not wishing to lose his counsels and direction. The last three months of his life he spent in entire solitude, preparing for death. On Maundy Thursday he gathered his community around him and exhorted them especially to have mutual charity amongst themselves and to maintain the rigour of their life and in particular perpetual abstinence. The next day, Good Friday, he again called them together and gave them his last instructions and appointed a vicar-general. He then received the last sacraments and asked to have the Passion according to St. John read out to him, and whilst this was being read, his soul passed away. Leo X canonized him in 1519. In 1562 the Huguenots broke open his tomb and found his body incorrupt. They dragged it forth and burnt it, but some of the bones were preserved by the Catholics and enshrined in various churches of his order. The Order of Minims does not seem at any time to have been very extensive, but they had houses in many countries. The definitive rule was approved in 1506 by Julius II, who also approved a rule for the nuns of the order. The feast of St. Francis of Paula is kept by the universal Church on 2 April, the day on which he died.

*Acta SS.*, 2 April; Lives by ROLLAND (Paris, 1874), FERRANTE (Monza, 1881), PRADIER (Paris, 1903). See BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 2 April; GIRY, *Vies des saints* (Paris, 1885), s. v. FATHER CUTHBERT.

**Francis of Vittoria**, Spanish theologian; b. about 1480, at Vittoria, province of Avila, in Old Castile; d. 12 August, 1546. While still young, he moved with his parents from their native city to Burgos, at that time the ordinary sojourn of the sovereigns of Castile. He received his early education in the schools of that place, and, on the completion of his academic studies, entered the Order of St. Dominic. While he devoted his energies to the study of the sacred sciences, the mastery of which made him an ornament to the Church, to his order, and to the universities of Spain, he was assiduous in the practice of piety. After his religious profession he was sent to the convent of St. James in Paris, then the chief house of studies of the order and affiliated with the University of Paris, where he made the best use of the advantages held out to him for the prosecution of his philosophical and theological studies. In 1516, he was appointed to teach in this convent, and it was here, in all probability, that he had for his pupil Dominic de Soto. In 1522, he returned to Spain and taught theology in the Dominican College of St. Gregory at Valladolid till 1524, when he was appointed to the principal chair of theology in the University of Salamanca which he

held till 1544. The influence which Francis exerted directly in the University of Salamanca and indirectly in the universities of Alcalá, Coimbra, Evora, Seville, Valladolid, and others, forms an interesting chapter in the history of theology. More than any other theologian of his time, he ministered to the actual intellectual needs of the Church. Scholasticism had lost its former prestige, and was passing through the most critical period in its history. The times had changed, and it required a master to adapt speculative thought to the new conditions. The revival of theological activity in the Catholic universities of this period, consequent upon the doctrines of the reformers, and the development of theological speculation inspired Francis to inaugurate a movement for the restoration of scholastic philosophy, and to give to theological science a purer diction and an improved literary form. With foresight and ability he devoted all his energies to the undertaking, and his success is attested by the many excellent theological works that were produced in Spain during the sixteenth century. Among his disciples were Melchior Cano, Bartholomew Medina, Dominic de Soto, and Martin de Ledesma, by whose efforts and that of the great Carmelite teachers a new zest was given to the study of St. Thomas, and by whose aid Francis was able to extend his influence to the other universities of Spain. He is justly styled the father of the Salmantacensis School, and especially of the new Scholasticism. His style, simple and un-rhetorical, is the more noteworthy for having attained its simplicity in the golden age of Humanism. He left a large number of valuable manuscripts, but his only published work is the "*Relectiones XII Theologicæ in duo libros distinctæ*" (Antwerp, 1604). The most important of his unpublished works is his "*Commentaria in universam Summam S. Thomæ*".

QUÉTIE AND ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 128; TROUON, *Hist. des hommes illust.*, IV, 55-65; HURTER, *Nomencl.*, ANTONIO, *Bibl. hisp. Nova*, I, 496; EHRLICH in *Katholik* (1884), II, 505 sqq., 518 sqq., where a detailed description of his unpublished works is given.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

**Francis Regis Clet**, BLESSED, a Lazarist missionary in China; b. 1748, martyred, 18 Feb., 1820. His father was a merchant of Grenoble in France, his mother's name was Claudine Bourquy. He was the tenth of fifteen children. The family was deeply religious, several members of it having consecrated themselves to God. Francis attended the Jesuit college at Grenoble and afterwards entered the diocesan seminary which was in charge of the Oratorians. His extant letters in French and Latin show a cultivated mind. On 6 Mar., 1769, he entered the novitiate of the Congregation of the Mission or Lazarists, at Lyons. There he made his vows in 1771 and was ordained priest in 1773. The same year he went as professor of moral theology to the diocesan seminary at Annecy. His zeal and learning produced excellent fruits. In the sixteenth year of his stay at Annecy he was sent to Paris for the election of a superior general of the congregation. He did not return, for the new superior general appointed him director of the internal seminary, at the mother house in Paris. Scarcely a year had elapsed when the sacking of St. Lazare, on the eve of the taking of the Bastille, scattered his flock. Many of the young men returned to the dismantled house the next day and gathered around their director, but the fury of the revolution prevented their remaining.

It was at this period that his ambition to become a missionary was manifested. His superior yielded to his desires, and he was sent to China in 1791. The first post assigned him was in Kiang-Si, one of the most destitute Christian settlements in China. He had great difficulty in acquiring the language, which he never fully mastered. The next year he was sent to Hou-Kouang where he laboured for 27 years. Death soon deprived him of his two brother-priests,

and for several years he ministered alone to a vast district. In spite of difficulties, he succeeded in keeping up the fervour of the Christians and bringing many pagans into the fold. In July, 1812, his church and school-house were destroyed, but he escaped. In 1818 the persecution broke out again with renewed fury. After several remarkable escapes from the searching parties, he was betrayed by a Chinese Christian, for the 1500 dollars set on his head, and was taken, 16 June, 1819. He had to undergo the greatest cruelty for five weeks, but not a word of complaint escaped him. Being transferred to another prison, he was treated more humanely and found there Father Chen, a Chinese Lazarist, from whom he could receive the sacraments. On 1 Jan., 1820, however, sentence of death was passed on him. The execution took place, 18 Feb., 1820. He was tied to a stake erected like a cross, and was strangled to death, the rope having been relaxed twice to give him a three-fold death agony. He was beatified by Pope Leo XIII, 27 May, 1900, and his feast day is on 17 February. His remains rest in the chapel of the mother house of the Lazarists, in Paris. His holy life and death were the inspiration of Blessed John Gabriel Perboyre, also a Lazarist, who was martyred in China in 1840.

*Lives* by VAURIS (Paris, 1853); *DEMIUVI* (2 vols., Paris, 1893); *RONGEST* (Paris, 1900); *DE MONGESTY* (Paris, 1906).

B. RANDOLPH.

**Francis Solanus**, SAINT, South American missionary of the Order of Friars Minor; b. at Montilla, in the Diocese of Cordova, Spain, 10 March, 1549; d. at Lima, Peru, 14 July, 1610. His parents, Matthew Sanchez Solanus and Anna Ximenes, were distinguished no less for their noble birth than for their virtue and piety. When Francis was twenty years old, he was received into the Franciscan Order at Montilla, and after his ordination, seven years later, he was sent by his superiors to the convent of Arifazza as master of novices. In 1589 he sailed from Spain for the New World, and having landed at Panama, crossed the isthmus and embarked on a vessel that was to convey him to Peru. His missionary labours in South America extended over a period of twenty years during which time he spared no fatigue, shrank from no sacrifice however great, and feared no danger that stood in the way of evangelizing the vast and savage regions of Tucuman and Paraguay. So successful, indeed, was his apostolate that he has been aptly styled the Thaumaturgus of the New World. Notwithstanding the number and difficulty of the dialects spoken by the Indians, he learned them all in a very short time, and it is said that he often addressed tribes of different tongues in one language and was understood by them all. Besides being engaged in active missionary work, he filled the office of custos of the convents of his order in Tucuman and Paraguay, and later was elected guardian of the Franciscan convent in Lima, Peru. In 1610, while preaching at Truxillo he foretold the calamities that were to befall that city, which was destroyed by an earthquake eight years later, most of the inhabitants perishing in the ruins. The death of St. Francis, which he himself had foretold, was the cause of general grief throughout Peru. In his funeral sermon at the burial of the saint, Father Sebastiani, S.J., said that "Divine Providence had chosen Father Francis Solanus to be the hope and edification of all Peru, the example and glory of Lima and the splendour of the Seraphic Order". St. Francis was beatified by Clement X, in 1675, and canonized by Benedict XIII, in 1726. His feast is kept throughout the Franciscan Order on the twenty-fourth of July.

*Life of St. Francis Solanus* (New York, 1888); *Leo, Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1886), II, 509-522; *Acta SS.*, July, V, 847-910.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

**Francis Xavier**, SAINT, b. in the Castle of Xavier near Sanguesa, in Navarre, 7 April, 1506; d. on the

Island of Sancian near the coast of China, 2 December, 1552. In 1525, having completed a preliminary course of studies in his own country, Francis Xavier went to Paris, where he entered the Collège de Sainte-Barbe. Here he met the Savoyard, Pierre Favre, and a warm personal friendship sprang up between them. It was at this same college that St. Ignatius Loyola, who was already planning the foundation of the Society of Jesus, resided for a time as a guest in 1529. He soon won the confidence of the two young men; first Favre and later Xavier offered themselves as his companions, and were the first to associate themselves with him in the formation of the Society. Four others, Lainez, Salmerón, Rodríguez, and Bobadilla, having joined them, the seven made the famous vow of Montmartre, 15 Aug., 1534.

After completing his studies in Paris and filling the post of teacher there for some time, Xavier left the city with his companions 15 November, 1536, and turned his steps to Venice, where he displayed zeal and charity in attending the sick in the hospitals. On 24 June, 1537, he received Holy orders with St. Ignatius. The following year he went to Rome, and after doing apostolic work there for some months, during the spring of 1539 he took part in the conferences which St. Ignatius held with his companions to prepare for the definitive foundation of the Society of Jesus. The order was approved verbally 3 September, and before the written approbation was secured, which was not until a year later, Xavier was appointed, at the earnest solicitation of John III, King of Portugal, to evangelize the people of the East Indies. He left Rome 16 March, 1540, and reached Lisbon about June. Here he remained nine months, giving many admirable examples of apostolic zeal.

On 7 April, 1541, he embarked in a sailing vessel for India, and after a tedious and dangerous voyage landed at Goa, 6 May, 1542. The first five months he spent in preaching and ministering to the sick in the hospitals. He would go through the streets ringing a little bell and inviting the children to hear the word of God. When he had gathered a number, he would take them to a certain church and would there explain the catechism to them. About October, 1542, he started for the pearl fisheries of the extreme southern coast of the peninsula, desirous of restoring Christianity which, although introduced years before, had almost disappeared on account of the lack of priests. He devoted almost three years to the work of preaching to the people of Western India, converting many, and reaching in his journeys even the Island of Ceylon. Many were the difficulties and hardships which Xavier had to encounter at this time, sometimes on account of the cruel persecutions which some of the petty kings of the country carried on against the neophytes, and again because the Portuguese soldiers, far from seconding the work of the saint, retarded it by their bad example and vicious habits.

In the spring of 1545 Xavier started for Malacca. He laboured there for the last three months of that year, and although he reaped an abundant spiritual harvest, he was not able to root out certain abuses, and was conscious that many sinners had resisted his efforts to bring them back to God. About January, 1546, Xavier left Malacca and went to the Molucca Islands, where the Portuguese had some settlements, and for a year and a half he preached the Gospel to the inhabitants of Amboyna, Ternate, Baranura, and other lesser islands which it has been difficult to identify. It is claimed by some that during this expedition he landed on the Island of Mindanao, and for this reason St. Francis Xavier has been called the first Apostle of the Philippines. But although this statement is made by some writers of the seventeenth century, and in the Bull of canonization issued in 1623, it is said that he preached the Gospel in Mindanao, up to the present time it has not been proved absolutely

that St. Francis Xavier ever landed in the Philippines.

By July, 1547, he was again in Malacca. Here he met a Japanese called Anger (Han-Sir), from whom he obtained much information about Japan. His zeal was at once aroused by the idea of introducing Christianity into Japan, but for the time being the affairs of the Society demanded his presence at Goa, whither he went, taking Anger with him. During the six years that Xavier had been working among the infidels, other Jesuit missionaries had arrived at Goa, sent from Europe by St. Ignatius; moreover some who had been born in the country had been received into the Society. In 1548 Xavier sent these missionaries to the principal centres of India, where he had established missions, so that the work might be preserved and continued. He also established a novitiate and house of studies, and having received into the Society Father Cosme de Torres, a Spanish priest whom he had met in the Moluccas, he started with him and Brother Juan Fernández for Japan towards the end of June, 1549. The Japanese Anger, who had been baptized at Goa and given the name of Pablo de Santa Fé, accompanied them.

They landed at the city of Kagoshima in Japan, 15 Aug., 1549. The entire first year was devoted to learning the Japanese language and translating into Japanese, with the help of Pablo de Santa Fé, the principal articles of faith and short treatises which were to be employed in preaching and catechizing. When he was able to express himself, Xavier began preaching and made some converts, but these aroused the ill will of the bonzes, who had him banished from the city. Leaving Kagoshima about August, 1550, he penetrated to the centre of Japan, and preached the Gospel in some of the cities of southern Japan. Towards the end of that year he reached Meaco, then the principal city of Japan, but he was unable to make any headway here because of the dissensions then rending the country. He retraced his steps to the centre of Japan, and during 1551 preached in some important cities, forming the nucleus of several Christian communities, which in time increased with extraordinary rapidity.

After working about two years and a half in Japan he left this mission in charge of Father Cosme de Torres and Brother Juan Fernández, and returned to Goa, arriving there at the beginning of 1552. Here domestic troubles awaited him. Certain disagreements between the superior, who had been left in charge of the missions, and the rector of the college, had to be adjusted. This, however, being arranged, Xavier turned his thoughts to China, and began to plan an expedition there. During his stay in Japan he had heard much of the Celestial Empire, and though he probably had not formed a proper estimate of its extent and greatness, he nevertheless understood how wide a field it afforded for the spread of the light of the Gospel. With the help of friends he arranged a commission or embassy to the Sovereign of China, obtained from the Viceroy of India the appointment of ambassador, and in April, 1552, he left Goa. At Malacca the party encountered difficulties because the influential Portuguese disapproved of the expedition, but Xavier knew how to overcome this opposition, and in the autumn he arrived in a Portuguese vessel at the small island of Sancian near the coast of China. While planning the best means for reaching the mainland, he was taken ill, and as the movement of the vessel seemed to aggravate his condition, he was removed to the land, where a rude hut had been built to shelter him. In these wretched surroundings he breathed his last.

It is truly a matter of wonder that one man in the short space of ten years (6 May, 1542—2 Dec., 1552) could have visited so many countries, traversed so many seas, preached the Gospel to so many nations, and converted so many infidels. The incomparable

apostolic zeal which animated him, and the stupendous miracles which God wrought through him, explain this marvel, which has no equal elsewhere. The list of the principal miracles may be found in the Bull of canonization. St. Francis Xavier is considered the greatest missionary since the time of the Apostles, and the zeal he displayed, the wonderful miracles he performed, and the great number of souls he brought to the light of the true Faith, entitle him to this distinction. He was canonized with St. Ignatius in 1622, although on account of the death of Gregory XV, the Bull of canonization was not published until the following year.

The body of the saint is still enshrined at Goa in the church which formerly belonged to the Society. In 1614 by order of Claudius Acquaviva, General of the Society of Jesus, the right arm was severed at the elbow and conveyed to Rome, where the present altar was erected to receive it in the church of the Gesù.

*Monumenta Xaveriana ex autographis vel ex antiquioribus exemplis collecta* (Madrid, 1899-1900), a collection of all the letters of the saint and his earliest biography, by VALIGNANO, hitherto unpublished; POLANCO, *Vita Ignatii Loiola et rerum Societatis Jesu historia* (Madrid, 1894); CROS, *Saint François-Xavier de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Toulouse, 1894); ASTRÁIN, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España* (Madrid, 1902); COLERIDGE, *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier* (London, 1902).

ANTONIO ASTRÁIN.

**Franck, KASPAR**, theologian and controversialist; b. at Ortrand, Saxony, 2 Nov., 1543; d. at Ingolstadt, 12 March, 1584. His parents were Lutherans and his early religious instruction filled him with enthusiasm for the new doctrine. His earnest desire for the conversion of his country led him to choose the ministry as his field of labour, and such was his zeal and success as a preacher that Count Ladislaus of Haag, who had but recently introduced the reformed faith into his province, invited him to his court. The premature death, however, of Ladislaus prevented Franck from carrying out the proposed plans of reform. Duke Albert, the successor of Ladislaus, resolved to restore the Catholic religion, and to that end called to his assistance the famous convert and preacher, Martin Eisengrein. His intercourse with Eisengrein soon led Franck to see the errors of the new creed. In 1566, he matriculated at the University of Ingolstadt, devoted himself to the study of the Fathers and the early Christian Church, and on 25 Jan., 1568, made a formal profession of the Catholic Faith. Albert, recognizing him as a man of great usefulness in reclaiming to the Faith many strayed souls, obtained from Pius V a dispensation to have him ordained a priest. Before beginning his missionary labours, he published a work setting forth the reasons and justification of his return to the ancient faith; "Klare vnd Gründliche vrsachen Warumb M. Caspar Franck Von der Sect, zu der allgemainen Christlichen vnd Römischen Kirchen getreten" (Ingolstadt, 1568); the same in Latin, "Dilucida expositio justissimarum causarum", etc. His apostolic labours in Haag and Kraiburg were crowned with success. In 1572, he was again in the University of Ingolstadt, pursuing his theological studies, and the following year he was appointed its rector, which office he again held later for several consecutive terms. On the occasion of the General Jubilee in 1575, he set out for Rome, won at Siena the doctorate in theology, and shortly afterwards Gregory XIII conferred on him the title of Prothonotary Apostolic and Comes Lateranensis. His vast erudition, zeal, and power of penetration place him on the long list of learned men who directed the destiny of the University of Ingolstadt during the sixteenth century. His polemical writings manifest earnest and painstaking labour and an intimate familiarity with patristic literature. Among his more important works may be mentioned: "Brevis et Pia Institutio de puro verbo Dei et clara S. Evangelii luce" (Ingolstadt, 1571); "Tractatus de ordinaria,

legitima et apostolica vocatione sacerdotum et concionatorum", etc. (Ingolstadt, 1571); "Casparis Franci de externo, visibili et hierarchico, Ecclesiae Catholicae sacerdotio", etc. (Cologne, 1575); "Catalogus haereticorum" (Ingolstadt, 1576); "Explicatio totius historiae Passionis et Mortis Domini", etc. (Ingolstadt, 1572); "Fundamentum Catholicae Fidei contra Schmidelin" (Ingolstadt, 1578).

RASS, *Die Convertiten seit der Reformation* (1866), II, 15-84; HURTER, *Nomenclator*; MEYERX, *Annales Ingolstadt*. (Ingolstadt, 1782), I, 312 and II, 90 sqq.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

**Franco, ANTIPOPE.** See BONIFACE VII, ANTIPOPE.

**Franco, GIOVANNI BATTISTA** (frequently known as IL SEMOLEI), Italian historical painter and etcher, b. at Udine in 1510; d. at Venice in 1580. He studied in Rome, giving special attention to the works of Michelangelo, and taking great interest in designing allegorical decorations on a large scale. He worked with Vasari in carrying out some decorative work in a palace for Ottaviano de' Medici, but is better known for his portraits of the Medici family, which were, however, to a great extent copies from the works of other men. His designs for majolica were of importance and were executed for the Duke of Urbino; but perhaps he is better remembered for his etchings, of which there are over a hundred, than for any other works. He is said to have been instructed in the art of etching by Marc' Antonio, and his plates are marked B.F.V.F. (Battista Franco Venetus Fecit). They are not particularly attractive, as their execution is somewhat mechanical, but there is a certain light and easy spirit about them by which they can be recognized. About half the number are original works, the others being derived from paintings by Raphael, Titian, and others.

VASARI, *Le Vite dei pittori* (Florence, 1878-1885); MICHELI, *Notizie d'Opera di disegno* (Bologna, 1884).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Frank, MICHAEL SIGISMUND**, Catholic artist and rediscoverer of the lost art of glass-painting; b. 1 June, 1770, at Nuremberg; d. at Munich, 16 January, 1847. His father was a dealer in provisions, living in comfortable circumstances, who destined his boy to become his successor in business. But these plans were thwarted by Sigismund's passionate fondness for art. The mother, without her husband's knowledge, had him instructed in drawing in the local academy, an institution of moderate merit. Young Frank's progress was so marked as to astonish his friends.

Having lost his father in early youth, Frank was apprenticed to his godfather Neubert, who carried on at Nuremberg the business of lacquering and decorating wooden boxes and caskets. His progress in this work was rapid, but he stayed less than a year with Neubert. After returning to the house of his mother, who had married a second time, he once more enthusiastically devoted himself to the study of drawing, meantime painting boxes for other manufacturers at Nuremberg and earning enough to pay his expenses. On completing his twenty-first year his parents induced him against his inclination to wed Marie H. Blechkoll, the daughter of an hotel-keeper who brought him as her dowry the inn Zur Himmelsleiter which exists to this day. But Frank was not born to be an innkeeper. He continued his art studies while his wife managed the hotel. However, he now turned his attention to painting porcelain, to which art one of his guests, the skilful porcelain-painter Trost, had introduced him. His success was immediate, and when, after a married life of five years, his wife died, he sold the hotel and established a porcelain factory. The undertaking, which brought him a good income, led him to travel in Austria, Hungary, and Turkey; at Vienna he made the acquaintance of several prominent artists, under whose instruction he perfected himself as a colourist.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, when Western Germany repeatedly became the scene of French invasions, Frank's business interests suffered severely. It was then that his attention was turned in a wholly new direction. At the shop of a business friend named Wirth he met an Englishman to whom Wirth sold some fragments of ancient coloured glass for what seemed to Frank a large sum. On inquiry he found that the high price paid was due to the fact that the art of painting in glass which had been coloured while molten—an art which had produced so many of the magnificent church and palace windows during the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance—had been entirely lost during the eighteenth century. Frank determined to recover the lost secret of this art. Unaided and untaught, he toiled for several years to accomplish his purpose; his savings fast disappeared, and his success seemed more and more doubtful. His friends expressed fears that he would become a financial and mental wreck, and urged him to give up his fruitless efforts. But Frank persevered, and in 1804 there came a turn in his fortunes. He had found at last the method of producing coloured glass which he had so long sought. His first commission was to paint the coat of arms of the Rhenish Count Schenk, for his chapel at Greifenstein in Franconia. When this glass-painting was seen by the travelling agent of a London art house named Rauh, a Nuremberger like Frank himself, he recognized at once that Frank's work was practically the same as the ancient glass-painting, the secret of which had been lost. He hastened to Nuremberg, saw Frank, and made business arrangements with him. Frank now made several hundred pieces for the English market, some of which made their way to Philadelphia and Baltimore. But the disappearance of Rauh in 1807 put an end to Frank's prosperity and might have had serious consequences had not King Maximilian I of Bavaria become the artist's patron (1808). So favourable was the impression made on the king by Frank's execution of the royal Bavarian coat of arms that the monarch not only paid him generously, but turned over to him for factory purposes the building called the Zwinger, in Nuremberg. Henceforth Frank produced many works for King Maximilian, such as the "Circumcision", after Heinrich Goltzius; the "Nativity", after Bolzwerth; the "Passion", six parts after Lucas van Leyden; the Mosque of Cordova; "St. Barbara", after Holbein; the "Judgment of Solomon", after Raphael; the "Magi", after Rubens. For King Louis I, also, Frank executed many commissions, especially the glass decorations of the cathedral of Ratisbon.

In 1818 Maximilian appointed Frank painter in glass at the royal porcelain factory in Munich, with a salary of 800 florins annually. When, in 1827, Maximilian's successor established the royal institute for glass-painting, Frank was entrusted with all the arrangements and with the technical management, particularly with the preparation of the colours to be used and the manufacture of the coloured glass plates. He was also charged with instructing assistants in the secrets of his craft. Here he worked until 1840 when he retired with an annual pension of 1200 florins.

He was the father of many children, of whom the most prominent is the well-known historical painter Julius Frank. Among his friends were the great physicist Fraunhofer and the Viennese glass-painter Mohn, who bore enthusiastic testimony to the excellence of Frank's colouring, especially his reds and his flesh colour.

*Mitteilungen des Verbandes deutscher Glasmalerei* (Munich, 1907); VON SCHADEN in his *Skizzen* (Munich, 1829).

CHARLES G. HERBERMANN.

**Frankenberg, JOHANN HEINRICH, GRAF VON**, Archbishop of Mechlin (Malines), Primate of Belgium, and cardinal; b. 18 September, 1726, at Gross-Glogau,



Silesia; d. at Breda, 11 June, 1804. He belonged to an ancient family devotedly attached to the House of Hapsburg, and which remained so after the conquest of Silesia by Frederick II (1740). Although he was the sole male heir of his family and assured of the protection of the Empress Maria Theresa, he decided, when quite young, to become a priest. He attended the Jesuit college of his native city, went later to the University of Breslau, and thence to the German College at Rome, where he obtained the degrees of Doctor of Theology, and of Canon Law, and was ordained a priest 10 August, 1749. On his return to Austria, he was made coadjutor to the Bishop of Görz in Carniola (1750-54), dean of the collegiate church of All Saints at Prague (1754), later of that of Sts. Cosmas and Damian at Alt-Bunzlau in Bohemia (1756), and finally Archbishop of Mechlín and primate of the Austrian Low Countries on 27 May, 1759. In this exalted post, as in those which he had previously occupied, his life was an example of every private and public virtue. It was not long before he was called on to defend the dignity and independence of his office against the Austrian Government, which, even under Maria Theresa, was foreshadowing the petty tyranny of Joseph II. Despite his great devotion to Maria Theresa, he more than once resisted the improper exactions of her ministers, who wished him to grant Lenten dispensations according to their pleasure, and interfered in the most annoying manner in matters that pertained exclusively to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He enjoyed, however, the personal favour of Maria Theresa, who sought to have him made Archbishop of Vienna, and in 1778 exerted herself to the uttermost to obtain for him the cardinal's hat. The situation changed with the accession of Joseph II, a disciple of the "philosophers" and imbued with the principles of an "enlightened despotism". This emperor began that politico-ecclesiastical system, known as Josephinism, which meant substantially the absolute supremacy of the State. Each imperial encroachment on the inalienable rights of the Church was opposed by Frankenberg with commendable fortitude, and yet in a gentle manner and with such respect for the civil authority that the cardinal brought upon himself the bitter reproaches of such unflinching zealots as the ex-Jesuits, Feller and Dedyar. His protests, however, were met by the Government in an ill-humoured and disdainful way. It affected, indeed, to pay no attention to them. The most serious of the conflicts was that which broke out with regard to the General Seminary, founded at Louvain in 1786 by the emperor, and to which he ordered the bishops to send their students, closing at the same time their diocesan seminaries. The heretical teaching of the professors in this new institution, and the avowed purpose of using it as an instrument of ecclesiastical reform and a weapon against "ultramontanism", soon provoked among the students an agitation that ended in a general dispersion. The irritated emperor, forthwith, summoned the cardinal to Vienna to intimidate him by means, as he wrote to Kaunitz, "of those vigorous and unanswerable arguments of which you know so well how to make use". Ill, bereft of his advisers, threatened with indefinite detention at a great distance from his diocese; reared, moreover, in those principles of respect for the sovereign power, which to us seem so exaggerated, the cardinal consented to sign a rather equivocal declaration, in which he stated that he was convinced of his obligation to conform to the imperial decrees "relative to the General Seminary", but reserved to himself the right to appeal to the emperor in cases where the eternal salvation of souls appeared to him to be imperilled.

On his return to Belgium, Frankenberg regained his former energy. He felt himself upheld by the ardent Catholic spirit of the nation, and announced to

the Government that his conscience would not permit him to concur in the establishment of the General Seminary. Despite all threats, he thenceforth remained firm. The emperor called on him to express his opinion on the doctrines then taught at the General Seminary, whereupon the cardinal condemned that teaching in his "Declaration"—a document which created a profound impression throughout Belgium. The country was already disturbed by insurrectionary movements, and the Government was obliged to close the General Seminary. It was too late, however, to repress the rebellious agitation. The Government sought, therefore, to make the cardinal responsible for it, and wished to place him under arrest. From his place of refuge, the cardinal protested against the accusation: "I take heaven and earth to witness", said he, "that I have had no share or influence whatever in this insurrection. The entire Netherlands will bear witness to this fact and do me justice in this respect." The Government, finding it necessary to abandon the criminal process it had begun against the cardinal, exhibited a conciliatory temper. In the meantime, however, the revolution broke out. The new administration found him friendly, and he was henceforth officially a member of the States-General. At the same time he held aloof from purely political discussions and confined himself to recommending political union. He received with submission and respect the re-establishment of the Austrian Government, to which he had always been attached. On the arrival of the French he had to undergo new trials. He refused the pension which the Government wished to grant him in compensation for the suppression of his revenue, declared his opposition to the oath exacted of the clergy, and was finally brutally expelled from Belgium (1797). He retired to Emmerich in Prussia, where, aged, sick, and poor, he lived on the charity of his flock, and continued to warn them against those ecclesiastics who had taken the oath. His apostolic courage and his constancy in these trials elicited solemn eulogies from both Pius VI and Pius VII. In deference to the pope's request and to render possible the execution of the concordat, he resigned, 20 November, 1801, the Archbishopric of Mechlín. Driven from Emmerich by the King of Prussia at the instance of the French Government, which affected to regard him as a conspirator, he retired to Borken in the territory of Münster (1801), and, after the suppression of this principality, to Breda, where he died. His courage, self-abnegation, and patience in the face of persecution and adversity make him one of the noblest figures of the Catholic episcopate during the eighteenth century.

CLAESSENS, *Histoire des Archevêques de Malines* (Louvain, 1881); VERHAEGEN, *Le Cardinal de Frankenberg, archevêque de Malines* (Bruges, Lille, 1890).

GODEFROID KURTH.

**Frankfort, COUNCIL OF**, convened in the summer of 794, "by the grace of God, authority of the pope, and command of Charlemagne" (can. i), and attended by the bishops of the Frankish kingdom, Italy, and the province of Aquitania, and even by ecclesiastics from England. The council was summoned primarily for the condemnation of Adoptionism (q. v.). According to the testimony of contemporaries two papal legates were present, Theophylact and Stephen, representing Pope Adrian I. After an allocution by Charlemagne, the bishops drew up two memorials against the Adoptionists, one containing arguments from patristic writings; the other, arguments from Scripture. The first was the "Libellus sacrosyllabus", written by Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileia, in the name of the Italian bishops; the second was the "Epistola Synodica", addressed to the bishops of Spain by those of Germany, Gaul, and Aquitania. In the first of its fifty-six canons the council condemned Adoptionism, and in the second repudiated the Sec-

and Council of Nicæa (787), which, according to the faulty Latin translation of its Acts (see CAROLINE BOOKS), seemed to decree that the same kind of worship should be paid to images as to the Blessed Trinity, though the Greek text clearly distinguishes between *λατρεῖα* and *προσκύνησις*. The remaining fifty-four canons dealt with metropolitan jurisdiction, monastic discipline, superstition, etc.

HEFELE, *Kirchengesch.*, III (Freiburg, 1877), 678 sqq.; HERGENROTHER-KIRSCH, *Kirchengesch.*—The *Libellus sacrosyllabus* may be found in *P. L.*, XCIX, 151 sq., or in MANSI, *Coll. conc.*, XII, 833; and the *Epistola synodica* in *P. L.*, CI, 1331 sq., or in MANSI, *Coll. conc.*, XIII, 883 sq.—The canons of the council are given in *P. L.*, XCVII.

LEO A. KELLY.


**Frankfort-on-the-Main**, formerly the scene of the election and coronation of the German emperors, is situated in the administrative district of Wiesbaden, in the Prussian province of Hesse-Nassau; it lies on both sides of the Main, twenty-four miles above its confluence with the Rhine at Mainz. On 1 December, 1905, the city had a population of 334,978, of whom 105,814 were Catholics, and 23,476 Jews.

Frankfort is partly under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Diocese of Limburg, and partly under that of Fulda. For the care of souls, the city is divided into six parishes; of these the city-parish proper is subdivided into six independent ecclesiastical districts, and one curacy; the Catholic soldiers have a military church of their own. Of the twenty-five Catholic churches and chapels in Frankfort, the most important is the cathedral of St. Bartholomew, in which the elections and coronations of the German emperors were held; it stands on the site formerly occupied by the church of the Saviour (*Salvator-kirche*), which was built by Louis the German (850-75), and rebuilt in 1239, in Gothic style, and the name changed to St. Bartholomew. Between 1315 and 1338 the choir was remodelled, and the transept in 1346; the famous tower (*Pfarrturm*) was added between 1415 and 1512. After the conflagration of 1867, the whole church was restored by Denzinger, the architect of the Ratisbon cathedral (1869-80), and the tower completed. (See "Der Kaiserdom zu Frankfurt a. M.," Frankfort, 1907.) Noteworthy also are the church of St. Leonard, a Gothic hall church (i. e. with aisles, but without clerestories), with five naves, erected between the thirteenth and the sixteenth century; the church of the Teutonic Knights (*Deutschordenskirche*), dedicated in 1309, rebuilt 1748-50, and restored 1883; and the Gothic church of Our Lady (*Liebfrauenkirche*), built 1325-1509. The care of souls is in charge of 31 secular priests. The religious orders and congregations represented in the city are: Capuchins (5 fathers and 3 brothers), Brothers of Mercy, Ursulines, Handmaids of Christ, and Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis from the mother-house at Aachen. The Catholic schools include 1 high school for boys, 2 high schools for girls, 1 institute for teachers, 8 elementary schools, 3 homes for children, 5 knitting- and sewing-schools. Of the 10 Catholic


benevolent institutions and foundations, mention may be made of the almshouse (founded 1593), the Catholic home for girls, the working-women's home, and the children's home; among the hospitals under Catholic direction are that of the Brothers of Mercy, the hospice of the Brothers of Mercy, and the hospital of St. Elizabeth, under the Sisters of Mercy. The most important of the numerous Catholic associations (about 70) are: the Boniface Association, the Catholic Charity Association, the Elizabeth Society, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, the Catholic Journeymen's Union, the Merchants' Union, the Workmen's Union, the People's Union of Catholic Germany (*Volksverein*), the Congregation of Mary for Girls, etc. (See "Handbuch für die Katholiken von Frankfurt a. M.," Frankfort, 1903.)

Recent excavations have confirmed the belief that the present cathedral stands on the site of a Roman fort, built during the reign of Domitian by the Fourteenth Legion, and that a Roman settlement grew up about it. During the reign of Hadrian the fortress was abandoned, but the settlement continued to grow, and towards the end of the third century was seized by the Germans, first by the Alamanni, and later by the Franks. The earliest mention of this colony occurs in Einhard's annals for 793, where it is called *Villa Francconofurt*. In 794 an important imperial and ecclesiastical council was convened here in the royal palace.

Of the German kings, Louis the Pious (814-40) and more especially Louis the German often used Frankfort as the royal residence; in the year of the latter's death, it is designated as *principalis sedes orientalis regni*. Louis the German built the church of the Saviour, later the cathedral, and founded the chapter of St. Bartholomew, consisting of one abbot and twelve priests. During the tenth century Frankfort declined in importance; in the year 1007 it was a public village of the empire without fortifications, a *villa dominica* or *indominicata*, which, however, was inhabited by freemen, as well as by serfs. During the twelfth century it rose to the rank of a city; between 1127 and 1142 the first city wall was built; by 1150 Frankfort had a tribunal of its own; in 1172 it was made a municipality (*municipium*); and in 1219 was removed from the jurisdiction of the king. Trade and industry received a powerful impetus; the Frankfort fair became one of the most important of Germany; the city gradually acquired control of the territory round about, and played an important rôle in the political struggles, particularly as a member of the Confederation of the Rhine. Louis the Bavarian (1314-47), whom Frankfort supported in his conflicts with the Holy See, notwithstanding a papal interdict, granted the city important prerogatives. The Golden Bull of Charles IV (1346-78) constituted Frankfort the legal electoral city of the German emperors; the city had already been the scene of the election of ten monarchs, between 1147 and 1300. After 1356 thirty-seven German emperors were elected at Frankfort,



PFARRTURM (1415-1512)  
Cathedral of St. Bartholomew, Frankfort-on-the-Main



SAALHOF, FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN

where, after Maximilian II, the coronation ceremony also took place, instead of at Aachen. A celebrated description of this ceremony is to be found in Goethe's "Wahrheit und Dichtung". The unfortunate difficulties between Frankfort and the electoral princes of the Palatinate and the nobles of the vicinity, in 1389, reduced the city to great straits, but could not shatter its power. Internal dissensions, like the insurrection of the guilds (1358-66) and the uprisings between 1389 and 1408, were finally brought to an end by the victory of the ruling families.

The Reformation found speedy acceptance among the majority of the city council and the middle classes, chiefly owing to the strained relations which the unjust distribution of taxes had brought about between the clergy and people. In 1525 the doctrines of Luther were preached in Frankfort for the first time; in 1533, by command of the council, Catholic services were entirely suspended for some time; finally, after 1548, of the three Catholic chapters only that of St. Bartholomew, with the cathedral, remained in possession of the Catholics. On the defeat of the Smalcaldic League (1546), which Frankfort had joined in 1536, the city was forced to surrender to an imperial army and pay 80,000 gold gulden. During the revolt of Maurice of Saxony (1552) against Charles V, Frankfort supported the emperor and withstood a siege by his enemies. During the succeeding decades the city gained in prosperity what it lost in political prestige. A serious danger, however, menaced it in the revolt of the middle classes against the misrule of the patricians (1612-16), headed by the pastry-cook and gingerbread-baker, Vincenz Fettmilch. This shook the city government to its very foundations, and only ended with the decapitation of seven of the leaders, and the victory of the ruling families who retained their supremacy until the dissolution of the German Empire. During the Thirty Years War the citizens were decimated by famine and plague, particularly in 1635, and the city suffered severely from Louis XIV's wars of conquest. Frankfort was invested by the French (1759-62) during the Seven Years War, and likewise during the Revolutionary period (1792 and 1795). By the Imperial Delegates Enactment (1803) Frankfort was declared a free neutral city of the empire, and at the same time all monasteries, with the exception of the property of the Teutonic Knights, were secularized. After the dissolution of the German Empire, the city was granted to Karl Dalberg, previously Elector of Mainz, and in 1810 was made the capital of the Grand Duchy of Frankfort. Under Dalberg's mild rule, Christians of all denominations were granted equal recognition, and the year 1811 was marked by the emancipation of the Jews. The Vienna Congress made Frankfort a free imperial city of the new German Confederation and the seat of the Federal Diet, which meant for the city great political prestige and brilliant possibilities from a social point of view. Beginning in 1818 various conferences were held at Frankfort to make some arrangement with the Holy See for the ecclesiastical reorganization of the states represented; these were Baden, Württemberg, Hesse-Cassel, Hesse-Darmstadt, Nassau, Frankfort, Hohenzollern-Heckingen, Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, and others. Negotiations covering several years finally resulted in the erection of the province of the Upper Rhine (*Oberrheinische Kirchenprovinz*). The Frankfort Riot of 1833 presented some serious aspects for the city; the proceedings of the Federal Diet against the press and the whole system of unions and associations gave rise to a revolutionary movement, which the Diet undertook to suppress. After the attempted insurrection had been easily put down, the city had to maintain, at its own expense, a Prusso-Austrian garrison from 1833 to 1842. In 1848-49 Frankfort was the seat of the *Vorparlament* (a provisional assembly preparatory to the National

Assembly) and the German National Assembly, and in 1863 of the German *Furstentag* (Diet of Princes). Frankfort having voted in the Federal Diet against Prussia (14 June, 1866), on 16 July the city was invested by the Prussians and condemned to pay a heavy fine, and on 8 October was annexed to the Prussian Monarchy. At Frankfort the peace between France and Germany was signed, 10 May, 1871. Under Prussian rule the city has attained a high commercial and industrial importance.

RITTER, *Evangelisches Denkmal der Stadt Frankfurt am Main* (Frankfort, 1726); KIRCHNER, *Gesch. der Stadt Frankfurt* (Frankfort, 1807-10); VON FICHARD, *Entstehung der Reichsstadt Frankfurt* (Frankfort, 1819); KRIEGER, *Frankfurter Bürgerzustände und Zustände im M. A.* (Frankfort, 1862); IDEM, *Gesch. von Frankfurt a. M.* (Frankfort, 1871); FANSEN, *Frankfurt's Reichs-correspondent, 1376-1519*, part III (Freiburg, 1863-73); *Frankfurt und seine Bauten herausgegeben vom Architekten- und Ingenieurverein* (Frankfort, 1886); BUCHER, *Die Bevölkerung von Frankfurt a. M. im 14. und 15. Jahrh.* (Tübingen, 1886); WEBER AND DIEFFENBACH, *Zur Reformationsgesch. der Reichsstadt Frankfurt a. M.* (Frankfort, 1895); HORNE, *Geschichte von Frankfurt a. M.* (Frankfort, 1902); BOEHMER-LAU, *Codex diplomaticus Mainfrancofurtanus* (2 vols., 1901, 1905); *Neues Archiv für Frankfurts Gesch. und Kunst* (Frankfort); *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Gesch. und Altertumskunde in Frankfurt a. M.* (Frankfort, 1860—).

JOSEPH LINS.

**Franks, THE**, were a confederation formed in Western Germany of a certain number of ancient barbarian tribes who occupied the right shore of the Rhine from Mainz to the sea. Their name is first mentioned by Roman historians in connexion with a battle fought against this people about the year 241. In the third century some of them crossed the Rhine and settled in Belgic Gaul on the banks of the Meuse and the Scheldt, and the Romans had endeavoured to expel them from the territory. Constantius Chlorus and his descendants continued the struggle, and, although Julian the Apostate inflicted a serious defeat on them in 359, he did not succeed in exterminating them, and eventually Rome was satisfied to make them her more or less faithful allies. After their overthrow by Julian the Apostate, the Franks of Belgium, becoming peaceful settlers, appear to have given the empire no further trouble, satisfied with having found shelter and sustenance on Roman soil. They even espoused Rome's cause during the great invasion of 406, but were overpowered by the ruthless hordes who devastated Belgium and overran Gaul and a part of Italy and Spain. Thenceforth the Belgian provinces ceased to be under the control of Rome and passed under the rule of the Franks.

When they first attracted attention in history the Franks were established in the northern part of Belgic Gaul, in the districts where their Germanic dialect is still spoken. Gregory of Tours tells us that their chief town was Dispargum, which is perhaps Tongres, and that they were under a family of kings distinguished by their long hair, which they allowed to flow over their shoulders, while the other Frankish warriors had the back of the head shaved. This family was known as the Merovingians, from the name of one of its members, to whom national tradition had ascribed a sea-god as ancestor. Clodion, the first king of this dynasty known to history, began his series of conquests in Northern Gaul about the year 430. He penetrated as far as Artois, but was driven back by Aetius, who seems to have succeeded in keeping him on friendly terms with Rome. In fact, it seems that his son Merovæus fought with the Romans against Attila on the Mauriac plains. Childeric, son of Merovæus, also served the empire under Count Ægidius and subsequently under Count Paul, whom he assisted in repelling the Saxons from Angers. Childeric died at Tournai, his capital, where his tomb was found in 1653 (Cochet, *Le tombeau de Childéric*, Paris, 1859). But Childeric did not transmit to his son Clovis, who succeeded him in 481, the entire inheritance left by Clodion. The latter seems to have reigned over all the

Cis-Rhenish Franks, and the monarchy was divided among his descendants, although the exact time of the division is not known. There were now two Frankish groups: the Ripuarians, who occupied the banks of the Rhine and whose kings resided at Cologne, and the Salians who had established themselves in the Low Countries. The Salians did not form a single kingdom; besides the Kingdom of Tournai there were kingdoms with centres at Cambrai and Tongres. Their sovereigns, both Salian and Ripuarian, belonged to the Merovingian family and seem to have been descended from Clodion.

When Clovis began to reign in 481, he was, like his father, King of Tournai only, but at an early date he began his career of conquest. In 486 he overthrew the monarchy that Syagrius, son of Ægidius, had carved out for himself in Northern Gaul, and set up his court at Soissons; in 490 and 491 he took possession of the Salian Kingdoms of Cambrai and Tongres; in 496 he triumphantly repelled an invasion of the Alamanni; in 500 he interposed in the war of the Burgundian kings; in 506 he conquered Aquitaine; and at length he annexed the Ripuarian Kingdom of Cologne. Henceforth Gaul, from the Pyrenees to the Rhine, was subject to Clovis, with the exception of the territory in the south-east, i. e. the kingdom of the Burgundians and Provence. Established at Paris, Clovis governed this kingdom by virtue of an agreement concluded with the bishops of Gaul, according to which natives and barbarians were to be on terms of equality, and all cause of friction between the two races was removed when, in 496, the king was converted to Catholicism. The Frankish kingdom thereupon took its place in history under more promising conditions than were to be found in any other state founded upon the ruins of the Roman Empire. All free men bore the title of Frank, had the same political status, and were eligible to the same offices. Besides, each individual observed the law of the people among whom he belonged; the Gallo-Roman lived according to the Roman code, the barbarian according to the Salian or Ripuarian law; in other words, the law was personal, not territorial. If there were any privileges they belonged to the Gallo-Romans, who, in the beginning were the only ones on whom the episcopal dignity was conferred. The king governed the provinces through his counts, and had a considerable voice in the selection of the clergy. The drawing up of the Salian Law (*Lex Salica*), which seems to date from the early part of the reign of Clovis, and the Council of Orléans, convoked by him and held in the last year of his reign, prove that the legislative activity of this king was not eclipsed by his military energy (see Clovis). Although founder of a kingdom destined to such a brilliant future, Clovis did not know how to shield it against a custom in vogue among the barbarians, i. e. the division of power among the sons of the king. This custom originated in the pagan idea that all kings were intended to reign because they were descended from the gods. Divine blood flowed in the veins of all the king's sons, each of whom, therefore, being a king by birth, must have his share of the kingdom. This view, incompatible with the formation of a powerful, durable monarchy, had been vigorously rejected by Genseric the Vandal, who, to secure the indivisibility of his kingdom, had established in his family a certain order of succession. Either because he died suddenly or for some other reason, Clovis took no measures to abolish this custom, which continued among the Franks until the middle of the ninth century and, more than once, endangered their nationality.

After the death of Clovis, therefore, his four sons divided his kingdom, each reigning from a different centre: Thierry at Metz, Clodomir at Orléans, Childebert at Paris, and Clotaire at Soissons. They continued the career of conquest inaugurated by their father, and, in spite of the frequent discords that divided

them, augmented the estates he had left them. The principal events of their reign were: (1) The destruction of the Kingdom of Thuringia by Thierry in 531, which extended Frankish power into the heart of what is now Germany; (2) the conquest of the Kingdom of the Burgundians by Childebert and Clotaire in 532, after their brother Clodomir had perished in a previous attempt to overthrow it in 524; (3) the cession of Provence to the Franks by the Ostrogoths in 536, on condition that the former would assist them in the war just declared against them by Emperor Justinian. But instead of helping the Ostrogoths, the Franks under Theudebert, son of Thierry, taking shameful advantage of this oppressed people, cruelly pillaged Italy until the bands under the command of Leuthar and Butilin were exterminated by Narses in 553. The death of Theudebert, in 548, was soon followed by that of his son Theobald, in 555, and by the death of Childebert in 558, Clotaire I, the last of the four brothers, becoming sole heir to the estate of his father, Clovis. Clotaire reduced the Saxons and Bavarians to a state of vassalage, and died in 561 leaving four sons; once more the monarchy was divided, being partitioned in about the same way as on the death of Clovis in 511: Gontran reigned at Orléans, Charibert at Paris, Sigebert at Reims, and Chilperic at Soissons. Charibert's death in 567 and the division of his estate occasioned quarrels between Chilperic and Sigebert, already at odds on account of their wives. Unlike his brothers, who had been satisfied to marry serving-women, Sigebert had won the hand of the beautiful Brunehilde, daughter of Athanagild, King of the Visigoths. Chilperic had followed Sigebert's example by marrying Galeswintha, Brunehilde's sister, but at the instigation of his mistress, Fredegonda, he soon had Galeswintha assassinated and placed Fredegonda upon the throne. Brunehilde's determination to avenge the death of her sister involved in bitter strife not only the two women but their husbands. In 575 Sigebert, who was repeatedly provoked by Chilperic, took the field, resolved to bring the quarrel to a conclusion. Chilperic, already banished from his kingdom, had taken refuge behind the walls of Tournai, whence he had no hope of escape, when, just as Sigebert's soldiers were about to raise him to the throne, he was felled by assassins sent by Fredegonda. Immediately the aspect of affairs changed: Brunehilde, humiliated and taken prisoner, escaped only with the greatest difficulty and after the most thrilling adventures, while Fredegonda and Chilperic exulted in their triumph. The rivalry between the two kingdoms, henceforth known respectively as Austrasia (Kingdom of the East) and Neustria (Kingdom of the West), only grew fiercer. Gontran's kingdom continued to be called Burgundy. First the nobles of Austrasia and then Brunehilde, who had become regent, led the campaign against Chilperic, who perished in 584 at the hand of an assassin. The murderer could not be ascertained. During this period of intestine strife, King Gontran was vainly endeavouring to wrest Septimania from the Visigoths, as well as to defend himself against the pretender Gondowald, the natural son of Clotaire I, who, aided by the nobles, tried to seize part of the kingdom, but fell in the attempt. When Gontran died in 592, his inheritance passed to Childebert II, son of Sigebert and Brunehilde, and after this king's death in 595 his states were divided between his two sons, Theudebert II taking Austrasia, and Thierry II Burgundy. In 600 and 604 the two brothers united their forces against Clotaire II, son of Chilperic and Fredegonda, and reduced him to the condition of a petty king. Soon, however, jealousy sprang up between the two brothers, they waged war against each other, and Theudebert, twice defeated, was killed. The victorious Thierry was about to inflict a like fate on Clotaire II, but died in 613, being still young and undoubtedly the victim of the excesses that had shortened the careers of most of the

abolished the Duchy of Alamannia. They also undertook the great work of reforming the Frankish Church, into which several generations of civil wars had introduced great disorders. National councils convoked, by their efforts, in Austrasia (at Estinnes, or Lestinnes) and Neustria (at Soissons) the work of which was completed by a large council attended by the bishops of both countries, were largely instrumental in restoring order and discipline in the Church, in eliminating abuses and in rooting out superstition. St. Boniface, the soul of this great work, after having, to some extent, created the Church of Germany, had also the glory of regenerating the Frankish Church. While deeply absorbed in this twofold task of defending the kingdom and reforming the Church, the two brothers thought of reinstating a Merovingian king (743), although for six years the nation had existed without one. It would seem that they were led to do this by the necessity of removing one of the objections that could be made to their authority, at a time when it was assailed on all sides and when they were treated as usurpers. Under these circumstances they placed upon the throne Childeric III, the last Merovingian king.

When the task common to both brothers was nearly accomplished, Carloman, yielding to the inclination he had always felt for the religious life, relinquished all his states in favour of Pepin and retired to a cloister on Mt. Soracte near Rome (747). Pepin, who thus remained alone at the head of the vast Frankish monarchy, reaped all the fruit of their combined labours. It was easy for him to subdue a last revolt by Grifon, who perished in Italy. Afterwards he enjoyed a few years of peace, a rare privilege in those stormy times. Having now become undisputed master of the greatest nation of Europe, and confident of being able to transmit intact to his sons the power he had received from his father, Pepin considered the question whether the time had not come to assume the name to which his sovereign authority entitled him. Such a step could hardly be objected to when he was virtually king. Since the Merovingian who occupied the throne was there only at Pepin's will, it was surely Pepin's privilege to remove him. Einhard describes the character of the royalty of the last Merovingians whom the princes of Pepin's family tolerated or replaced upon the throne. "This king to whom nothing royal had been left save the title of king, sat upon the throne and, with long hair and unkempt beard, played the part of master. He gave audience to the ambassadors who came from various countries and issued replies that had been dictated to him, as if coming from himself. In reality, outside of a hollow name and a doubtful pension paid him at the will of the mayor of the palace, he had nothing for his own save a small farm yielding a meagre income, and here he lived with a small number of serfs. When he went out, he rode in an ox-cart driven by a rustic driver. In this vehicle he annually attended the *Champs de Mai*. The mayor of the palace alone controlled public affairs." This description, it is true, is somewhat of a caricature, and there is evidence in public charters that the position of the Merovingian kings was not as insecure as Einhard says. Nevertheless, it expresses well the marked contrast between the humiliating position of the king and the exalted, powerful standing of the mayor of the palace. It can be understood, therefore, that in 751, Pepin and the Frankish nobles might well discuss the question as to whether he should assume the kingly crown. The question had a moral side, namely, whether it was lawful to assume a title which seemed to belong to another. It was decided to appeal for a solution to the sovereign pontiff, recognized by all as the custodian and interpreter of the moral law. A Frankish embassy left for Rome and submitted the question to Pope Zachary. The latter's reply was given in the form of a declaration of principles admir-

ably embodying Catholic doctrine on this important point: "ut melius esset", said the pope, "illum regem vocari, qui potestatem haberet, quam illum qui sine regali potestate maneret" [it were better for him to be called king who holds the power than the one who remains (king in name) without the regal power]. Reassured by this decision, Pepin hesitated no longer, and had himself proclaimed king at Soissons in 751. Childeric III was sent to end his days in a cloister. The nature of the authority with which Pepin was invested was emphasized for the first time among the Franks, by the coronation ceremony, which imparted a religious nature to his power and imprinted upon him a sacred character. It has been said, but without proof, that St. Boniface attended the coronation. In this way, after having exercised the royal power almost uninterruptedly for over a century, the descendants of Arnulf and Pepin finally assumed the title of sovereignty, and the Carolingian dynasty replaced that of the Merovingians on the Frankish throne.

GREGORY OF TOURS, *Historia Francorum* (538-94); the seventh-century chronicle attributed to a certain FREDEGARUS, and its eighth-century continuation; these, with the *Liber Historie* and the lives of the Merovingian saints are included in the *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. rer. Merov.*, I, II, IV; the *Lex Saliica*, often edited, e.g. HESSELS AND KERN, *The Lex Saliica* (London, 1880).

MODERN WORKS.—RICHTER, *Annalen des fränkischen Reichs im Zeitalter der Merovinger* (Halle, 1873); SCHULTZE, *Das merovingische Frankenreich* (Stuttgart, 1896), in *ZWIEDEWED-SUDENHORST, Bibliothek deutscher Geschichte*, II; PROU, *La Gaule mérovingienne* (Paris, s. d.); BAYET AND PEISTER in *LAVISSE, Histoire de France*, II; VACANDARD, *Vie de saint Ouen* (Paris, 1902).

GODEFROI KURTH.

Franzelin, JOHANN BAPTIST, cardinal and theologian; b. at Aldein, in the Tyrol, 15 April, 1816; d. at Rome, 11 Dec., 1886. Despite their poverty, his parents sent him at an early age to the neighbouring Franciscan college at Bolzano. In 1834 he entered the Society of Jesus at Graz, and after some years spent in higher studies and teaching in Austrian Poland, began in 1845 his course of theology in the Roman college of the Society, where he also acted as assistant in Hebrew, in which he was especially proficient. Driven from Rome by the Revolution of 1848, he went successively to England, Belgium, and France, where he was ordained in 1849. In 1850 he returned to the Roman college as assistant professor of dogma, and lecturer on Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldean. In 1853 he became prefect of studies in the German college and in 1857 professor of dogmatic theology in the Roman college, where he remained for nineteen years, winning for himself by his lectures and publications a foremost place among the theologians of that time. During this period he acted as consultor to several Roman Congregations, and aided in the preliminaries of the Vatican Council, in which he afterwards served as papal theologian. In 1876, despite his sincere and strenuous protests, he was raised to the cardinalate by Pius IX. This dignity made almost no change in his scrupulously simple and laborious life. He continued his use of poor garments; occupied but two bare rooms in the Jesuit novitiate of Sant' Andrea; rose every morning at four and spent the time till seven in devotional exercises, always hearing Mass after saying his own; fasted every Saturday, and towards the end of his days Fridays also, besides using other forms of corporal penance.

Though of delicate health, Franzelin had always been a constant and most laborious worker, never allowing himself any recreation during his long years of poor health, severe toil, and painful scruples, save the short recreation after dinner and supper. As a cardinal his sole departure from strict adherence to Jesuit rule was to omit this daily recreation. Moreover, though constantly engaged as Prefect of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics, and consultor of several other Congregations, he steadily refused the aid of a secretary. His entire income as a cardinal



he distributed among the poor, the foreign missions, and convents whose property had been seized by the Italian Government. As a theologian Franzelin takes high rank. From the first, his works were recognized as a mine of rich material for the preacher no less than the professor; and for years he was accustomed to receive numerous letters from priests in all parts of the world, spontaneously acknowledging the great aid in preaching they had derived from his books. Of his works, which have gone through numerous editions, the treatise "*De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*" (Rome, 1870) is considered classical. The others are "*De SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramento et Sacrificio*" (1868); "*De Sacramentis in Genere*" (1868); "*De Deo Trino*" (1869); "*De Deo Uno*" (1870); "*De Verbo Incarnato*" (1870); some smaller treatises, and the posthumous "*De Ecclesia Christi*" (1887).

BOHAVENIA, *Raccolta di Memorie intorno alla vita dell' Em. Cardinale Giovanni Battista Franzelin* (Rome, 1887); WALSH, *John Baptist Franzelin. A Sketch and a Study* (Dublin, 1895); *Commentarius de Vita Eminentissimi Auctoris* in FRANZELIN'S posthumous work, *De Ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1887); HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Frascati, DIOCESE OF (TUSCULANA)**, one of the six suburbicarian (i. e. neighbouring) dioceses from an immemorial date closely related to the Roman Church. The city of Frascati is about twelve miles from Rome on the northern slopes of the Alban Hills, pleasantly and healthfully situated. Its principal source of wealth is its vineyards, which yield an excellent wine. The history of the city (population, 10,000) is bound up with that of ancient Tusculum, which, according to the legend, was founded by Telegonus, the son of Ulysses and Circe. In the kingly period Tusculum was an ally of Rome, to which it later became subject. After the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus, Octavius Manilius, the tyrant of Tusculum, and son-in-law of Tarquinius, roused the Latin communes against the Roman Republic (507 B.C.); they were routed, however, at the battle of Lake Regillus (496 B.C.). In 493 the Latin League with Rome was renewed. After the disastrous battles of Vesuvius and Trifanum (338 B.C.), Rome, in order to detach Tusculum and other towns from the Latin League, conferred on them the privilege of the highest citizenship (*jus suffragii et honorum*). While the other Latin towns waned steadily, Tusculum grew and became in the course of time the favourite pleasure resort of the rich Roman nobles, whose sumptuous villas were scattered over the slopes of the hill; many of them can even yet be identified among the mass of ruins. The Villa of Lucullus, now the Villa Torlonia, the most splendid of them all, was famous for its library. The Villa of Agrippina, the Villa of Claudius, and those of the Flavian emperors stood on the site of modern Frascati. That of Marcus Porcius Cato, the Censor, rose on the site now occupied by the village of Monte Porzio Catone, named therefrom. Tiberius, Julia, and Vespasian also had villas at Tusculum. The exact site of Cicero's villa, where he wrote the "*Disputationes Tusculanæ*" and other works, is a matter of learned controversy. In the opinion of some it occupied the present site of the monastery of Grottaferrata; others hold that it was near the modern Villa Rufinella. A more probable opinion is that it stood on the knoll above Grottaferrata. To adorn it Cicero commissioned his friend Atticus to purchase statues in Athens, the cost of which almost ruined him financially. When he was exiled in 58 B.C. the villa was sacked, and the Consul Gabinius carried off much booty to his own house. On the top of the hill near the western gate of the old town, there are to be seen even to-day the ruins of an immense villa, discovered by Canina, who drew a plan of it; it is commonly but erroneously known as the Villa of Tiberius. The ancient town was built along the ridge of the hill, about 2000 feet above the sea-level. There remain the ruins

of the Greek theatre, the fortress with megalithic walls, and an amphitheatre locally known as *Scuola di Cicerone* (Cicero's School); there are also rough roads paved with huge polygonal blocks of stone, and lined with tombs, grottoes, etc. Excavations were begun by the Jesuits in 1741, and were placed by Lucien Bonaparte under the direction of Biondi and Amati in 1819; later Maria Christina of Savoy had the work carried on by Canina, who wrote a description of the discoveries. Some of the most beautiful sculptures in the Vatican Museum and elsewhere at Rome were found at Tusculum.

Among the many inscriptions found at Frascati very few are Christian, and the excavations so far show no trace of early Christianity. The basilica of the monastery at Grottaferrata, and the chapel of San Cesario, close to the modern episcopal residence,



CATHEDRAL OF S. PIETRO, FRASCATI  
Designed by Girolamo Fontana

are the only Christian monuments that antedate the destruction of ancient Tusculum in 1191. Nevertheless from its very proximity to Rome, Tusculum must have received the Christian Faith at an early date. Perhaps the villa of the Acilii, a Christian family, on the site of which stands the monastery of Grottaferrata, was the cradle of Christianity for the people of Tusculum. The first known Bishop of Tusculum is Vitalianus in 680, whose subscription appears on Pope Agatho's letter to the Sixth General Council. Being one of the suburbicarian bishops, the Bishop of Tusculum from the seventh century was bound to take his turn in replacing the pope at the functions in the Lateran; but it is not till the time of Bishop Pietro (1050) that we find the title of cardinal given to the Bishop of Tusculum. From the tenth century onwards the Counts of Tusculum exercised a preponderant influence over the Government of Rome and the papacy itself. Theophylactus, Senator of the Romans and founder of the family, was the husband of Theodora, who under Sergius III was absolute mistress of Rome, and whose daughter Marozia married Alberic I, Margrave of Camerino and Duke of Spoleto, father of Alberic II, who from 932 to 954 ruled Rome under the

Merovingian princes. Brunehilde, who, throughout the reigns of her son and grandsons, had been very influential, now assumed the guardianship of her great-grandson, Sigebert II, and the government of the two kingdoms. But the earlier struggle between monarchical absolutism and the independence of the Frankish nobility now broke out with tragic violence. It had long been latent, but the sight of a woman exercising absolute power caused it to break forth with boundless fury. The Austrasian nobles, eager to avenge the sad fate of Theudebert on the descendants of Thierry, joined with Clotaire II, King of Neustria, who took possession of the Kingdoms of Burgundy and Austrasia. The children of Thierry II were slain. Brunehilde, who fell into the hands of the victor, was tied to the tail of a wild horse and perished (613). She had erred in imposing a despotic government on a people who chafed under government of any kind. Her punishment was a frightful death and the cruel calumnies with which her conquerors blackened her memory.

The nobles had triumphed. They dictated to Clotaire II the terms of victory and he accepted them in the celebrated edict of 614, at least a partial capitulation of Frankish royalty to the nobility. The king promised to withdraw his counts from the provinces under his rule, i. e. he was virtually to abandon these parts to the nobles, who were also to have a voice in the selection of his prime minister or "mayor of the palace", as he was then called. He likewise promised to abolish the new taxes and to respect the immunity of the clergy, and not to interfere in the elections of bishops. He had also to continue Austrasia and Neustria as separate governments. Thus ended the conflict between the Frankish aristocracy and the monarchical power; with its close began a new period in the history of the Merovingian monarchy. As time went on royalty had to reckon more and more with the aristocracy. The Merovingian dynasty, traditionally accustomed to absolutism, and incapable of altering its point of view, was gradually deprived of all exercise of authority by the triumphant nobility. In the shadow of the throne the new power continued to grow rapidly, became the successful rival of the royal house, and finally supplanted it. The great power of the aristocracy was vested in the "mayor of the palace" (*major domus*), originally the chief of the royal household. During the minority of the Frankish kings he acquired steadily greater importance until he came to share the royal prerogative, and eventually reached the exalted position of prime minister to the sovereign. The indifference of the latter, usually more absorbed in his pleasures than in public affairs, favoured the encroachments of the "mayor of the palace", and this office finally became the hereditary right of one family, which was destined to replace the Merovingians and become the national dynasty of the Franks. Such then were the transformations which occurred in the political life of the Franks after the downfall of Brunehilde and during the reign of Clotaire II (614-29). While this king governed Neustria he was obliged, as has been said, to give Austrasia a separate government, his son Dagobert becoming its king, with Arnulf of Metz as councillor and Pepin of Landen as mayor of the palace (623). These two men were the ancestors of the Carolingian family. Arnulf was Bishop of Metz, though resident at court, but in 627 he resigned his episcopal see and retired into monastic solitude at Remiremont, where he died in the odour of sanctity. Pepin, incorrectly called of Landen (since it was only in the twelfth century that the chroniclers of Brabant began to associate him with that locality), was a great lord from Eastern Belgium. With Arnulf he had been at the head of the Austrasian opposition to Brunehilde.

On the death of Clotaire II, Dagobert I, his only heir, re-established the unity of the Frankish monarchy and took up his residence in Paris, as Clovis had

done in the past. He too was soon forced to give Austrasia a separate government, which he confided to his son Sigebert III, with Cunibert of Cologne as his councillor and Adalgisil, son of Arnulf of Metz and son-in-law of Pepin, as mayor of the palace. Pepin, who had lost royal favour, was temporarily deprived of any voice in the government. The reign of Dagobert I was one of such great pomp and outward show, that contemporaries compared it to that of Solomon; however, it marked a decline in the military prowess of the Franks. They subdued, it is true, the small nations of the Bretons and Basques, but were themselves beaten by the Frankish merchant Samo, who had created a Slavonic kingdom on their eastern confines. Dagobert relieved the situation only by exterminating the Bulgars who had taken refuge in Bavaria. Like most of his race, Dagobert was subject to the females of his family. He died young and was buried in the celebrated Abbey of Saint-Denis which he had founded and which subsequently became the burial-place of the kings of France. After his death Austrasia and Neustria (the latter united with Burgundy) had the same destiny under their respective kings and mayors of the palace. In Neustria the young king, Clovis II, reigned under the guardianship of his mother, Nanthilde, with Aega, and later Erkinwald, as mayor of the palace. Sigebert III reigned in Austrasia with Pepin of Landen, who had returned and was installed as mayor of the palace after the death of Dagobert. The history of Austrasia is better known to us as far as 657 because, at that time, it had a chronicler. On the death of Pepin of Landen in 639, Otto, mayor of the palace, took the reins of power, but was overthrown and replaced by Grimoald, son of Pepin. Grimoald went even further; when, in 656, Sigebert III died, he conceived the bold plan of seizing the crown for the benefit of his family. He banished young Dagobert II, son of Sigebert, to an Irish monastery. Not daring to ascend the throne himself, he followed the example of Odoacer and gave it to his son Childebert. But this attempt, as bold as it was premature, caused his downfall. He was delivered up to Clovis II by the Austrasian nobles and, so far as can be ascertained, seems to have perished in prison. Clovis II remained sole master of the entire Frankish monarchy, but died the following year, 657.

Clotaire III (657-70), son of Clovis, succeeded his father as head of the entire monarchy under the guardianship of his mother, Bathilde, with Erkinwald as mayor of the palace. But like Clotaire II, in 614, Clovis was constrained in 660 to grant Austrasia a separate rule, and appointed his brother Childeric II its king, with Wulfoald as mayor of the palace. Austrasia was now overshadowed by Neustria owing to the strong personality of Ebroin, Erkinwald's successor as mayor of the palace. Like Brunehilde, Ebroin sought to establish a strong government and, like her, drew upon himself the passionate opposition of the aristocracy. The latter, under the leadership of St. Léger (Leodegarius), Bishop of Autun, succeeded in overthrowing Ebroin. He and King Thierry III who, in 670, had succeeded his brother Clotaire III, were consigned to a convent, Childeric II, King of Austrasia, being summoned to replace him. Once again monarchical unity was re-established, but it was not destined to last long. Wulfoald, mayor of Austrasia, was banished, also St. Léger. Childeric II was assassinated and for a short time general anarchy reigned. However, Wulfoald, who managed to return, proclaimed King of Austrasia young Dagobert II, who had come back from exile in Ireland, while St. Léger, reinstated in Neustria, upheld King Thierry III. But Ebroin, who meanwhile had been forgotten, escaped from prison. He invaded Neustria, defeated the mayor Leudesius, Erkinwald's son, who, with the approval of St. Léger, was governing this kingdom, reassumed the power, and maltreated the Bishop of Autun, whom he

caused to be slain by hired assassins (678). He afterwards attacked Austrasia, banished Wulfoald, and had King Thierry III acknowledged. The opposition shown Ebroin by the Austrasian nobles under the leadership of Pepin II and Martin was broken at Laffaux (Latofao), where Martin perished, and Pepin disappeared for a while. Ebroin was then for some years real sovereign of the Frankish monarchy and exercised a degree of power that none save Clovis I and Clotaire I had possessed. There are few characters of whom it is as difficult to form a just estimate as of this powerful political genius who, without any legal authority, and solely by dint of his indomitable will, acquired supreme control of the Frankish monarchy and warded off for a time the reforms of the aristocracy. The friendship professed for Ebroin by Saint Ouen, the great Bishop of Rouen, seems to indicate that he was better than his reputation, which, like that of Brunehilde, was intentionally blackened by chroniclers who sympathized with the Frankish nobles.

Ebroin's disappearance afforded full scope to the power of the family which was now called on to give a new dynasty to the Franks. Forced to remain in obscurity for over twenty years, in consequence of Grimoald's crime and downfall, this family finally reappeared at the head of Austrasia under Pepin II, inappropriately called Pepin of Heristal. There flowed in the veins of Pepin II, son of Adalgisil and of St. Begga, daughter of Pepin I, the blood of the two illustrious men who, by the overthrow of Brunehilde, had established a moderate monarchy in Austrasia. Despite the defeat inflicted on him by Ebroin, Pepin remained the leader and the hope of the Austrasians, and, after the death of his dreaded adversary, vigorously resumed the struggle against Neustria, a kingdom which was then disturbed by the rivalry between Waratton, mayor of the palace, and his son Gislemar. From 681 to 686 the functions of mayor were alternately discharged by Waratton and Gislemar, again by Waratton, and finally, at his death, by his son-in-law Berthar. Pepin, who seems to have had amicable relations with Waratton, would not acknowledge Berthar, whom he overthrew in the battle of Testri near Soissons (687); in this way Austrasia avenged the above-mentioned defeat at Laffaux. The death of Berthar, assassinated in 688, removed the last obstacle to the authority of Pepin in Neustria, who was thenceforth simultaneously mayor of the palace for all three kingdoms. So vast was his power that from that date history merely mentions the names of the Merovingian kings whom he kept on the throne; Thierry III (d. 691), Clovis III (d. 695), Childebert III (d. 711), and Dagobert III (d. 715). Indeed, it is only through respect for a traditional fiction of history that Pepin II is not put down as the first sovereign of the Carolingian dynasty. The direction of the destinies of the Frankish monarchy now passed from the hands of the Salian into those of the Ripuarian Franks. These constituted the Germanic element of the nation which took the place of the Roman party in the government. Their policy was better adapted to the spirit of the times inasmuch as it abolished the traditional absolutism of the Merovingians. Finally the Carolingians had the merit and the satisfaction (for it was both) of re-establishing unity in the Frankish monarchy which had been so frequently divided; from 687 to 843, that is, for over a century and a half, all the Franks were united under the same government. But Pepin II did not confine himself to restoring Frankish unity; he extended the frontiers of the monarchy by subduing the Frisians, his neighbours on the north. These restless barbarians, who occupied a large portion of the present Kingdom of the Netherlands, were fanatical pagans; Ratbod, their duke, was a bitter enemy of Christianity. Pepin forced him to surrender Western Frisia, which nearly corresponded to the present provinces of South and North Hol-

land, and obliged him to keep the peace for the rest of his life.

Pepin could now consider the Kingdom of the Franks as an hereditary patrimony, and he conferred the mayoralty of Neustria on his son Grimoald. At his death in 714, which was subsequent to that of his two sons Grimoald and Drogon, he bequeathed the entire monarchy, as a family heritage, to his grandson Theodoald, Grimoald's son, still a minor. This act was a political blunder suggested to the clear-minded Pepin on his death-bed by his wife Plectrude. Pepin had a son Charles by a mistress named Alpaide, who at his father's death was twenty-six years of age and quite capable, as events showed, of vigorously defending the paternal inheritance. It cannot be said that the stigma of illegitimacy caused him to be put aside, for Theodoald was also a natural son, but the blood of the ambitious Plectrude coursed through the latter's veins, and she reigned in his name. The people, however, would not now submit to the regency of a woman any more than in the time of Brunehilde. There was a universal uprising among the Neustrians, Aquitanians, and Frisians. Elsewhere may be found an account of these struggles. (See CHARLES MARTEL.) Here it suffices to say that Plectrude was soon cast aside and Charles Martel, whom she had thrown into prison, escaped and placed himself at the head of the national Austrasian party. Defeated at first, but soon victorious over all his enemies, Charles reduced nearly all the rebellious tribes to obedience, not only those just named, but also the Bavarians and Alamanni. His greatest service to civilization was the glorious victory over the Arabs between Tours and Poitiers (732), which earned him the name of Martel, the hammer. This conquest saved Christianity and preserved Europe from the power of the Mussulmans. It was not, however, Charles's last encounter with the Arabs; he banished them from Provence and in 739 defeated them again on the banks of the Berre near Narbonne. This sovereign, whose exclusively military career consisted in restoring, by dint of force, an empire that was crumbling away, could not escape the accusation of having abetted violence in others and resorted to it himself. He has especially been charged with secularizing many ecclesiastical estates, which he took from churches and abbeys and gave in fief to his warriors as a recompense for their services. This land actually remained the property of the ecclesiastical establishments in question, but its hereditary usufruct was assured to the new occupants. This expedient enabled Charles Martel to collect an army and secure faithful followers. Another no less censurable practice was that of conferring the highest ecclesiastical dignities upon unworthy persons whose only right was that they were loyal soldiers of Charles Martel. However, it must be remembered that these measures enabled him to muster the forces with which he saved Christian civilization at Tours. He also aided efficaciously St. Boniface in his project of spreading the Christian Faith throughout Germany. Such were the popularity and prestige of Charles that when, in 737, King Thierry IV died, he saw no necessity of providing a successor for him, and reigned alone. He died at Quierzy-sur-Oise 21 October, 741, after having divided the provinces between his two sons: Carloman received Austrasia with its Germanic dependencies, and Pepin, Neustria, Burgundy, and Provence, while Grifon, a natural son, was excluded from the succession as Charles himself had been.

Pepin and Carloman reigned together until 747, supporting each other in their various enterprises and combating the same enemies. During the first years of their administration they had to subdue the revolts of the Aquitanians, the Saxons, the Alamanni, as well as those of their brother Grifon, and of Odilo, Duke of Bavaria. They conquered all the rebels, but left to Aquitaine and Bavaria their national dukes while they

abolished the Duchy of Alamannia. They also undertook the great work of reforming the Frankish Church, into which several generations of civil wars had introduced great disorders. National councils convoked, by their efforts, in Austrasia (at Estinnes, or Lestinnes) and Neustria (at Soissons) the work of which was completed by a large council attended by the bishops of both countries, were largely instrumental in restoring order and discipline in the Church, in eliminating abuses and in rooting out superstition. St. Boniface, the soul of this great work, after having, to some extent, created the Church of Germany, had also the glory of regenerating the Frankish Church. While deeply absorbed in this twofold task of defending the kingdom and reforming the Church, the two brothers thought of reinstating a Merovingian king (743), although for six years the nation had existed without one. It would seem that they were led to do this by the necessity of removing one of the objections that could be made to their authority, at a time when it was assailed on all sides and when they were treated as usurpers. Under these circumstances they placed upon the throne Childeric III, the last Merovingian king.

When the task common to both brothers was nearly accomplished, Carloman, yielding to the inclination he had always felt for the religious life, relinquished all his states in favour of Pepin and retired to a cloister on Mt. Soracte near Rome (747). Pepin, who thus remained alone at the head of the vast Frankish monarchy, reaped all the fruit of their combined labours. It was easy for him to subdue a last revolt by Grifon, who perished in Italy. Afterwards he enjoyed a few years of peace, a rare privilege in those stormy times. Having now become undisputed master of the greatest nation of Europe, and confident of being able to transmit intact to his sons the power he had received from his father, Pepin considered the question whether the time had not come to assume the name to which his sovereign authority entitled him. Such a step could hardly be objected to when he was virtually king. Since the Merovingian who occupied the throne was there only at Pepin's will, it was surely Pepin's privilege to remove him. Einhard describes the character of the royalty of the last Merovingians whom the princes of Pepin's family tolerated or replaced upon the throne. "This king to whom nothing royal had been left save the title of king, sat upon the throne and, with long hair and unkempt beard, played the part of master. He gave audience to the ambassadors who came from various countries and issued replies that had been dictated to him, as if coming from himself. In reality, outside of a hollow name and a doubtful pension paid him at the will of the mayor of the palace, he had nothing for his own save a small farm yielding a meagre income, and here he lived with a small number of serfs. When he went out, he rode in an ox-cart driven by a rustic driver. In this vehicle he annually attended the *Champs de Mai*. The mayor of the palace alone controlled public affairs." This description, it is true, is somewhat of a caricature, and there is evidence in public charters that the position of the Merovingian kings was not as insecure as Einhard says. Nevertheless, it expresses well the marked contrast between the humiliating position of the king and the exalted, powerful standing of the mayor of the palace. It can be understood, therefore, that in 751, Pepin and the Frankish nobles might well discuss the question as to whether he should assume the kingly crown. The question had a moral side, namely, whether it was lawful to assume a title which seemed to belong to another. It was decided to appeal for a solution to the sovereign pontiff, recognized by all as the custodian and interpreter of the moral law. A Frankish embassy left for Rome and submitted the question to Pope Zachary. The latter's reply was given in the form of a declaration of principles admin-

ably embodying Catholic doctrine on this important point: "ut melius esset", said the pope, "illum regem vocari, qui potestate haberet, quam illum qui sine regali potestate maneret" [it were better for him to be called king who holds the power than the one who remains (king in name) without the regal power]. Reassured by this decision, Pepin hesitated no longer, and had himself proclaimed king at Soissons in 751. Childeric III was sent to end his days in a cloister. The nature of the authority with which Pepin was invested was emphasized for the first time among the Franks, by the coronation ceremony, which imparted a religious nature to his power and imprinted upon him a sacred character. It has been said, but without proof, that St. Boniface attended the coronation. In this way, after having exercised the royal power almost uninterruptedly for over a century, the descendants of Arnulf and Pepin finally assumed the title of sovereignty, and the Carolingian dynasty replaced that of the Merovingians on the Frankish throne.

GREGORY OF TOURS, *Historia Francorum* (538-94); the seventh-century chronicle attributed to a certain FREDEGARIUS, and its eighth-century continuation; these, with the *Liber Historiae* and the lives of the Merovingian saints are included in the *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. rer. Merov.* I, II, IV; the *Lex Saxonica*, often edited, e. g. HESSELS AND KERN, *The Lex Saxonica* (London, 1880).

MODERN WORKS.—RICHTER, *Annalen des fränkischen Reichs im Zeitalter der Merowinger* (Halle, 1873); SCHULTZE, *Das merovingische Frankenreich* (Stuttgart, 1896), in ZWIEDEWED-SUDENHORST, *Bibliothek deutscher Geschichte*, II; PROU, *La Gaule mérovingienne* (Paris, s. d.); BAYET AND PFISTER in LAVISSE, *Histoire de France*, II; VACANDARD, *Vie de saint Ouen* (Paris, 1902).

CODEFROI KURTH.

Franzelin, JOHANN BAPTIST, cardinal and theologian; b. at Aldein, in the Tyrol, 15 April, 1816; d. at Rome, 11 Dec., 1886. Despite their poverty, his parents sent him at an early age to the neighbouring Franciscan college at Bolzano. In 1834 he entered the Society of Jesus at Graz, and after some years spent in higher studies and teaching in Austrian Poland, began in 1845 his course of theology in the Roman college of the Society, where he also acted as assistant in Hebrew, in which he was especially proficient. Driven from Rome by the Revolution of 1848, he went successively to England, Belgium, and France, where he was ordained in 1849. In 1850 he returned to the Roman college as assistant professor of dogma, and lecturer on Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldean. In 1853 he became prefect of studies in the German college and in 1857 professor of dogmatic theology in the Roman college, where he remained for nineteen years, winning for himself by his lectures and publications a foremost place among the theologians of that time. During this period he acted as consultant to several Roman Congregations, and aided in the preliminaries of the Vatican Council, in which he afterwards served as papal theologian. In 1876, despite his sincere and strenuous protests, he was raised to the cardinalate by Pius IX. This dignity made almost no change in his scrupulously simple and laborious life. He continued his use of poor garments; occupied but two bare rooms in the Jesuit novitiate of Sant' Andrea; rose every morning at four and spent the time till seven in devotional exercises, always hearing Mass after saying his own; fasted every Saturday, and towards the end of his days Fridays also, besides using other forms of corporal penance.

Though of delicate health, Franzelin had always been a constant and most laborious worker, never allowing himself any recreation during his long years of poor health, severe toil, and painful scruples, save the short recreation after dinner and supper. As a cardinal his sole departure from strict adherence to Jesuit rule was to omit this daily recreation. Moreover, though constantly engaged as Prefect of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics, and consultant of several other Congregations, he steadily refused the aid of a secretary. His entire income as a cardinal

he distributed among the poor, the foreign missions, and convents whose property had been seized by the Italian Government. As a theologian Franzelin takes high rank. From the first, his works were recognized as a mine of rich material for the preacher no less than the professor; and for years he was accustomed to receive numerous letters from priests in all parts of the world, spontaneously acknowledging the great aid in preaching they had derived from his books. Of his works, which have gone through numerous editions, the treatise "*De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*" (Rome, 1870) is considered classical. The others are "*De SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramento et Sacrificio*" (1868); "*De Sacramentis in Genere*" (1868); "*De Deo Trino*" (1869); "*De Deo Uno*" (1870); "*De Verbo Incarnato*" (1870); some smaller treatises, and the posthumous "*De Ecclesia Christi*" (1887).

BONAVENIA, *Raccolta di Memorie intorno alla vita dell' Em. Cardinale Giovanni Battista Franzelin* (Rome, 1887); WALSH, *John Baptist Franzelin, A Sketch and a Study* (Dublin, 1895); *Commentarius de Vita Eminentissimi Auctoris* in FRANZELIN'S posthumous work, *De Ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1887); HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Frascati, DIOCESE OF (TUSCULANA)**, one of the six suburbicarian (i. e. neighbouring) dioceses from an immemorial date closely related to the Roman Church. The city of Frascati is about twelve miles from Rome on the northern slopes of the Alban Hills, pleasantly and healthfully situated. Its principal source of wealth is its vineyards, which yield an excellent wine. The history of the city (population, 10,000) is bound up with that of ancient Tusculum, which, according to the legend, was founded by Telegonus, the son of Ulysses and Circe. In the kingly period Tusculum was an ally of Rome, to which it later became subject. After the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus, Octavius Manilius, the tyrant of Tusculum, and son-in-law of Tarquinius, roused the Latin communes against the Roman Republic (507 B.C.); they were routed, however, at the battle of Lake Regillus (496 B.C.). In 493 the Latin League with Rome was renewed. After the disastrous battles of Vesuvius and Trifanum (338 B.C.), Rome, in order to detach Tusculum and other towns from the Latin League, conferred on them the privilege of the highest citizenship (*jus suffragii et honorum*). While the other Latin towns waned steadily, Tusculum grew and became in the course of time the favourite pleasure resort of the rich Roman nobles, whose sumptuous villas were scattered over the slopes of the hill; many of them can even yet be identified among the mass of ruins. The Villa of Lucullus, now the Villa Torlonia, the most splendid of them all, was famous for its library. The Villa of Agrippina, the Villa of Claudius, and those of the Flavian emperors stood on the site of modern Frascati. That of Marcus Porcius Cato, the Censor, rose on the site now occupied by the village of Monte Porzio Catone, named therefrom. Tiberius, Julia, and Vespasian also had villas at Tusculum. The exact site of Cicero's villa, where he wrote the "*Disputationes Tusculanæ*" and other works, is a matter of learned controversy. In the opinion of some it occupied the present site of the monastery of Grottaferrata; others hold that it was near the modern Villa Rufinella. A more probable opinion is that it stood on the knoll above Grottaferrata. To adorn it Cicero commissioned his friend Atticus to purchase statues in Athens, the cost of which almost ruined him financially. When he was exiled in 58 B.C. the villa was sacked, and the Consul Gabinius carried off much booty to his own house. On the top of the hill near the western gate of the old town, there are to be seen even to-day the ruins of an immense villa, discovered by Canina, who drew a plan of it; it is commonly but erroneously known as the Villa of Tiberius. The ancient town was built along the ridge of the hill, about 2000 feet above the sea-level. There remain the ruins

of the Greek theatre, the fortress with megalithic walls, and an amphitheatre locally known as *Scuola di Cicerone* (Cicero's School); there are also rough roads paved with huge polygonal blocks of stone, and lined with tombs, grottoes, etc. Excavations were begun by the Jesuits in 1741, and were placed by Lucien Bonaparte under the direction of Biondi and Amati in 1819; later Maria Christina of Savoy had the work carried on by Canina, who wrote a description of the discoveries. Some of the most beautiful sculptures in the Vatican Museum and elsewhere at Rome were found at Tusculum.

Among the many inscriptions found at Frascati very few are Christian, and the excavations so far show no trace of early Christianity. The basilica of the monastery at Grottaferrata, and the chapel of San Cesario, close to the modern episcopal residence,



CATHEDRAL OF S. PIETRO, FRASCATI  
Designed by Girolamo Fontana

are the only Christian monuments that antedate the destruction of ancient Tusculum in 1191. Nevertheless from its very proximity to Rome, Tusculum must have received the Christian Faith at an early date. Perhaps the villa of the Acilii, a Christian family, on the site of which stands the monastery of Grottaferrata, was the cradle of Christianity for the people of Tusculum. The first known Bishop of Tusculum is Vitalianus in 680, whose subscription appears on Pope Agatho's letter to the Sixth General Council. Being one of the suburbicarian bishops, the Bishop of Tusculum from the seventh century was bound to take his turn in replacing the pope at the functions in the Lateran; but it is not till the time of Bishop Pietro (1050) that we find the title of cardinal given to the Bishop of Tusculum. From the tenth century onwards the Counts of Tusculum exercised a preponderant influence over the Government of Rome and the papacy itself. Theophylactus, Senator of the Romans and founder of the family, was the husband of Theodora, who under Sergius III was absolute mistress of Rome, and whose daughter Marozia married Alberic I, Margrave of Camerino and Duke of Spoleto, father of Alberic II, who from 932 to 954 ruled Rome under the



title of Patrician and Senator, and obtained from the Romans the assurance that after his death his son Octavian should be made pope (John XII). When John XII was deposed (963), the Counts of Tusculum yielded for a time to the Crescenzi, but their power was soon restored to them. From 1012 to 1044 three popes of the great Tusculan family succeeded one another: Benedict VIII, his brother John XIX, and their nephew Benedict IX. The Tusculan domination, it is well known, was far from creditable to the Roman Church. Benedict VIII alone has a claim to our respect (Kleinermanns, "Papst Benedict VIII", in "Der Katholik", 1887, II, 407, 480, 624). It was Count Gregory I, father of Benedict VIII, who gave to St. Nilus (1002) the monastery of Grottaferrata. In the conflict over Investitures between Paschal II and Henry V (1111), while Tolomeo, Count of Tusculum, was on the emperor's side, Cardinal-Bishop Giovanni led the Roman opposition to Henry. Under Alexander III, however, Bishop Imaro sided with Antipope Victor IV, though Tusculum itself was in favour of Pope Alexander. The town also opposed the Roman Senate in its attempt to deprive the popes of their temporal power. In 1182 the Romans made war on Tusculum, whereupon Archbishop Christian of Mainz was called in by Pope Lucius III and defeated the Romans. In 1191, Henry VI recalled the German garrison from Tusculum and, as a result, the town was soon destroyed by the Romans and never regained its former prestige (Lugari, *L'origine di Frascati e la distruzione di Tivoli*, Rome, 1891).

In time the people of Tusculum gathered around the Castello di San Cesario, and the village thus begun was called Frascati, either because of the *frasche* (wattles) of which the first huts were built, or because the locality had already been known as *Frascaria*, which in Low Latin means a place covered with underbrush. From the fifteenth century Frascati once more became a favourite health resort of Roman cardinals and nobles. Foremost among the edifices that soon ornamented Frascati are the Villa Mondragone, built by Cardinal Marco Sittico d'Altemps, a nephew of Pius IV, a vast structure with a splendid portico, now used as a Jesuit college; Villa Taverna, now Borghesiana, founded in 1614; Villa Falconieri, the work of Borromini (1648), with paintings by Carlo Maratta (*The Birth of Venus*), Ciro Ferri, and Pierleone Ghezzi (caricatures and portraits of himself); in 1901 it was bought by the Trappists and now belongs to the German Emperor; Villa Lancellotti with its glorious forest drives, where may be seen the little church of San Michele, over which is a small room in which Cardinal Baronius wrote his "*Annales Ecclesiastici*"; Villa Rufinella, higher up the hill, a Jesuit college from 1740 to 1773, which later belonged to the House of Savoy, and is now united to the Villa Lancellotti; Villa Aldobrandini (or Belvedere), the most beautiful of the Frascati villas, built in 1603 by Pietro Cardinal Aldobrandini from designs by Giovanni Fontana, with paintings by Il Cavaliere d'Arpino and by Domenichino (*the Myth of Apollo*); Villa Torlonia, with its numerous fountains; Villa Sora, built by Gregory XIII, now used as a Salesian boarding school. Among the important churches are: the cathedral, the work of Girolamo Fontana; the Gesù, with its imitation cupola painted by the Jesuit Oblate Pozzo; San Rocco, formerly known as S. Maria in Vivario, the cathedral until 1700; Madonna di Capo Croce, and Madonna delle Scuole Pie.

Among the Tusculum bishops of note are Egidius, sent by John XII to Poland in 964; the learned Jacques de Vitry (1228), who preached against the Albigenses; Pietro di Lisbona (1276), chief physician of Gregory IX, and afterwards pope as John XXI; Berengarius of Frédo (1309), who collaborated on the "*Liber Sextus Decretalium*" of Boniface VIII; Baldassare Cossa (1419), after his submission to Martin

V; Giuliano Cesarini (1444); Bessarion (1449); Alessandro Farnese (1519), afterwards Paul III; Giovanni Pietro Carafa (1550), afterwards Paul IV; Giovanni Antonio Serbelloni (1583); Lorenzo Corsini (1725), afterwards Clement XII; Henry Benedict, Duke of York (1761-1807), son of James III, the English Pretender (Cardinal York left his rare collection of books to the seminary library); Bartolomeo Pacca (1818); Francesco Xaverio Castiglione (1821), afterwards Pius VIII; Luigi Micara, the Capuchin (1837); Jean-Baptiste Pitra (1879); and Francesco di Paola Satolli (1904), for several years the first Apostolic Delegate at Washington, U. S. A. In the Diocese of Frascati is situated Monte Compatri, the ancient Labicum, whose cardinal-bishops are often mentioned in medieval history. The diocese has 8 parishes and 16,000 souls, 9 monasteries for men (among them the famous Abbey of Grottaferrata, and one Camaldolese monastery).

TOMMASETTI, *Della campagna Romana in Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria*, IX, sqq.; CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), I, 625-51; MATTEI, *Memorie storiche dell'antico Tuscolo* (Rome, 1836); GROSSI-GONDI, *Le ville tuscolane del rinascimento* (Rome, 1901); IDEM, *Le ville tuscolane dell'età classica* (Rome, 1907).

U. BENIGNI.

**Frasen**, CLAUDE, celebrated Scotist theologian and philosopher of the Order of Friars Minor; b. near Péronne, France, in 1620; d. at Paris, 26 February, 1711. He entered the Franciscan Order at Péronne in his seventeenth year; and after the year of novitiate was sent to Paris, where he completed his studies and remained for thirty years as professor of philosophy and theology. In 1662 he was made doctor of the Sorbonne, and as definitor general, to which office he was elected in 1682, he took part in the general chapters of the order at Toledo and Rome. Outside of the order his counsel was sought not only by ecclesiastics but likewise by secular dignitaries, King Louis XIV of France, in particular, holding him in high esteem. He died at the ripe old age of ninety-one years, seventy-four of which he had spent in religion. Of the writings of Frassen the best known is his "*Scotus Academicus*". This work is rightly considered one of the most important and scholarly presentations of the theology of Duns Scotus. Few, if any, of the numerous interpreters and commentators of Scotus have succeeded so well as Frassen in combining simplicity of style and clearness of method with that subtlety of thought which characterizes Scotistic theology as a whole. The value of the work is enhanced by frequent quotations from the Fathers, and by an impartial statement of all controverted questions in scholastic theology. The first volume is prefaced with a chronological list and a brief historical and dogmatical account of the different heresies from the beginnings of Christianity to the fifteenth century. The latest edition of the "*Scotus Academicus*", published by the Friars Minor (Rome, 1900-02) in twelve volumes, was prepared from notes left by the author himself and preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. Earlier editions were those of Paris (1672-77), Rome (1721), and Venice (1744). Frassen is also the author of a "*Cursus Philosophiæ*", published at Paris in 1688 and at Venice in 1767. On Scripture, he wrote "*Disquisitiones Biblicæ*", vol. I (Paris, 1682); vol. II: "*Disquisitiones in Pentateuchum*" (Rouen, 1705).

HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

**Fraticelli** (or FRATICELLI), a name given to various heretical sects which appeared in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, principally in Italy. The word being frequently a misnomer, a definition is apposite. Considered philologically, *Fraticelli* is a diminutive derived from the Italian *frate* (plural *frati*). *Frati* was a designation of the members of the mendicant orders founded during the thirteenth century, principally the Franciscans or Friars Minor. The Latin *Fraterculus*

does not occur in the old records which concern the Fraticelli. Etymologically the name *Friars Minor* (*Fratres Minores*) is equivalent to the diminutive *Fraticellus*. The ideal of the founder of the Friars Minor, St. Francis, was that his disciples by evangelical poverty, complete self-denial, and humility, should lead the world back to Christ. The Italian people designated as Fraticelli all the members of religious, particularly mendicant, orders, and especially solitaries, whether these observed a definite rule or regulated their own lives.

In this article the name *Fraticelli* is confined to heretical sects which separated from the Franciscan Order on account of the disputes concerning poverty. The Apostolics (Pseudo-Apostles or Apostolic Brethren) are excluded from the category, because admission to the Order of St. Francis was expressly denied to their founder, Segarelli (see APOSTOLICS). They had no connexion with the Minorites, in fact desired rather to exterminate them. It is therefore necessary to differentiate the various groups of Fraticelli, although the one term may be applied to all.

The origin of the Fraticelli and the cause of their growth within and without the Franciscan Order must be sought in the history of the Spirituals. It must suffice here to note that in consequence of St. Francis's severe requirements concerning the practice of poverty, his followers divided into two branches, the *Zelanti*, or Spirituals, and the *Relaxati*, known later as the Conventuals. The popes of the thirteenth century intervened to bring about harmony between the two factions, and Gregory IX, Innocent IV, and Nicholas III gave in their Bulls authoritative explanations of the points at issue. But the differences were not fully adjusted nor was unity ever completely restored between the Spirituals and the main body of the order, the Community (*Fratres de Communitate*).

1. The group founded by Brother Angelo da Clareno (or da Cingoli) comes first in order of time. Angelo and several brethren from the March of Ancona had been condemned (c. 1278) to imprisonment for life, but were liberated by the general of the order, Raimondo Gaufredi (1289-95) and sent to Armenia (1290), where they did good work as missionaries. Exiled from Armenia towards the end of 1293, they returned to Italy, where in 1294 Celestine V, who was noted for his asceticism, but whose pontificate lasted scarcely six months, willingly permitted them to live as hermits in the strict observance of the Rule of St. Francis. After the abdication of Celestine V, his successor, Boniface VIII, revoked all Celestine's concessions, and they emigrated to Greece, where some of them attacked the legality of the papal action. As the pope, through the Patriarch of Constantinople, caused active measures to be taken against them, they fled to Italy, where their leader, Fra Liberatus, attempted a vindication of their rights, first with Boniface VIII (d. 11 October, 1303), and then with Benedict XI, who also died prematurely (7 July, 1304). On his journey to Clement V (1305-14) at Lyons, Liberatus died (1307), and Angelo da Clareno succeeded to the leadership of the community. He remained in Central Italy until 1311, when he went to Avignon, where he was protected by his patrons Cardinals Giacomo Colonna and Napoleone Orsini. Early in 1317 John XXII, pursuant to a decree of Boniface VIII, declared Angelo excommunicated and placed him in custody. He defended himself ably in his "Epistola Excusatoria", representing himself as a zealous Franciscan, but John XXII refused to admit his plea, Angelo being a Celestine hermit, and in the decree "Sancta Romana et universalis ecclesia" (30 December, 1317) refused to authorize the congregation of which Angelo was head. Angelo submitted temporarily, but in 1318 fled to Central Italy, where, acting as general, he assumed charge of the congregation dissolved by the pope, appointed provincials, ministers, and custodians, estab-

lished new monasteries, arrogated all authority, issued pastoral letters, and received novices; in a word, he founded an independent Franciscan Order, the Fraticelli. His adherents professed themselves the original Friars Minor. They denied that John XXII was really pope, as he had abrogated the Rule of St. Francis, which, according to their doctrine, represented the Gospel pure and simple. They asserted that his decrees were invalid, all other religious and prelates were damned, and that the commission of mortal sin deprived priests of the sacerdotal dignity and powers. These views were brought out in the trials to which the imprisoned adherents of Fra Angelo were subjected by the inquisitors, especially in 1334. In the processes of these trials and in numerous papal Bulls they are called, as a rule, *Fraticelli seu fratres de paupere vita*. As appears from the papal Bulls, the followers of Angelo established themselves in Central Italy, i. e., in the province of Rome, Umbria, and the March of Ancona, and also in Southern Italy (Campania, Basilicata, and Naples). Fra Angelo enjoyed the protection of the Abbot of Subiaco, in spite of the fact that John XXII (21 Feb., 1334) commanded the guardian of the cloister at Ara Coeli to imprison Angelo, "the demented heretic who styles himself general of the condemned sect of the Fraticelli". Equally unsuccessful had been a papal warrant issued for his arrest (22 November, 1331), when he fled to Southern Italy. He died 15 July, 1337, and the congregation, deprived of its leader and hard pressed by the Inquisition, split into a number of groups each holding its own doctrines, though it is impossible to determine exactly their origin. It should further be noted that after the controversy regarding poverty broke out (1321-28), all the Fraticelli showed a stronger opposition to the papacy. It was only natural that men of their calibre and extreme tendencies should fall into excesses; but, schismatics and heretics as they were, the moral lapses of individuals are not to be imputed to the whole body, which after all was but loosely organized. Angelo da Clareno, despite the circumstances of his death, was venerated as a worker of miracles.

Keeping in view the earlier history of the sect, we shall have to seek traces of it in Central Italy, Umbria and the March of Ancona. Angelo was highly esteemed by the Augustinian Hermits, with whom he was on friendly terms, especially with Gentile da Foligno and Simone da Cassia, an ascetic writer of great repute. He corresponded with both, and Simone bitterly laments in the death of Angelo the loss of a friend and spiritual adviser. We may, therefore, safely assume that the Fraticelli whom Simone afterwards successfully defended against the Dominicans in the civil courts at Florence (c. 1355), where he was then preaching, were adherents of Clareno. The same is probably true, also, of the Fraticelli in Tuscany who about the same time were attacked in the sensational, though neither learned nor skilful, letters of the hermit, Fra Giovanni dalle Celle. The letters were answered by the Fraticelli. Giovanni went even so far as to use Fra Angelo as a pawn against his adversaries. These, indeed, had separated themselves entirely from the Roman Church. They had attained such power in Florence that they invited the "theologians" to public debate. The "theologians", i. e. the official clergy, did not respond. On 13 October, 1378, the priors of Florence enacted a statute against the Fraticelli; on 8 July, 1381, the city council of Florence commanded them to leave the city in two days or face the tribunal of the Inquisition. They were respected so highly, however, that, when their expatriation was demanded by the city magistrates in the same year (14 December, 1381), one of the councillors took a bold stand against the proposal.

Nevertheless, Fra Michele Berti, from Calci near Pisa, a member of the Ancona branch of Fraticelli, after preaching the Lenten course to his associates in

Florence, was arrested 20 April, 1389, as he was about to leave the city, and was condemned by the Franciscan Archbishop of Florence, Bartolomeo Oleari, to be burned at the stake. He died chanting the *Te Deum*, while his followers, unmolested by the authorities, exhorted him to remain steadfast (30 April, 1389). To the end he maintained that John XXII had become a heretic by his four decretals; that he and his successors had forfeited the papacy, and that no priest supporting them could absolve validly.

We have unmistakable evidence that several heretical followers of Clarenò were in the territory of Naples in 1362. Louis of Durazzo, a nephew of Robert, King of Naples, maintained a number of Fraticelli in a hospital adjoining his castle, Monte Sant' Angelo, and attended their services. These Fraticelli were divided into three sects: those acknowledging Tommaso da Bojano, former Bishop of Aquino; the followers of the pretended minister general, Bernard of Sicily; and those who claimed Angelo da Clarenò as their founder and acknowledged only his successor as their general. All three sects agreed in holding that the true papacy had ceased since the alleged heresy of John XXII, but the party of the minister general held it lawful to accept, in case of necessity, the ministrations of priests who adhered to the papacy.

The "Poor Hermits" of Monte della Majella, near Sulmona, were also Fraticelli and adherents of Angelo da Clarenò, and at one time afforded protection to the famous tribune of the people, Cola di Rienzi (1349). Fanatical as they were on the subject of poverty, they were, in accordance with ancient custom, sheltered by the Celestine monks in the near-by abbey of Santo Spirito. The origin of the orthodox Clarenò, approved as true Franciscans by Sixtus IV in 1474, is unknown; nor is it clear whether they were followers of Angelo who kept aloof from heresy or, after falling into his error, retracted.

II. The second main group of Fraticelli, chronologically considered, were the Spirituals who fled from Tuscany to Sicily, and were surnamed at first the *Rebellious Brothers and Apostates*, but later the *Fraticelli de paupere vita*. It is an error to apply the name *Beghards* to them. When, in 1309, the differences between the Relaxati and the Spirituals had reached a critical point, Clement V cited representatives of both parties to appear before the Curia with a view to adjusting their disputes. The result of this conference was the Constitution "*Exiit de Paradiso*", enacted at the final session of the Council of Vienne (6 May, 1312). This Constitution contained an explanation of the Rule of St. Francis along stricter lines than those of the Bull "*Exiit qui seminat*" of Nicholas III (14 August, 1279), and justified the Spirituals in various matters. This proceeding, however, only provoked the Relaxati superiors to take energetic measures against the Zelanti. Towards the end of 1312 a number of Tuscan Spirituals deserted their monasteries and took forcible possession of the monasteries of Carmignano (near Florence), Arezzo, and Asciano, putting the Relaxati to flight. About fifty, fearing punishment, fled to Sicily. Clement V, hearing of the insurrection, commanded the Archbishop of Genoa and two other bishops to force them to return to obedience under penalty of excommunication. As nearly all disregarded this mandate, the prior of San Fidele at Siena, who had been commissioned to execute it, declared them excommunicated and placed their monasteries under interdict (14 May, 1314). Being also prosecuted by the Archbishop of Florence, the rebels made a solemn protest against the violation of the rule on the part of the Community or Conventuals (7 July, 1313). As it soon became impossible for them to remain in Tuscany, they all fled to Sicily, where they were joined by numerous Zelanti from Northern Italy and Southern France. King Frederick of Sicily, brother of King James II of Aragon, admit-

ted them after they had submitted their statutes to his inspection. Fra Enrico da Ceva was now their leader. On 23 January, 1318, Pope John XXII excommunicated them in the Bull "*Gloriosam ecclesiam*", specifying five errors, to wit: (1) they designated the Roman Church as carnal and corrupt, and themselves as spiritual; (2) they denied to the Roman priesthood all power and jurisdiction; (3) they forbade taking an oath; (4) they taught that priests in the state of sin could not confer the sacraments; and (5) they asserted that they alone were the true observers of the Gospel. At this time they had adopted a close fitting, short, and filthy dress as their religious habit. John XXII (15 March, 1317) admonished King Frederick to take severe measures against them. In a letter of the same date addressed by the cardinals at Avignon to the entire hierarchy of Sicily, special stress was laid on the fact that the rebellious fugitives had elected a superior general, provincials, and guardians. Banished from Sicily, where, however, some remained till at least 1328, they established themselves securely in Naples. On 1 August, 1322, John XXII issued a general decree against them, and after sending King Robert (4 Feb., 1325) the Bulls specially directed against Ceva, on 10 May, 1325, demanded their imprisonment at the hands of King Robert and of Charles, Duke of Calabria. The pope had to repeat this admonition several times (1330, 1331); meanwhile he had ordered the Franciscan Provincial of Calabria (7 March, 1327) and the inquisitors there (1327, 1330, 1331) to proceed against the Fraticelli and had renewed (5 Dec., 1329) the injunctions laid down in the Bull "*Gloriosam Ecclesiam*". From this time onward the adherents of Ceva are hardly to be distinguished from those of the following group; they joined the Michaelites and used the same methods of attack against the papacy. The statement that some professed Mohammedanism may be based on fact, considering their situation and the local circumstances.

III. The third group of the Fraticelli are called the Michaelites, deriving their name from Michael of Cesena, their chief representative and natural leader. It must be premised that this name was in vogue during the fifteenth century and that the party it designated exerted great influence in doctrinal matters on the other groups as early as 1329. It is to be noted also that shortly after this period it becomes difficult to differentiate these groups with anything like precision. The "theoretical" controversy about poverty, carried on in the Franciscan Order, or rather, carried on against John XXII, gave occasion to the formation of this group. It is called "theoretical" to distinguish it from the "practical" controversy waged by the Spirituals relative to the practice of Franciscan poverty which they wished to observe, whereas the leaders in the present conflict were former members of the Relaxati party and sworn enemies of the Spirituals (1309-22).

In 1321 the Dominican Inquisitor at Narbonne, John of Belna, declared heretical the teaching of an imprisoned Beghard of that region, who asserted that Christ and the Apostles owned nothing either individually or in common. The Franciscan lector, Bérenger Talon, defended the Beghard. As he refused to retract and was threatened with punishment by the inquisitor, Bérenger appealed to the pope. The matter soon developed into a general controversy between the Dominicans and Franciscans; among the latter, Relaxati and Zelanti alike supported Bérenger on the basis of the Bull of Nicholas III, "*Exiit qui seminat*". In that Bull Nicholas III had defined the poverty of the Franciscans, both individually and collectively, as equivalent to that of the Apostles, and had therefore transferred to the Roman Church all their holdings in land and houses, as had already been enacted by Innocent IV (14 Nov., 1245). The prohibition of Nicholas III to discuss this point was revoked by John XXII in

a new Bull, "Quia nonnunquam" (26 March, 1322). On 6 March of the same year John XXII had submitted the matter to a consistory. The order was vigorously defended by the Cardinals Vitalis du Four and Bertrand de Turre (de la Tour), Archbishop Arnaldo Royardi of Salerno, and various other bishops, all Franciscans; other cardinals opposed their views, and the pope leaned towards the opposition. He also requested the opinion of Ubertino of Casale, a renowned Spiritual leader (1328), who, with a fine-spun distinction, declared (28 March, 1322) that Christ and the Apostles did possess property, inasmuch as they governed the Church, but not as individuals or as exemplars of Christian perfection. This distinction, more subtle than real, seemed satisfactory to both sides, when the provocative measures taken by the chapter of the order destroyed all prospects of peace. Fra Michael of Cesena, General of the Franciscan Order (elected 1316), a Conventual, as attested by various measures enacted by him with the approval of John XXII, convened a general chapter for 1 June, 1322, at Perugia. Anticipating, on the advice of the Franciscan Cardinals Vitalis and Bertrand, the definitive decision of the pope, the chapter solemnly declared in favour of the "absolute poverty" of Christ (4 June, 1322). This *pronunciamento* was signed by the general, Michael of Cesena, the provincial ministers of Southern Germany, England (William of Nottingham, not Occam), Aquitania, Northern France, and others, as well as by several renowned scholars. On 11 June the chapter solemnly published its decrees to all Christendom. Indignant at these proceedings, John XXII, in the Bull "Ad conditorem canonum" (8 December, 1322), declared that the Roman Church renounced all its claims to the movable and immovable properties of the Franciscan Order and therewith returned them. Thus the pope revoked the Bull "Exiit" of Nicholas III and did away with the poverty which formed the basis of the Franciscan Order. It is easy to understand the effect of this upon the Franciscans, particularly the Zelanti. In the name of the order Fra Boncortese (Bonagrazia) of Bergamo, a capable lawyer and up to that time a bitter enemy of the Zelanti, presented a daring protest against this Bull to the Consistory (14 January, 1323). Although the pope thereupon revised the text of the Bull and reissued it under the original date, he incarcerated Bonagrazia and in the Bull "Cum inter nonnullos" (12 November, 1323) declared heretical the assertion that Christ and the Apostles possessed no property either separately or collectively.

The controversy between the pope and the order soon took on a political character, the Minorites having been appointed counsellors to Louis IV the Bavarian, King of Germany, who also was engaged in a conflict with the pope. After Louis IV (1314-47) had defeated his rival Frederick, Duke of Austria, at the battle of Mühldorf (18 Sept., 1322), and had invaded Lombardy to further the cause of the Ghibelline Visconti, John XXII ordered the whole question of right to the German throne to be brought before the papal tribunal and, on 8 October, 1323, began canonical proceedings against Louis. In the Nuremberg Appeal (18 Dec., 1323) Louis, curiously enough, had accused the pope of unduly favouring the Minorites, though this document was never published. But the Sachsenhausen Appeal of the same King Louis (22 May, 1324) was full of invectives against the "heretic who falsely designates himself Pope John XXII" for doing away with the poverty of Christ. This famous "Spiritualist excursus" is closely connected with the Appeal of Bonagrazia, and with writings of Ubertino of Casale and of Pietro di Giovanni Olivi. It is certain that it originated among the Franciscans who, under the protection of the king, aimed it at John XXII and his teaching, although Louis IV later denied all responsibility in the matter. The result was that Louis IV was excommunicated (11 July, 1324) and, in the decree

"Quia quorundam" (10 Nov., 1324), John XXII forbade all contradiction and questioning of his constitutions "Cum inter nonnullos" and "Ad conditorem". The general chapter of the order, assembled at Lyons (20 May, 1325) under the presidency of Michael of Cesena, forbade any disrespectful reference to the pope. On 8 June, 1327, Michael received instructions to present himself at Avignon, a command which he obeyed (2 Dec., 1327). The pope having sharply reproved him in public (9 April, 1328) for the chapter's action at Perugia (1322), he drew up a secret protest (13 April) and, fearing punishment, fled, despite the orders of the pope, to Aigues-Mortes (28 May) and thence to Pisa, together with Bonagrazia of Bergamo and William of Occam. In the meanwhile other events of importance had occurred. Louis the Bavarian had entered Rome with a German army, to the great joy of the Ghibellines. Accompanying him were Ubertino of Casale, John of Jandun and Marsilius of Padua, the authors of the "Defensor pacis", which declared that the emperor and the Church at large were above the pope. Louis had himself solemnly crowned Emperor of Rome by Sciarra Colonna (17 Jan., 1328), and on 12 May he nominated and had consecrated as antipope Pietro Rainalducci of Corvara, a Franciscan, under the name of Nicholas V. The three fugitives from Avignon presented themselves to Louis and accompanied him to Bavaria, where they remained till their death. John XXII deposed Michael as general of the order (6 June, 1328) and (13 June) appointed the Minorite Cardinal Bertrand de Turre vicar-general of the order to reside at the chapter to be held in Paris (2 June, 1329), which Michael of Cesena vainly attempted to prevent, and brought about the election of Fra Gerardus Odonis of Châteauroux, of the province of Aquitaine. Obedient to John XXII, he induced the majority of the order to submit to the Apostolic See. Michael of Cesena and all his adherents, the Michaelites, were repudiated by the order. At the same time, by command of John XXII, papal proceedings were instituted against them everywhere. The Michaelites denied John's right to the papacy and denounced both him and his successors as heretics. This shows the dangerous character of the sect. In their numerous and passionate denunciations of the popes, especially of John XXII, they always single out for refutation isolated statements of John in his Bulls. To the contention regarding poverty was added (1333) the question of the beatific vision of the saints, concerning which John XXII, contrary to general opinion, yet without intending to define the matter, had declared that it would begin only at the last judgment.

During this period the antipope, Nicholas V, had nominated six cardinals (15 May, 1328), among them an Augustinian and a Dominican, and between September, 1328, and December, 1329, three other cardinals; also among the bishops whom he consecrated were members of the two orders mentioned above. After Louis IV had returned to Bavaria, Nicholas V, deprived of all support, took refuge with the Count of Donoratico. Finally, in his distress, Nicholas appealed to John XXII, cast himself at his feet (Avignon, 4 Aug.), and submitted to honourable confinement at Avignon, where he remained till his death (16 October, 1333).

John, meanwhile, had taken steps against Michael and his followers. In accordance with his instructions (20 June, 1328) to Aycardo, Archbishop of Milan, the proceedings against Michael were published in various localities. On 5 September, 1328, John XXII commanded the imprisonment of Fra Azzolino, who was acting as Michael's vicar, and on 18 August, 1331, the arrest of another vicar, Fra Thedino, who represented Michael in the March of Ancona. Prominent among the followers of Michael were the more or less numerous Minorites in the monasteries of Todi and Amelia

(against whom proceedings were instituted in 1329-30), of Cortona (1329), and of Pisa (1330), where, however, they appeared openly as late as 1354, and at Albignano, and Savona (1329-32).

On 21 Dec., 1328, John XXII graciously pardoned Fra Minus, the Provincial of Tuscany, while on 2 Dec., he had ordered the trial of Fra Humilis, Custodian of Umbria. Papal decrees reveal the presence of Michaelites in England (1329), Germany (1322), Carcassone, Portugal (1330), Spain (1329), Sicily and Lombardy (1329, 1334), Sardinia, Armenia, and other places. John XXII and his immediate successors also issued numerous decrees against the Fraticelli in the March of Ancona, where the bishops and minor feudal barons defended them stubbornly and successfully in spite of papal threats; also in Naples and Calabria, where King Robert and Queen Sanzia exhibited special veneration for St. Francis and his humble followers. In the royal castle, where the chaplaincies were held by Franciscans, there resided Fra Philip of Majorca, a brother of the queen. This Philip had (1328) petitioned John XXII for permission for himself and other Franciscans to observe literally the Rule of St. Francis, independently of the superiors of the order; the pope of course refused. In a letter dated 10 August, 1331, the pope was obliged to settle some doubts of the queen relating to the observance of "holy poverty", and the king had even composed a treatise favouring the views of the Chapter of Perugia (1322). The papal condemnations of the Fraticelli, therefore, had produced but slight results in the Kingdom of Naples. On 8 July, 1331, the pope admonished King Robert to withhold no longer the papal decrees against Michael of Cesena nor prevent their publication in his kingdom. Philip of Majorca, however, preached openly against the pope. It was due to the influence of the royal family that Fra Andrea of Galiano, a court chaplain at Naples, was acquitted in the process instituted against him at Avignon in 1338, as he still continued his intercourse with Michael of Cesena and with the fifty Michaelites who resided for some time under the king's protection in the castle of Lettere near Castellamare, but who later (1235) humbly submitted to their lawful superiors. In 1336 "short-robed" Fraticelli still occupied the monastery of Santa Chiara at Naples, founded by Queen Sanzia, and were established in other parts of the kingdom; their expulsion was demanded (24 June, 1336) by Benedict XII (1334-42). In 1344 Clement VI (1342-52) found it necessary to reiterate the earlier decrees. Between 1363-1370 it at last became possible for Franciscans to take possession of several monasteries in Calabria and Sicily from which the Fraticelli had been expelled; but Gregory XI complains (12 Sept., 1372) that the "ashes and bones of Fraticelli were venerated as relics of saints in Sicily, and churches were even erected in their honour".

From the records of a process (1334) conducted in irregular form against the Fraticelli of the Franciscan monastery at Tauris, who had been reported by Dominicans, we learn that they inveighed openly against John XXII and upheld the views of Michael of Cesena, although in their apocalyptic manner they declared that the order of the Friars Minor was divided in three parts, and that only those would be saved who would journey to the East, i. e. themselves. It is uncertain whether these were identical with the Fraticelli in Armenia, Persia, and other oriental localities, where all bishops were commanded by Clement VI to prosecute them (29 May, 1344).

For a long time the sect prospered exceedingly in the Duchy of Spoleto on account of the continual political turmoil. In a process instituted against a particular Umbrian group of Fraticelli in 1360, we are informed that Fra Francesco Niccolò of Perugia was their founder. They pretended to observe the Rule of St. Augustine, but were fanatical on the question of

poverty and regarded all prelates as guilty of simony. Salvation was to be found only in their, supposedly perfect, order. They imitated the Sicilian Fraticelli in their doctrines and methods of instruction. An interesting letter is still extant which the Fraticelli of the Campagna (1353-55) wrote to the magistrates of Narni when they heard that one of their number (Fra Stefano) had been cruelly imprisoned by the Inquisition of that city twelve or fifteen years before. In this letter they petitioned the magistrates to liberate him according to the example of the cities of "Todi, Perugia, Assisi, and Pisa".

The Fraticelli enjoyed complete liberty in Perugia. They lived where it best suited them, principally in the country-houses of the rich. They became so bold as to publicly insult the Minorites (Conventuals) in the monastery of San Francesco al Prato. It appears that these Fraticelli had elected their own popes, bishops and generals, and that they were split into various factions. The Conventuals, as their one means of defence, called in Fra Paoluccio of Trinci, the founder of the Observants, and ceded to him the small monastery on Monte Ripido near the city (1374). Fra Paoluccio was successful in his disputations with the Fraticelli, and when they had been clearly exposed as heretics, the people drove them from the city. It should be noted that these Fraticelli, and probably all the others of that period, were designated *Fraticelli della opinione*, perhaps on account of their opinion that the Roman papacy had ceased to exist with John XXII (1323) or Celestin V, and that they alone constituted the true Church. About this time Fra Vitale di Francia and Fra Pietro da Firenze exercised a sort of generalship over the Fraticelli. They received protection and hospitality from rich and influential families in Apulia, around Rome, and in the March. One of their protectors was the knight Andreuccio de Palumbario, who sheltered them in his castle near Rieti, for which he was sharply called to account by Urban VI (4 May, 1388). On the same day the Benedictine Abbot of Farfa was reprimanded for a similar fault. On 14 November, 1394, Boniface IX empowered the Minorites of Terra di Lavoro to take possession of the monasteries deserted by the Fraticelli. Martin V conceded the same rights to the Franciscans of the Roman Province (14 November, 1418) and, on 7 April, 1426, transferred to them as a special grant the monastery of Palestrina, which had been a stronghold of the Fraticelli. In the same year Martin V nominated St. John Capistran (27 May) and St. James of the March (11 October) as inquisitors general to take action against the Fraticelli. These promoters of order among the Franciscans fulfilled the duties of their office strictly and energetically and succeeded in striking at the very vitals of the sect. In 1415 the city of Florence had formally banished the "Fraticelli of the poor life, the followers of Michelino of Cesena of infamous memory", and in Lucca five Fraticelli, on trial, had solemnly abjured their error (1411). Martin V also ordered the Bishops of Porto and Alba to take steps against all Fraticelli "in the Roman province, the March of Ancona, the Duchy of Spoleto and other localities" (7 June, 1427). On 27 January of the same year, Martin V had permitted the Observants of Ancona to occupy the monastery of the Fraticelli at Castro l'Eremita as a first step in the campaign against the Fraticelli of that neighbourhood. On 1 June, 1428, he commanded the Bishop of Ancona to enforce his rulings strictly in Maiolati, to put all suspects to the rack, destroy their village, separate the children from heretical parents, and disperse the elder population. A circular letter, which the Fraticelli addressed to all Christendom, proved ineffectual and their doom was sealed. John of Capistran and James of the March burned thirty-six of their establishments, or dispersed the members, and a number were burned at the stake at Florence and Fabriano, at the latter



place in the presence of the pope. St. James of March, commissioned by Nicholas V to proceed against them (1449), wrote the famous "Dialogus contra Fraticellos", which he first published in 1452, making some additions to it later on. According to this the main establishments of the Fraticelli were situated in the valley of Jesi, at Maiolati, Poggio Cupo, Massaccia, and Mergo. They had also constituted bishops in other districts where there were a sufficient number of adherents. They made frequent journeys for propaganda purposes, especially in Tuscany. Some dressed partly as Minorites, some as hermits, often disguising themselves for the sake of protection. Their doctrine was a résumé of their former sectarian errors: the whole Roman Church had deserted the true Faith since the time of John XXII (1323); they alone constituted the true Church and retained the sacraments and the priesthood.

A form of Fraticelli was also represented by Philip of Berbegal, a fanatical and eccentric Observant of Spain (1433), who attempted to establish a strict society of *la Capuciola*, but met vigorous opposition from John Capistran, who issued a dissertation against him.

Only once again are measures known to have been taken against the Fraticelli, viz. in 1466, when a number of Fraticelli from Poli, near Palestrina, and Maiolati were captured at Assisi during the Portiuncula celebration. They were imprisoned in the castle of Sant' Angelo and proceedings instituted against them. Their protector at Poli, Count Stefano de' Conti, was imprisoned, but they also received the protection of the Colonna family of Palestrina. Tradition also mentions that the Fraticelli established many other colonies and that they had an important centre in Greece, whence they sent out emissaries and where they sought refuge from the aggressive measures of St. James of the March. They generally held their reunions at night in private houses and half of the inhabitants of Poli are said to have been among their adherents. The allegation that their religious services were defiled by immoral practices cannot be proved. According to their doctrine, as contained in the "Dialogus", immoral priests incurred the loss of the powers of order and jurisdiction. They had also their own bishop, Nicholas by name.

During this period numerous pamphlets were published controverting the errors of the Fraticelli. While the campaign was going on at Rome, information was brought concerning another sect similar to the Fraticelli, which had been discovered in Germany; but though these visionaries, led by Brothers Johann and Livin of Wirsberg, found adherents among the Mendicants in Bohemia and Franconia, they cannot be considered as Fraticelli. In spite of all persecutions, remnants of the original Fraticelli still survived, but their strength was crippled and they thenceforth constituted no serious danger to the Roman Church. The foregoing sketch sufficiently proves that these heretics were not members of the Order of St. Francis, but rather that they had been expelled from the order and from the Church. The order as such and in the great majority of its members remained faithful to the Church in spite of the fact that many prominent monks and even whole sections fell away.

The best source for the general history of the Fraticelli is EHRLE in *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, III (Berlin, 1887), 553-614; IV (Freiburg, 1888), 1-201; I (Berlin, 1885), 509-70, 154-165; II (Berlin, 1886), 108-64, 249-336, 353-416, 653-69; III (Berlin, 1887), 1-195, 540-52. EUBEL, *Bullarium Franciscanum* (Rome), V (1898), VI (1902), VII (1904); WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, ad ann. 1320-34 (2nd ed., Rome, 1733); BALUZE, *Miscellanea* (2nd ed., 7 vols., Paris, 1678-1715; 4 vols., Lucca, 1761-64); *Analecta Franciscana* (Quaracchi), II (1887), 120 sqq.; III (1897), 474 sqq.; MÜLLER, *Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern mit der römischen Kirche* (2 vols., Tübingen, 1879-80); RIEZLER, *Die literarischen Widersacher der Papste zur Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern* (Leipzig, 1874); MARCOUR, *Anteil der Minoriten am Kampfe zwischen K. Ludwig IV. von Bayern und Papst Johann XXII bis zum Jahre 1328* (Emmerich, 1874); PREGER, *Der kirchenpolitische Kampf*

*unter Ludwig dem Bayern* (Munich, 1877); SCHREIBER, *Die politischen und religiösen Doktrinen unter Ludwig dem Bayern* (Landshut, 1888); FELTEN, *Die Bulle: Ne prætereat, und die Rekonziliationsverhandlungen Ludwigs des Bayern* (2 vols., Trier, 1885-87); IDEM, *Forschungen zur Geschichte Ludwigs des Bayern* (Neuss, 1900); RIEZLER, *Vatikanische Akten zur deutschen Geschichte in der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern* (Innsbruck, 1891); SCHWALM, *Die Appellation König Ludwigs des Bayern von 1324* (Weimar, 1906); for further German bibliography see DAHLMANN-WAITZ, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Gesch.* (7th ed., Leipzig, 1906), n. 4421 sqq., 4499-4529. Tocco, *Un codice della Marciana di Venezia sulla questione della povertà* (Venice, 1886-87); IDEM, *L'eresia nel medio evo* (Florence, 1884); IDEM, *Un processo contro Luigi di Durazzo in Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane*, XII (Naples, 1887); IDEM, *I Fraticelli o poveri Eremiti di Celestino, secondo i nuovi documenti in Bollettino della società di storia patria . . . negli Abruzzi*, XIV (Aquila, 1895), 117-60, XIII, 95-105; IDEM, *Nuovi documenti sui dissidii francescani in Accademia dei Lincei, Scienze mor., stor. e filol.*, ser. V, vol. X (Rome, 1901), 3-20; IDEM, *L'eresia dei Fraticelli e una lettera inedita del b. Giovanni dalle Celle*, *ibid.*, XV (Rome, 1906), 1-18, 109-80, IDEM, *Fraticelli in Archivio storico italiano*, ser. V, vol. XXXV (Florence, 1905), 332-68; DAVIDSON, *Un libro di entrate e spese dell' inquisitore fiorentino (1322-29)*, *ibid.*, ser. V, vol. XXVII (Florence, 1901), 346-55; SAVINI, *Sui Flagellanti, sui Fraticelli e sui bizocchi nel Teramano*, *ibid.*, ser. V, vol. XXXV (Florence, 1905), 82-91 (without value); ZAMBIRINI, *Storia di Fra Michele Minorita come fu arso in Firenze nel 1389 con documenti riguardanti i Fraticelli della povera vita* (Bologna, 1884); FUMI, *Eretici e ribelli nell' Umbria dal 1220 al 1330 studiati su documenti inediti dell' archivio segreto vaticano in Bollettino della reale deputazione di storia patria per l' Umbria*, III (Perugia, 1897), 257-82, 429-89; IV (1898), 221-301, 437-86; V (1899), 1-46, 205-425; IDEM, *Una epistola dei "Powerelli di Cristo" al comune di Narni*, *ibid.*, VII (Perugia, 1901), 353-69; LEA, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1888), III; PASTOR, *Gesch. der Papste im Zeitalter der Renaissance*, II (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1894), 360 sqq.; FINKE, *Acta Pragensia* (2 vols., Berlin, 1908); TOCCO, *Studi Francescani*, I (Naples, 1909); HOLZAPFEL, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens* (Freiburg im Br. 1909), 56 sqq., tr. Lat., *ibid.* (1909), 50 sqq.; LIV. OLIGER in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, I (Piaracchi, 1908), 617 sqq.; BIEHL, *ibid.*, II (1909), 137 sqq., 158 sqq.

MICHAEL BIEHL.

**Fratres Uniti.** See HOLZHAUSER, BARTHOLOMÄUS.

**Fraud**, in the common acceptation of the word, an act or course of deception deliberately practised with the view of gaining a wrong and unfair advantage. Its connotation is less wide than that of deceit, which is used of concealment or perversion of the truth for the purpose of misleading. Stratagems employed in war to deceive the enemy are not morally wrong; yet even in war it would not be right to practise fraud on him. Fraud is something which militates not only against sincerity and straightforward conduct, but against justice, and justice is due even to enemies.

The question of fraud is of special importance in the matter of contracts. It is of the essence of a contract that there should be an agreement of wills between the parties as to its subject-matter. Without such an agreement in all that is essential there can be no contract. Hence, if by fraud one of the parties to a contract has been led into a mistake about what belongs to its substance, the contract will be null and void. If a dealer in jewellery offers a piece of coloured glass to a customer as a valuable ruby, and induces him to pay a large sum of money for it, the contract is invalid for want of consent. The customer wished to buy a precious stone, and he was offered glass. If one of the parties to a contract is fraudulently led into a mistake about something which is merely accidental to the contract and which did not induce him to enter into it, the contract will be valid and there is no reason for setting it aside. If a higher price or more favourable terms were obtained by means of the fraud, there was, of course, wrong done thereby, and if, in consequence, more than the just value was given, there will be an obligation to make restitution for the injustice. But there was no mistake about the substance of the contract, there was union of wills therein, and so, there is no reason why it should not stand. If, however, such a mistake, not indeed regarding the substance of the contract, but caused by the fraud of the other party, was the reason why the contract was entered into, there are special reasons why such a contract should not be upheld.

As there was agreement about the substance of the contract, this will, indeed, be valid, but inasmuch as the consent of the party who was deceived was obtained by fraud and would not otherwise have been given, the contract should be voidable at the option of the party deceived. It is a matter of importance for the public weal that no one should be able to reap benefit from fraud (*Nemini fraus sua patrocinari debet*), as canonists and moralists never tire of repeating. Moreover, the fraudulent party inflicted an injury on the other by inducing him by fraud to do what he would not have done otherwise. It is only equitable and right that one who has thus suffered should be able to rescind the contract and put himself again in the same position as he was in before—if that be possible. Contracts, therefore, induced by the fraud of one of the parties, even though there was no substantial mistake, are voidable at the option of him who was deceived, if the contract can be annulled. If the fraud was committed by a third person without the connivance of the other party to the contract, there will be no reason for annulling it.

Besides fraud committed against a person and against justice, canonists and moral theologians frequently mention fraud against law. One is said to act in fraud of the law when he is careful to observe the letter, but violates the spirit of it and the intention of the lawgiver. Thus one who is bound to fast would act in fraud of the Church's law if on a fasting day he undertook some hard and unnecessary work, such as digging, in order to be excused from fasting. On the other hand, there is no fraud against the law committed by one who leaves the territory within which the law binds, even if he do this with the intention of freeing himself from the law. He is at liberty to go and live where he pleases, and he cannot act fraudulently in doing what he has a right to do. And so, on a fast day which is only kept in some particular diocese, one who lives in the diocese may without sin leave it even with the intention of escaping from the obligation of fasting, and when he is once outside the limits of the diocese he is no longer bound by a purely diocesan law. There are two celebrated declarations of the Holy See which seem at first sight to contradict this doctrine. The first occurs in the Bull "Superna" of Clement X (21 June, 1670), where the pope says that a regular confessor may absolve strangers who come to him from another diocese from sins reserved therein unless he knows that they have come to him in fraud of the reservation. These words have caused great difficulty and have been variously interpreted by canonists and divines.

According to the common opinion they limit the power of the confessor only when the principal motive which induced the penitent to leave his diocese was to avoid the jurisdiction of his own pastor and to make his confession in a place where the sin was not reserved. By reserving the sin in question the ecclesiastical authority desired to compel a delinquent to appear before it and to receive the necessary correction; by leaving the diocese with a view to making his confession elsewhere the penitent would circumvent the law and make it nugatory. If he left the diocese from some other motive, and while outside took the opportunity to make his confession, he would not act in fraud of the law of reservation. Urban VIII (14 Aug., 1627) approved of a declaration of the Sacred Congregation of the Council according to which parties subject to the Tridentine law of clandestinity would not contract a valid marriage in a place where that law was not in force if they betook themselves thither with fraud. There was a similar difficulty as to the meaning of fraud in this decree. According to the more common view, the parties were guilty of fraud by the very fact of leaving the parish with the intention of contracting marriage without the assistance of the parish priest, whose right and duty it was to testify

to the valid celebration of the marriage of his parishioners. This question, however, is now only of historical interest, as the law has been radically changed by the papal decree "Ne temere" (2 Aug., 1907) q. v. St. ALPHONSUS, *Theologia Moralis* (Turin, 1825), III, 1046; VI, 589, 1080; LEHMKEHL, *Theologia Moralis* (Freiburg, 1898), I, 156; II, 780; REIFFENSTUEL, *Jus canonicum* (Rome, 1834); LESSIUS, *De Justitia et Jure* (Venice, 1625).

T. SLATER.

**Frauenburg.** See ERMLAND.

**Frauenlob.** See HEINRICH OF MEISSEN.

**Fraunhofer,** JOSEPH VON, optician, b. at Straubing, Bavaria, 6 March, 1787; d. at Munich, 7 June, 1826. He was the tenth and last son of a poor glass-grinder who was unable to give his boy even the rudiments of knowledge. At the age of twelve he lost both parents and was apprenticed to a mirror-maker and lens-grinder for six years without pay. There he was not permitted to study or even to attend holiday school. The house where he worked collapsed in 1801, burying the boy under the ruins, but not injuring him fatally. This fortunate accident brought him to the notice of court-councillor von Utzschneider, who gave him books on mathematics and optics, and also interested King Max Joseph in him, who made him a present of eighteen ducats. With this money Joseph acquired a grinding-machine and bought his release from the obnoxious apprenticeship. He tried to earn a living at his trade and also as an engraver on metal. Finally, in 1806, he was called to the mathematico-technical institute of Reichenbach, Utzschneider, and Liebherr as an assistant. There he did such excellent work that he became a partner and manager of the optical institute of the firm at Benediktbeuern. In 1814 Utzschneider gave him 10,000 florins and formed with him the new firm of Utzschneider and Fraunhofer. The optical institute was moved to Munich in 1819 and Fraunhofer was appointed professor royal. The University of Erlangen gave him the degree of Ph.D., *honoris causa*, in 1822. The following year he was appointed conservator of the physical cabinet of the academy at Munich. Nobility, the order of merit, and the honorary citizenship of Munich were conferred upon him in 1824. The Imperial Leopoldina Academy, the Astronomical Society of London, and the Society for Natural Science and Medicine of Heidelberg elected him to membership. Shortly before his death he was made a Knight of the Danish order of Danebrog.

The work of this self-taught mathematical and practical optician was chiefly in developing improved methods of preparing optical glass, of grinding and polishing lenses, and of testing them. His success deprived England of its supremacy in the optical field. He invented the necessary machines, constructed a spherometer, and developed the moving and measuring devices used in astronomical telescopes, such as the screw micrometer and the heliometer. His fame, however, rests above all on his initiation of spectrum analysis. While studying the chromatic refraction of different glasses he discovered the banded spectra of artificial lights and also the dark lines in the solar spectrum, called now the Fraunhofer lines. He also accomplished an important theoretical work on diffraction and established its laws; he placed the diffraction slit in front of the objective of a measuring telescope and later made and used diffraction gratings with up to 10,000 parallel lines to the inch, ruled by a specially constructed dividing engine. By means of these gratings he was able to measure the minute wave-lengths of the different colours of light. As a Christian, Fraunhofer was faithful and observant even in details. The simple inscription on his tomb reads: *Approxi-maverit sidera*. His important memoirs were first published in "Denkschriften" of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, the one on refraction, spectra, and lines in 1817, and that on diffraction and its laws

in 1821. They were soon translated into English and French. His collected works have been published by Lommel (Munich, 1888), and translated in part and edited by Ames (New York and London, 1898).

*Sketch of Dr. Jos. Fraunhofer in Pop. Science Monthly*, VI, 739; *Memoir in Jr. Fr. Institute*, VIII, 96; *Mez, Das Leben und Wirken* (Landshut, 1865); *BAUERNFEIND, Gedächtnissrede auf F.* (Munich, 1887).

#### WILLIAM FOX.

**Frayssinous, DENIS DE**, 1765-1841, Bishop of Hermopolis in *partibus infidelium*, is celebrated chiefly for his conferences at Notre-Dame de Paris. He was one of the first orators and apostles who accomplished so much towards the restoration of the Faith in France after the Revolution. He was born at Curières in Rouergue, France, and died at St-Geniez in the department of Aveyron. His earliest sermons were delivered at Paris, first in the church of the Carmelites, and later at Saint-Sulpice, where he continued them for seven years. He was compelled to interrupt his preaching at the order of Napoleon in 1809, but resumed in 1814, and continued, with the brief interruption of the Hundred Days, until 1822. Despite his severity towards the preacher, Napoleon esteemed the Abbé Frayssinous and had made him a councillor of the university, of which he later became grand master. He was elected to membership in the French Academy, and in 1817 pronounced there a panegyric of St. Louis which is still famous. In 1817 he was named almoner to the court of Louis XVIII, and later consecrated Bishop of Hermopolis. He had been raised to the French peerage when, in 1824, he pronounced the funeral oration of Louis XVIII. It was at this time that the Society of Jesus, which had been re-established by Pius VII, wished to return to France. A number of former Jesuits, reunited under the name of Fathers of the Faith, addressed themselves, in 1824, to Mgr de Frayssinous, the minister of public worship, and obtained his protection of their project.

His political career came to an end with the revolution of 1830. After acting as tutor to the Duc de Bordeaux until 1838, he went to live at St-Geniez in Provence, where he died three years later. His conferences had been published some years before, and 'orm, under the title "Défense du Christianisme" (4 vols.), the chief work by which he is known. He published also, in 1818, his slightly Gallican work "Les vrais principes sur les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane". His conferences lack the vibrating warmth and the brilliancy of style which marked those of Lacordaire and his successors in the pulpit of Notre-Dame. But Mgr de Frayssinous possesses the distinction of having inaugurated a great movement of restoration and of having made the word of God acceptable to both the indifferent and the incredulous, owing to the clearness with which he explained dogmatic truths, his judgment in the choice of his proofs and his loyalty in discussion. He was the first in the nineteenth century to sow, in this manner, the apostolic seed, and he assured an abundant harvest to those who followed him.

HENRIOT, *Vie de M. Frayssinous* (Paris, 1843); *Sept conférences et discours de M. D. Frayssinous* (Paris, 1843), preface; RICARD, *L'Abbé Cambalot*.

#### LOUIS LALANDE.

**Fréchette, LOUIS-HONORÉ**, b. at Notre-Dame de Lévis, P. Q., Canada, 16 November, 1839; d. 30 May, 1908. He attended the schools of his native town, and completed his studies at the Seminary of Nicolet, after which he chose the profession of law, and in 1864 was admitted to the Bar at Quebec. As clients did not come as quickly as he desired he decided to go to Chicago, where for seven years he worked as a journalist, and became corresponding secretary of the land department of the Illinois Central Railroad. In 1871 Fréchette returned to Canada, and in 1874 was elected a deputy in the House of Commons by the Liberal

party. Defeated in the general elections of 1878 and 1882, he abandoned public life and returned to journalism, the products of his pen appearing in the "Journal de Québec", the "Journal de Lévis", the "Patrie" of Montreal, the "Opinion Publique", "The Forum", "Harper's Monthly", and "The Arena". Meanwhile his poetry won him fame abroad and admiration at home. The list of his poetical works is somewhat lengthy. The following are given in their chronological order: "Mes Loisirs", 1863; "La Voix d'un Exilé", 1866—first part published at Chicago. Another complete edition appeared at Montreal in 1874. "Pêle-Mêle; Fantaisies et souvenirs poétiques", 1877; "Les Fleurs Boréales, and Les Oiseaux de Neige, Poésies Canadiennes", a work crowned by the French Academy, 1879; "La Légende d'un Peuple—Poésies Canadiennes", 1887-1890; "Les Feuilles Volantes", 1891. Fréchette wrote also much in prose, notably: "Félix Poutre" (an historical drama), 1871; "Lettres à Basile à propos des Causeries du Dimanche", 1872; "Le retour de l'Exilé" (a drama in five acts and eight tableaux), 1880; "Le drapeau fantôme" (historical episode), 1884; "Episode de l'insurrection Canadienne de 1837", 1885; "Originaux et Détraqués", 1892; "Lettres à l'abbé Baillargé sur l'éducation", 1893; "Christmas in French Canada" (in English), 1900. He translated into French, Howell's "Chance Acquaintance" and George W. Cable's "Old Creole Days". Fréchette became a member of the Royal Society of Canada at its foundation in 1882; he was named Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George in 1897, on the occasion of the Jubilee of Queen Victoria. The University of Laval, McGill University, and Queen's University conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Letters. From 1889 Fréchette occupied the position of clerk of the Council in the legislature of Quebec. In 1876 he married Emma Beaudry, second daughter of J.-B. Beaudry, a banker of Montreal, by whom he had two children. He has been called the "Lamartine of Canada". He certainly elevated the poetry of Canada, and his work will rank with that of Crémazie. N. E. DIONNE.

**Fredegarius**, the name used since the sixteenth century (for what reason is not known) to designate the supposed author of an anonymous historical compilation (*Chronicon Fredegarii*) of the seventh century, in which is related the history of the Franks from the earliest times until 658. The name appeared for the first time in the "Antiquités gauloises" (Paris, 1599) of Claude Fauchet, who states that it is used "through ignorance of the real author". Modern research has resulted in the discovery that the work is really made up of three texts each of which belongs to a different author. The first author is a Burgundian whose work is an epitome of six books of the "Ecclesiastical History of the Franks", by Gregory of Tours, from the earliest times to the death of Chilperic I in 584. He also wrote the "Liber generationis" and made extracts from Idatius and St. Jerome which form, in the critical edition of Krusch, the first and second books of the "Chronicon". Including the epitome, or the third book, he has therefore written the largest portion of the work. This portion, it must be said, is also the least important, for it contains no original matter, and confines itself to the use of previous sources, and not without blunders and inaccuracies. It is true that the part of the fourth book which goes to 613 (Krusch), or even to 616 (Schnürer), has been attributed to the same author. The latter remarks that the writer was in touch with Warnacharius the "mayor of the palace" and believes that he may be identified with Agrestius, a monk of Luxeuil. The second author, also a Burgundian, belonged to the south of France and had apparently spent some time at Paris. He wrote an original work extending to the year 642 and containing

information which is valuable because not to be found elsewhere. He is an impartial and veracious author whose testimony deserves to be received in general with great confidence. The third author, who brings the "Chronicon" to a conclusion, is a partisan of Grimoald, the "mayor of the palace" and a great admirer of the Carolingian family. Chapters lxxxiv to lxxxviii and several interpolations are his. These rather important conclusions have been reached in recent times by the critical acumen of B. Krusch. Several points have been more precisely defined by G. Schnürer, and their opinions taken together may be considered definitive, although the last word on the subject has not been said.

Interest in the "Chronicon" of Fredegarius consists for us in the fact that it is the sole document which informs us in a continuous way concerning that period in the history of the Franks which goes from 591 (the year in which the "Ecclesiastical History" of Gregory of Tours comes to a close) to 658. Apart from this work we have almost no knowledge of the period of Frankish history covered by it. All three writers exhibit, it is true, much barbarism in diction and in thought; we are all the more indebted to them for the serious effort they made to preserve some memory of the events of their times. The "Chronicon" of Fredegarius was edited by B. Krusch in "Scriptores Rer. Merovingicarum", II (Hanover, 1888).

KRUSCH, *Die Chronica des sogenannten Fredegars in Neues Archiv*, VII (1882); IDEM, preface to his aforesaid edition; SCHNÜRER, *Die Verfasser der sogenannten Fredegar-Chronik* (Fribourg, Switzerland, 1900) in *Collectanea Friburgensia*, IX; KURTH, *L'histoire de Clovis d'après Frédégaire in Revue des questions historiques* (1890), XLVII; IDEM, *La reine Brunehaut*, *ibid.* (1891), L; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (7th ed., Stuttgart, Berlin, 1894), I, 114-118; 141-142.

GODEFROID KURTH.

**Fredegis of Tours** (FRIDUGISUS or FREDEGISUS), a ninth-century monk, teacher, and writer. Fredegis was an Anglo-Saxon, b. in England towards the end of the eighth century; d. at Tours in 834. He was a pupil of Alcuin, first at York and afterwards at the court of Charles the Great. The proximate date of his birth is determined by a reference to him as "a boy" (*puer*) in a letter of Alcuin dated 798. He was a favourite pupil of Alcuin and was one of the group of distinguished scholars who formed the *Schola palatina*, in which he was known by the name Nathaniel. At that time he was a deacon. When, in 796, Alcuin became Abbot of Tours Fredegis seems to have remained at the court. According to some authorities he was Alcuin's successor as Master of the Palace School. This is, however, improbable. In 804 he succeeded his teacher as Abbot of Tours, retaining at the same time his relations with the emperor. Among his contemporaries he enjoyed a reputation for great learning. He composed several poems and a short treatise in epistolary form, which deals with the nature of nothing and darkness, "*De nihilo et tenebris*". The epistle was written probably during the author's residence at Tours. It is addressed "to all the faithful and to those who dwell in the sacred Palace of the most serene prince Charles".

The occasion of the discussion of a problem which to the modern mind seems childish, namely, Are nothing and darkness real things? was doubtless the Biblical use of the words in the first chapter of Genesis. If the Bible uses the words *nothing* and *darkness*, it seemed in that naively realistic age that there must be things corresponding to those words. Fredegis accepts the realistic answer and defends it both by arguments from authority and by arguments from reason. That his solution, however, was not generally accepted is clear from the opening words of the treatise, in which he refers to the long prevailing divergence of opinion in the matter. The importance of the treatise lies in the use which it makes of the dialectical

method which was afterwards developed into the scholastic method by Abelard, Alexander of Hales, and St. Thomas.

*De nihilo et tenebris* in *P. L.*, CV, 751 and in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epp.*, V, 615; AHNER, *Fredegis von Tours* (Leipzig, 1878), 16. For Life etc. cf. AHNER, *op. cit.*; ENDRES in *Philosophisches Jahrb.* (1906), XIX, 4; MULLINGER, *Schools of Charles the Great* (London, 1877), 72; TURNER, *Hist. of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903), 244.

WILLIAM TURNER.

**Frederick I**, surnamed BARBAROSSA, German King and Roman Emperor, son of Frederick of Swabia (d. 1147) and Judith, daughter of Henry the Black; born c. 1123; died 10 June, 1190. Connected maternally with the Guelphs, he seemed destined to effect a reconciliation between them and the Ghibellines. In 1146 he had already roused public attention by a



FREDERICK BARBAROSSA  
Figure on the Monument of Emperor William I on the Kyffhauser.

determined and victorious war against Duke Conrad of Zähringen. On 4 March, 1152, after having been designated by Conrad III as his successor, he was elected German king, unopposed, and crowned at Aachen on 9 March. Taking Charles the Great as his ideal of a German emperor, Frederick determined to expand his supremacy to its utmost limits. This explains his ecclesiastical policy. With astonishing firmness his bold spirit pursued the aims it had once marked out for itself. Though no scholar, Frederick surprises us by the clearness and cleverness of his speech, by his rapid comprehension and decision, and by his well-reasoned and logical policy. A born ruler, he considered it his duty to secure for his subjects the blessings of peace. The majesty of his personal appearance was combined with attractive kindness. Though shrewd and calculating, he had at times fits of uncontrolled passion. However, he was sufficiently master of himself to restrain his anger if the object to be attained was endangered by an outburst. Such a man naturally excited the admiration and invited the confidence of his fellow-men.

The sense of national unity that grew out of the rivalries existing in the crusading armies found in him an ideal for its enthusiasm. In public opinion Frederick found the support which was lacking to his predecessors, Lothair and Conrad. The German people loved their king, who soon after his coronation visited



the various parts of his realm and manfully exerted himself to establish internal peace. There was no reason why the secular princes of his empire should oppose the newly chosen king; his naturally conservative mind knew how to deal with existing forces. Of the princes, whose power was already approaching sovereignty, he demanded only respect for the existing order. He sought also to unite the interests of the German princes, especially those of the House of Guelph with the interests of the empire. The Gregorian, hierarchical party in Germany was in a state of complete dissolution. From the bishops Frederick had no reason to fear radical opposition to his policy towards the Church, dissatisfaction with the papal administration in Germany being then widespread. He succeeded in recovering the influence formerly exercised by the German king in the selection of bishops. Many powerful men were at that time to be found among the German clergy, prominent among them being the provost of Hildesheim, Rainald von Dassel, consecrated Archbishop of Cologne in May, 1156, and made chancellor of the empire. For eleven years he was the most faithful counsellor of Frederick. Rainald was a formidable opponent of the papacy; in him the bishop almost wholly disappears in the statesman. Similar to Frederick in character, he vigorously supported the anti-hierarchical policy of the emperor. Another prelate, also a staunch supporter of the king, was Wichmann, Archbishop of Magdeburg, more of a soldier than a bishop, and uncanonically promoted from the See of Zeitz to the Archbishopric of Magdeburg. Thus assisted by the various estates of the empire, Frederick sought to make the power of the crown as independent as possible. This he did by vigorously

furthering the interests of his ancestral house. The administrators of his family property, the *ministeriales*, were not only managers of great estates, but at the same time an ever-ready body of warriors. The negotiations between the king and the pope concerning the appointment to the See of Magdeburg revealed for the first time a radical difference between the policies of the Church and the State. During these stormy controversies, forerunners of the approaching tempest, Frederick was strengthened in his views regarding the superiority of the royal over the papal power, chiefly through intercourse with the leading jurists of the University of Bologna. The conception of the dignity of the Roman emperor placed before him by these men confirmed him in his claims to the supremacy of the German kings over the Church, which he based upon the rights exercised by them during the Carolingian period. The whole internal and external policy of Frederick was controlled by the idea of restoring the ancient *imperium mundi*. In Northern Italy, where many prosperous communes had acquired independence, the former imperial suzerainty had passed away. Frederick failed to see that in these cities a new political factor was developing, and underrated the powers of resistance of these free municipal republics. Concerned only with immediate advantages, he sought to recover the *regalia* (income from vacant sees and benefices), which the cities had gradually usurped, and to

utilize them in pursuing his imperial policy. The conduct of Frederick in Northern Italy and the mistaken concept of the relations between Church and State could not fail to bring about a conflict with the papacy. In this conflict for supremacy in Northern Italy, the pope was forced to prove that he was able to defend the position of equality with the king, which the papal see had acquired, and in this way to gain a complete victory over the emperor. The king, a deeply religious man, was, indeed, convinced that the secular and ecclesiastical powers should co-operate with each other, but he made it clear that even the pope should respect in him the imperial lord. If Frederick became master of Italy, the pope would have to acknowledge this supremacy. In the beginning, it seemed probable that Frederick would triumph. The pope

needed German help. Threatened by the Normans from without, he was not even secure in his own city, which governed itself through a senate elected by popular vote and tolerated the revolutionary Arnold of Brescia within its walls. It was in these circumstances that the Treaty of Constance was signed between the pope and the king (March, 1153). This treaty was aimed against the enemies of the pope both in Rome and Southern Italy. In return the pope promised to crown Frederick emperor and to help him against his enemies.

In October, 1154, Frederick began his march Romewards. Owing to the weakness of his army, the king did not succeed at this time in subjecting to his power Northern Italy and the rebellious city of Milan. In 1155 he went on with his army to Rome, where he met the newly elected Pope Adrian IV, who maintained himself in Rome with difficulty and was anxiously awaiting the arrival of the German king. Frederick

could not establish permanent order in Rome. The Treaty of Constance, promising the pope help against the Romans and Normans, was therefore not carried out. On 18 June, 1155, after having delivered Arnold of Brescia into the pope's hands, Frederick was crowned as Roman emperor in spite of the opposition of the rebellious Romans. In Southern, as in Northern, Italy Frederick made little progress during this Italian expedition. During the years 1155-1158, Frederick reached the height of his power, and energetically safeguarded the tranquillity of his realm. The difficult Bavarian question, replete with imminent danger of war, was successfully settled; Henry Jasomirgott surrendered Bavaria to Henry the Lion and in return received Austria as an independent duchy, a step that was pregnant with consequences for the future of Germany. Frederick's policy was also successful along the eastern and western boundaries of his empire. His suzerainty in Burgundy was, in the main, re-established, after Frederick, with the consent of the Curia, had separated from Adela von Vohburg, and married Beatrice, the heiress of Burgundy. On his eastern frontier, he succeeded more and more in Germanizing and Christianizing the local tribes. In this respect, Henry the Lion was the chief pioneer of the future imperial policy. Frederick maintained amicable relations with Denmark, Poland, and Hungary. Impelled by his proud consciousness



FREDERICK BARBAROSSA AS CRUSADER  
Miniature of 1188, Vatican Library



of authority, which found expression at the Diet of Wurzburg (1157), Frederick undertook a second Italian campaign in 1158. In the meantime, conditions had changed in Italy; the pope, from being an opponent of the Normans, had become their ally. The friendly relations between the pope and emperor had suffered a shock after the Diet of Besançon (1157). On that occasion the papal legate had called the imperial dignity a benefice (*beneficium*) of the popes. The expression was ambiguous, since the Latin word *beneficium* might mean either a personal benefit or a feudal concession. There is no doubt, however, that the indignant German princes were right in understanding it to be an assertion of the superiority of the popes over the emperors. In sharp denial of this claim, Frederick



SEAL OF FREDERICK BARBAROSSA

"Frederic[us] Dei Gra[tia] Roman[us] Imperator Aug[ustus]"  
From a document in the State archives at Berlin

defended his imperial sovereignty. The relations between pope and emperor became more strained. Pope Adrian was considering the excommunication of the emperor, when his death relieved the existing tension. Relying on his own resources, Frederick now began another campaign against the cities of Northern Italy. Milan succumbed after a short siege (7 Sept., 1158). At the Diet of Roncaglia the emperor undertook to define with precision the rights of the empire as against its subject rulers and cities, also to restore the earlier strong suzerainty by the appointment of imperial officials (*podestà*) in the North Italian cities. His intention was to establish peace, but the Lombards failed to understand this and openly rebelled. During his war with the city of Cremona occurred the disputed papal election of 1159. As supreme protector of Christendom, Frederick claimed the right to decide this quarrel. Of course, had he been able to enforce his claims it would have been a proof of the supremacy of the empire. The Synod of Pavia, assembled by Frederick in Feb., 1160, decided in favour of Victor IV. Thereupon, as Victor's protector, Frederick undertook to win over to the cause of this antipope the other rulers of Europe. Milan, in the meantime, had surrendered (March, 1162) and met with a fearful castigation.

The successes of the emperor excited the envy of the other European rulers. Pope Alexander III, ani-

mated with the spirit of Gregory VII, refused to acknowledge the imperial supremacy. Around the pope gathered all the enemies of Frederick. The universal papal power was destined to triumph over the idea of a universal imperial power. The Western rulers were determined to resist every attempt to re-establish the imperial hegemony in the West. Frederick was again left to his own resources and, after a short sojourn in Germany, undertook a new expedition to Italy (1163). For a time the death of the antipope, Victor IV, gave rise to hopes of a reconciliation between Frederick and Alexander III, but soon the emperor recognized another antipope, Paschal III. At the same time an anti-imperial alliance, the Lombard League, was formed by the cities of Verona, Vicenza, and Padua; it was joined by Venice, Constantinople, and Sicily. Internal troubles caused by the schism prevented the emperor from coping successfully with the famous League. Some of the German clergy, moreover, had espoused the cause of Alexander III, and Frederick was unable to overcome their opposition. Nevertheless, he again left Germany (1166), marched through the disaffected cities of Northern Italy, and, accompanied by the antipope, entered Rome. There a deadly fever destroyed his army, while behind him the Lombard insurrection assumed more dangerous proportions. Lengthy negotiations followed, and the emperor again attempted to overthrow the coalition of the League and Pope Alexander (1174). The great battle of Legnano (29 May, 1176) destroyed the imperial hopes, and left Frederick willing to enter on negotiations for peace. The most important result of the ensuing treaty of Venice (1177) was the failure of the emperor to establish his supremacy over the pope; and in acknowledging the complete equality of Alexander, whom he now recognized as pope, Frederick confessed the defeat of the imperial pretensions.

While Frederick was fighting in Northern Italy, the head of the Guelphs, Henry the Lion, had refused to give him armed assistance. Now he openly rebelled against Frederick. The emperor overthrew Henry, and henceforth aimed at impeding the growth of his powerful vassals by dividing the dukedoms as much as possible. Bavaria, without Styria however, was at this time granted to the Guelph house of Wittelsbach, which act naturally revived the feud between the Houses of Guelph and Hohenstaufen.

The Treaty of Constance (25 June, 1183) between Frederick and the Lombards deprived the pope of his important ally, the combined cities of Northern Italy. Shortly afterwards, Frederick's son Henry married Constance, the Norman princess of Sicily. The papacy was now threatened both from the north and the south. Friendly relations between the pope and the emperor were also endangered by complaints about the exercise of the *Jus spolii* and the collection of the tithes by laymen. The coronation of Frederick's son Henry as King of Italy (27 Jan., 1186) led to an open rupture. The political weakness of the papacy was offset to some extent by the fact that Philipp von Heinsberg, Archbishop of Cologne and a powerful prince, became the champion of the pope. By skilful management and with the aid of a majority of the German bishops Frederick evaded the threatening peril.

The death of Urban III and the election of Gregory VIII brought about a change in the dealings of the Curia with the empire, owing chiefly to the gloomy reports from the Holy Land.

At the Diet of Mainz in 1188, Frederick took the cross, and on 11 May, 1189, started for Palestine. On 10 June, 1190, he met with a sudden death while crossing the River Saleph in Asia Minor.

SIMONSFELD, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Friedrich I.* (Leipzig, 1908), Vol. I, 1152-1158; PRUTZ, *Kaiser Friedrich I.* (Danzig, 1871-73); HAUCK, *Frederick Barbarossa als Kirchenpolitiker* (Leipzig, 1898); WOLFRAM, *Friedrich I. und das Wormser Konkordat* (Marburg, 1883); SCHAEFER, *Die Verurtei-*

lung Heinrichs des Lowen in *Hist. Zeitschrift*, LXXVI; SCHÉFFER-BOICHORST, *Kaiser Friedrichs letzter Streit mit der Kurie* (1866).

F. KAMPERS.

**Frederick II**, German King and Roman Emperor, son of Henry VI and Constance of Sicily; b. 26 Dec., 1194; d. at Fiorenzina, in Apulia, 13 Dec., 1250. He adopted his father's policy of making Italy the centre of his power, and was interested in Germany only because it guaranteed to him his title to Upper and Central Italy. On the other hand, he could not arrest the dissolution of the empire hastened by the failure of his predecessor Otto IV. The possessions of the empire and those of his own Hohenstaufen family, by means of which Frederick I had sought to build up his power, were plundered. Frederick's sole desire was for peace in Germany, even if to secure this he had to make the greatest sacrifices; and for this reason, he granted to the ecclesiastical and temporal lords a series of privileges, which subsequently developed into the independent sovereignty of these princes. This emperor's policy was entirely dominated by the idea that without Sicily the possession of Italy would always be insecure, and that a king of Italy could not maintain himself without being at the same time emperor. This policy was naturally antagonistic to the papacy. The popes, isolated as they were in Central Italy, felt themselves compelled to prevent the union of Southern Italy with the empire. Frederick recognized this fact, and for several years strove to maintain peace by extreme concessions. Innocent III had chosen Frederick to be his instrument for the destruction of the Guelph, Otto IV. In return for Innocent's support, Frederick had been obliged to make promises to the pope at Eger (12 July, 1215), which would put an end to the undue influence of the civil power over the German bishops. The emancipation of the Church from the royal power dates from this time. The cause of Frederick's concessions to the Church lay not in his religious convictions but in his political aims.

Frederick had also been obliged to acknowledge the pope as his overlord in Sicily, thus abandoning his father's cherished hopes of uniting Sicily with the imperial crown of Germany, though the attempts of the pope to entirely nullify this "personal union" were far from successful. Italian affairs continued to be the hinge on which turned the papal policy towards the emperor, for the popes in their efforts to sustain their traditional supremacy could not allow the emperor a controlling influence in Italy. The conflict between the two powers strangely influenced the Crusades. Frederick had been forced to pledge himself to take part in a new crusade, for which inadequate preparations had been made by the pope, and the Council of Lateran (1215) fixed 1 June, 1216, as the time for beginning the crusade.

The condition of Germany, however, did not permit the absence of the emperor. At Frankfurt in April, 1220, the German diet passed regulations concerning the Roman expedition and the crusade. After Frederick's young son Henry had been chosen king, and Engelbert, the powerful Archbishop of Cologne, named vice-regent, Frederick set out for Italy. He was crowned emperor at Rome (22 Nov., 1220), and renewed his vow to take the cross, promising to begin the campaign in the following year. By a severe edict against heretics, he placed the secular power at the service of the Church, and thus appeared to have arrived at a complete understanding with the pope. Even when he failed to keep his promise to start the crusade in the following year, the friendly relations of pope and emperor remained unaltered. For this the peace-loving pope deserved the chief credit, though Frederick also strove to avoid a breach by his loyal policy towards the Holy See. Both pope and emperor, however, saw that this peace was maintained

only by skilful diplomacy, and that it was constantly imperilled by their conflicting interests.

Frederick at this time was chiefly solicitous about Sicily, towards which he was drawn by his Norman parentage on the mother's side, while the character of his own German people did not attract his sympathies. He had grown up in Sicily where Norman, Greek and Mohammedan civilization had intermingled, at once strengthening and repelling one another. The king, endowed with great natural ability, had acquired a wonderful fund of learning which made him appear a prodigy to his contemporaries, but, although he was intimately acquainted with the greatest productions of eastern and western genius, his soaring spirit never lost itself in romantic dreams. He eagerly studied both the more and the less impor-



SEAL OF FREDERICK II


"Fridericus D[omi]ni Gra[tia] Romanor[um] Rex et se[m]p[er] August[us] et Rex Sicil[ie]"

From a document in the municipal archives at Frankfurt

tant interests of the political and economical life of Southern Italy. The founding of the University of Naples sufficiently attests his interest in education. He was an intelligent admirer of the beauties of nature, his love for which was intensified by his natural powers of observation. The unlimited resources of the physical world and its constantly multiplying problems increased the inclination of this sceptical spirit towards a thorough empiricism. In none of his contemporaries does intellectual subjectivism show itself so strongly and at the same time so one-sidedly. This desire to penetrate into the secrets of the universe, as well as his scandalous sensual indulgence, brought on Frederick the reputation of an atheist. In spite, however, of his sceptical tendencies, he was not an atheist. An epigrammatic utterance about "the three impostors, Moses, Christ and Mohammed" has been unjustly ascribed to him in later times, and he remained true to the Church. Perhaps his rationalistic mind took pleasure in the strictly logical character of Catholic dogma. He was not, however, a champion of rationalism, nor had he any sympathy with the mystico-heretical movements of the time; in fact he joined in suppressing them. It was not the Church of the Middle Ages that he antagonized, but its representatives. It is in his conflict with the pope that his colossal character becomes manifest. At the same time, it becomes apparent how he combined force and ability with cunning and the spirit of revenge. His most prominent characteristic was his self-conceit. In Germany this megalomania was kept in check, but not so in Sicily. Here he could build up

a modern state, the foundations of which it is true had already been laid by the great Norman kings.

The organization of his Sicilian hereditary states was completed by the "Constitutiones imperiales", published at Amalfi, 1231. In these laws, Frederick appears as sole possessor of every right and privilege, an absolute monarch, or rather an enlightened despot standing at the head of a well-ordered civil hierarchy. His subjects in this system had duties only, but they were well defined. After practically completing the reorganization of Sicily (1235), the emperor attempted, like his powerful grandfather, to re-establish the imperial power in Upper Italy, but with insufficient resources. The result was a new hostile league of the Italian cities. Through the mediation of the pope, however, peace was maintained. During this time Archbishop Engelbert of Cologne, supported by several princes of the empire who had been efficiently



TOMB OF EMPEROR FREDERICK II  
Palatine Chapel, Cathedral of Palermo, XIII Century

assisted by the royal power in their struggle with the cities, preserved the peace in Germany. After the archbishop's death, however, a new order set in—a time of savage feuds and widespread disorder followed by the first open quarrel between the papacy and the emperor. Frederick had completed extensive preparations for a crusade in 1227. Four years previously, he had espoused Isabella (or Iolanthe), heiress of Jerusalem, and now styled himself "Romanorum imperator semper Augustus; Jerusalem et Sicilia rex". It was his serious intention to carry out his promise to begin his crusade in August, 1227 (under pain of excommunication), but a malignant fever destroyed a great part of his army and prostrated the king himself. Nevertheless Gregory IX declared Frederick excommunicated (29 Sept., 1227), showing by this step that he considered the time had come to break the illusive peace and to clear up the situation.

Although the radical antagonism between empire and papacy did not appear on the surface, it was at the root of the ensuing conflict between Church and State. At the beginning of this struggle the excommunicated emperor started on his crusade against the express wish of the pope, wishing no doubt to justify his attitude by success. On 17 March, 1229, he

crowned himself King of Jerusalem. On 10 June, 1229, he landed at Brindisi on his return. During the emperor's absence the curia had taken vigorous measures against him. Frederick's energetic action after his return forced the pope to recognize the emperor's success in the East and to release him from excommunication. The treaty of San Germano (20 July, 1230), in spite of many concessions made by the Emperor, was in reality an evidence of papal defeat. The pope had been unable to break the power of his dangerous adversary. Frederick forthwith resumed his North Italian policy. Again his attempts were frustrated, on this occasion by the threatening attitude of his son Henry, who now appeared as independent ruler of Germany, thereby becoming his father's enemy and unfurling the banner of rebellion (1234). After a long absence, Frederick now returned to Germany, where he took prisoner his rebel son (1235). Henry died in 1242.

About this time Frederick married Elizabeth of England (at Worms), and in 1235 held a brilliant diet at Mainz, where he promulgated the famous Laws of the Empire, a landmark in the development of the empire and its constitution. New measures for the maintenance of peace were enacted, the right of private feuds was greatly restricted, and an imperial court with its own seal was constituted, thereby establishing a basis for the future national law. As soon as the emperor had established order in Germany, he again marched against the Lombards, which conflict soon brought on another with the pope. The latter had several times mediated between the Lombards and the emperor, and now reasserted his right to arbitrate between the contending parties. In the numerous manifestos of the pope and the emperor the antagonism of Church and State becomes daily more evident. The pope claimed for himself the "imperium animarum" and the "principatus rerum et corporum in universo mundo". The emperor on the other hand wished to restore the "imperium mundi"; Rome was again to be the capital of the world and Frederick was to become the real emperor of the Romans. He published an energetic manifesto protesting against the world-empire of the pope. The emperor's successes, especially his victory over the Lombards at the battle of Cortenuova (1237), only embittered the opposition between Church and State. The pope, who had allied himself with Venice, again excommunicated the "self-confessed heretic", the "blasphemous beast of the Apocalypse" (20 March, 1239). Frederick now attempted to conquer the rest of Italy, i. e. the papal states. His son Enrico captured in a sea-fight all the prelates who by the command of Gregory were coming from Genoa to Rome to assist at a general council. Gregory's position was now desperate, and, after his death (22 Aug., 1241), the Holy See remained vacant for almost two years save for the short reign of Celestine IV.

During this interval the bitterness existing between the rival parties seemed to moderate somewhat, and about this time the emperor was threatened by a new and dangerous movement in Germany. The German episcopate could ill bear the prospect of being henceforth at the mercy of the reckless tyrant of Italy. Frederick sought to weaken the hostile bishops by favouring the secular princes and granting privileges to the cities. The energetic Innocent IV ascended the papal throne on 25 June, 1243. To secure peace with the newly elected pontiff, the emperor was inclined to make concessions. The main issue at stake however was not settled, i. e., the jurisdiction of the emperor in North Italy. In order to nullify Frederick's military superiority in the future phases of the struggle, Innocent left Rome secretly and went by way of Genoa to Lyons. Here he summoned a general council (21 June, 1245) by which Frederick was again excommunicated. Immediately there appeared several pretenders in Germany, i. e., Henry Raspe of Thuringia and

William of Holland. It was only with the greatest difficulty that Frederick's son Conrad could hold his own in Germany, since the greater part of the clergy supported the pope. Most of the lay lords, however, remained faithful to the emperor and exhibited an attitude of hostility to the clergy. A contemporary writer describes as follows the situation in 1246: "Injustice reigned supreme. The people were without leaders and Rome was troubled. Clerical dignity was lost sight of and the laity were split into various factions. Some were loyal to the Church and took the cross, others adhered to Frederick and became the enemies of God's religion."

For some time fortune alternately smiled and frowned on Frederick in Italy, but, after completing all his preparations for a decisive battle, he died at Fiorentina in Apulia, and was buried at Palermo. In German legend he continued to live as the emperor fated to return and reform both Church and State. In more recent times, however, he has had to yield his place in popular legend to Frederick Barbarossa, a figure more in harmony with German sentiment.

SCHIRRMACHER, *Kaiser Friedrich II.* (Göttingen, 1859-65); HUIILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, *Historia diplomatica Frederici secundi* (Paris, 1852); FREEMAN, *Historical Essays* (London, 1886); WINKELMANN, *Reichsannalen, Kaiser Friedrich II.*, 1218-1225, 1228-1233 (Leipzig, 1889); ZELLER, *L'empereur Fréd. II. et la chute de l'empire germanique du moyen âge, Conrad IV. et Conradin* (1885); KAMPF, *Kaiser Friedrich II. in Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXIII. Among the Catholic writers see BALLAN, *Storia di Gregorio IX e suoi tempi* (Modena, 1872-73); FELTEN, *Papst Gregor IX.* (Freiburg, 1886); HERGENROTHER-KIRSCH, *Kirchengeschichte*, 4th ed. (Freiburg, 1904).

F. KAMPERS.

**Fredoli, BERENGER**, Cardinal-Bishop of Frascati; b. at Vérune, France, c. 1250; d. at Avignon, 11 June, 1323. He was canon and precentor of Béziers, secular Abbot of Saint-Aphrodise in the same city, canon and archdeacon of Corbières, and canon of Aix. He later held the chair of canon law at Bologna, and was appointed chaplain to Celestine V, who in 1294 consecrated him Bishop of Béziers. Fredoli was one of those entrusted by Boniface VIII with the compilation of the text of the Decretals, and afterwards known as the "Liber Sextus". He took a prominent part in the negotiations then in progress between the pope and Philip the Fair, and attended the council held in Rome in 1302. In 1305 Clement V created him cardinal, with the title of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus, appointed him major penitentiary, and in 1309 raised him to the Cardinal-Bishopric of Frascati. The same pontiff employed him in investigating the charges made against the Knights Templars, and also in the enquiry into the peculiar tenets entertained at that time by a section of the Franciscan Order. On the death of Clement V, Fredoli was proposed by the French cardinals for the vacant chair, but without success. He continued in favour with the new pope, John XXII, by whose order he deposed the Abbot of Gérard and Hugo, Bishop of Cahors, for conspiring against the pope's life. The works of Fredoli are chiefly concerned with canon law, and include "Oculus", a commentary on the "Summa" of the Cardinal of Ostia (Basle, 1573), "Inventarium juris canonici", and "Inventarium speculi judicialis", abridged from a work of Durand, Bishop of Mendes. A namesake and nephew of the preceding was Bishop of Béziers in 1309, and Cardinal-Bishop of Porto in 1317. He died in 1323.

*Gallia Christiana*, VI; UGHELLI, *Italia Sacra*; TRITHHEM, *De Script. Eccles.*; BALUZE, *Vite paparum Avenionensium* (Paris, 1693); KREUTZWALD in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

H. G. WINTERSGILL.

**Free Church of Scotland** (known since 1900 as the UNITED FREE CHURCH), an ecclesiastical organization in Scotland which includes (1908) more than 500,000 of the 1,200,000 inhabitants of that country professing adherence to Presbyterian principles. The

existence of the Free Church as a separate ecclesiastical body dates from 1843, when a large number of members, both lay and clerical, of the Established Church of Scotland, severed their connexion with that body as a protest against the encroachment of the civil power on the independence of the Church, especially in the matter of presentation to vacant benefices.

According to the Free-Church view, the Church of Scotland, from the date of its inception in 1560, upon the overthrow of the old religion, had possessed the inherent right of exercising her spiritual jurisdiction through her elected assembly, absolutely free of any interference by the civil power. Such an independence had been asserted by her first leaders, Knox and Melville, and especially laid down and claimed in both her first and second books of discipline, issued in 1560 and 1581. The restoration of "prelacy" (the episcopal form of church government) in 1606 by James I, the revival of the self-governing powers of the Assembly in 1649, its subsequent suspension under Cromwell in 1653 and again after the Restoration, the Revolution settlement in 1690, and the Act of Queen Anne in 1712 re-establishing the system of private patronage in the Presbyterian Church, were the principal crises, now favourable, now the reverse, to the cherished principles of spiritual independence, through which the Church passed during the first century and a half of its existence. Throughout the eighteenth century a party within the Church continued to protest against civil interference with her rights, especially as regarded patronage; but at the same time there grew up the ecclesiastical party known as Moderates, who in this and other questions displayed an indifference towards state encroachments which more than neutralized the sentiments of the more fervent section. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, the latter was strengthened by the growing force of so-called "Evangelicalism," which was sweeping over Scotland as well as England. The views of the two parties, the Evangelical and the Moderate, became more and more opposed, the final result being the "Ten Years' Conflict" between them, which ended in the triumph of the former, and in the passing by the General Assembly, in 1834, of the famous "Veto Act". This act asserted (or rather reasserted, for the principle had often been declared in previous Assemblies) that it was a fundamental law of the Church that no pastor should be intruded upon a congregation contrary to the popular will, and that any presentee to a living should be rejected on the dissent of a majority of the heads of families. This direct blow at the rights of private patrons was soon challenged in the civil courts, and was ultimately decided (in 1838), in the famous Auchterarder case, against the Church. The decision immediately elicited from the Assembly a still clearer and more outspoken declaration of the independence of the Church; and when it was finally confirmed by the House of Lords, in 1839, the Assembly resolved to transmit to the sovereign, through the Lord High Commissioner who presided over its proceedings, a "claim, declaration, and protest" complaining of the encroachment of the civil power, and praying for the abolition of patronage. An unfavourable answer was received, and in response to a petition submitted to the House of Commons, that body refused any redress of the grievances complained of. Accordingly, at the next meeting of the General Assembly, 396 members, afterwards increased to 474, withdrew in a body, and constituted the first Assembly of the new Free Church, under Dr. Thomas Chalmers as moderator. The ministers and professors adhering to the newly constituted body publicly renounced all claim to the benefices which they had held in the Established Church, thus surrendering an annual income of upwards of £100,000.

A sustentation fund was at once inaugurated for the new organization, and nearly £400,000 was subscribed

for the erection of churches in the first year after the "Disruption", as it came to be called. Colleges for the training of the clergy were subsequently built at large cost in Edinburgh and Aberdeen; manse (residences for the ministers) were erected at a cost of a quarter of a million; and an equal or larger amount was expended on the building of congregational schools. After the passing of the Education Act of 1872 most of these schools were voluntarily transferred by the Free Church to the newly established school-boards.

The Free Church never professed to adopt any new article of faith, to inaugurate any new ritual, or originate any new principle of doctrine or discipline. She claimed to represent the Presbyterian Church of the country enjoying its full spiritual independence, and freed from the undue encroachment of the State; but it did not abandon the principle of establishment, or give up the view that Church and State ought to be in intimate alliance. This raised the difficulty in the way of its union with the United Presbyterians, the next most numerous and important body of seceders from the Establishment, and for many years rendered all negotiations for such union abortive. In 1876, however, another dissenting body, known as the Cameronians, or Reformed Presbyterians, joined the Free Church, and, possibly under the stimulus of this achievement, negotiations were renewed for union with the U. P.'s, as they were familiarly called. These proved finally successful, and the union between the U. P.'s and the Free Church became an accomplished fact on 31 October, 1900. A small minority of Free Churchmen resisted the fusion of the two bodies, and these (the "Wee Frees", as they were nicknamed) were successful in the Scottish Courts in claiming, as the original Free Church, nearly all the buildings erected by the body during the previous fifty-seven years. This anomaly, however, was rectified by a subsequent Act of Parliament (following on a Royal Commission) which permitted the "Wee Frees" to retain only such churches and other edifices as were proportionate to the small number of their adherents.

The well-wishers of the new United Free Church are naturally looking forward to an enlarged field of influence and a wider scope of activity, both at home and in the mission-field. What must, however, fill with anxiety every friend of Scottish Christianity who studies the teaching of this body, both in its training colleges and in its pulpits, is the spirit of rationalism by which it is becoming more and more pervaded. A generation has passed away since its most brilliant member, William Robertson Smith, was summarily removed from his professorial chair at Aberdeen on account of his latitudinarian views as expressed in his published articles. The "higher criticism" in the Free Church of to-day, largely based as it is on the rationalizing influence of German Protestant theology, goes far beyond the "heresies and errors" for which Smith was indicted thirty years ago. It is hardly too much to say that the modern Free Churchman is really not a Christian at all, in the Catholic sense of that word. The United Free Church, by the re-arrangement of its two constituent bodies, has now (1908) twelve synods and twenty-four presbyteries. Its supreme court is the General Assembly, which meets every May in Edinburgh. According to the latest statistics, the total membership of the body is about 504,000, divided into 1623 congregations. 244,000 scholars, taught by 26,000 teachers, frequent the Sunday Schools, which number 2400. Some 300 agents from Scotland, and nearly 4000 native pastors and teachers, are employed in foreign mission work, and the whole income of the Church, at the close of the last financial year, was estimated at £1,029,000.

TURNER, *The Scottish Secession of 1843* (Edinburgh, 1854); WILSON, *Free Church Principles* (Edinburgh, 1887); BROWN, *Annals of the Disruption* (Edinburgh, 1885); BUCHANAN, *Ten*

*Years' Conflict* (Glasgow, 1849); SYDOW, *Die schottischen Kirchen* (Potsdam, 1845); HANNA, *Life of Chalmers* (1852).  
D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

**Freeman, WILLIAM, VENERABLE, priest and martyr,** b. at Manthorp near York, c. 1558; d. at Warwick, 13 August, 1595. His parents were recusants, though he conformed outwardly for some time to the religion of the country. Educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, he took his degree as B.A. in 1581, then lived for some years in London, where he witnessed the martyrdom of Edward Stransham in 1586. Strongly impressed with this example, he left England and was ordained priest in 1587 at Reims. Returning to England in 1589, he worked for six years on the borders of Warwickshire, and in his interesting life many persons are mentioned who were contemporaries or friends of Shakespeare. In January, 1595, a special commission was sent down to Stratford-on-Avon to search the house of Mrs. Heath, who had engaged his services as tutor to her son. William Freeman was arrested, and spent seven months in prison. He denied his priesthood, but also refused all friendly offers to escape, not wishing to lose his opportunity of martyrdom. Owing to the treachery of a fellow-prisoner, William Gregory, he was at last sentenced as a seminary priest, and in spite of a touching protest of loyalty, suffered the death of a traitor at Warwick.

POLLEN, *Cath. Record Soc.*, V, 345; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II, 332; BOASE, *Oxford Register*, II, iii, 92.  
J. H. POLLEN.

**Freemasonry.** See MASONRY.

**Free-Thinkers**, those who, abandoning the religious truths and moral dictates of the Christian Revelation, and accepting no dogmatic teaching on the ground of authority, base their beliefs on the unfettered findings of reason alone. Free-thought, of which they make profession, is an exaggerated form, though a quite logical development, of the doctrine of private judgment in religious matters. The free-thinker holds such principles, whether of truth or of action, as he is persuaded that he can prove; and he gives assent to no others. He is a rationalist. But since the persuasion of having proved (or of being able to prove) even the doctrines of natural religion by reason alone varies indefinitely with the individual, it is difficult, save on the most general lines, to class free-thinkers together. This difficulty is apparent in the case of the Deists (see DEISM), to whom the appellation was characteristically applied in the latter end of the seventeenth century. They all agree, however, in refusing to accept the doctrines of an authoritative Christianity; and it is on this negative ground that their position is most clearly defined.

Although the words "Free-thinker" and "Free-thought" first appeared in connexion with the English Deists [Collins, "Discourse of Freethinking occasioned by the Rise and Growth of a Sect called Freethinkers" (1713), gives the deistical tendency this name], "the phenomenon of free-thought has existed, in specific form, long before it could express itself in propagandist writings, or find any generic name save those of Atheism or Infidelity" (Robertson). Taken in the broad sense in which Robertson here uses it, the term would seem to include the reactionary movement against any traditional form of doctrine to which men were expected to assent. In this sense it is possible to speak of free-thinkers of Greece or Rome, or, indeed, of any considerable body that can impress its teaching upon the multitudes. There were undoubtedly, to a certain extent at any rate, in classical times those who either publicly scoffed at the authoritative myths of their country's religion or philosophically explained their meaning away. So—but this in a truer sense—in the Middle Ages there were to be found rationalists, or free-thinkers, among the philosophers of the schools. The Fathers of the Church had met paganism with its own weapons and argued against its falsehoods with



the help of the natural reason. The early heretics were free-thinkers in their rejection of the regulating authority of the Church upon points connected with their heresies, which they elaborated frequently upon rationalistic lines; and the pantheists and others of the schools criticized and syllogized revelation away in true free-thought style. Both were in consequence condemned; but the spirit of excess in criticism and the reliance on the sufficiency of human reason are as typical of the free-thought of medieval times as of that of the twentieth century.

From the Deists onwards, free-thought has undoubtedly gained ground among the masses. Originally the intellectual excess of the learned and the student, and rarely leaving the study in a form in which it could be expected to be at all popular, it began with Annet and Chubb (see DEISM) to become vulgarized and to penetrate the lower strata of society. Its open professors have apparently always been less numerous than its adherents. Some stop short in a negative position, claiming no more than an autonomy for the science or philosophy they represent. Others carry on a bitter and unscrupulous warfare against religion. It is apparent in the various branches of science and criticism, as well as in philosophy; and though it generally pretends to a scientific plan it makes use of *a priori* methods more than *a posteriori* ones. One of its most dangerous forms, which generally ends in pure religious scepticism, can be traced to the Kantian distinction between the noumenal and the phenomenal. But its main positive positions are the denial of prophecy, miracle and inspiration, its rejection of all external revelation (including obviously ecclesiastical authority), and its assertion of the right of free speculation in all rational matters. On this latter frequently follows the negation of, or suspension of judgment with regard to, the existence of God (atheism and agnosticism), the denial of the immortality of the soul or of its truth being susceptible of proof, and the rejection of the freedom of the will. Among the principal free-thinkers may be mentioned Voltaire, Thomas Paine (*The Rights of Man*), Renan, Ingersoll, Strauss (*Leben Jesu*), Haeckel, Clough, and Holyoake.

ROBERTSON, *A Short History of Free Thought*, 2d ed. (London, 1899); WHEELER, *Biog. Dict. of Free Thinkers* (London, 1889); GERARD, *Modern Free Thought in Westminster Lectures* (London, 1905); MACCANN, *Secularism: unphilosophical, immoral and anti-social* (London, 1887); FLINT, *Anti-Theistic Theories* (Edinburgh, 1885); PEARSON, *Positive Creed of Free Thought* (London, 1888); CAIRNS, *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh, 1882); SPATEHAM, *Free Thought and True Thought* (London, 1884); SANDAY, *Free Thinking in Oxford House Papers*, No. IX (1886); *The Fallacies of Atheism explored by a Working Man* (London, 1882); also bibliography under DEISM.

FRANCIS AVELING.

**Free Will.**—The question of free will, moral liberty, or the *liberum arbitrium* of the Schoolmen, ranks amongst the three or four most important philosophical problems of all time. It ramifies into ethics, theology, metaphysics, and psychology. The view adopted in response to it will determine a man's position in regard to the most momentous issues that present themselves to the human mind. On the one hand, does man possess genuine moral freedom, power of real choice, true ability to determine the course of his thoughts and volitions, to decide which motives shall prevail within his mind, to modify and mould his own character? Or, on the other, are man's thoughts and volitions, his character and external actions, all merely the inevitable outcome of his circumstances? Are they all inexorably predetermined in every detail along rigid lines by events of the past, over which he himself has had no sort of control? This is the real import of the free-will problem.

**RELATION OF THE QUESTION TO DIFFERENT BRANCHES OF PHILOSOPHY.**—(1) Ethically, the issue vitally affects the meaning of most of our fundamental moral terms and ideas. Responsibility, merit, duty, remorse, justice, and the like, will have a totally differ-

ent significance for one who believes that all man's acts are in the last resort completely determined by agencies beyond his power, from that which these terms bear for the man who believes that each human being possessed of reason can by his own free will determine his deliberate volitions and so exercise a real command over his thoughts, his deeds, and the formation of his character. (2) Theology studies the questions of the existence, nature, and attributes of God, and His relations with man. The reconciliation of God's foreknowledge and universal providential government of the world with the contingency of human action, as well as the harmonizing of the efficacy of supernatural grace with the free natural power of the creature, has been amongst the most arduous labours of the theological student from the days of St. Augustine down to the present time. (3) Causality, change, movement, the beginning of existence, are notions which lie at the very heart of metaphysics. The conception of the human will as a free cause involves them all. (4) Again, the analysis of voluntary action and the investigation of its peculiar features are the special functions of psychology. Indeed, the nature of the process of volition and of all forms of appetitive or conative activity is a topic that has absorbed a constantly increasing space in psychological literature during the past fifty years. (5) Finally, the rapid growth of sundry branches of modern science, such as physics, biology, sociology, and the systematization of moral statistics, has made the doctrine of free will a topic of the most keen interest in many departments of more positive knowledge.

**HISTORY.**—*Free Will in Ancient Philosophy.*—The question of free will does not seem to have presented itself very clearly to the early Greek philosophers. Some historians have held that the Pythagoreans must have allotted a certain degree of moral freedom to man, from their recognition of man's responsibility for sin with consequent retribution experienced in the course of the transmigration of souls. The Eleatics adhered to a pantheistic monism, in which they emphasized the immutability of one eternal unchangeable principle so as to leave no room for freedom. Democritus also taught that all events occur by necessity, and the Greek atomists generally, like their modern representatives, advocated a mechanical theory of the universe, which excluded all contingency. With Socrates, the moral aspect of all philosophical problems became prominent, yet his identification of all virtue with knowledge and his intense personal conviction that it is impossible deliberately to do what one clearly perceives to be wrong, led him to hold that the good, being identical with the true, imposes itself irresistibly on the will as on the intellect, when distinctly apprehended. Every man necessarily wills his greatest good, and his actions are merely means to this end. He who commits evil does so out of ignorance as to the right means to the true good. Plato held in the main the same view. Virtue is the determination of the will by the knowledge of the good; it is true freedom. The wicked man is ignorant and a slave. Sometimes, however, Plato seems to suppose that the soul possessed genuine free choice in a previous life, which there decided its future destiny. Aristotle disagrees with both Plato and Socrates, at least in part. He appeals to experience. Men can act against the knowledge of the true good; vice is voluntary. Man is responsible for his actions as the parent of them. Moreover his particular actions, as means to his end, are contingent, a matter of deliberation and subject to choice. The future is not all predictable. Some events depend on chance. Aristotle was not troubled by the difficulty of prevision on the part of his God. Still his physical theory of the universe, the action he allots to the *νοῦς ποιητής*, and the irresistible influence exerted by the Prime Mover make the conception of genuine moral freedom in his system very obscure and difficult. The

Stoics adopted a form of materialistic Pantheism. God and the world are one. All the world's movements are governed by rigid law. Unvaried causality, unity of design, fatalistic government, prophecy and foreknowledge—all these factors exclude chance and the possibility of free will. Epicurus, oddly in contrast here with his modern hedonistic followers, advocates free will and modifies the strict determinism of the atomists, whose physics he accepts, by ascribing to the atoms a *clinamen*, a faculty of random deviation in their movements. His openly professed object, however, in this point as in the rest of his philosophy, is to release men from the fears caused by belief in irresistible fate.

*Free Will and the Christian Religion.*—The problem of free will assumed quite a new character with the advent of the Christian religion. The doctrine that God has created man, has commanded him to obey the moral law, and has promised to reward or punish him for observance or violation of this law, made the reality of moral liberty an issue of transcendent importance. Unless man is really free, he cannot be justly held responsible for his actions, any more than for the date of his birth or the colour of his eyes. All alike are inexorably predetermined for him. Again, the difficulty of the question was augmented still further by the Christian dogma of the fall of man and his redemption by grace. St. Paul, especially in his Epistle to the Romans, is the great source of the Catholic theology of grace.

*Catholic Doctrine.*—Among the early Fathers of the Church, St. Augustine stands pre-eminent in his handling of this subject. He clearly teaches the freedom of the will against the Manichæans, but insists against the Semipelagians on the necessity of grace, as a foundation of merit. He also emphasizes very strongly the absolute rule of God over men's wills by His omnipotence and omniscience—through the infinite store, as it were, of motives which He has had at His disposal from all eternity, and by the foreknowledge of those to which the will of each human being would freely consent. St. Augustine's teaching formed the basis of much of the later theology of the Church on these questions, though other writers have sought to soften the more rigorous portions of his doctrine. This they did especially in opposition to heretical authors, who exaggerated these features in the works of the great African Doctor and attempted to deduce from his principles a form of rigid predeterminism little differing from fatalism. The teaching of St. Augustine is developed by St. Thomas Aquinas both in theology and philosophy. Will is rational appetite. Man necessarily desires beatitude, but he can freely choose between different forms of it. Free will is simply this elective power. Infinite Good is not visible to the intellect in this life. There are always some drawbacks and deficiencies in every good presented to us. None of them exhausts our intellectual capacity of conceiving the good. Consequently, in deliberate volition, not one of them completely satiates or irresistibly entices the will. In this capability of the intellect for conceiving the universal lies the root of our freedom. But God possesses an infallible knowledge of man's future actions. How is this prevision possible, if man's future acts are not necessary? God does not exist in time. The future and the past are alike ever present to the eternal mind. As a man gazing down from a lofty mountain takes in at one momentary glance all the objects which can be apprehended only through a lengthy series of successive experiences by travellers along the winding road beneath, in somewhat similar fashion the intuitive vision of God apprehends simultaneously what is future to us with all it contains. Further, God's omnipotent providence exercises a complete and perfect control over all events that happen, or will happen, in the universe. How is this secured without infringement of man's freedom?

Here is the problem which two distinguished schools in the Church—both claiming to represent the teaching, or at any rate the logical development of the teaching of St. Thomas—attempt to solve in different ways. The heresies of Luther and Calvin brought the issue to a finer point than it had reached in the time of Aquinas, consequently he had not formally dealt with it in its ultimate shape, and each of the two schools can cite texts from the works of the Angelic Doctor in which he appears to incline towards their particular view.

*Thomist and Molinist Theories.*—The Dominican or Thomist solution, as it is called, teaches in brief that God premoves each man in all his acts to the line of conduct which he subsequently adopts. It holds that this premotive decree inclines man's will with absolute certainty to the side decreed, but that God adapts this premotion to the nature of the being thus premoved. It argues that as God possesses infinite power He can infallibly premove man—who is by nature a free cause—to choose a particular course freely, whilst He premoves the lower animals in harmony with their natures to adopt particular courses by necessity. Further, this premotive decree being inevitable, though adapted to suit the free nature of man, provides a medium in which God foresees with certainty the future free choice of the human being. The premotive decree is thus prior in order of thought to the Divine cognition of man's future actions. Theologians and philosophers of the Jesuit School, frequently styled Molinists, though they do not accept the whole of Molina's teaching and generally prefer Suarez's exposition of the theory, deem the above solution unsatisfactory. It would, they readily admit, provide sufficiently for the infallibility of the Divine foreknowledge and also for God's providential control of the world's history; but, in their view, it fails to give at the same time an adequately intelligible account of the freedom of the human will. According to them, the relation of the Divine action to man's will should be conceived rather as of a concurrent than of a premotive character; and they maintain that God's knowledge of what a free being would choose, if the necessary conditions were supplied, must be deemed logically prior to any decree of concurrence or premotion in respect to that act of choice. Briefly, they make a threefold distinction in God's knowledge of the universe based on the nature of the objects known—the Divine knowledge being in itself of course absolutely simple. Objects or events viewed merely as possible, God is said to apprehend by simple intelligence (*simplex intelligentia*). Events which will happen He knows by vision (*scientia visionis*). Intermediate between these are conditionally future events—things which would occur were certain conditions fulfilled. God's knowledge of this class of contingencies they term *scientia media*. For instance Christ affirmed that, if certain miracles had been wrought in Tyre and Sidon, the inhabitants would have been converted. The condition was not realized, yet the statement of Christ must have been true. About all such conditional contingencies propositions may be framed which are either true or false—and Infinite Intelligence must know all truth. The conditions in many cases will not be realized, so God must know them apart from any decrees determining their realization. He knows them therefore, this school holds, *in seipsis*, in themselves as conditionally future events. This knowledge is the *scientia media*, "middle knowledge", intermediate between vision of the actual future and simple understanding of the merely possible. Acting now in the light of this *scientia media* with respect to human volitions, God freely decides according to His own wisdom whether He shall supply the requisite conditions, including His co-operation in the action, or abstain from so doing, and thus render possible or prevent the realization of the event. In other words, the infinite intelligence of God sees clearly what

would happen in any conceivable circumstances. He thus knows what the free will of any creature would choose, if supplied with the power of volition or choice and placed in any given circumstances. He now decrees to supply the needed conditions, including His *concursus*, or to abstain from so doing. He thus holds complete dominion and control over our future free actions, as well as over those of a necessary character. The Molinist then claims to safeguard better man's freedom by substituting for the decree of an inflexible premotion one of concurrence dependent on God's prior knowledge of what the free being would choose, if given the power to exert the choice. He argues that he exempts God more clearly from all responsibility for man's sins. The claim seems to the present writer well founded; at the same time it is only fair to record on the other side that the Thomist urges with considerable force that God's prescience is not so understandable in this, as in his theory. He maintains, too, that God's exercise of His absolute dominion over all man's acts and man's entire dependence on God's goodwill are more impressively and more worthily exhibited in the premotion hypothesis. The reader will find an exhaustive treatment of the question in any of the Scholastic textbooks on the subject.

*Free Will and the Protestant Reformers.*—A leading feature in the teaching of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, especially in the case of Luther and Calvin, was the denial of free will. Picking out from the Scriptures, and particularly from St. Paul, the texts which emphasized the importance and efficacy of grace, the all-ruling providence of God, His decrees of election or predestination, and the feebleness of man, they drew the conclusion that the human will, instead of being master of its own acts, is rigidly predetermined in all its choices throughout life. As a consequence, man is predestined before his birth to eternal punishment or reward in such fashion that he never can have had any real free-power over his own fate. In his controversy with Erasmus, who defended free will, Luther frankly stated that free will is a fiction, a name which covers no reality, for it is not in man's power to think well or ill, since all events occur by necessity. In reply to Erasmus's "*De Libero Arbitrio*," he published his own work, "*De Servo Arbitrio*," glorying in emphasizing man's helplessness and slavery. The predestination of all future human acts by God is so interpreted as to shut out any possibility of freedom. An inflexible internal necessity turns man's will whithersoever God preordains. With Calvin, God's preordination is, if possible, even more fatal to free will. Man can perform no sort of good act unless necessitated to it by God's grace, which it is impossible for him to resist. It is absurd to speak of the human will "co-operating" with God's grace, for this would imply that man could resist the grace of God. The will of God is the very necessity of things. It is objected that in this case God sometimes imposes impossible commands. Both Calvin and Luther reply that the commands of God show us not what we can do but what we ought to do. In condemnation of these views, the Council of Trent declared that the free will of man, moved and excited by God, can by its consent co-operate with God, Who excites and invites its action; and that it can thereby dispose and prepare itself to obtain the grace of justification. The will can resist grace if it chooses. It is not like a lifeless thing, which remains purely passive. Weakened and diminished by Adam's fall, free will is yet not destroyed in the race (Sess. VI, cap. i and v).

*Free Will in Modern Philosophy.*—Although from Descartes onward, philosophy became more and more separated from theology, still the theological significance of this particular question has always been felt to be of the highest moment. Descartes himself at times clearly maintains the freedom of the will (*Meditations*, III and IV). At times, however, he atten-

uates this view and leans towards a species of providential determinism, which is, indeed, the logical consequence of the doctrines of occasionalism and the inefficacy of secondary causes latent in his system.

Malebranche developed this feature of Descartes's teaching. Soul and body cannot really act on each other. The changes in the one are directly caused by God on the occasion of the corresponding change in the other. So-called secondary causes are not really efficacious. Only the First Cause truly acts. If this view be consistently thought out, the soul, since it possesses no genuine causality, cannot be justly said to be free in its volitions. Still, as a Catholic theologian, Malebranche could not accept this fatalistic determinism. Accordingly he defended freedom as essential to religion and morality. Human liberty being denied, God should be deemed cruel and unjust, whilst duty and responsibility for man cease to exist. We must therefore be free. Spinoza was more logical. Starting from certain principles of Descartes, he deduced in mathematical fashion an iron-bound pantheistic fatalism, which left no room for contingency in the universe and still less for free will. In Leibniz, the prominence given to the principle of sufficient reason, the doctrine that man must choose that which the intellect judges as the better, and the optimistic theory that God Himself has inevitably chosen the present as being the best of all possible worlds, these views, when logically reasoned out, leave very little reality to free will, though Leibniz set himself in marked opposition to the monistic geometrical necessitarianism of Spinoza.

In England, the mechanical materialism of Hobbes was incompatible with moral liberty, and he accepted with cynical frankness all the logical consequences of his theory. Our actions either follow the first appetite that arises in the mind, or there is a series of alternate appetites and fears, which we call deliberation. The last appetite or fear, that which triumphs, we call will. The only intelligible freedom is the power to do what one desires. Here Hobbes is practically at one with Locke. God is the author of all causes and effects, but is not the author of sin, because an action ceases to be sin if God wills it to happen. Still God is the cause of sin. Praise and blame, rewards and punishments cannot be called useless, because they strengthen motives, which are the causes of action. This, however, does not meet the objection to the justice of such blame or praise, if the person has not the power to abstain from or perform the actions thus punished or rewarded. Hume reinforced the determinist attack on free will by his suggested psychological analysis of the notion or feeling of "necessity". The controversy, according to him, has been due to misconception of the meaning of words and the error that the alternative to free will is necessity. This necessity, he says, is erroneously ascribed to some kind of internal nexus supposed to bind all causes to their effects, whereas there is really nothing more in causality than constant succession. The imagined necessity is merely a product of custom or association of ideas. Not feeling in our acts of choice this necessity, which we attribute to the causation of material agents, we mistakenly imagine that our volitions have no causes and so are free, whereas they are as strictly determined by the feelings or motives which have gone before, as any material effects are determined by their material antecedents. In all our reasonings respecting other persons, we infer their future conduct from their wonted action under particular motives with the same sort of certainty as in the case of physical causation.

The same line of argument was adopted by the Associationist School down to Bain and J. S. Mill. For the necessity of Hobbes or Spinoza is substituted by their descendants what Professor James calls a "soft determinism", affirming solely the invariable succession of volition upon motive. J. S. Mill merely developed with greater clearness and fuller detail the

principles of Hume. In particular, he attacked the notion of "constraint" suggested in the words *necessity* and *necessarianism*, whereas only sequence is affirmed. Given a perfect knowledge of character and motives, we could infallibly predict action. The alleged consciousness of freedom is disputed. We merely feel that we choose, not that we could choose the opposite. Moreover the notion of free will is unintelligible. The truth is that for the Sensationalist School, who believe the mind to be merely a series of mental states, free will is an absurdity. On the other side, Reid, and Stewart, and Hamilton, of the Scotch School, with Mansel, Martineau, W. J. Ward, and other Spiritualist thinkers of Great Britain, energetically defended free will against the disciples of Hume. They maintained that a more careful analysis of volition justified the argument from consciousness, that the universal conviction of mankind on such a fact may not be set aside as an illusion, that morality cannot be founded on an act of self-deception, that all languages contain terms involving the notion of free will and all laws assume its existence, and that the attempt to render necessarianism less objectionable by calling it determinism does not diminish the fatalism involved in it.

The truth that phenomenalism logically involves determinism is strikingly illustrated in Kant's treatment of the question. His well-known division of all reality into phenomena and noumena is his key to this problem also. The world as it appears to us, the world of phenomena, including our own actions and mental states, can only be conceived under the form of time and subject to the category of causality, and therefore everything in the world of experience happens altogether according to the laws of nature; that is, all our actions are rigidly determined. But, on the other hand, freedom is a necessary postulate of morality: "Thou canst, because thou oughtest." The solution of the antinomy is that the determinism concerns only the empirical or phenomenal world. There is no ground for denying liberty to the *Ding an sich*. We may believe in transcendental freedom, that we are noumenally free. Since, moreover, the belief that I am free and that I am a free cause, is the foundation stone of religion and morality, I must believe in this postulate. Kant thus gets over the antinomy by confining freedom to the world of noumena, which lie outside the form of time and the category of causality, whilst he affirms necessity of the sensible world, bound by the chain of causality. Apart from the general objection to Kant's system, a grave difficulty here lies in the fact that all man's conduct—his whole moral life as it is revealed in actual experience either to others or himself—pertains in this view to the phenomenal world and so is rigidly determined.

Though much acute philosophical and psychological analysis has been brought to bear on the problem during the last century, it cannot be said that any great additional light has been shed over it. In Germany, Schopenhauer made will the noumenal basis of the world and adopted a pessimistic theory of the universe, denying free will to be justified by either ethics or psychology. On the other hand, Lotze, in many respects perhaps the acutest thinker in Germany since Kant, was an energetic defender of moral liberty. Among recent psychologists in America Professors James and Ladd are both advocates of freedom, though laying more stress for positive proof on the ethical than on the psychological evidence.

THE ARGUMENT.—As the main features of the doctrine of free will have been sketched in the history of the problem, a very brief account of the argument for moral freedom will now suffice. Will viewed as a free power is defined by defenders of free will as the capacity of self-determination. By *self* is here understood not a single present mental state (James), nor a series of mental states (Hume and Mill), but an abiding rational being which is the subject and cause of these

states. We should distinguish between (1) spontaneous acts, those proceeding from an internal principle (e. g. the growth of plants and impulsive movements of animals); (2) voluntary acts in a wide sense, those proceeding from an internal principle with apprehension of an end (e. g. all conscious desires); and, finally, (3) those voluntary in the strict sense, that is, deliberate or free acts. In such, there is a self-conscious advertence to our own causality, or an awareness that we are choosing the act, or acquiescing in the desire of it. Spontaneous acts and desires are opposed to co-action or external compulsion, but they are not thereby morally free acts. They may still be the necessary outcome of the nature of the agent as, e. g. the actions of lower animals, of the insane, of young children, and many impulsive acts of mature life. The essential feature in free volition is the element of choice—the *vis electiva*, as St. Thomas calls it. There is a concomitant interrogative awareness in the form of the query, "shall I acquiesce or shall I resist? Shall I do it or something else?", and the consequent acceptance or refusal, ratification or rejection, though either may be of varying degrees of completeness. It is this act of consent or approval, which converts a mere involuntary impulse or desire into a free volition and makes me accountable for it. A train of thought or volition deliberately initiated or acquiesced in, but afterward continued merely spontaneously without reflective advertence to our elective adoption of it, remains free *in causa*, and I am therefore responsible for it, though actually the process has passed into the department of merely spontaneous or automatic activity. A large part of the operation of carrying out a resolution, once the decision is made, is commonly of this kind. The question of free will may now be stated thus: "Given all the conditions requisite for eliciting an act of will, except the act itself, does the act necessarily follow?" Or, "Are all my volitions the inevitable outcome of my character and the motives acting on me at the time?" Fatalists, necessarians, determinists say "Yes". Libertarians, indeterminists or anti-determinists say "No. The mind or soul in deliberate actions is a free cause. Given all the conditions requisite for action, it can either act or abstain from action. It can, and sometimes does, exercise its own causality against the weight of character and present motives."

*Proof.*—The evidence usually adduced at the present day is of two kinds, ethical and psychological—though even the ethical argument is itself psychological. (1) Ethical Argument.—It is argued that necessarianism or determinism in any form is in conflict with the chief moral notions and convictions of mankind at large. The actual universality of such moral ideas is indisputable. Duty, moral obligation, responsibility, merit, justice signify notions universally present in the consciousness of normally developed men. Further, these notions, as universally understood, imply that man is really master of some of his acts, that he is, at least at times, capable of self-determination, that all his volitions are not the inevitable outcome of his circumstances. When I say that I *ought* not to have performed some forbidden act, that it was my *duty* to obey the law, I imply that I *could* have done so. The judgment of all men is the same on this point. When we say that a person is justly held responsible for a crime, or that he deserves praise or reward for an heroic act of self-sacrifice, we mean that he was author and cause of that act in such fashion that he had it in his power not to perform the act. We exempt the insane or the child, because we believe them devoid of moral freedom and determined inevitably by the motives which happened to act on them. So true is this, that determinists have had to admit that the meaning of these terms will, according to their view, have to be changed. But this is to admit that their theory is in direct conflict with universal psychological facts. It thereby stands disproved.

Again, it may be urged that, if logically followed out, the determinist doctrine would annihilate human morality, consequently that such a theory cannot be true. (See FATALISM.) (2) Psychological Argument.—Consciousness testifies to our moral freedom. We feel ourselves to be free when exercising certain acts. We judge afterwards that we acted freely in those acts. We distinguish them quite clearly from experiences, in which we believe we were not free or responsible. The conviction is not confined to the ignorant; even the determinist psychologist is governed in practical life by this belief. Henry Sidgwick states the fact in the most moderate terms, when he says: "Certainly in the case of actions in which I have a distinct consciousness of choosing between alternatives of conduct, one of which I conceive as right or reasonable, I find it impossible not to think that I can now choose to do what I so conceive, however strong may be my inclination to act unreasonably, and however uniformly I may have yielded to such inclinations in the past" (Methods of Ethics). The force of the evidence is best realized by carefully studying the various mental activities in which freedom is exercised. Amongst the chief of these are: voluntary attention, deliberation, choice, sustained resistance to temptation. The reader will find them analysed at length by the authors referred to at the end of this article; or, better still, he can think them out with concrete examples in his own inner experience.

*Objections.*—The main objection to this argument is stated in the assertion that we can be conscious only of what we actually do, not of our ability to do something else. The reply is that we can be conscious not only of what we do, but of how we do it; not only of the act but of the mode of the act. Observation reveals to us that we are subjects of different kinds of processes of thought and volition. Sometimes the line of conscious activity follows the direction of spontaneous impulse, the preponderating force of present motive and desire; at other times we intervene and exert personal causality. Consciousness testifies that we freely and actively strengthen one set of motives, resist the stronger inclination, and not only drift to one side but actively choose it. In fact, we are sure that we sometimes exert free volition, because at other times we are the subject of conscious activities that are *not* free, and we know the difference. Again, it is urged that experience shows that men are determined by motives, and that we always act on this assumption. The reply is that experience proves that men are influenced by motives, but not that they are always inexorably determined by the strongest motive. It is alleged that we always decide in favour of the strongest motive. This is either untrue, or the barren statement that we always choose what we choose. A free volition is "a causeless volition". The mind itself is the cause. (For other objections see FATALISM; ENERGY, THE LAW OF THE CONSERVATION OF; and the works referred to at the end of this article.)

*NATURE AND RANGE OF MORAL LIBERTY.*—Free will does not mean capability of willing in the absence of all motive, or of arbitrarily choosing anything whatever. The rational being is always attracted by what is apprehended as good. Pure evil, misery as such, man could not desire. However, the good presents itself in many forms and under many aspects—the pleasant, the prudent, the right, the noble, the beautiful—and in reflective or deliberate action we can choose among these. The clear vision of God would necessarily preclude all volition at variance with this object, but in this world we never apprehend Infinite Good. Nor does the doctrine of free will imply that man is constantly exerting this power at every waking moment, any more than the statement that he is a "rational" animal implies that he is always reasoning. Much the larger part of man's ordinary life is administered by the machinery of reflex action, the automatic

working of the organism, and acquired habits. In the series of customary acts which fill up our day, such as rising, meals, study, work, etc., probably the large majority are merely "spontaneous" and are approximately determined by their antecedents, according to the combined force of character and motive. There is nothing to arouse special volition, or call for interference with the natural current, so the stream of consciousness flows smoothly along the channel of least resistance. For such series of acts we are responsible, as was before indicated, not because we exert deliberate volition at each step, but because they are free *in causa*, because we have either freely initiated them, or approved them from time to time when we adverted to their ethical quality, or because we freely acquired the habits which now accomplish these acts. It is especially when some act of a specially moral complexion is recognized as good or evil that the exertion of our freedom is brought into play. With reflective advertence to the moral quality comes the apprehension that we are called on to decide between right and wrong; then the consciousness that we are choosing freely, which carries with it the subsequent conviction that the act was in the strictest sense our own, and that we are responsible for it.

*CONSEQUENCES.*—Our moral freedom, like other mental powers, is strengthened by exercise. The practice of yielding to impulse results in enfeebling self-control. The faculty of inhibiting pressing desires, of concentrating attention on more remote goods, of reinforcing the higher but less urgent motives, undergoes a kind of atrophy by disuse. In proportion as a man habitually yields to intemperance or some other vice, his freedom diminishes and he does in a true sense sink into slavery. He continues responsible *in causa* for his subsequent conduct, though his ability to resist temptation at the time is lessened. On the other hand, the more frequently a man restrains mere impulse, checks inclination towards the pleasant, puts forth self-denial in the face of temptation, and steadily aims at a virtuous life, the more does he increase in self-command and therefore in freedom. The whole doctrine of Christian asceticism thus makes for developing and fostering moral liberty, the noblest attribute of man. William James's sound maxim: "Keep the faculty of effort alive in you by a little gratuitous exercise every day", so that your will may be strong to stand the pressure of violent temptation when it comes, is the verdict of the most modern psychology in favour of the discipline of the Catholic Church.

The literature of the free-will controversy is enormous, nearly all the leading philosophers having dealt with the problem. Perhaps the best general historical treatment of all the branches of the question—fatalism, predestination, necessitarianism, determinism—is to be found in FONSEGRIVE, *Essai sur le libre arbitre* (2nd ed., Paris, 1896). See also ALEXANDER, *Theories of the Will* (New York, 1884); JANET and SEAILLES, *History of Problems of Philosophy* (tr. New York and London, 1902). Free will is defended by WARD, *Philosophy of Theism* (London, 1884); MARTINEAU, *A Study of Religion*, II (Oxford, 1888); JOSEPH RICKABY, *Free-will and Four English Philosophers* (London, 1906); JAMES, *Principles of Psychology* (New York and London, 1901); LADD, *Psychology, Descriptive and Explanatory* (New York and London, 1894); MAHER, *Psychology* (6th ed., New York and London, 1905). The case for determinism will be found in HOBBS, *The Leviathan in Works*, ed. MOLESWORTH (London, 1839-45); IDEM, *Liberty and Necessity*; HUME, *Treatise of Human Nature*, Bk. II (London, 1874); MILL, *Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy* (London, 1895); BAIN, *Emotions and Will* (3rd ed., London, 1875); SPINOZA, *Ethics*, ed. WILLIS (London, 1870). See also SIDGWICK, *Methods of Ethics* (6th ed., London and New York, 1901). For anti-determinists: NOEL, *La Conscience du libre arbitre* (Paris, 1897); PIAT, *La Liberté* (Paris, 1895); GUTERLEIT, *Die Willensfreiheit* (2nd ed., Fulda, 1907). On the Scholastic controversy see SCHNEEMANN, *Controversiarum de Divina Gratia Liberique Arbitrii Concordia* (Freiburg, 1881); DUMMERMUTH, *S. Thomas et Doctrina Præmotionis Physicæ* (Paris, 1886); FRINS, *S. Thomas Doctrina de Coopérationem cum omni Naturâ Creatâ præsertim Libera*.

MICHAEL MAHER.

**Fregoso, FEDERIGO**, cardinal; b. at Genoa, about 1480; d. 22 July, 1541; belonged to the Fregosi, one of the four great bourgeois families who from the end of the



fourteenth century gave many doges to the republic. Federigo was the son of Agostino Fregoso, governor of Genoa in 1488 for Ludovic Moro, and of Gentilla de Montefeltre, niece of Guidobaldo, Duke of Urbino. His brother, Ottaviano, was Doge of Genoa. Having spent his youth at the court of his uncle, the Duke of Urbino, he took Holy orders, and in 1507 received from Julius II the Archbishopric of Salerno. But the King of Spain having refused to recognize him because of his sympathies with France, the Pope promised him the See of Gubbio. At the court of Urbino, Federigo had received a good classical education, and had allied himself with such humanists as Bembo and Baldassare Castiglione. Every day he withdrew himself from his occupations in order to devote several hours to the study of the ancients. Nevertheless, circumstances were to make him a man of action.

In 1510, after the troubles in Genoa and the victory of the Adorni, Federigo was exiled and compelled to seek refuge at Rome. Three years later, the Fregosi returned to Genoa, Ottaviano was elected Doge, and Federigo, having become his chief counsellor, was placed at the head of the army, and defended the republic against internal dangers (revolts of the Adorni and the Fieschi) and external dangers (suppression of the Barbary piracy). Cortogoli, a corsair from Tunis, blockaded the coast with a squadron, and within a few days had captured eighteen merchantmen. Being given the command of the Genoese fleet, in which Andrea Doria was serving, Federigo surprised Cortogoli before Bizerta, effected a descent on the island of Djerba and returned to Genoa with great booty. The Fregosi had recognized Francis I, King of France, as Lord of Genoa. In 1522, Charles V besieged the city. Federigo directed the defence and was wounded. The Spaniards having taken the city by assault, he was compelled to seek safety on a French vessel. Francis I accorded him a warm reception and gave him the Abbey of St. Benignus at Dijon. Here he devoted himself to the study of Greek and Hebrew, but he had quarrels with the monks, who could not endure his severity, and he returned to Italy. In 1529 he resigned the See of Salerno and was named titular Bishop of Gubbio. In 1539 Paul III made him a cardinal-priest, with the title of St. John and St. Paul. He died at Gubbio, in 1541, mourned by the people of his diocese, who had named him, "the father of the poor". He wrote several edifying works, and some of his letters are in the collections of Bembo and Baldassare Castiglione.

CIACONIUS, *Vite de pontifici*, III. 660; DITTRICH, *Contarini* (1885), 352-54; PASTOR, *History of the Popes, ad ann.*; BRUCK, in *Kirchenlex.* s. v.

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

**Freiburg**, city, archdiocese, and university in the Archduchy of Baden, Germany.

**THE CITY.**—Freiburg im Breisgau, the third largest city in Baden, is beautifully situated at the foot of the Schwarzwald mountains on both banks of the Dreisam. The census of 1 December, 1905, gave the number of its inhabitants as 76,286, of whom 53,133 were Catholics. The city was founded in 1120 by Conrad, a member of the Swabian House of Zähringen, which rules in Baden even to this day. According to the original city charter, which is still in existence, the city was from the beginning a market or commercial centre, and all the privileges then enjoyed by the citizens of Cologne were granted to the merchants and other citizens who settled in Freiburg. It became a flourishing town even during the lifetime of its founder. In 1146 Bernard of Clairvaux preached the crusades there. It appears that under Berthold IV (1112-1186), Conrad's successor, the erection of a Romanesque cathedral was begun. After the death of Berthold V (son of preceding), Freiburg was inherited by his brother-in-law, Count Egon I of Urach. The consort of Egon II (1218-36) induced the Dominican

Fathers to settle in Freiburg, and founded at Adelshausen the Dominican nunnery, renowned in the history of German mysticism. Among the famous Dominicans connected in some degree with Freiburg were Albert the Great and John of Freiburg, while Berthold the Black (der schwarze Berthold), the supposed inventor of gunpowder, was a member of the local Franciscan convent. The city took advantage of the pecuniary embarrassment of its lords to purchase important rights and liberties. Ludwig of Bavaria, whom the city assisted in his war against Frederic the Fair, confirmed (1339) by a *Bulla Aurea* (golden charter) all the concessions and privileges of Freiburg and granted it an independent municipal court. A serious quarrel arose between the city and Count Egon IV (1358-68), but in 1368 the count gave up all his rights to Freiburg, and the city placed itself voluntarily under the suzerainty of Austria, and for more than five centuries it shared the fortunes of the House of Hapsburg.

As early as 1247, the municipal council calculated the inhabitants to number 4000, and at the end of the fourteenth century the town contained 1778 buildings, twenty of which were monasteries. In 1393 the council was composed of 12 nobles, 12 merchants, 18 guild-masters, and 6 specially elected members of guilds. In 1415, Freiburg, which had given refuge to Pope John XXIII (April 10-16) after his flight from Constance, was made a free imperial city (*freie Reichsstadt*), but was reconquered by the Austrians in 1425. In 1456, Archduke Albert founded its university (see below). The city was afterwards made the seat of government for Hither Austria and attained to a high degree of prosperity, especially during the reign of Maximilian I. Many Renaissance edifices were built, some of which still adorn the city; the famous minster (cathedral) was decorated with fine paintings by Hans Baldung, its choir being consecrated in 1513. The diet of the empire met here in 1498.

The great social and religious disturbances of the sixteenth century exerted a most detrimental influence on the prosperity of the city. In 1524, the rebellious peasants surprised the castle on the Schlossberg, captured the city, and forced the inhabitants to pay tribute. The city council and citizens in general had little sympathy with the Reformation, and, although the new doctrine found some adherents in the beginning, its propagation was effectually hindered by the Austrian Government, the city council, and the university (see ZASLUS, ULRICH). In 1529, Freiburg became the residence of the cathedral chapter of Basle, driven from that city by the Reformation (see BASLE-LUGANO). In spite of repeated epidemics, the sixteenth century was considered on the whole a prosperous period for the city. The Thirty Years War brought with it much suffering. Freiburg was besieged five times, captured four times and lost about two-thirds of its population by contagious diseases. Hardly had the city recovered from these disasters, when Louis XIV began his predatory wars on Germany. In 1677, Freiburg was taken by the French and converted into a formidable fortress by Vauban. In the course of this transformation, 14 churches and 4 monasteries were demolished. The French supremacy lasted only a short time, and Freiburg was restored to Austria by the Peace of Ryswick in 1697. On two later occasions it was held by the French for a short time, in 1713-14 during the War of the Spanish Succession, and during the War of the Austrian Succession (1744-48). These two wars destroyed the prosperity of the city so completely that in 1754 the number of its inhabitants sank to 3655, of whom at least one third were in a state of beggary.

Hardly had Freiburg begun to flourish again under Maria Theresa and Joseph II, whose reform measures were executed partly in the Breisgau, when the French Revolution broke out. By the treaty of Campo

Formio (1787), Freiburg and all Breisgau was ceded to the Duke of Modena, but a little later, by the Treaty of Presburg (1805), it reverted to the house of Zähringen. The city swore allegiance to the new Archduke of Baden on 30 Jan., 1806. The new government immediately abolished most of the monasteries and convents, or converted them into educational institutions. It abolished also the ancient representative system of the "estates", or the three ranks of the social order (clergy, nobles, bourgeois). In 1821, Freiburg became the metropolitan see of the newly-founded province of the Upper Rhine (see BADEN), and in 1827 the first archbishop took possession of the see. In the revolution of 1848-49, Freiburg played an important part, becoming at its close the seat of the provisional revolutionary government. Since then the city has flourished wonderfully; the number of its inhabitants has increased from 25,000 in 1872 to nearly 80,000 at the present time (1909), and its university is attended by 2900 students.

Freiburg is the residence of an archbishop, metropolitan of the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, and is the seat of his ecclesiastical administration, and of one of the deaneries of the diocese. Including the recently incorporated suburbs, the city has now 7 Catholic parishes, one parochial curacy (*Pfarrkuratie*), 22 churches and chapels; 63 priests; 17 institutions of the Vincentian Sisters of Charity (212 members); 4 houses of the Franciscan Sisters of Charity (39 members); 5 convents of the Sisters of Charity of the Holy Cross (61 members); a theological faculty at the university, an archiepiscopal theological seminary; an archiepiscopal residential gymnasium; a Catholic high school for girls, etc. The most prominent among the numerous charitable institutions conducted by Catholic sisterhoods are: St. Joseph's Hospital; St. Charles' Home (for pensioners); St. Ann's Home, for women engaged in business; St. Mary's Home, for servant girls, with employment bureau; St. Francis' Home for the aged; St. Elizabeth's Home (house-keeping and boarding school); Home for apprentices and journeymen, etc. Catholic sisters are also in charge of a number of institutions belonging to the municipality, for example the Hospital of the Holy Ghost, the Home for Beneficed Clergymen, the *Kartause* (poor-house), the People's Kitchen, the orphan asylum in Günterstal, and the large clinical hospital connected with the university. They also conduct two kindergartens, four industrial schools, two house-keeping schools, and five schools for small children.

The minster, one of the few existing Gothic cathedrals, completed in the Middle Ages, ranks first among the city churches. Its oldest parts, the transept and the intersection of nave and transept, were constructed during the thirteenth century in Romanesque style. The new part (Early Gothic) was begun in 1250, when the corner-stone of the tower (380 feet) was laid, and

was completed in the fourteenth century. In 1354, the choir (Late Gothic) was begun, but operations were suspended in 1370, and resumed only after a lapse of one hundred years. In 1513, the cathedral was practically finished. The minster is rich in art treasures, of which the most notable are: the painting over the main altar by Hans Baldung (1511-17); the choir-chapel with paintings by the elder Lucas Cranach and Hans Holbein (the Elder and the Younger); the artistic windows in the side-aisles, dating in part from the fourteenth century; lastly the decorations in the vestibule with an aggregate of over 200 figures,

one of the most elaborate examples of medieval theological symbolism and popularly attributed to Albert the Great. Among the other churches are: St. Martin's (Gothic), erected for the Franciscans during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, renovated and ornamented with a tower, 1876-93 (Hansjakob, St. Martin zu Freiburg im Breisgau als Kloster und Pfarrei, Freiburg, 1890); the University church (1630-40), erected by the Jesuits (Baroque) and used by the Old Catholics 1875-94; the church of the Sacred Heart, erected 1892-97 (Later Romanesque and Rhenish Transition style); St. John's (1894-99); St. Michael's Chapel in the old cemetery (1744), the vestibule of which is decorated with a remarkable "Dance of Death".

For a complete bibliography of the city of Freiburg see KIENTZ AND WAGNER, *Literatur der Landes- und Volkskunde des Grossherzogtums Baden* (Karlsruhe, 1901), II, 308-348; and, for the history of the city, ALBERT, *Die Geschichtschreibung der Stadt Freiburg im Breisgau in alter und neuer Zeit* (Freiburg, 1902). Important works are: SCHREIBER, *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Freiburg im Breisgau* (1828-66); IDEM, *Gesch. der Stadt und Universität Freiburg* (1857-60); IDEM, *Freiburg mit seinen Umgebungen* (3rd ed., 1840); BADER, *Gesch. der Stadt Freiburg* (1882-83); KIEPERT, *Freiburg in Wort und Bild* (1889); POINSIGNON AND FLAMM, *Geschichtliche Ortsbeschreibung der Stadt Freiburg* (1891 and 1904); SCHÄFER, *Das alte Freiburg* (1895); *Freiburg im Breisgau, die Stadt und ihre Bauten*, published by the SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS of Baden (1898); BAUMGARTEN, *Freiburg im Br. und Umgebung* (Stuttgart, 1906). Valuable contributions are met with in the following periodicals: *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft*, etc., for the history, antiquities, and popular customs of Freiburg and vicinity (since 1867); *Schauinsland* (since 1873); *Zeitschrift f. d. Gesch. des Oberrheins* (since 1880); *Freiburger Adress-Kalender* (since 1817). For the minster, see GEIGES, *Unserer Lieben Frauen Münster zu Freiburg* (illustrated; Freiburg, 1897); IDEM, *Der alte Fensterschmuck des Freiburger Münsters* (1902); KEMPF AND SCHUSTER, *Das Freiburger Münster* (1906); BAUMGARTEN, *Das Freiburger Münster* (Stuttgart, 1906); *Freiburger Münsterblätter* (Freiburg, since 1905, half-yearly).


THE ARCHDIOCESE.—*Statistics*.—It includes the Grand Duchy of Baden (q. v.), the Hohenzollern possessions of the Prussian Crown, bounded by Baden and Württemberg, together with some few places in Württemberg. The Catholic population is 1,263,280, according to the census of 1905. The suffragans of Freiburg are the Bishops of Fulda, Limburg, Mainz, and Rottenburg. The archbishop is elected by the cathedral chapter, but the names of the candidates must be submitted to the sovereign, who has the right to cancel the names of candidates not acceptable to



THE CATHEDRAL, FREIBURG

him, provided that a sufficient number remain on the list to allow a choice. The cathedral chapter consists of the dean [at present (1909) the auxiliary bishop Dr. Fr. Justus Knecht, titular Bishop of Nebo], 6 canons and 6 prebendaries. The ordinariate consists of the archbishop, the members of the chapter, of 2 other priests and 2 laymen. The ordinariate is the archiepiscopal metropolitan court; the archiepiscopal diocesan court is termed the officialate (6 members). The church property is administered, partly by the ordinariate and partly by the civil body known as the Catholic "Oberstiftungsrat" at Karlsruhe (see BADEN). The pastoral work of the archdiocese is carried on by two incorporated parishes (the cathedral parish of Freiburg and the parish of Sankt Peter), and by 43 deaneries (4 in Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen) with 911 parishes and parochial curacies (Pfarrkuratien), 116 chaplaincies and 265 other pastoral charges.

In January, 1909, the secular clergy of the archdiocese consisted of 904 rectors and curates, 281 chaplains and vicars, 106 other active priests (professors, teachers, editors, etc.), 107 priests retired or on leave of absence: a total of 1398, besides 80 regular priests. The diocesan institutions for the education of the clergy are: the seminary in the former Benedictine



TOWN HALL, FREIBURG

monastery of Sankt Peter; the theological seminary in Freiburg, whose students frequent the university; and the 5 archiepiscopal gymnasia of Freiburg, Constance, Rastatt, Tauberbischofsheim and Sigmaringen. In the university, eleven priests are professors of Catholic theology and their lectures were attended in the summer-semester of 1909 by 224 students. Male religious orders are excluded from Baden proper by civil law. In the Hohenzollern section of the archdiocese, there are three monasteries for men: the Benedictines at Beuron (61 priests, 9 clerics, and 89 lay brothers), the Franciscans at Gorheim (12 priests, 12 clerics, and 10 lay brothers), and the mission house of the White Fathers at Haigerloch (47 fathers and 6 lay brothers). The religious institutions for women are: the Ladies of the Holy Sepulchre with an academy in Baden-Baden (40 sisters); the Benedictine Sisters in Habsthal, Hohenzollern (20 sisters); the Dominican Sisters with an academy in Constance (53 sisters); the Cistercians with an academy in Lichtenthal (54 sisters); the Choir Sisters of St. Augustine with an academy in Offenburg and one branch (43 sisters); the Ursulines with an academy in Villingen and in Breisach (40 sisters); the Vincentian Sisters of Charity, including the mother-house in Freiburg, 151 convents (all in Baden), with 900 sisters; the Franciscan Sisters of Charity with mother-house at Gengenbach, 154 houses (all in Baden) and 727 sisters; the Sisters of Charity of the Holy Cross from Ingenbohl (Switzerland), mother-house in Hegne near Constance, 134 houses and 728 sisters (3 convents, 20 sisters in Hohenzollern); the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul (from Strasburg), 11 convents, 72 sisters (7

houses with 50 sisters in Hohenzollern); the Sisters of Charity of Our Blessed Saviour from the mother-house in Oberbronn (Alsace), 57 convents (all in Baden) and 410 sisters; the Sisters of Charity of St. Francis from the mother-house in Mallersdorf (Bavaria), 2 houses in Baden, 18 sisters; the Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph from St. Marx (Alsace), 18 convents in Baden and 52 sisters; the Sisters of Charity of St. Francis from the mother-house in Limpertsberg (Luxemburg), 16 convents in Baden and 64 sisters; the Sisters of Charity of St. Francis (mother-house in Oberzell near Würzburg), 1 convent in Baden and 2 sisters; the Sisters of Christian Love (mother-house in Paderborn), 1 convent in Hohenzollern and 7 sisters. These sisters conduct numerous charitable works: 428 institutions for outdoor nursing, 98 hospitals, 17 endowed homes (Pfrundenhäuser), 13 poor-houses, 7 crèches or infant asylums, 236 kindergarten schools, 56 orphanages, 4 business-girls' homes, 12 servant-girls' homes, 13 homes for working-women, 10 high-schools for girls, 12 schools of domestic economy, 121 industrial schools, 6 evening schools, 1 institution for the manufacture of church vestments, 7 peoples' kitchens, 4 apprentices' and journeymen's homes, 6 homes for girls, 19 homes for the care of the sick and aged.

General statistics relative to the Catholic associations of the archdiocese are lacking. The most notable among these societies are: St. Boniface Society (Bonifatiusverein), which had an income of over \$130,000 in 1907, and ranks first (financially) among all diocesan societies; the Volksverein for Catholic Germany; Catholic "Gesellenvereine" or journeymen's unions with branches in 56 different localities; the Catholic Workmen's Society with 154 branches; the Catholic Workwomen's Society, 8 branches; the Catholic Apprentices' and Young Men's Society, 38 branches; the Vincentian Society; Society of St. Charles Borromeo; Congregation of Mary, for boys and girls; the Infant Jesus Society; Society of the Holy Family, etc. The archdiocese has 30 Catholic newspapers and periodicals. The most important churches of the Grand Duchy have been mentioned in the article BADEN; the most important churches in Hohenzollern are those of Haigerloch, Hechingen and Sigmaringen.

*History.*—The foundation and history of the archdiocese have been treated exhaustively under BADEN; also, the relations between the Church and the State (II, 195–200). It only remains to add a few remarks concerning the Hohenzollern section of the archdiocese.

The two principalities, Hohenzollern-Hechingen and Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, which formerly belonged to the Diocese of Constance, were joined to the Archdiocese of Freiburg, when the province of the Upper Rhine was created by the concordats of 18–27 Oct., and 14–21 Nov., 1821. Both princes had pledged themselves to carry out the Josephist principles which then prevailed in the other states of the Upper Rhine province, though they were the only Catholic sovereigns of the province and reigned over an almost exclusively Catholic population. Both governments consequently exercised all the rights which Febronianism and Josephinism claimed for the secular government as its inalienable *jus circa sacra*, and restricted ecclesiastical authority as much as possible. The "Regium Placet", or civil control of papal and episcopal decrees, was rigorously enforced. Taxes and contributions for the pope and "foreign" ecclesiastical superiors were prohibited; the archbishop's jurisdiction was held subordinate even in spiritual matters to the civil authority; the cathedral chapter was placed in a position of administrative equality with the bishop, and even episcopal acts were subjected to the most scrutinizing supervision and arbitrary control of the civil power (*jus supremæ inspectionis*). The government, especially in Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, sought to secure a predominating influence in matters concerning divine worship, marriages (by introducing

the Josephist matrimonial legislation), the education and pastoral duties of the clergy, appointments to ecclesiastical benefices, and the administration and employment of church property. Furthermore, it compelled the clergy, monasteries, and confraternities to contribute to the support of higher and elementary education and charitable institutions. The Hohenzollern princes, however, were well disposed towards the Church, hence these pretensions of the civil power were enforced much less rigorously in their principalities than in the Baden section of the archdiocese and other parts of the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine.

The innovations of Wessenberg (Vicar-General of the Diocese of Constance, and, until 1827, acknowledged as such by both Hohenzollern and Baden governments, despite the protests of the pope) affected the liturgy, processions, pilgrimages, confraternities, the number of holidays of obligation, and included the introduction of the German language into the Mass and also the so-called liturgical confession and communion. To the credit of the Hohenzollern princes, it must be said that they hindered rather than promoted these innovations, which are so alien from the true spirit of the Church. In various other ways, also, these princes were helpful to the interests of the Church. They assisted the ecclesiastical authorities to bring up a moral and zealous clergy, regulated by decrees the observance of Sunday, strove in union with the Church to suppress immorality, made a strong stand against the pietistic movement which originated in the Hailerloch deanery, and opposed the spread of the rationalistic book entitled "Stunden der Andacht" (Hours of Devotion). They also bound the clergy to give catechetical instruction regularly in the schools. In general, however, though no violence was used to enforce the principles of Josephinism, the activity of the Church was in many ways restricted and paralyzed; her property rights, above all, were greatly interfered with. The wrongs committed in this respect were so great that the clergy, most of whom had been brought up in the principles of Febronianism and Josephinism, and many of whom favoured the abolition of the breviary and of celibacy, presented an unavailing petition to the government in 1831 for gentler treatment.

The situation became more favourable, when in 1849 these two principalities were by treaty annexed to Prussia under King Frederick William IV. Thanks to the king's friendly disposition towards the Church and the untiring efforts of Archbishop Hermann von Vicari, the Catholics of Hohenzollern soon secured the same liberties as those then allowed to the Prussian Catholics. The Church was permitted to erect monasteries, and to re-establish fraternities. Missions were again held, pilgrimages became more popular and a general revival of religious life took place. Unfortunately the Kulturkampf (q. v.), though originating in Prussia, was also felt in Hohenzollern, now part of the Prussian Kingdom, although the so-called *May Laws* and other persecuting enactments were not enforced there so strictly as in Prussia proper. The Benedictine monastery at Beuron, the Jesuit novitiate at Gorheim near Sigmaringen, and the Franciscan convent at Stetten near Hechingen were suppressed; the teaching sisters, the Sisters of Christian Charity, and the Sisters of the Holy Cross (Ingenbohl) were expelled. It was forbidden to appoint or install any more parish priests, curates, etc. Two temporary rectors of churches, appointed in spite of this prohibition, were imprisoned, and Lothar von Kübel, after Vicari's death administrator of the archdiocese for 14 years, was heavily fined for appointing priests to vacant parishes. Most of the clergy were deprived of the right of local school-inspection, but, in virtue of an old law (1809), were permitted to give religious instruction. At the close of the Kulturkampf, better relations

were developed between Church and State, and continue in general to the present day.

For bibliography see KIENITZ and WAGNER, *Litteratur der Landes- und Volkskunde des Grossherzogtums Baden*, I, 244-83. Important works. LONGNER, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz* (Tübingen, 1863); BRUCK, *Die oberrheinische Kirchenprovinz* (Mainz, 1868); FRIEDBERG, *Der Staat und die kath. Kirche im Grossherzogtum Baden* (2d ed., Leipzig, 1874); HEINER, *Gesetze des kath. Kirche (in Baden) betreffend* (Freiburg, 1890); IDEM, *Die kirchlichen Erlasse, Verordnungen u. Bekanntmachungen der Erzdiocese Freiburg* (2d ed., 1898); MAAS, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche im Grossherzogtum Baden* (1891); MEYER, *Der Orden d. Barmherzigen Schwestern vom hl. Vincenz v. Paul in der Erzdiocese Freiburg* (1896); MEISTER, *Das Beamtenrecht der Erzdiocese Freiburg* (Stuttgart, 1904); ROSCH, *Die Bezeichnungen der Staatsgewalt zur kath. Kirche in den beiden hohenzollernschen Fürstentümern 1800-1850* (Sigmaringen, 1906); IDEM, *Das religiöse Leben in Hohenzollern unter dem Einflusse des Wessenbergianismus, 1800-1850* (Cologne, 1908); LAUR, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in Baden* (Freiburg, 1908); VON FUNN, in *Kirchenlexikon*, IX, 593-612; *Die kath. Kirche und ihre Diener*, II; *Personalschematismus* (yearly), *Realschematismus der Erzdiocese Freiburg* (1893), new edition in preparation. For the churches of the archdiocese see KRAUS, *Kunstdenkmäler d. Grossherzogtums Baden* (Freiburg, since 1887, 8 vols.); ZWINGLER and LAUR, *Die Bau- und Kunst-Denkmäler in den Hohenzollernschen Ländern* (Stuttgart, 1896). Periodicals: *Freiburger Diözesanarchiv* (Freiburg, since 1865, annual; vol. XXIX has a complete ecclesiastico-historical bibliography of the archdiocese); *Zeitschrift für Gesch. des Oberrheins* (1850-1908); *Freiburger Katholisches Kirchenblatt* (1857-89); *Oberrheinisches Pastoralblatt* (Freiburg, since 1890).

THE UNIVERSITY.—For the foundation of its university Freiburg is indebted to Archduke Albrecht VI of Austria, who was entrusted by his brother, Emperor Frederick III, with the government of the Further Austrian territories. The idea was first conceived by Mechtilde, the accomplished wife of Albrecht, and it was at her suggestion that he resolved to found the university, having obtained the sanction of Callistus III in the Bull of 20 April, 1455. The revenue of the university was ensured by the foundation of several benefices, and the incorporation of the cathedral parish of Freiburg, together with the parishes of Breisach, Ensisheim, and other places, in the new institution (Deed of 28 August, 1456), this endowment being approved by Frederick III. The town also made considerable contributions, although the foundation-brief of 21 September, 1457, granted the new university its own jurisdiction and immunity from taxation for its members. The real work of organization and the preparation of the constitution fell on the erudite Matthaeus Hummel of Villingen, and it was entirely due to his untiring zeal that the university could be opened with seven lecturers (four being theologians) on 26 April, 1460. Matthaeus was solemnly elected in the cathedral as first rector, and, despite the initial modesty of the institution and the fewness of its lecturers, the university was attended during the first year of its academic existence by two hundred and fourteen students (including one hundred and eight theologians), the majority of whom were from the Diocese of Constance, from Bavaria, Burgundy, and Lorraine.

The supreme authority over the university was vested in the rector, who was elected by the professorate for a single term. In the preservation of academic discipline, the rector was assisted by the senate (also called the consistory or regency), which usually comprised the preceding rector and three counsellors. Of the four faculties at the "Albertina", the faculty of arts was the most important. The course usually lasted three years, and included logic, dialectics, physics, mathematics, Aristotle and the peripatetics, poetry and oratory being added in 1471 and Greek in 1521. The most important lectures of this faculty during the first century of the university's existence were: Gregorius Reisch, a Carthusian, the teacher of Johann Eck and author of the "Margarita Philosophica", which treated of the totality of knowledge at the time; Jacob Locher, called Philomusus, who translated Brant's "Narrenschiff" (Ship of Fools) into Latin; Philip Engelbrecht of Engen (Engentinus), a poet and a secret follower of Luther; Henricus Loriti,

called Glareanus, the renowned Latinist, musician, and geographer; John Hartung, professor of Greek and Hebrew. In the theological faculty, which usually employed three lecturers in the sixteenth century, taught (at least for a short period) the following eminent scholars: Geiler of Kaisersberg, one of the university's earliest students; Johann Eck; Thomas Murner; Erasmus of Rotterdam, who had however never studied there, etc. The faculty of law, to which six regular professors were assigned in the sixteenth century, was long famous throughout Europe, thanks to Ulrich Zasius, the founder of modern political science. At this period three professors constituted the medical faculty, whose statutes had been sketched by Hummel himself. As a rule the students lived with their professors in residences or boarding-houses



THE UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG

(the so-called *Bursen*), of which there were seven at Freiburg, including the "Alte Burse", the "Domus Carthusiana", and the "Collegium Sapientiae". The university having attained so rapidly to renown, it was but natural that many of its professors should have been appointed to offices of high intellectual importance. From Freiburg the Chapter of Augsburg chose two, and Vienna three of its prince-bishops; the Chapters of Constance, Augsburg, Basle, and Speyer many of their suffragans, and the University of Vienna one of its chancellors.

During the widespread confusion of the Reformation period which exercised so deleterious an effect on many of the German universities, Freiburg succeeded by its judicious and cautious attitude in maintaining its ground. It is indeed a fact that several of its professors were in correspondence with Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin; that many others were suspected of favouring their innovations; that the senate itself censured Glareanus for inveighing so fiercely against Luther, Oecolampadius, and the other reformers in his lectures; still the university in general remained

true to the ancient Faith, and through its influence the town became a bulwark of Catholicism. The university refused henceforth to enrol any students who had studied in Wittenberg or Leipzig, and after 1567 only those who declared on oath their acceptance of the Tridentine Confession of Faith were admitted. To secure a still more Catholic atmosphere, Archduke Ferdinand invited the Jesuits in 1577 to found a college in Freiburg, and to incorporate it in the university. This scheme, however, aroused such energetic opposition, especially from Jodocus Lorichius, professor of theology and founder of the Collegium Pacis (*Burse zum Frieden*) that it had to be laid aside. On 5 November, 1520, shortly after the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, the Jesuits were introduced into the university on the strength of a fiat of Archduke Leopold in spite of the opposition of the senate, and entrusted with the whole faculty of arts and temporarily with two of the theological chairs. From the rectorship and quaestorship, however, they were excluded, although the cathedral pulpit was soon resigned into their hands. The most renowned of the Jesuit professors at Freiburg was the astronomer, Christopher Scheiner (q. v.), who left Freiburg finally in 1630. The frequent change of the fathers was indeed injurious to the university, at which too many remained but a very short time; thus, in the faculty of arts alone, no fewer than 123 different Jesuits were employed as lecturers during the 153 years preceding the suppression of the order.

The seventeenth century, especially the Thirty Years War and the predatory wars of Louis XIV, brought the university to the brink of ruin. Almost all its funded property was lost, as well as a great portion of its income from the parishes, now sadly impoverished by pillage and fire. The professors were frequently compelled to wait years for their stipend, and in 1643 the number of students had fallen to 46. Emperor Leopold was the first to take steps to remove the financial difficulties, but, when the town was ceded to the French by the Peace of Nimwegen (1679), the majority of the professors and students migrated to Constance. The Jesuit fathers remained and opened in 1684 a *studium gallicanum* under the patronage of Louis XIV, but it was not until some years later that the old personnel of the university could initiate academic courses in Constance. After the Peace of Ryswick (1697), the professorate returned from Constance to Freiburg, when the old contentions, which had so often broken out between the university and the Society of Jesus, were settled by the so-called "Viennese Transaction" of forty articles. According to this agreement, the Jesuits were still excluded from the rectorate, and were refused the precedence, which they had claimed; on the other hand they received the building of the "Alte Burse", which they had previously occupied, as their private property, and in addition an increased annual stipend, as well as all arrears of salary.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the outlook of the university was far from hopeful, and in 1713 the members were compelled to secede once more to Constance, returning in 1715. Emperor Charles VI later increased the revenue of the university, whose staff again included many illustrious professors—the jurists Stapf, Egermayer, Waizenegger, and Reinhart; the physicians Blau, Strobel, and Baader; the Jesuits Nicasius Grammatici and Steinmayer—but the university never reached the educational level of the halcyon days of the sixteenth century. After the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773, their college buildings together with their church (built 1630–40) and *Gymnasium Academicum* were annexed in 1777 by Empress Maria Theresa to the university. The importance of the Albertina waxed greater with the increasing prosperity of the country. The new curriculum of studies, which Maria Theresa caused to be



drawn up for the higher educational institutions of her dominions, was introduced into Freiburg, in 1767, and at first met with much opposition. Although this action of the university led to the withdrawal of many of its ancient privileges (e.g. its governmental independence), it paved the way for a more intimate connexion between the university and the government, and from this period dates the adoption of a more reasonable attitude by both parties.

The transference of Further Austrian Breisgau to the House of Zähringen by the Peace of Pressburg (1805) seemed to menace greatly the position of Freiburg, since the new inconsiderable State of Baden possessed already in Heidelberg an older and more famous university. Thanks to the zealous efforts of the professors and town of Freiburg, however, their university was retained, and in 1807 the elector himself accepted the office of rector. Since then, the sovereign has always been the "rector magnificientissimus" of the university, and confirms the annual election by the ordinary professors of the pro-rector to exercise the office of rectorship in his name. In 1816 the university was again threatened with dissolution, but the danger was obviated principally through the influence of Karl von Rotteck. The independence of the university was, however, seriously curtailed, and the curriculum reformed after the model of Heidelberg, for which purpose the revenue, which had fallen very low, was increased by an annual State grant amounting at first to 15,000 gulden. The attendance varied between 270 and 320 students. In 1818 the university sent one representative to the newly-created diet, at which von Rotteck, the historian, was its deputy for many years. In consequence of the opposition between the professors and the town, the university was closed in 1832 for a short period, of which the government took advantage to recognize the previous republican constitutions on a more oligarchical basis. The retention or relinquishment of the university was also the subject of debate; indeed, for thirty years the danger of dissolution lay ever threatening. The Revolution occasioned a brief closing of the university in May, 1849. In 1857 the solemn celebration of its 400th anniversary was held in the presence of the sovereign. The efforts of the Catholic party to restore to the university its initial purely Catholic character by securing for the archbishop, not alone a deciding voice in the appointment of theological professors, but also a certain right of supervision over the other faculties, were rendered ineffectual through the rejection of the concordat between Rome and the government by the Diet of Baden in 1859. Since then the Catholic characteristics of the university both in its professors and in its students, who are recruited mainly from North Germany, have become gradually impaired. When, after the establishment of the German Empire, a new university was founded in Strasburg, a serious decay of Freiburg was anticipated. Fortunately these forebodings proved to be groundless, since, while the number of students in 1872 was only 272—a figure which does not exceed the attendance during the first century of the university's existence—it exceeded 1000 in 1885, 1500 in 1898, 2000 in 1904, and 2600 in 1908, thus placing Freiburg fifth in the list of German universities as regards attendance.

Of the many scholars, who shed a lustre on the name of Freiburg at the close of the eighteenth and during the nineteenth centuries, the following (excluding those still living) may be mentioned; the theologians Engelbert Klüpfel, Johann Leonhard Hug, Heinrich Schreiber, historian of the town and University of Freiburg, Alban Stolz, the renowned popular author, and Franz Xaver Kraus, who wrote on the history of the Church and of fine arts; the jurists Jodocus Riegger, Johann Caspar Ruef; the statesman Joseph Buss, Gustav Rümelin, who for many years represented the university in the first diet; the philologists and philo-

sophers, Johann Georg Jacobi and Anton Baumstark; the physicians and scientists, Alexander Ecker, Adolf Kussmaul, Alfred Hegar, Anton de Bary.

The University of Freiburg at present contains four faculties: that of Catholic theology, that of law and political science, that of medicine, and that of philosophy, the last-mentioned being subdivided into philosophical—historical and mathematico-physical. At the beginning of 1909, the teaching staff consisted of 140 lecturers: 11 theologians, 16 jurists and political economists, 50 physicians, 43 in the first division of the philosophical faculty and 30 in the second. In the summer term of 1908 Freiburg was attended by over 2600 students, and in the winter term (1908–09) by 1966 matriculated (including 67 women) and 153 private students. Of the sixty institutions connected with the university the most important are the large medical infirmaries (surgical, gynaecological, psychiatric, optical) and general clinical hospitals; the physical, geological, botanical, and zoological institutes; the academical reading-rooms. The university library contains 300,000 volumes, a large number of which belonged to the old cloister-libraries, and 700 manuscripts. The majority of the institutes possess excellent special libraries. The property of the university consists partly of invested capital to the value of 1,300,000 marks (about 300,000 dollars), and partly of unremunerative capital (e.g. the university buildings, etc.) to the value of 2,800,000 or, allowing for certain outstanding liabilities, 2,380,000 marks. According to the budget of 1908–09, its income was 1,075,300 marks, of which 958,500 was paid by the state. The expenditure, which equalled the income, was as follows: 475,600 marks for salaries of regular professors and officials; 132,200 for the extraordinary staff; 335,900 for the different institutions, and the remainder for sundry expenses.

A complete list of the literature dealing with the university is contained in ERMAN and HORN, *Bibliographie der deutschen Universitäten II* (Leipzig, 1904), 195–213. The most important works are: RIEGGER, *Analecta academica Friburgensis* (Freiburg, 1774 and 1779); IDEM, *Imagines, Sigilla atque nonnulla alia monumenta Academiae Friburgensis* (Freiburg, 1778); SCHRIEBER, *Geschichte der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität* (3 vols., Freiburg, 1857–60); *Die Universität Freiburg seit dem Reptersantritt Grossherzog Friedrichs* (Freiburg, 1881); FEYSER, *Die finanziellen Verhältnisse der Universität Freiburg* (Freiburg, 1881); MAYER, *Die Universität Freiburg im Br. in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (3 parts, Bonn, 1892–94); KÖNIG in *Freiburger Diöcesan-Archiv*, vols. XXI, XXII, XXIV, and XXVII; KAUFMANN, *Geschichte der deutschen Universitäten II* (Stuttgart, 1895); MAYER, *Die Matrikel der Universität Freiburg im Br. von 1460–1656*, I (Freiburg, 1907); BAUMGARTEN, *Freiburg im Breisgau in Die deutschen Hochschulen*, I (Berlin, 1907).

JOSEPH LINS.

**Freiburg** (SWITZERLAND), UNIVERSITY OF. See FRIEBURG, UNIVERSITY OF.

**Freising.** See MUNICH.

**Fréjus** (FORUM JULII), DIOCESE OF, suffragan of Aix, comprises the whole department of Var (France). It was suppressed by the Concordat of 1801, re-established by that of 1817, and definitively established in 1823. The *arrondissement* of Grasse, which until 1860 belonged to the department of Var, when it was annexed to that of the Alpes-Maritimes, was, in 1886, separated from the Diocese of Fréjus and attached to that of Nice. A Brief of 1852 authorized the bishop to assume the title of Bishop of Fréjus and Toulon. The present diocese comprises the territory of the ancient Diocese of Fréjus as well as that of the ancient Diocese of Toulon.

I. FRÉJUS.—Christianity would seem to have been introduced into Fréjus in the time of Emperor Constantine. History relates that in 374 a certain Acceptus falsely declared himself guilty of some crimes in order to rid himself of the episcopal dignity, and that the Council of Valencia besought the Church to name another in his stead. The following are named among the bishops of this see: St. Leontius (419–433),

brother of St. Castor and friend of John Cassian, who dedicated to him his first ten "Collationes", and of St. Honoratus, founder of the monastery of Lérins; Theodore (433-455), Abbot of the Iles d'Hyères, to whom Cassian dedicated the last seven "Collationes"; St. Auxilius (c. 475), formerly a monk of Lérins, and later a martyr under Euric, Arian King of the Visigoths; Riculfus (973-1000), who restored the ruins made by the Saracens, and built the cathedral and the episcopal palace; Bertrand (1044-91), who founded the collegiate church of Barjols; Raymond Berengarius (1235-1248), who arranged the marriage of Beatrice, daughter of the Count of Provence, with Charles of Anjou; Jacques d'Euse (1300-1310), preceptor of St. Louis of Toulouse, and later pope under the name of John XXII; Cardinal Nicolò Fieschi (1495-1524), who at the time of his death was dean of the Sacred College; André-Hercule de Fleury (1698-1715).

II. TOULON.—The legend which states that a certain Cleon, who accompanied St. Lazarus to Gaul was the founder of the Church of Toulon, is based on an apocryphal document composed in the fourteenth century and ascribed to a sixth-century bishop named Didier. Honoratus and Gratianus, according to the "Gallia Christiana", were the first bishops of Toulon whose names are known to history, but Duchesne gives Augustalis as the first historical bishop. He assisted at councils in 441 and 442 and signed in 449 and 450 the letters addressed to Pope Leo I from the province of Arles. St. Cyprian, disciple and biographer of St. Cæsarius of Arles, is also mentioned as a Bishop of Toulon. His episcopate, begun in 524, had not come to an end in 541; he converted to Catholicism the Visigoth chiefs, Mandrier and Flavian, who became anchorites and martyrs on the peninsula of Mandrier.

The Island of Lérins, well known as the site of the celebrated monastery founded there in 410 (see LÉRINS) was sold in 1859 by the Bishop of Fréjus to an English purchaser. A number of the saints of Lérins are especially honoured in the diocese. Among them are Sts. Honoratus, Cæsarius, Hilary, and Virgilius, all of whom became archbishops of Arles; Quinidius, Bishop of Vaison; Valerius, Bishop of Nice; Maximus, Bishop of Riez; Veranus and Lambertus, Bishops of Venice; Vincent of Lérins, author of the "Commonitorium", and his brother Lupus, Bishop of Troyes; Agricola, Bishop of Avignon; Aigulphus and Porcarius, martyrs. St. Tropesius, martyr during the persecution of Nero; St. Louis (1274-1297), a native of Brignoles,

in the Diocese of Toulon, and later Archbishop of Toulouse; and the virgin St. Roseline, prioress of the monastery of La Celle-Roubaud, who died in 1329, and whose shrine, situated at Les Arcs near Draguignan, has been for six centuries a place of pilgrimage,



PORTAL OF THE EPISCOPAL PALACE, FRÉJUS

are likewise especially honoured in the diocese. The sojourn in 1482 of St. Francis of Paula at Bormes and at Fréjus, where he caused the cessation of the plague, made a lasting impression. The chief places of pilgrimage in the Diocese of Fréjus and Toulon are those of Notre-Dame des Anges at Pignans, the chapel which King Thierry established in 508, for the veneration of a statue of the Blessed Virgin recovered by a shepherd and which, it was said, had been brought to Pignans by St. Nympha, niece of St. Maximinus and companion of St. Mary Magdalen; Notre-Dame de Bénat, a shrine dating from the sixteenth century; Notre-Dame de Grâces at Cotignac, which dates from 1519, and later served by some priests who formed themselves into a religious community under the rule

of St. Philip Neri, and were the first Oratorians in France. In 1637, as the result of an apparition of the Blessed Virgin to Frère Fiacre, Louis XIII and Anne of Austria sent him to Cotignac to offer up prayers. Anne of Austria became the mother of Louis XIV, and in 1660 he went in solemn state to Cotignac to return thanks to Notre-Dame de Grâces.



CATHEDRAL OF SAINT-ETIENNE, FRÉJUS

The church of St. Maximinus, begun towards the end of the thirteenth century by Charles II of Sicily and completed by the end of the fifteenth century, is the most beautiful example of pointed architecture in the south of France. The head of St. Mary Magdalen is honoured here, and the crypt contains tombs which date from the first centuries of the Christian Era. (For an account of the traditions on this subject, see LAZARUS and MARY MAGDALEN.) The celebrated preacher Massillon (1663-1742) was born at Hyères in this diocese. In 1905 (last year of the Concordat) the diocese numbered 326,384 inhabitants, 28 parishes, 142 succursal parishes, and 67 vicariates paid by the State. Before the enforcement of the law against the congregations in 1901 there were in the diocese communities of Trappists, Capuchins, Carthusians, Dominicans,

Marists, Salesians, and Sulpicians. An important diocesan congregation founded in 1838, for teaching and hospital work, was that of Notre-Dame de la Miséricorde, the mother-house of which was at Draguignan. Before the law of 1901 the religious congregations possessed in the diocese 2 founding asylums, 36 day nurseries, a seaside hospital for sick children, 2

orphanages for boys, situated in the country, 9 orphanages for girls, 6 workhouses, 2 houses of rescue, 3 houses of charity for the assistance of the poor, 30 hospitals or hospices, 2 houses of retreat, 7 religious houses for the care of the sick in their homes.

*Gallia Christiana, Nova* (1715), I, 418-447, 739-762; *Instrumenta*, 82-85, 129-131; ALBANES, *Gallia Christiana novissima* (Montbéliard, 1899); DUCHESNE, *Fastes Episcopaux*, I, 269-276, ESPITALIER, *Les évêques de Fréjus* (Draguignan, 1891-1898); LAMBERT, *Histoire de Toulon* (Toulon, 1892); DISDIER, *Description historique du diocèse de Fréjus, d'après les manuscrits de Girardin et d'Antelmy* (Draguignan, 1872); FOUGETRET, *Sanctuaires anciens et modernes de la Très-Sainte Vierge dans les diocèses de Fréjus et de Toulon* (Toulon, 1891); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibl.*, 1240, 3125.

GEORGES GOYAU.

**Fremin, JAMES**, Jesuit missionary to the American Indians; b. at Reims, 12 March, 1628; d. at Quebec, 2 July, 1691. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1646 and in 1655 set out for the Onondaga mission in Canada to devote the rest of his life to the evangelization of the savages. At the invitation of a Cayuga chieftain he set out, in 1666, for Lake Tiohero, near the present Cayuga, but his stay there was of short duration. The next year he was sent to revive the mission founded by Father Jogues among the Mohawk and, on his way, instituted the first Catholic settlement in Vermont, on Isle La Motte. Arriving at Tinnontoguen, the Mohawk capital, he rapidly acquired the language and by his courage and kindness won the respect of his savage charges. Unfortunately, the Mohawk did not readily respond to his efforts, and his chief care seems to have been to attend to the Huron captives who were already Christianized.

In October, 1668, Father Fremin proceeded to the Seneca country, but the war then being waged with the Ottawa and the Susquehanna prevented many conversions. In August, 1669, he left for Onondaga to preside at a general meeting of the missionary priests, but shortly returned to Gannougare to resume his work among the captive Huron. The high repute he had gained among the various tribes was responsible for his recall, in 1670, to take charge of La Prairie, the Christian settlement near Montreal where the converted Indians had been gathered, and it was he who placed this refuge on a solid footing and eliminated the liquor traffic. From that time on, with the exception of several voyages to France in the interest of the mission, he devoted himself exclusively to the work of preserving in the Faith those Indians who had been baptized, and, despite the persistent efforts of the tribes from which the converts came, he was able to prevent any serious defection. He died worn out by his long apostolate, having been the means of bringing over ten thousand Indians into the Church.

CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (New York, 1908); JESUIT RELATIONS; HOLMES in *Handbook of American Indians*, s. v. *Caughnawaga* (Washington, 1907).

STANLEY J. QUINN.

**French, NICHOLAS**, Bishop of Ferns, Ireland, b. at Ballytory, Co. Wexford, in 1604, his parents being John French and Christina Rosseter; d. at Ghent, 23 Aug., 1678. He studied at Louvain and appears to have been president of one of the colleges there, and on his return to Ireland in 1640 he was appointed parish priest of Wexford. During the Confederation War in Ireland he joined the Confederate party and took an active part in the deliberations of the Kilkenny Assembly. He was appointed Bishop of Ferns and was consecrated in November, 1645. Though opposed to the party of Preston he favoured the peace of 1648 against the Nuncio Rinuccini, but in the synod at Jamestown in 1650, he bitterly opposed the Ormond faction. In 1651 he went on a deputation to the Duke of Lorraine to solicit his assistance against Cromwell, and to offer him the protectorship of Ireland, but this mission having proved a failure he remained on the Continent. It is not clear whether it

was at this particular period or later that he officiated for a while as coadjutor Bishop of Paris. He retired to Santiago in Spain, where he assisted the Archbishop of Santiago, and where he wrote his book, "Lucubrations of the Bishop of Ferns in Spain". At the Restoration period he was about to return to Ireland, but being greatly disliked by Ormond on account of his attitude at the conference at Jamestown, the permission that had been given was withdrawn, and he remained in different parts of the Continent, notably at Paris and Ghent. During this portion of his life he published many pamphlets on Irish affairs, which are extremely valuable for the elucidation of the history from the outbreak of the war till 1675. In his last years he appears to have officiated as assistant to the Bishop of Ghent, and in that city he died, aged seventy-three years. There, too, a magnificent monument was raised to his memory.

He was a man of great literary activity as is evident from his numerous works. Besides a course of philosophy still in manuscript in March's Library, Dublin, he published "Queeres propound by the Protestant Party in Ireland concerning the peace now treated of in Ireland" (Paris, 1644); "A Narrative of Clarendon's Sale and Settlement of Ireland, etc." (Louvain, 1668); "The Bleeding Iphigenia" (1674), and "The Unkind Deserter of Loyal men and true friends", i. e. Ormond (Paris, 1676). An edition of his works was prepared by Samuel H. Bindon and was published at Dublin, in 1846.

BRADY, *Episcopal Succession* (Rome, 1867); WARE-HARRIS, *Antiquities of Ireland* (Dublin, 1739-45); Rinuccini's *Embassy in Ireland*, ed. HUTTON (Dublin, 1873); CLARENDON, *History of Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Dublin, 1719); GILBERT, *History of Irish Confederation* (Dublin, 1882-1891).

JAMES MACCAFFREY.

**French Catholics in the United States.**—The first Bishop of Burlington, the Right Reverend Louis de Goesbriand, in a letter dated 11 May, 1869, and which appeared in "Le Protecteur Canadien", a French newspaper then published at St. Albans, Vermont, made the following statement: "I am convinced from positive information, that when we say that there are 500,000 French-Canadians in the United States, the figures are far below the truth." The sources from which the late prelate drew his information are unknown to the writers of this article, but it is a fact that to-day the Diocese of Burlington has a Catholic population of 76,000 souls, of which 50,000 at least are of French Canadian birth or origin. It is also a fact that the French Canadian element has increased, both naturally and by immigration, to such an extent that it now numbers nearly 1,200,000 souls in the United States, that it has made its influence felt throughout the Eastern States, in all walks of life, and furthermore that, in point of numbers, it is the predominant element in several dioceses, and an important part of the population in many others. However, except in their own newspapers, or a few little-known books, scarcely anything had been said of the part taken by these immigrants in the civil and religious life of their new country, until, very recently, they took into their own hands the task of reviewing their history, of gathering statistics of their numbers, and of recording their achievements and the progress they have made in fifty years. The task is still far from complete, but enough has been done to demonstrate the progress of the French Canadians and their devotion to their Church and to their adopted country.

The immigration of French Canadians to the United States began before the War of American Independence (1775-83). French Canadians had then already immigrated to New England, and we find them in large numbers in the armies of Washington. After the war the American Congress, in recognition of their services and to prevent their being prosecuted

in Canada on the charge of high treason, gave them land on the shores of Lake Champlain, where their descendants are still to be found. That concession of land, situated in the State of New York, has long been known as "the Refugees' Tract". In 1837, after the rebellion in the Province of Quebec, a new immigration to the Eastern States took place, to the State of Vermont, more particularly, where the "Patriots", vanquished in battle, sought refuge with their families. But the chief influx from French Canada to the United States took place after the Civil War. Notwithstanding the fact that they had at that time but few organized parishes, the French Canadians were here in sufficient numbers during the war to furnish 40,000 soldiers to the Union. The immigration at the close of the war has been ascribed to many causes, the most considerable of which are the unprecedented industrial prosperity that followed the Civil War and the inborn love of the French Canadian for travelling, together with the desire to earn the high wages and to share in the vast opportunities which the Republic offered to its citizens.

Some writers—and many of these in earnest—have given as the principal cause of this French Canadian immigration, three-fourths of which took place between 1865 and 1890, the necessity in which the farmers of the Province of Quebec found themselves of seeking a new home after leading a life of luxury and dissipation. Undoubtedly this was true of some, but the general moral character of the hundreds of thousands who crossed the border is the best proof that the true cause of this movement must be sought elsewhere. The Jesuit, Father Hamon, writing on this subject, does not hesitate to say: "The rapidity with which this immigration was accomplished, and the ease with which these Canadians transplanted into a foreign land, have immediately reconstructed the Catholic mould of the parish that made their strength in Canada; the energy shown by them in erecting churches and convents, in grouping themselves together, and in organizing flourishing congregations, supported within by all that nourishes Christian piety, protected without against pernicious influences by the strength of association, and a press generally well inspired; all these elements of Catholic life, organized within a quarter of a century in the very citadel of old Puritanism, seem to indicate a Providential action as well as a Providential mission, the importance of which the future alone will reveal."

Those who do not look higher than material considerations in studying the causes of national movements will not give much credence to this opinion of Father Hamon. Nevertheless it is to-day a fact recognized by noted economists, that the French Canadians, now better known in the Republic under the name of French Americans, are, as labourers and artisans, the most solid and reliable pillar of industry in New England. And New England has received within its borders, more than two-thirds of their total immigration. As Catholics, it is obvious that they have played a rôle no less important, as may easily be seen by the perusal of Catholic Directories. Father Hamon classifies the French Canadian immigration as temporary, fluctuating, and permanent. Figures show the relative importance of each of these classes and demonstrate the spirit which animated the whole movement. The temporary immigration comprised a class of farmers who came to the United States with the avowed intention of going back to their old homes as soon as they had saved enough money to clear their farms from mortgages and all other financial incumbrances. This class became less numerous from day to day; so much so, that it was practically unnoticeable, as early as 1880. In many cases the intention of returning to the old home was never carried out. Frequently this class, by revealing to their neighbours the opportunities offered across the border, induced

many of them to follow in their footsteps. As to the fluctuating immigration, only a mere mention is necessary. Always on the move, from one country to the other, from city to city, from mill to mill, those who formed this class led that kind of life which relies, as Father Hamon says, on the Providence of God for its support. This roving class is still less numerous than the temporary group, and it is to be found not only in all classes of newcomers, but in settled populations as well. The permanent immigration has been the most numerous, and, naturally, the most substantial. It is these permanent French Canadian immigrants who have organized parishes and parochial schools, erected churches and convents, and now constitute the labouring power *par excellence* in all the industrial centres of New England. Most of them, if not all, came from the rural districts of Canada, especially from the Eastern townships, from the Dioceses of Trois Rivières and Rimouski, and from the Counties of Beauce, Bellechasse, and others on the borders. Their farms had become insufficient to support large families; in the Eastern townships their titles to the land they occupied were disputed, and they were forced to give up the fruit of many years of labour; they were the victims of the indifference shown by their Governments, both Provincial and Federal, towards colonization and the opening up of new farming districts. The increasing population was thus compelled by circumstances, to look elsewhere, for more land and greater opportunities. At the same time, the reports sent home by those who had taken part in the earlier immigration had widely advertised throughout the whole Province of Quebec, the material advantages of the United States. This migration was called at the time "the desertion of the Fatherland". But those who spoke thus were forgetful of the historical fact, that the French of America have from the very beginning felt perfectly at home in the whole northern part of the continent, on the soil of which their missionaries, their *coureurs des bois*, explorers, and warriors have left their footprints broadcast. In spite of all opposing efforts, hundreds of thousands of French Canadians, most of them farmers, between 1870 and 1890, left their rural occupation to adopt the more arduous life of the New England factories and the various industries of the Western States. This movement took place quietly, slowly, without creating any disturbance, and almost unnoticed. It was, in a certain sense, a repetition of that other movement which, advocated by Horace Greeley, sent toward the Golden Gate so many young men of the East.

Doubtless, this depopulation on a large scale was a great loss to Canada, where the emigrants might have founded families of colonists. But the nature of this emigration was such that it could not be checked by any special legislation. The movement had set in, and it was too late to forestall an event prepared by many years of economic conditions misunderstood or wilfully ignored. The stream had found its way across the borders, where new industries, phenomenal opportunities, and advantages unheard of before, were ready to absorb and utilize this new and valuable power of production.

In order to present a strictly accurate idea of the importance of the French American element, both numerically and from a Catholic standpoint, the following sources of information have been used for this article: (1) the Twelfth Census of the United States (1900); (2) local enumerations made in New England since 1900, and as late as the present year (1908); and (3) the Catholic Directory of the United States.

The accompanying table, compiled from the first of these three sources, shows, first, the number of French Americans born in Canada and, secondly, this first class combined with those of whom at least one parent was born in Canada.

## DISTRIBUTION OF FRENCH AMERICANS

	Foreign-born.	Of Foreign Parentage.
Maine.....	30,908	57,682
New Hampshire.....	44,420	73,359
Vermont.....	14,924	40,097
Massachusetts.....	134,416	244,586
Rhode Island.....	31,533	55,771
Connecticut.....	19,174	36,867
New York.....	27,199	69,236
New Jersey.....	1,118	2,140
Pennsylvania.....	1,468	3,603
Totals for North Atlantic Division.....	305,160	583,341
Delaware.....	41	77
Maryland.....	87	178
District of Columbia.....	97	236
Virginia.....	104	194
West Virginia.....	72	165
North Carolina.....	36	69
South Carolina.....	31	56
Georgia.....	80	203
Florida.....	88	200
Totals for South Atlantic Division.....	636	1,378
Ohio.....	2,903	7,034
Indiana.....	948	3,242
Illinois.....	9,129	24,477
Michigan.....	32,483	75,584
Wisconsin.....	10,091	27,981
Minnesota.....	12,063	32,406
Missouri.....	1,059	3,536
Iowa.....	1,519	5,613
North Dakota.....	3,162	6,512
South Dakota.....	1,138	3,516
Nebraska.....	1,039	3,003
Kansas.....	1,485	5,547
Totals for North Central Division.....	77,019	198,451
Kentucky.....	136	397
Tennessee.....	119	312
Alabama.....	89	211
Mississippi.....	75	141
Texas.....	400	1,004
Louisiana.....	253	759
Indian Territory.....	48	173
Oklahoma.....	179	702
Arkansas.....	161	411
Totals for South Central Division.....	1,460	4,110
Montana.....	3,516	5,725
Wyoming.....	150	385
Colorado.....	960	2,300
New Mexico.....	84	270
Arizona.....	153	264
Utah.....	128	505
Nevada.....	222	486
Idaho.....	395	846
Washington.....	1,899	3,862
Oregon.....	874	2,169
California.....	2,410	5,392
Totals for Western Division.....	10,791	22,204

The figures given for Louisiana are, of course, exclusive of all other inhabitants of French extraction; those relating to California are exclusive of the large population of immigrants from France established in that State, more especially in the city of San Francisco. There were also, 115 persons of French Canadian parentage in Alaska, and 4 in Hawaii, besides 502 persons of the same parentage in the military and naval service of the United States, stationed abroad and not credited to any State or Territory. Combining with these small figures the totals for the five

divisions given in the last column of the table, we get the grand total of 810,105 persons of French Canadian parentage living under the United States Flag. But these figures only represent the first and second generations, i. e. original immigrants still living, and their immediate descendants. In this connexion the director of the census says: "A small number of the persons reported as of foreign birth, are themselves of native parentage, so that, to a very small extent, the number of persons of foreign birth reported at each census is not included in its entirety in the number of persons reported as of foreign parentage. The figures are sufficiently comparable, however, to show the large body of population which must be added to the foreign born element itself in order to ascertain, even approximately, the number of persons of foreign extraction at any of the census periods considered. Moreover, this is the best figure that can be given as expressing the element of our population which is of foreign extraction, as the census inquiry does not go beyond the immediate parents of each person enumerated, and it is impracticable, at least under present conditions, to endeavor to determine the origin of the people beyond a single generation."

It is obvious, that an inquiry which does not go beyond the immediate ancestors of each person enumerated cannot convey an exact idea of the real number of those who may still be distinctly classified as French Americans, even though both of their parents may have been born in the United States. And when it is remembered that the French Canadians were early settlers in the northern part of the State of New York, that they were, practically, the first settlers of the State of Maine, and had found their way into Vermont as early as 1830; that French Canadians were the pioneers of the Western States, where they founded, or assisted in founding, great cities like Chicago, St. Louis, St. Paul, Dubuque, Milwaukee, and Detroit, it is not difficult to understand that in certain parts of the country at least three generations of French Americans have been recorded by the census of 1900 as native whites of native parents. How far short of the actual number of French Americans are the figures of the National Census, may be estimated by considering the local enumerations taken in the New England States since 1900, with the following results:

Maine.....	91,567
New Hampshire.....	84,011
Vermont.....	58,217
Massachusetts.....	366,379
Rhode Island.....	76,775
Connecticut.....	46,083

Total.....723,532

These figures, compared with the total (508,362) of those given in the Census of 1900 for the same six States, show an excess of the local over the national enumeration of 215,170 persons, or more than 42.3 per cent, for New England alone. This excess, explained in part by the fact that the census inquiry of 1900 was limited to only two generations, is also attributable to the continuous flow of immigration and in greater measure to the large birth-rate which is still maintained among the French Americans, it having been scientifically established that the French Canadians—at least in Canada—double their numbers by natural increase every twenty-six years. Taking into consideration the increase (42.3 per cent) shown by the enumerations in New England over the figures given by the National Census, and also bearing in mind the fact that the figures quoted above do not include the French from France (reported as being 265,441 by the census of 1900) and the French-speaking Belgians, scattered throughout other States than those of New England, we may conclude that the French Americans in the United States to-day number



more than 1,500,000, of whom nearly 1,200,000 can be classified as of French Canadian extraction. As this immigration of French Canadians was almost exclusively an immigration of Catholics, we are led to inquire what provisions were made for them in the different dioceses.

The French Canadians had left behind them in Canada a perfect Catholic organization, with parishes flourishing in all parts of the province, with episcopal sees in Quebec, Ontario, and the West—an organization comprising to-day many ecclesiastical provinces with archbishops, bishops, a numerous clergy, both secular and regular, as well as educational and charitable institutions of the highest order. It was not to be expected that the immigrants should find in their new country the religious organization they had possessed in Canada. Nevertheless, they had to be provided for, and it became a serious problem for the hierarchy, of New England especially, to determine how these newcomers should be cared for spiritually. The question of language stood in the way from the very beginning. The French Canadians, though willing to become staunch Americans, did not know the English language, and even when they had learned it, they still preserved a strong attachment for their mother tongue. That this problem puzzled the bishops of New England, is shown by the time taken for its solution, and by the fact that in some instances they were reluctant, or often unable, to deal with the situation in the only proper way, which was, to give to these people priests of their own tongue and nationality. Even to-day this problem is not adequately solved. It was feared at the beginning, as it is feared now in some quarters, that to grant to the French Canadian immigrants priests of their own tongue and nationality would encourage them to form a sort of state within the state, thereby causing great harm to the nation as a whole. Time has shown the fallacy of that argument. The patriotism of the French American element is undisputed. They possess the sterling civic qualities desirable and necessary to promote the best interests of the republic. As a matter of fact, the French Canadian immigration has created no new state in the state; and the French Americans have willingly learned the English language while remaining as closely attached as ever to their mother tongue, in which they see the best safeguard of their faith.

The progress accomplished for God and country through the organization of French American parishes all over New England is the conclusive proof of their excellency from every standpoint. It proves, at the same time, that further progress, religious and patriotic, can be accomplished by pursuing the same policy. At first, it was necessary to call priests from the Province of Quebec. That policy, inaugurated in the Diocese of Burlington in 1850, by the lamented Bishop de Goesbriand, has proved to be a blessing wherever it has been carried out. These early French Canadian missionaries, of whom many are still living, knew their people, understood their character and customs, had the same mentality as their flock, and easily succeeded in organizing flourishing parishes entirely devoted to the Church. As early as 1890 Father Hamon notes that these newcomers already possessed 120 churches and chapels, ministered to by Canadian priests, and 50 large schools, affording education to more than 30,000 children. Let us recall a few dates which mark the beginning of this new impulse given to the Catholic Church in the United States.

The first French American parish in the United States, after the foundation of Detroit, Michigan, was that of St. Joseph, at Burlington, Vermont, founded 28 April, 1850, with the Rev. Joseph Quévillon as first pastor. In the same state, the parish of the *Nativité de la Sainte-Vierge*, at Swanton, was organized in

1856, and that of St-François-Xavier at Winooski, in 1868. In the Diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts, the parish of Notre-Dame du Bon Conseil, at Pittsfield, was organized in 1867. In all, 22 parishes were organized by French Americans from that date to 1890, besides 15 parishes of mixed population, wherein the French Catholics were associated with their English-speaking brethren. In the Diocese of Providence, R. I., the parish of St-Jacques, at Manville, was organized in 1872, that of the *Précieus Sang*, at Woonsocket, in 1873, and that of St-Charles, at Providence, in 1878. In the Diocese of Hartford, Conn., the parish of St-Laurent, at Meriden, was organized in 1880, and five other parishes between 1880 and 1889. In the Diocese of Boston, the parish of St-Joseph, at Lowell, was organized in 1869, and that of Ste-Anne, at Lawrence, in 1873. In the Diocese of Portland, Maine, the parish of St-François de Sales, at Waterville, was organized in 1869, that of St-Pierre, at Lewiston, in 1871, that of St-Joseph, at Biddeford, in 1872, and that of St-Augustin, at Augusta, in 1888. In the Diocese of Manchester, New Hampshire, the parishes of St-Augustin, at Manchester, and St-Louis, at Nashua, were organized in 1872. Similar results were accomplished in the Dioceses of Ogdensburg, Albany, and Syracuse, and in the Western States. The accompanying table shows the actual religious organization of the French-American Catholics in New England—their clergy, parishes, etc.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Diocese	Parishes	Missions	Secular Priests	Regular Priests
Boston. . . . .	20	2	33	31
Hartford. . . . .	13	7	14	16
Springfield. . . . .	38	5	59	14
Burlington. . . . .	39	31	48	11
Portland. . . . .	30	40	40	16
Manchester. . . . .	25	15	38	17
Providence. . . . .	21	—	42	8
Fall River. . . . .	16	1	28	17
Totals. . . . .	202	101	302	130

To complete these figures for the United States would necessitate a study of all the dioceses, as there are French Americans in every state and territory of the Union; a few statistics, however, of the priests of French extraction in the principal dioceses will help to give a more definite idea of the organization as a whole: Baltimore has 21; Chicago, 62; Albany, 19; St. Paul, 14; San Francisco, 3; New York, 25; Oregon, 5; Philadelphia, 3; Dubuque, 7; Milwaukee, 9; New Orleans, 96; Syracuse, 5; and Ogdensburg, 63.

Of the distinguished clergymen whose names are associated with the work already described, the following have already been called to their reward: Norbert Blanchette, first Bishop and first Archbishop of Oregon City; J. B. Lamy, Archbishop of Santa Fé, New Mexico; Monsignor Magloire Blanchette, Prothonotary Apostolic, of Walla Walla, Washington; the Rev. P. M. Mignault, of Chambly, Quebec, who in the fifties was vicar-general of the Diocese of Boston, with the special mission of caring for the spiritual needs of his compatriots in the United States; the Rev. Joseph Quévillon, of Burlington, Vermont; Monsignor Brochu, of Southbridge, the Rev. J. B. Primeau, of Worcester, the Rev. L. G. Gagnier, of Springfield, and the Rev. J. B. Bédard, of Fall River, Massachusetts; the Rev. J. Roch Magan, of Muskegon, Michigan. Mention should also be made of the Right Rev. Bishop Michaud, lately deceased, whose father was a French Acadian, and who had been for many years at the head of the Diocese of Burlington,

proving himself a worthy successor to Bishop de Goesbriand. Among the living there are scores of others who have been true pioneers of the Faith, and to whom is due great credit for having so well organized a new and loyal membership of the Church in the United States. Recently one of their number has been elevated to the See of Manchester, New Hampshire, in the person of the Right Rev. George Albert Guertin, consecrated 19 March, 1907.

The religious orders of men and women have been worthy co-labourers with the priests in the building-up of parishes. To them have been entrusted the education of children and the care of the sick and orphans. This mission has been especially well fulfilled in the French American parishes, where the convent of the sisters and the school of the brothers are the necessary complements of the church itself. One does not go without the other, and as a rule the school is built before the church and is used for a church also. The number of members in the different religious communities of women is given in the accompanying table.

## FEMALE RELIGIOUS IN NEW ENGLAND

Diocese	Total in All Communities	In French Communities
Boston . . . . .	1567	200
Burlington . . . . .	268	115
Fall River . . . . .	322	254
Hartford . . . . .	1115	219
Manchester . . . . .	435	300
Portland . . . . .	482	355
Providence . . . . .	551	222
Springfield . . . . .	792	320
Totals . . . . .	5532	1985

These 1985 women are distributed in 30 different orders, bearing the following names: Congrégation de Notre-Dame de Montréal, Filles de Marie (France), Sœurs de Ste-Croix de Montréal, Sœurs de la Providence de Montréal, Sœurs de la Présentation de Marie de St-Hyacinthe, Sœurs de Ste-Anne de Lachine, Sœurs Grises de Montréal, Sœurs de la Merci, Sœurs Grises d'Ottawa, Sœurs de l'Assomption, Sœurs du Bon Pasteur de Québec, Sœurs Dominicaines, Sœurs Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie, Sœurs Grises de St-Hyacinthe, Sœurs de Jésus-Marie de Sillery, Ursulines des Trois Rivières, Congrégation Notre-Dame (Villa Maria), Sœurs de la Sainte Union des Sacrés-Cœurs, Sœurs du Saint-Esprit, Sœurs du Saint-Rosaire, Filles de la Sagesse, Petites Sœurs des Pauvres, Sœurs de St-Joseph (Le Puy), Sœurs du Sacré-Cœur, Sœurs de St-Joseph (Chambéry), Sœurs Servantes du Cœur Immaculé de Marie, les Fidèles Compagnes de Jésus, Sœurs du Bon Pasteur (Angers), Petites Sœurs Franciscaines de Marie (Malbaie), Dames de Sion. The most important of these are: the Sœurs de Ste-Croix, with 18 convents and 149 members; Sœurs Grises, with 17 convents and 268 members; Sœurs de la Présentation de Marie, with 16 convents and 193 members; Sœurs de Jésus-Marie, with 19 convents and 171 members.

There are a few communities of brothers: Frères de la Charité de St-Vincent de Paul, 27 members; Frères Maristes d'Iberville, 47; Frères de St-Gabriel, 7; Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes, 7; Frères du Sacré-Cœur, 31—making a total of 119 members. Besides these orders entirely devoted to education, the regular clergy has been given charge of a number of parishes which stand to-day among the most numerous and flourishing. For instance, the Dominican Order has two parishes, Ste-Anne, at Fall River, Massachusetts, and St-Pierre, at Lewiston, Maine. The Oblates are established at Lowell, Mass., and Plattsburg, N. Y.; the Pères de la Salette, in Connecticut and Massachusetts; the Pères du Sacré-Cœur, in

Rhode Island and Massachusetts; the Pères Maristes in Massachusetts.

The French Americans have 133 parochial schools, in which 54,983 children receive Christian education.

## CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS IN NEW ENGLAND

Diocese	Total Schools	French Schools	Total Pupils	Pupils in French Schools
Boston . .	76	15	48,192	7,263
Burlington	21	17	5,951	4,009
Fall River . .	21	14	9,300	6,171
Hartford . .	69	10	30,275	3,508
Manchester.	36	19	12,800	8,833
Portland. . .	23	13	9,138	6,073
Providence. .	26	14	16,000	7,414
Springfield . .	55	31	22,780	11,712
Totals	327	133	154,436	54,983

To these must be added the secondary (high-school and university academic courses) college established by the Pères de l'Assomption from France, at Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1904, and 14 small academies, commercial colleges, and boarding schools in which there are about 1000 pupils of both sexes. In connexion with the subject of higher education, it may be well to remark that about 3500 French American children attend annually the commercial and secondary colleges in different cities of Canada. French religious orders, both of women and men, also have charge of 2618 orphans in New England. French nuns have charge of 1865 sick and aged adults, wayward women, and working girls.

Besides their religious work, vast and praiseworthy as it is, the French Canadian immigrants have also displayed industry and activity in other walks of life, and in their closer relations with their fellow-citizens they have shown qualities and traits found only in the best of citizens. In other words they have stood well up to the standard in the body politic and in many ways have exercised over their surroundings an influence for the general good of the community such as to fully justify, at least so far as it refers to them, the statement made by Vice-President Fairbanks, that in the American Nation "flows the richest blood that courses in the veins of all the peoples in all quarters of the globe." In fifty years, they have built up a press that is not surpassed, from the Catholic point of view, by that of any other group of immigrants in the United States. That press is composed to-day of seven dailies—"L'Indépendant", of Fall River, Mass.; "L'Opinion Publique", of Worcester, Mass.; "L'Est-toile", of Lowell, Mass.; "La Tribune", of Woonsocket, R. I.; "L'Avenir National", and "Le Reveil", of Manchester, N. H.; "L'Echo de la Presse", of New Bedford, Mass.; two papers issued every other day—"Le Messager", of Lewiston, Maine; "L'Impartial", of Nashua, N. H.; one semi-weekly "Le Jean-Baptiste", of Pawtucket, R. I.; and the fifteen weeklies—"L'Union", of Woonsocket, R. I., official organ of L'Union St-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique; "Le Canado-Américain", of Manchester, N. H., official organ of L'Association Canado-Américaine; "La Justice", of Biddeford, Maine; "La Justice", of Central Falls, R. I.; "La Justice", of Holyoke, Mass.; "L'Estafette", of Marlboro, Mass.; "Le Progrès", of Lawrence, Mass.; "Le Courrier", of Lawrence, Mass.; "Le Courrier de Salem", of Salem, Mass.; "L'Echo de l'Ouest", of Minneapolis, Minn.; "Le Courrier Franco-Américain", of Chicago, Ill.; "L'Indépendant" (weekly edition), of Fall River, Mass.; "L'Indépendant", of Fitchburg, Mass.; "Le Progrès", of Woonsocket, R. I., and "Le Citoyen", of

Haverhill, Mass. These newspapers are thoroughly Catholic in spirit, as well as sincerely American. Their editors and publishers met in convention, at Woonsocket, R. I., on 25 September, 1906, and organized the Association des Journalistes Franco-Américains de la Nouvelle Angleterre. At that meeting they adopted resolutions asserting their loyalty to the republic, and advising the French Americans to show themselves true and sincere American citizens, to promote naturalization, to preserve their mother tongue, to learn the English language, to maintain parochial schools, wherein both languages should be taught on an equal footing, and to ask for priests of their own nationality to be their pastors. The resolutions also requested the Holy See to appoint, when feasible and proper, bishops of their nationality, familiar with both the English and French languages, in all dioceses in which the French Americans constitute the majority of the Catholic population. The first French newspaper to appear in the United States was "Le Courier de Boston", which was published weekly during a period of six months in 1789, the first number appearing on 23 April, and the last on 15 October. The editor and publisher was Paul Joseph Guérard de Nancrede, later a bookseller and stationer at Boston, and instructor in French at Harvard University from 1787 to 1800. The next French American newspaper was published in 1825, at Detroit, under the title of "La Gazette Française", which issued only four numbers. In 1817, the Detroit Gazette published a French column during four months and then abandoned the venture. The second French American newspaper in New England was "Le Patriote", published at St. Albans, Vermont, in 1839. Since that time nearly 200 newspapers published in the French language have appeared and disappeared, leaving only those mentioned above.

French American activity, while effectively applied to the enterprises of religion, education, and the press, has not neglected provident organizations. The first French institution of this kind was the Société de Jacques Cartier, founded in St. Albans, Vermont, in 1848, while the Société St-Jean-Baptiste de New York, organized in 1850, is still in existence. In 1868 they had 17 benevolent societies, and since then they have organized more than 400 others, of which about 142 are still in existence. Moreover they have established federations, which have more than four hundred and fifty councils or branches, with thousands of members. To these organizations are due, in a great measure, the existence and prosperity of the most of the parishes. Many of them have inserted in their by-laws articles recommending naturalization. To obtain membership in any one of them the applicant must, in all cases, be of French origin and a practising Catholic. The local societies which still survive are distributed among the different states as follows: Massachusetts, 62; Vermont, 18; New Hampshire, 25; Maine, 12; Rhode Island, 11; Connecticut 14—making a total of 142. It was in 1900 that, in response to the acknowledged need of a central organization embracing all the groups of the French race in the United States, the Union St-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique was organized, with headquarters in Woonsocket, R. I., through the federation of a considerable number of the local societies. This move has proved to be a very wise one, as is shown by the rapid growth of the new society, which has enrolled over 19,500 members in eight years. The Association Canado-Américaine of Manchester, New Hampshire, established in 1896, has a membership of over 11,000 and is working along the same religious and patriotic lines. In 1906, a new society, the Ordre des Forestiers Franco-Américains, was formed by the secession of a few thousand members from the Foresters of America, and it now comprises 40 courts. All the French American societies, with the exception of the Forestiers, give life insur-

ance, and, without exception, they provide for sick benefits. Millions of dollars have been distributed by them to the widows and orphans of their members and to their sick fellow-members. The Société des Artisans Canadiens-Français, though a Canadian Society, and the Société L'Assomption, a society of French Acadians drawing the greater part of its membership from the maritime provinces, also have members in the United States and are therefore included in the accompanying table, which shows the number of councils or courts and the membership of the four national societies in New England.

#### Membership of National Societies

	Councils or Courts	Members
L'Union St-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique	255	19,576
Association Canado-Américaine . . . . .	159	11,158
Ordre des Chevaliers de Jacques Cartier	4	897
Ordre des Forestiers Franco-Américains	40	8,500
Artisans Canadiens-Français . . . . .	75	12,000
L'Assomption . . . . .	17	1,500

These societies are all Catholic, and in 1905 the Union St-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique and L'Association Canado-Américaine were instrumental in organizing the Société Franco-Américaine du Denier de St-Pierre, whose sole object is to collect funds for the Holy See. The Société Historique Franco-Américaine, incorporated under the laws of the State of Massachusetts, was organized at Boston in 1899, "for the purpose of encouraging the careful and systematic study of the history of the United States, and especially to bring forth in its true light the exact part taken by the French race in the evolution and formation of the American people". With this end in view this society has met regularly twice a year since its organization. Noted American historians and writers, as well as several from France and Canada, have delivered before it addresses which have contributed in no slight measure to enrich the store of French American historical literature. Another organization which seems destined to play an important rôle, at least among the French Americans of to-morrow, is the Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Franco-Américaine, which was formed at Baltimore, Maryland, 4 January, 1908, by twenty-two young French Americans who were students in various universities of that city. This organization aims first of all to form true sons of the Catholic Church and useful citizens of the American Republic. Piety, study, and action constitute its threefold motto. Its first congress, held at Worcester, Massachusetts, 23 and 24 August, 1908, was attended by delegates from circles formed in different New England localities.

Besides the admirable work they have accomplished by means of their parishes, press, and societies, and in order to render their efforts more effective, the French Americans have held at different times conventions called for various purposes. The first of these gatherings, destined to promote the interests of the mutual benefit societies then existing, and held under their auspices, took place at New York City, in 1865. Thereafter similar conventions were held annually, the year 1877 excepted, until 1881, as follows: 1865, New York; 1869, Detroit; 1873, Biddeford, Maine; 1866, New York; 1870, St. Albans, Vermont; 1874, New York; 1867, Troy; 1871, Worcester, Mass.; 1875, Glens Falls, N. Y.; 1868, Springfield, Mass.; 1872, Chicago, Ill.; 1876, Holyoke, Mass.; 1878, Troy, N. Y.; 1879, Boston, Mass.; 1880, Northampton, Mass.; 1881, Lawrence, Mass. Since 1880 there have been six general conventions of French Americans, to which all the groups of this element, as well as all their societies, were invited to send delegates. These national gatherings took place as follows: 1880, Springfield, Mass.; 1882, Cohoes, N. Y.; 1884, Troy; 1886,

Rutland, Vermont; 1888, Nashua, N. H.; 1893, Chicago, Ill. In October, 1901, delegates (to the number of 742) of the various groups and societies of French Americans in New England and the State of New York met in a "Congress" at Springfield, Mass. The four great subjects of deliberation were naturalization, benevolent societies, education, and the religious situation, and the spirit of the numerous and forcible addresses made on these heads is fittingly and admirably reflected in the resolutions. This congress, undoubtedly the most successful gathering of French Americans held up to that time, appointed a permanent commission consisting of the president of the congress and two delegates from each state represented, authorizing it to take all necessary measures for putting the resolutions of the congress into effect, and giving it the power to call another congress, local or general, according to its discretion.

Besides these general conventions, others have been held at different times and places for the purpose of considering a particular question or the interests of the French Americans of a particular state or diocese. For instance, the French Americans of Connecticut have held eighteen conventions in the last twenty-three years. Political organizations have also flourished among citizens of French Canadian origin, and naturalization clubs can be found in every city, town, or village where they are sufficient in number to maintain such institutions. In June, 1906, there was organized in the State of Massachusetts the Club Républicain Franco-Américain, with headquarters at Boston, at the first banquet of which, in April, 1907, Hon. Charles J. Bonaparte, a member of the Roosevelt Cabinet, was the guest of honour. The French Americans, in 1890, had 13 representatives in the Legislatures of Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Hampshire, besides numerous public servants in the city councils and the municipal administrations; in 1907 they elected senators in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island; their representatives in New England numbered, in 1907, as follows:—

Maine . . . . .	5	Representatives	2	Senators
Massachusetts . .	6	"	1	"
New Hampshire . .	18	"	..	"
Connecticut . . . .	2	"	..	"
Rhode Island . . . .	4	"	2	"

—a total of 5 Senators and 35 Representatives. In many instances their candidates for high political honours have been successful at the polls. Such has been the case with the Hon. Pierre Broussard, Congressman from Louisiana; the Hon. Aram J. Pothier, of Woonsocket, R. I., elected governor of his state in November, 1908, after having been its lieutenant-governor and mayor of his city; the Hon. Adélar Archambault, also of Woonsocket, and who has likewise filled the offices of lieutenant-governor and mayor; Judge Joseph A. Breaux, of Louisiana; Pierre Bonvouloir, of Holyoke, Mass., whose service as city treasurer covers a period of fifteen consecutive years; Hugo A. Dubuque, of Fall River, Mass., ex-member of the Massachusetts Legislature, and city solicitor; Alex. L. Granger, of Kankakee, Ill., district attorney; Aimé E. Boisvert, of Manchester, N. H., district attorney; and Arthur S. Hogue, of Plattsburg, N. Y., also district attorney. Studying an earlier period, we find the names of Pierre Ménard, first Lieutenant-Governor of Illinois; the Rev. Gabriel Richard, second Congressman from Michigan (the only Catholic priest who ever sat in Congress), and Louis Vital Bougy, United States Senator from Wisconsin. At the present time, prominent among those who serve the country abroad are the following French Americans: Arthur M. Beaupré (Illinois), Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Netherlands; Alphonse Gaulin (Rhode Island), Consul-

General at Marseilles, France; Eugène L. Belisle (Massachusetts), Consul at Limoges, France; Pierre P. Demers (New Hampshire), Consul at Bahia, Brazil; Joseph M. Authier (Rhode Island), Consul at Guadeloupe, West Indies.

In civil life, belonging to the generation departed for a better world, though their names are still present to the memory of their fellow-citizens and compatriots, were Ferdinand Gagnon, of Worcester, Mass., the father of French American journalism; Dr. L. J. Martel, of Lewiston, Maine, his worthy associate in the advancement of the French American element in the New England States; Major Edmond Mallet, of Washington, D. C., recognized as an authority upon the history of the North-West, and whose library (preserved intact by L'Union St-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique) is the largest and most complete collection of documents relating to the French Americans ever gathered; Frédéric Houde and Antoine Mousette, pioneer journalists; Judge Joseph LeBoeuf, of Cohoes, N. Y.; Pierre F. Peloquin, of Fall River, Mass., and a score of others who for years had been foremost among their compatriots as champions of their rights, both civil and religious.

To sum up, the record of the French Americans in their new country has been such that prominent men of native origin, writers and politicians of note, have sung their praise on more than one occasion. In this respect, one will readily remember the homage paid them upon different occasions by the late Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, as well as the marks of high esteem shown them by governors and members of Congress. As recently as 20 March, 1908, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, speaking on "Immigration" before the Boston City Club, made the following statement: "Later than any of these (movements of immigration) was the immigration of French Canadians, but which has assumed large proportions, and has become a strong and most valuable element of our population. But the French of Canada scarcely come within the subject we are considering, because they are hardly to be classed as immigrants in the accepted sense. They represent one of the oldest settlements on this continent. They have been, in the broad sense, Americans for generations, and their coming to the United States, is merely a movement of Americans across an imaginary line, from one part of America to another." In truth, the sentiment of hostility and suspicion, which rebuked the French Americans at their arrival in the republic, has subsided before their splendid conduct and magnificent spirit, and is replaced to-day by that tribute of respect which mankind acknowledges as due, and never fails to grant, to men of talent, industry, generosity, and patriotism.

J. L. K. LAFLAMME.

DAVID E. LAVIGNE.

J. ARTHUR FAVREAU.

**French Indo-China.** See INDO-CHINA, FRENCH.

**French Revolution.** See FRANCE; REVOLUTION.

**Freppel, CHARLES-EMILE,** b. at Ober-Ehnheim, Alsace, 1 June, 1827; d. at Paris, 22 Dec., 1891. He was Bishop of Angers, France; and deputy from Finistère. He began his studies at a school in this little town; and at seventeen he had received his baccalaureate degree, and entered the seminary of Strasburg, where he received the subdiaconate at the hands of Mgr Roess in 1848, and was at once appointed to the chair of history. Subsequent to his ordination to the priesthood in 1849, he took a noteworthy part in the discussions of Bonnetty and Maret on the subject of traditionalism. He passed a brilliant examination which secured for him the degree of doctor at the Sorbonne, and after a competitive examination he was named chaplain of the church of Ste-Geneviève at Paris. Here he delivered a course of

sermons on the "Divinity of Jesus Christ" which have since been published in book form. He conducted the Advent and Lenten exercises at the Madeleine and afterwards at the churches of St-Roch, Ste-Clotilde, St-Louis d'Antin, at Notre-Dame-de-Lorette, and St-Germain l'Auxerrois. His early discourses were published in 1869, in two volumes. Having been appointed to the chair of sacred eloquence at the Sorbonne, he conducted a series of scholarly studies on the Apostolic Fathers and the Christian apologists. They fill ten volumes (4th ed., Paris, 1885). In 1867 Napoleon III invited him to preach the Lenten sermons at the Tuileries, and these discourses have been published in a volume entitled "La Vie Chrétienne".

It was about this time that Renan's "Vie de Jésus" provoked such a storm of controversy. Mgr. Freppel published a reply to the work, his "Examen critique de la Vie de Jésus de M. Renan" (Paris, 1863), which



CHARLES-ÉMILE FREPPEL

was perhaps the best refutation of the theories expounded by the French free-thinker. Pius IX, who was then making preparations for the Council of the Vatican, summoned the Abbé Freppel to Rome to assist in the work of drawing up the *schemata* (drafts of decrees). The pope thus showed his appreciation of Freppel's learning and accomplishments, and appointed him to the Bishopric of Angers, rendered vacant by the death of Mgr. Angebault. He received the episcopal consecration at Rome, 18 April, 1870. Later there was shown a disposition to elevate him to the metropolitan See of Chambéry; but he declined with the same modesty which, in 1885, caused him to implore those, who, with M. Jules Ferry, desired his elevation to the dignity of the cardinalate, to discontinue their efforts on his behalf. Upon his return from Rome he proved himself, by his defence of his country, as good a patriot as at the council he had shown himself an able theologian.

In 1871, he accepted the candidature for one of the electoral divisions of Paris. He was defeated because of the ill will which the liberals had borne him since the council, at which, according to them, he had shown himself too ultramontane. In 1880, the electors of Finistère asked him to act as their representative; he was elected by a large majority to this position of trust. His first speech in the French Chamber was a vigorous protest against the expulsion of the Jesuits. For eleven years the bishop-deputy (*évêque député*) was the most attentively-heard orator in the Chamber, treating with equal authority the most diverse subjects, and such as would seem farthest removed from his ordinary studies. While he did not bring about the triumph of justice to the extent he desired, he defended it nobly though running violently counter to the prejudices of that assembly. He won even the esteem of his enemies, and M. Floquet was one day able to re-echo the plaudits not only of the Chamber but of the whole of France. His "Œuvres polémiques" and his "Oratoires" have been collected in seventeen volumes (Paris, 1869-88). Almost all the great religious, political, and social questions which engaged men's minds at that time are here treated. Amongst his numerous other writings should be mentioned his

work on the French Revolution (Paris, 1889), and "Bossuet et l'éloquence sacrée au XVII<sup>ème</sup> siècle" (Paris, 1894).

RICARD, *Mgr. Freppel* (Paris, 1892); IDEM, *Les grands évêques* (Paris, 1893); VEUILLOT in *l'Univers*, Dec., 1891. See also lives of Freppel by LESUR and BOURNAND (Paris, 1893), CORNUZ (Paris, 1893), TAILLIEZ (Paris, 1904).

LOUIS LALANDE.

**Frequent Communion.**—Without specifying how often the faithful should communicate, Christ simply bids us eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, and warns us, that if we do not do so, we shall not have life in us (John, vi, etc.). The fact, however, that His Body and Blood were to be received under the appearances of bread and wine, the ordinary daily food and drink of His hearers, would point to the frequent and even daily reception of the Sacrament. The manna, too, with which He compared "the bread which He would give", was daily partaken of by the Israelites. Moreover, though the petition "give us this day our daily bread" does not primarily refer to the Eucharist, nevertheless it could not fail to lead men to believe that their souls, as well as their bodies, stood in need of daily nourishment. In this article we shall deal with (I) the history of the frequency of Holy Communion, (II) the present practice as enjoined by Pius X.

**I. HISTORY.**—In the early Church at Jerusalem the faithful received every day (Acts, ii, 46). Later on, however, we read that St. Paul remained at Troas for seven days, and it was only "on the first day of the week" that the faithful "assembled to break bread" (Acts, xx, 6-11; cf. I Cor., xvi, 2). According to the "Didache" the breaking of bread took place on "the Lord's day" (*κατὰ κυριακήν*, c. xiv). Pliny says that the Christians assembled "on a fixed day" (Ep. x); and St. Justin, "on the day called Sunday" (*τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ*, Apol., I, lxvii, 3, 7). It is in Tertullian that we first read of the Liturgy being celebrated on any other day besides Sunday (De Orat., c. xix; De Corona, c. iii). Daily reception is mentioned by St. Cyprian (De Orat. Domin., c. xviii in P. L., IV, 531); St. Jerome (Ep. ad Damasum); St. John Chrysostom (Hom., iii in Eph.); St. Ambrose (in Ps. cxviii, viii, 26, 28 in P. L., XV, 1461, 1462); and the author of the "De Sacramentis" (V, iv, 25; P. L., XVI, 452).

It should be noted that in the early Church and in the patristic ages, the faithful communicated, or at any rate were expected to communicate, as often as the Holy Eucharist was celebrated (St. John Chrysostom, loc. cit.; Apostolic Canons, X; St. Gregory the Great, Dial. II, 23). They received even oftener, since it was the custom to carry away the Sacred Elements and communicate at home (St. Justin, loc. cit.; Tertullian, "Ad Uxorem", II, v; Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", VI, xlv). This was done especially by hermits, by dwellers in monasteries without priests, and by those who lived at a distance from any church. On the other hand, we find that practice fell far short of precept, and that the faithful were frequently rebuked for so seldom receiving the Holy Communion (see especially St. John Chrysostom, loc. cit., and St. Ambrose, loc. cit.). St. Augustine sums up the matter thus: "Some receive the Body and Blood of the Lord every day; others on certain days; in some places there is no day on which the Sacrifice is not offered; in others on Saturday and Sunday only; in others on Sunday alone (Ep. liv in P. L., XXXIII, 200 sqq.). Whether it was advisable for the faithful, especially those living in matrimony, to receive daily, was a question on which the Fathers were not agreed. St. Jerome is aware of this custom at Rome, but he says: "Of this I neither approve nor disapprove; let each abound in his own sense" (Ep. xlviii in P. L., XXII, 505-6; Ep. lxxi in P. L., XXII, 672). St. Augustine discusses the question at length, and comes to the conclusion, that there is much to be



said on both sides (Ep. liv in P. L., XXXIII, 200 sqq.). Good Christians still communicated once a week, down to the time of Charlemagne, but after the break-up of his empire this custom came to an end. St. Bede bears witness to the Roman practice of communicating on Sundays and on the feasts of the Apostles and Martyrs, and laments the rarity of reception in England (Ep. ad Egb. in P. L., XCIV, 665).

Strange to say, it was in the Middle Ages, "the Ages of Faith", that Communion was less frequent than at any other period of the Church's history. The Fourth Lateran Council compelled the faithful, under pain of excommunication, to receive at least once a year (c. Omnis utriusque sexus). The Poor Clares, by rule, communicated six times a year; the Dominicans, fifteen times; the Third Order of St. Dominic, four times. Even saints received rarely: St. Louis six times a year, St. Elizabeth only three times. The teaching of the great theologians, however, was all on the side of frequent, and to some extent daily, Communion (Peter Lombard, IV Sent., dist. xii, n. 8; St. Thomas, Summa Theol., III, Q. lxxx, a. 10; St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent., dist. xii, punct. ii, a. 2, q. 2; see Dalgairns, "The Holy Communion" (Dublin) part III, chap. i). Various reformers, Tauler, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Vincent Ferrer, and Savonarola, advocated, and in many instances brought about, a return to frequent reception. The Council of Trent expressed a wish "that at each Mass the faithful who are present, should communicate" (Sess. XXII, chap. vi). And the Catechism of the council says: "Let not the faithful deem it enough to receive the Body of the Lord once a year only; but let them judge that Communion ought to be more frequent; but whether it be more expedient that it should be monthly, weekly, or daily, can be decided by no fixed universal rule" (pt. II, c. iv, n. 58). As might be expected, the disciples of St. Ignatius and St. Philip carried on the work of advocating frequent Communion. With the revival of this practice came the renewal of the discussion as to the advisability of daily Communion. While all in theory admitted that daily reception was good, they differed as to the conditions required.

The Congregation of the Council (1587) forbade any general restriction, and ordered that no one should be repelled from the Sacred Banquet, even if he approached daily. In 1643, Arnauld's "Frequent Communion" appeared, in which he required, for worthy reception, severe penance for past sins and most pure love of God. The Congregation of the Council was once more appealed to, and decided (1679) that though universal daily Communion was not advisable, no one should be repelled, even if he approached daily; parish priests and confessors should decide how often, but they should take care that all scandal and irreverence should be avoided (see Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 10th ed., n. 1148). In 1690, Arnauld's conditions were condemned. In spite of these decisions, the reception of Holy Communion became less and less frequent, owing to the spread of rigid Jansenistic opinions, and this rigour lasted almost into our own day. The older and better tradition was, however, preserved by some writers and preachers, notably Fénelon and St. Alphonsus, and, with the spread of devotion to the Sacred Heart, it gradually became once more the rule. Difficulty, however, was raised regarding daily Communion. This practice, too, was warmly recommended by Pius IX and Leo XIII, and finally received official approval from Pius X.

II. PRACTICE.—(a) The rules for frequent and daily Communion are laid down by the decree of the Congregation of the Council "Sacra Tridentina Synodus" (20 Dec., 1905). (1) "Frequent and daily Communion . . . should be open to all the faithful, of whatever rank and condition of life; so that no one who is in the state of grace, and who approaches the holy table with

a right and devout intention, can be lawfully hindered therefrom." (2) "A right intention consists in this: that he who approaches the Holy Table should do so, not out of routine, or vainglory, or human respect, but for the purpose of pleasing God, or being more closely united with Him by charity, and of seeking this Divine remedy for his weaknesses and defects". Rule 3 declares that "it is sufficient that they (the daily communicants) be free from mortal sin, with the purpose of never sinning in future", and Rule 4 enjoins that "care is to be taken that Holy Communion be preceded by serious preparation and followed by a suitable thanksgiving, according to each one's strength, circumstances, and duties". "Parish priests, confessors, and preachers are frequently and with great zeal to exhort the faithful to this devout and salutary practice" (Rule 6); two rules (7 and 8) refer to the daily Communion in religious communities and Catholic institutions of all kinds; and the last rule (9) forbids any further controversy on the subject.

(b) *Acts and Decrees of Pius X* on frequent and daily Communion.—For two years these decrees or pronouncements follow one another in the order indicated here.

30 May, 1905.—On the eve of the Eucharistic Congress in Rome, Pius X indulged the "Prayer for the diffusion of the pious custom of daily Communion", which was published and distributed on the last day of the Congress.

4 June, 1905.—The Holy Father, presiding at the closing of the Congress in Rome, said: "I beg and implore of you all to urge the faithful to approach that Divine Sacrament. And I speak especially to you, my dear sons in the priesthood, in order that Jesus, the treasure of all the treasures of Paradise, the greatest and most precious of all the possessions of our poor desolate humanity, may not be abandoned in a manner so insulting and so ungrateful."

The decree of 20 December, 1905, has already been summarized.

25 Feb., 1906.—To gain the plenary indulgence, granted to those who communicate five times weekly, it is not necessary to go to confession every week, every fortnight, or every month; even less frequent recurrence will do. No definite interval is given.

11 August, 1906.—The papal Brief "Romanorum Pontificum" grants indulgences and unusual privileges to the Sacramental League of the Eucharist, which has for its object the inducement of the faithful to adopt the practice of daily or frequent Communion. By a singular favour, all confessors inscribed in this League are urged to exhort their penitents to receive daily, or almost daily, to obtain a plenary indulgence once a week.

15 Sept., 1906.—It was explained, on this date, that the decree of 20 Dec., 1905, applies not merely to adults and the youth of both sexes, but also to children so soon as they have received their first Communion in accordance with the rules of the Roman Catechism, that is to say, as soon as they manifest sufficient discretion.

7 Dec., 1906.—Sick persons bed-ridden for one month, without some hope of prompt recovery, may receive Holy Eucharist, even though they may have broken their fast after midnight, by drinking something, as, for instance, chocolate, tapioca, semolina, or bread soup, which are *drink* in the sense of the decree. This may be repeated once or twice a week, if the Blessed Sacrament is kept in the house; otherwise, once or twice a month.

25 March, 1907.—The hierarchy are urged to secure that there be held each year, in the cathedral church, a special Triduum for the purpose of exhorting the people to practise frequent Communion. In parish churches one day will suffice. Indulgences are granted for these exercises.

8 May, 1907.—A general permission is granted to give Communion in private oratories to all who attend Mass, except as to Easter Communion and Viaticum.

14 July, 1907.—Brief again delegating Cardinal V. Vannutelli to the Eucharistic Congress at Metz, which was exclusively devoted to the consideration of the question of Holy Communion. The following is an extract from the Brief: "This [frequent Communion] in truth is the shortest way to secure the salvation of every individual man as well as that of society."

HEDLEY, *The Holy Eucharist*, viii (London, 1907); DE ZULUETA, *Notes on Daily Communion*, 2nd ed. (London, 1907); FERRERES, *The Decree on Daily Communion*, tr. JIMENEZ (London, 1908); DE SÉCUR, *La Très Sainte Communion in Œuvres* (Paris, 1872), III, 417 sqq.; FRASSINETTI, *Teologia Morale* (Genoa, 1875), II, 53 sqq.; GÖTT, *Exagérations Historiques et Théologiques concernant la Communion Quotidienne* (Brussels, 1904); CHATEL, *Défense de la Doctrine Catholique sur la Communion Fréquente* (Brussels, 1905); PETAVIUS, *De Theologicis Dogmatibus* (Venice, 1757), II, *De Pœnitentia Publica et Præparatione ad Communionem*; ST. ALPHONSUS, *Theologia Moralis* (Paris, 1862), V, *Præcis Confessarii*, n. 148 sqq.; LEHMKEHL, *Theologia Moralis* (Freiburg im Br., 1902), n. 156 sqq.; BRIDGETT, *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, ed. H. THURSTON (London, 1908), part III, c. i; LINTELLO, *Opusculum sur la Communion fréquente et quotidienne* (Paris, 1908); SALTER, *Frequent Communion in The Messenger* (New York, Dec., 1908).

T. B. SCANNELL.

**Fresnel**, AUGUSTIN-JEAN, physicist; b. at Broglie near Bernay, Normandy, 10 May, 1788; d. at Ville d'Avray, near Paris, 14 July, 1827.



AUGUSTIN-JEAN FRESNEL

His early progress in letters was slow though he showed while still young an aptitude for physical science. In his seventeenth year he entered the Ecole Polytechnique in Paris where he attracted the attention of Legendre. After spending some time at the Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées he was assigned to the engineering corps and served successively in the departments of Vendée, Drôme, and Ile-et-Vilaine. He lost his appointment through politics on the return of Napoleon from Elba. In 1819 he was made a member of the Lighthouse Commission, becoming its secretary in 1824, and was an examiner at the Ecole Polytechnique from 1821 to 1824. Shortly afterward his health, which had never been robust, became so weakened that he was obliged to give up nearly all active work. He was unanimously elected a member of the Académie des Sciences in 1823, and in 1825 was made an associate of the London Royal Society, receiving its Rumford Medal on his death-bed.

Fresnel occupies a prominent place among the French physicists of the nineteenth century. His chosen field of research was optics, and in a series of brilliant memoirs he did much to place the wave theory upon a firm basis. He introduced with conspicuous success the conjecture of Hooke (1672) that the light vibrations are transverse. His first paper was on aberration, but it was never published. In connexion with his study of the theory and phenomena of diffraction and interference he devised his double mirrors and biprism in order to obtain two sources of light independent of apertures or the edges of opaque obstacles. His article on diffraction won the prize of the Académie des Sciences in 1819. He extended the work of Huyghens and others on double refraction and devel-

oped the well-known theory which bears his name. With Arago he investigated the phenomena and formulated the laws of the interference of polarized light. He showed how to obtain and detect circularly polarized light by means of his rhomb. An account of his more important contributions to optics may be found in Preston's "Theory of Light" (New York, 1901), or Wood's "Physical Optics" (New York, 1905). Fresnel gave a course of physics for some months at the Athénée in 1819, but otherwise had no academic connexions apart from his position as examiner at the Ecole Polytechnique. Most of his researches were carried on in the leisure he could obtain from his professional duties. In applied optics mention should be made of his system of lenses developed during his connexion with the lighthouse commission which has revolutionized lighthouse illumination throughout the world. Fresnel was a deeply religious man and remarkable for his keen sense of duty. A three-volume edition of his complete works was published in 1866.

ARAGO, *Œuvres Complètes* (Paris, 1854), I, 107-185; VERDET, *Œuvres Complètes d'Aug. Fresnel*, introduction in vol. I (Paris, 1866); HELLER, *Geschichte der Physik* (Stuttgart, 1884), II.

H. M. BROCK.

**Friar** [from Lat. *frater*, through O. Fr. *fredre*, *frere*, M. E. *frere*; It. *frate* (as prefix *fra*); Sp. *fraile* (as prefix *fray*); Port. *frei*; unlike the other Romance languages, French has but the one word *frère* for friar and brother], a member of one of the mendicant orders.

**USE OF THE WORD.**—In the early Church it was usual for all Christians to address each other as *fratres*, or brothers, all being children of the one Heavenly Father, through Christ. Later, with the rise and growth of the monastic orders, the appellation began gradually to have a more restricted meaning; for obviously the bonds of brotherhood were drawn more closely between those who lived under the rule and guidance of one spiritual father, their abbot. The word occurs at an early date in English literature with the signification of brother, and from the end of the thirteenth century it is in frequent use referring to the members of the mendicant orders, e. g. c. 1297, "frere prechors" (R. Glouc. 10105); c. 1325, "freres of the Carme and of Saint Austin" (Pol. Songs, 331); c. 1400, "frere meneours" (Maunder, xxxi, 139); c. 1400, "Sakked freres" (Rom. Rose). Shakespeare speaks of the "Friars of orders gray" (Tam. Shr., iv, i, 148). The word was also loosely applied to members of monastic and military orders, and at times to the convent of a particular order, and hence to the part of a town in which such a convent had been located.

The word *friar* is to be carefully distinguished in its application from the word *monk*. For the monk retirement and solitude are undisturbed by the public ministry, unless under exceptional circumstances. His vow of poverty binds him strictly as an individual, but in no way affects the right of tenure of his order. In the life of the friar, on the contrary, the exercise of the sacred ministry is an essential feature, for which the life of the cloister is considered as but an immediate preparation. His vow of poverty, too, not only binds him as an individual to the exercise of that virtue, but, originally at least, precluded also the right of tenure in common with his brethren. Thus originally the various orders of friars could possess no fixed revenues and lived upon the voluntary offerings of the faithful. Hence their name of mendicants. This second feature, by which the friar's life differs so essentially from that of the monk, has become considerably modified since the Council of Trent. In Session XXV, ch. iii, "De Regular," all the mendicant orders—the Friars Minor and Capuchins alone excepted—were granted the liberty of corporate possession. The Discalced Carmelites and the Jesuits have availed themselves of this privilege with restrictions (cf. Wernz, *Jus Decretal.*, III, pt. II, 262, note). It may, however, be pertinently remarked here that the

Jesuits, though mendicants in the strict sense of the word, as is evident from the very explicit declaration of St. Pius V (Const. "Cum indefessæ", 1571), are classed not as mendicants or friars, but as clerics regular, being founded with a view to devoting themselves, even more especially than the friars, to the exercise of the sacred ministry (Vermeersch, *De Relig.*, I, xli, n. 8).

**ORDERS OF FRIARS.**—The orders of friars are usually divided into two classes: the four great orders mentioned by the Second Council of Lyons (can. xxiii) and the lesser orders. The four great orders in their legal precedence are: (1) the Dominicans (St. Pius V, Const. "Divina", 1568); (2) the Franciscans; (3) the Carmelites; (4) the Augustinians. The Dominicans, or Friars Preachers, formerly known as the Black Friars, from the black *cappa* or mantle worn over their white habit, were founded by St. Dominic in 1215 and solemnly approved by Honorius III, 22 Dec., 1216. They became a mendicant order in 1221. The Franciscans, or Friars Minor (Grey Friars), were founded by St. Francis of Assisi, who is rightly regarded as the patriarch of the mendicant orders. His rule was orally approved by Innocent III in 1209 and solemnly confirmed by Honorius III in 1223 (Const. "Solet"). It is professed by the Friars Minor, the Conventuals, and the Capuchins. The Carmelites, or White Friars, from the white cloak which covers their brown habit, were founded as a purely contemplative order, but became mendicants in 1245. They received the approbation of Honorius III (Const. "Ut vivendi", 30 Jan., 1226) and later of Innocent IV (Const. "Quæ honorem", 1247). The order is divided into two sections, the Calced and Discalced Carmelites. The Augustinians, or Hermits of St. Augustine (Austin Friars), trace their origin to the illustrious Bishop of Hippo. The various branches which subsequently developed were united and constituted from various bodies of hermits a mendicant order by Alexander IV (Const. "Iis, quæ", 31 July, 1255, and Const. "Licet", 4 May, 1256). These four orders are called by canonists the *quatuor ordines mendicantes de iure communi*. The Fourth Lateran Council ("De relig. dom.", III, tit. xxxvi, c. ix) had forbidden in 1215 the foundation of any new religious orders. In face of this prohibition a sufficient number of new congregations, especially of mendicants, had sprung up to attract the attention of the Second Council of Lyons. In canon xxiii, the council, while specially exempting the four mendicant orders above mentioned, condemns all other mendicant orders then existing to immediate or to gradual extinction. All orders established since the Council of Lateran, and not approved by the Holy See, were to be dissolved at once. Those since established with such approval were forbidden to receive new members. The illustrious order of Servites, founded in 1233 and approved by Alexander IV in 1256 (Const. "Deo grata"), happily survived this condemnation. Concerning the four greater orders, the council concludes: "Be it understood, however, that we do not conceive of the extension of this constitution to the Orders of Friars Preachers and of Friars Minor, whose evident service to the universal Church is sufficient approval." As for the Hermits of St. Augustine and the Order of Carmelites, whose foundation preceded the said Council (Fourth Lateran), we wish them to remain as solidly established as heretofore" (Lib. III, tit. xvii, c. un., in VI). The importance of the orders thus singled out and exempted was afterwards still further emphasized by the insertion of this canon into the "Corpus Juris" in the "Liber Sextus" of Boniface VIII.

The so-styled lesser orders, of which the following are to-day the most flourishing, were founded and approved at various subsequent periods: the Minims (1474); the Third Order Regular of St. Francis (1521); the Capuchins—as constituting a different branch of

the Franciscan Order—(1525); the Discalced Carmelites—as constituting a distinct branch of the Carmelites—(1568); the Discalced Trinitarians (1599); the Order of Penance, known in Italy as the Scalzetti (1781).

REIFFENSTUEL, SCHMALZGRUEBER, and other writers on titles xxxi and xxxvi of Bk. III of the Decretals of Gregory IX; FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca. Relig. Regularis* (Rome, 1885-96), I, 24; SUAREZ, *De Virtute et Statu Religionis* (Mainz, 1604), pt. II, tract. ix; BARBOSA, *Juris Eccl. Universi* (Lyons, 1699), I, c. xli, n. 207; VERMEERSCH, *De Relig. Inst. et Personis* (2nd ed., Bruges, 1907), I, 38; WERNZ, *Jus Decretal.* (Rome, 1908), III, pt. II, 262; HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen* (2nd ed., Paderborn, 1907), I, 39; also popular works, with plates showing the different religious habits, such as MALLESON AND TUKER, *Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome*, III (London, 1900); STEELE, *Monasteries and Religious Houses in Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1903). HÉLYOT, *Hist. des ordres religieux* (Paris, 1714-19); republished by MIGNÉ as *Dict. des ordres religieux* (Paris, 1847-59).

GREGORY CLEARY.

**Friars Minor, ORDER OF.**—This subject may be conveniently considered under the following heads: I. General History of the Order; A. First Period (1209-1517); B. Second Period (1517-1909); II. The Reform Parties; A. First Period (1226-1517); B. Second Period (1517-1897); (1) The Discalced; (2) The Reformati; (3) The Recollects, including a survey of the history of the Franciscans in the North, especially in Great Britain and Ireland (America is treated in a separate article); III. Statistics of the Order (1260-1909); IV. The Various Names of the Friars Minor; V. The Habit; VI. The Constitution of the Order; VII. General Sphere of the Order's Activity; VIII. The Preaching Activity of the Order; IX. Influence of the Order on the Liturgy and Religious Devotions; X. Franciscan Missions; XI. Cultivation of the Sciences; XII. Saints and Beati of the Order.

**I. GENERAL HISTORY OF THE ORDER.**—A. *First Period (1209-1517).*—Having gathered about twelve disciples around him (1207-08), St. Francis of Assisi appeared before Innocent III, who, after some hesitation, gave verbal sanction to the Franciscan Rule. Thus was legally founded the Order of Friars Minor (*Ordo Fratrum Minorum*), the precise date being, according to an ancient tradition in the order, 16 April, 1209. His friars having rapidly increased in number and spread over various districts of Italy, St. Francis appointed, in 1217, provincial ministers (*ministri provinciales*), and sent his disciples farther afield. At the general chapter of 1219 these missions were renewed and other friars dispatched to the East, to Hungary, to France, and to Spain. Francis himself visited Egypt and the East, but the innovations introduced during his absence by some of the friars caused his speedy return in 1220. In the same year he resigned the office of general of the order, which he entrusted first to Peter of Cattaneo, on whose early death (10 March, 1221) he appointed Elias of Cortona. Francis, however, retained a certain supreme direction of the order until his death on 3 October, 1226.

Elias of Cortona, as the vicar of Francis, summoned the regular Pentecost chapter for the following year, and on 29 May, 1227, Giovanni Parenti, a jurist, was chosen as first successor of St. Francis and first minister-general. He has often been regarded as a native of Florence, but probably came from the neighbourhood of Rome. Gregory IX employed the new general on political missions at Florence and Rome, authorized the Minorites to lay out their own cemeteries (26 July, 1227), and charged them with the direction and maintenance of the Poor Clares (1 December, 1227). In 1228 and the succeeding years, Elias of Cortona laboured zealously at the construction of a church to be dedicated to Francis of Assisi, who was canonized by Gregory IX on 16 July, 1228. On the day following the pope himself laid the foundation stone of this church at Assisi destined to receive the body of St. Francis, and he shortly afterwards

entrusted to Thomas of Celano the task of writing the biography of the saint, which he confirmed on 25 February, 1229. The translation of the saint's body from the church of San Giorgio to the new basilica took place on 22 May, 1230, three days before the appointed time, and Elias of Cortona, possibly fearing some disturbance, took possession of the body, with the assistance of the civic authorities, and buried it in the church, where it was discovered in 1818. Elias was censured and punished for this action in the Bull of 16 June, 1230. The usual general chapter was held about the same date, and on 28 September, 1230, the Bull "Quo elongati" was issued, dealing with the Testament of St. Francis and certain points in the Rule of 1223. Elias meanwhile devoted all his energy to the completion of the magnificent church (or rather double church) of S. Francesco, which stands on the slope of a hill in the western portion of Assisi, and of the adjacent monastery with its massive pillars and arcades. His election as general in 1232 gave him freer scope, and enabled him to realize the successful issue of his plans. As a politician, Elias certainly possessed genius. His character, however, was too ostentatious and worldly, and, though under his rule the order developed externally and its missions and studies were promoted, still in consequence of his absolutism, exercised now with haughty bearing and again through reckless visitors, there arose in the order an antagonism to his government, in which the Parisian masters of theology and the German and English provinces played the most prominent part. Unable to stem this opposition, Elias was deposed, with Gregory IX's approval, by the Chapter of Rome (1239), and the hitherto undefined rights and almost absolute authority of the general in matters of income and legislation for the order were considerably restricted. Elias threw in his lot with Frederick II (Hohenstaufen), was excommunicated in consequence, and died on 22 April, 1253. Albert of Pisa, who had previously been provincial of Germany and Hungary, was chosen at the chapter of 1239 to succeed Elias, but died shortly afterwards (23 January, 1240). On All Saints' Day, 1240, the chapter again met and elected Haymo of Faversham, a learned and zealous English Franciscan, who had been sent by Gregory IX (1234) to Constantinople to promote the reunion of the Schismatic Greeks with the Apostolic See. Haymo, who, with Alexander of Hales had taken part in the movement against Elias, was zealous in his visitation of the various houses of the order. He held the Provincial Chapter of Saxonia at Aldenburg on 29 September, 1242, and, at the request of Gregory IX, revised the rubrics to the Roman Breviary and the Missal.

After Haymo's death in 1244 the General Chapter of Genoa elected Crescenzo Grizzi of Jesi (1245-47) to succeed him. Crescenzo instituted an investigation of the life and miracles of St. Francis and other Minorites, and authorized Thomas of Celano to write the "Legenda secunda S. Franciscei", based on the information (Legenda trium Sociorum) supplied to the general by three companions of the saint (*Tres Socii*, i.e. Leo, Angelus, and Rufinus). From this period also dates the "Dialogus de Vitis Sanctorum Fratrum Minorum". This general also opposed vigorously the separatist and particularistic tendencies of some seventy-two of the brothers. The town of Assisi asked for him as its bishop, but the request was not granted by Innocent IV, who, on 29 April, 1252, appointed him Bishop of Jesi, in the March of Ancona, his native town. John of Parma, who succeeded to the generalship (1247-57), belonged to the more rigorous party in the order. He was most diligent in visiting in person the various houses of the order. It was during this period that Thomas of Celano wrote his "Tractatus de Miraculis". On 11 August, 1253, Clare of Assisi died, and was canonized by Alexander

IV on 26 September, 1255. On 25 May, 1253, a month after the death of the excommunicated Elias, Innocent consecrated the upper church of S. Francesco. John of Parma unfortunately shared the apocalyptic views and fancies of the Joachimites, or followers of Joachim of Floris, who had many votaries in the order, and was consequently not a little compromised when Alexander IV (4 November, 1255) solemnly condemned the "Liber introductorius", a collection of the writings of Joachim of Floris with an extravagant introduction, which had been published at Paris. This work has often been falsely ascribed to the general himself. Its real author was Gerardo di Borgo S.-Donnino, who thus furnished a very dangerous weapon against the order to the professors of the secular clergy, jealous of the success of the Minorites at the University of Paris. The chapter convened in the Ara Coeli monastery at Rome forced John of Parma to abdicate his office (1257), and, on his recommendation, chose as his successor St. Bonaventure from Bagnorea. John was then summoned to answer for his Joachimsism before a court presided over by the new general and the cardinal-protector, and would have been condemned but for the letter of Cardinal Ottoboni, afterwards Adrian V. He subsequently withdrew to the hermitage of Greccio, left it (1289) at the command of the pope to proceed to Greece, but died an aged, broken man at Camerino on 20 March, 1289.

St. Bonaventure (q. v.), a learned and zealous religious, devoted all his energy to the government of the order. He strenuously advocated the manifold duties thrust upon the order during its historical development—the labour in the care of souls, learned pursuits, employment of friars in the service of the popes and temporal rulers, the institution of large monasteries, and the preservation of the privileges of the order—being convinced that such a direction of the activities of the members would prove most beneficial to the Church and the cause of Christianity. The Spirituals accused Bonaventure of laxity; yet he laboured earnestly to secure the exact observance of the rule, and energetically denounced the abuses which had crept into the order, condemning them repeatedly in his encyclical letters. In accordance with the rule, he held a general chapter every three years: at Narbonne in 1260, at Pisa in 1263, at Paris in 1266, at Assisi in 1269, and at Lyons in 1274, on the occasion of the general council. He made most of the visitations to the different convents in person, and was a zealous preacher. The Chapter of Narbonne (1260) promulgated the statutes of the order known as the "Constitutiones Narbonenses", the letter and spirit of which exercised a deep and enduring influence on the Franciscan Order. Although the entire code did not remain long in force, many of the provisions were retained and served as a model for the later constitutions.

Even before the death of Bonaventure, during one of the sessions of the council (15 July, 1274), the Chapter of Lyons had chosen as his successor Jerome of Ascoli, who was expected by the council with the ambassadors of the Greek Church. He arrived, and the reunion of the churches was effected. Jerome was sent back by Innocent V as nuncio to Constantinople in May, 1276, but had only reached Ancona when the pope died (21 July, 1276). John XXI (1276-77) employed Jerome (October, 1276) and John of Vercelli, General of the Dominicans, as mediators in the war between Philip III of France and Alfonso X of Castile. This embassy occupied both generals till March, 1279, although Jerome was preferred to the cardinalate on 12 March, 1278. When Jerome departed on the embassy to the Greeks, he had appointed Bonagratia of S. Giovanni in Persiceto to represent him at the General Chapter of Padua in 1276. On 20 May, 1279, he convened the General Chapter of Assisi, at which Bonagratia was elected

general. Jerome later occupied the Chair of Peter as Nicholas IV (15 February, 1288–4 April, 1292). Bonagratia conducted a deputation from the chapter before Nicholas III, who was then staying at Soriano, and petitioned for a cardinal-protector. The pope, who had himself been protector, appointed his nephew Matteo Orsini. The general also asked for a definition of the rule, which the pope, after personal consultation with cardinals and the theologians of the order, issued in the "*Exiit qui seminat*" of 14 August, 1279. In this the order's complete renunciation of property *in communi* was again confirmed, and all property given to the brothers was vested in the Holy See, unless the donor wished to retain his title. All moneys were to be held in trust by the *nuntii*, or spiritual friends, for the friars, who could however raise no claim to them. The purchase of goods could take place only through procurators appointed by the pope, or by the cardinal-protector in his name.

The Bull of Martin IV "*Ad fructus uberes*" (13 December, 1281) defined the relations of the mendicants to the secular clergy. The mendicant orders had long been exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop, and enjoyed (as distinguished from the secular clergy) unrestricted freedom to preach and hear confessions in the churches connected with their monasteries. This had led to endless friction and open quarrels between the two divisions of the clergy, and, although Martin IV granted no new privileges to the mendicants, the strife now broke out with increased violence, chiefly in France and in a particular manner at Paris. Boniface VIII adjusted their relations in the Bull "*Super cathedram*" of 18 February, 1300, granting the mendicants freedom to preach in their own churches and in public places, but not at the time when the prelate of the district was preaching. For the hearing of confessions, the mendicants were to submit suitable candidates to the bishop in office, and obtain his sanction. The faithful were left free in regard to funerals, but, should they take place in the church of a cloister, the *quarta funerum* was to be given to the parish priest. Benedict XI abrogated this Bull, but Clement V reintroduced it (1312). Especially conspicuous among the later contentions over the privileges of the mendicants were those caused by John of Poliac, a master of theology of Paris (1320), and by Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh (1349). In 1516 the Fifth Council of the Lateran dealt with this question, which was definitively settled by the Council of Trent.

In the Bull "*Exultantes*" of 18 January, 1283, Martin IV instituted the *syndici Apostolici*. This was the name given to the men appointed by the ministers and custodians to receive in the name of the Holy See the alms given to the Franciscans, and to pay it out again at their request. The *syndici* consequently replaced the *nuntii* and procurators. All these regulations were necessary in consequence of the rule of poverty, the literal and unconditional observance of which was rendered impossible by the great expansion of the order, by its pursuit of learning, and the accumulated property of the large cloisters in the towns. The appointment of these trustees, however, was neither subversive of nor an evasion of the rule, but rather the proper observance of its precepts under the altered conditions of the time. Under Bonagratia (1279–83) and his immediate successors Arlotto da Prato (1285–86), and Matthew of Acquasparta (1287–89), a learned theologian and philosopher who became cardinal in 1288 and rendered notable service to the Church, the Spiritual movement broke out in the Province of Ancona, under the leadership of Pietro Giovanni Olivi, who, after the General Chapter of Strasburg (1282), caused the order considerable trouble. The general, Raimondo Gaufredi (Geoffroy) of Provence (1289–95), favoured the Spirituals and denounced the lax interpretations of the Community,

i.e. the majority of the order who opposed the minority, termed Spirituals or Zelanti. Raimondo even ventured to revise the general constitutions at the General Chapter of Paris in 1292, whereupon, having refused the Bishopric of Padua offered him by Boniface VIII, he was compelled by the pope to resign his office. Giovanni Minio of Muravalle, in the March of Ancona, a master of theology, was elected general by the Chapter of Anagni (1294), and although created Cardinal-Bishop of Porto (*Portuensis*) in 1302, continued to govern the order until Gonzálvez of Valleboa (1304–13), Provincial of Santiago, Spain, was elected to succeed him by the Chapter of Assisi.

In his encyclical of 1302, Giovanni Minio had inculcated the rule of poverty, and forbidden both the accumulation of property and vested incomes. Gonzálvez followed the same policy (12 February, 1310), and the Chapter of Padua (1310) made the precept still more rigorous by enjoining the "simple use" (*usus pauper*) and withdrawing the right of voting at the chapter from convents which did not adopt it. The *usus pauper* had indeed been a source of contention from 1290, especially in Provence, where some denied that it was binding on the order. These dissensions led to the *Magna Disputatio* at Avignon (1310–12), to which Clement V summoned the leaders of the Spirituals and of the Community or Relaxati. Clement laid the strife by his Bull and Decretal "*Exivi de Paradiso*", issued at the third and last session of the Council of Vienne, 5 May, 1312. The prescriptions contained in the Franciscan Rule were divided into those which bound under pain of mortal, and those which bound under pain of venial, sin. Those enjoining the renunciation of property and the adoption of poverty were retained: the Franciscans were entitled only to the *usus* (use) of the goods given to them, and wherever the rule prescribed it, only to the *usus pauper* or *arctus* (simple use). All matters concerning the Franciscan habit, and the storehouses and cellars allowed in cases of necessity, were referred to the discretion of the superiors of the order.

The Spirituals of Provence and Tuscany, however, were not yet placated. At the General Chapter of Barcelona (1313), a Parisian master of theology, Alexander of Alexandria (Lombardy), was chosen to succeed Gonzálvez, but died in October, 1314. The General Chapter of Naples (1316) elected Michael of Cesena, a moderate Conventual. The commission appointed by this chapter altered the general statutes on several points (called the third revision), and Michael in an encyclical insisted upon the observance of the rule of poverty. The Spirituals immediately afterwards rekindled the property strife, but John XXII interdicted and suppressed their peculiar notions by the Constitution "*Quorumdam exigit*" (7 October, 1317), thus completely restoring the official unity of the order. In 1321, however, the so-called theoretical discussion on poverty broke out, the inquisitor, John of Belna, a Dominican, having taken exception to the statement that Christ and the Apostles possessed property neither *in communi* nor *in speciali* (i.e. neither in common nor individually). The ensuing strife degenerated into a fierce scholastic disputation between the Franciscans and the Dominicans, and, as the pope favoured the views of the latter, a very dangerous crisis seemed to threaten the Minorites. By the Constitution "*Ad conditorem canonum*" (8 December, 1322) John XXII renounced the title of the Church to all the possessions of the Friars Minor, and restored the ownership to the order. This action, contrary to the practice and expressed sentiments of his predecessors, placed the Minorites on exactly the same footing as the other orders, and was a harsh provision for an order which had laboured so untiringly in the interests of the Church. In many other ways, however, John fostered the order. It will thus be readily understood why the members inclined



to laxity joined the disaffected party, leaving but few advocates of John's regulations. To the dissenting party belonged Gerardus Odonis (1329-42), the general, whose election at Paris in 1329 John had secured in the place of his powerful opponent Michael of Cesena. Odonis, however, was supported only by the minority of the order in his efforts to effect the abolition of the rule of poverty. The deposed general and his followers, the Michaelites (cf. FRATICELLI), were disavowed by the General Chapter of Paris, and the order remained faithful to the Holy See. The constitutions prescribed by Benedict XII, John's successor, in his Bull of 28 November, 1336, and imposed on the order by the Chapter of Cahors (hence the name "Constitutiones Cataracenses" or "Benedictinæ"), contained not a single reference to the rule of poverty. Benedict died in 1342, and on the preference of Gerardus Odonis to the Patriarchate of Antioch, Fortanerio Vassalli was chosen general (1343-47).

Under Guillaume Farinier (1348-57) the Chapter of Marseilles resolved to revive the old statutes, a purpose which was realized in the general constitutions promulgated by the General Chapter of Assisi in 1354 ("Constitutiones Farineriæ" or "Guilelmi"). This code was based on the "Constitutiones Narbonenses" (1260), and the Bulls "Exiit" and "Exivi", but the edicts of John XXII, being promulgated by the pope over and above the chapter, still continued in force. The great majority of the friars accommodated themselves to these regulations and undertook the care and proprietorship of their goods, which they entrusted to *fratres procuratores* elected from among themselves. The protracted strife of the deposed general (Michael of Cesena) with the pope, in which the general was supported with conspicuous learning by some of the leading members of the order and encouraged by the German Emperor Louis IV (the Bavarian), for reasons of secular and ecclesiastical polity, gave great and irresistible impulse to laxity in the order, and prejudiced the founder's ideal. It was John XXII who had introduced Conventualism in the later sense of the word, that is, community of goods, income and property as in other religious orders, in contradiction to Observantism or the strict observance of the rule, a movement now strong within the order, according to which the members were to hold no property *in communi* and renounce all vested incomes and accumulation of goods. The Bull "Ad conditorem", so significant in the history of the order, was only withdrawn 1 November, 1428, by Martin V.

Meanwhile the development of Conventualism had been fostered in many ways. In 1348 the Black Death swept devastatingly over Europe, emptying town and cloister. The wealth of the order increased rapidly, and thousands of new brothers were admitted without sufficiently close examination into their eligibility. The liberality of the faithful was also, if not a source of danger for the Minorites, at least a constant incitement to depart to some extent from the rule of poverty. This liberality showed itself mainly in gifts of real property, for example in endowments for prayers for the dead, which were then usually founded with real estate. In the fourteenth century also began the land wars and feuds (e. g. the Hundred Years War in France), which relaxed every bond of discipline and good order. The current feelings of anarchic irresponsibility were also encouraged by the Great Western Schism, during which men quarrelled not only concerning obedience to the papacy, to which there were three claimants since the Council of Pisa, but also concerning obedience to the generals of the order, whose number tallied with the number of the popes.

Guillaume Farinier was named cardinal in 1356, but continued to govern the order until the election of Jean Bouchier (de Buco) in 1357. John having died

in 1358, Mark of Viterbo was chosen to succeed him (1359-66), it being deemed desirable to elect an Italian, the preceding four generals having been French. Mark was raised to the cardinalate in 1366, and was succeeded by Thomas of Farignano (1367-72), who became Patriarch of Grado in 1372, and cardinal in 1378. Leonardo Rossi of Giffone (1373-78) succeeded Thomas as general, and supported Clement VII during the schism. This action gave umbrage to Urban VI, who deposed him and named Ludovico Donato his successor. Ludovico was also chosen in 1379 by the General Chapter of Gran in Hungary, at which, however, only twelve provinces were represented, was named cardinal in 1381, but was executed in 1385 with some other cardinals for participating in a conspiracy against Urban VI. His third successor, Enrico Alfieri (1387-1405), could only bewail the privileges subversive of discipline, by means of which the claimants to the papacy sought to bind their supporters more closely to themselves. Alfieri's successor, Antonio de Pireto (1405-21), gave his allegiance to the Council of Pisa and Alexander V (1409-10). Alexander (Pietro Philargi of Crete) had been Archbishop of Milan and a member of the Franciscan Order, and was therefore supported by the majority of the order. Indignant at this conduct, Gregory XII named Antonio da Cascia general (1410-15), a man of no great importance. With the election of Martin V (1417-31) by the Council of Constance, unity was restored in the order, which was then in a state of the greatest confusion.

The Observance (*Regularis Observantia*) had meanwhile prepared the ground for a regeneration of the order. At first no uniform movement, but varying in different lands, it was given a definite character by St. Bernardine of Siena (q. v.) and St. John Capistran (q. v.). In Italy as early as 1334, Giovanni de Valle had begun at San Bartolomeo de Brugliano, near Foligno, to live in exact accordance with the rule but without that exemption from the order, which was later forbidden by Clement VI in 1343. It is worthy of notice that Clement, in 1350, granted this exemption to the lay brother Gentile da Spoleto, a companion of Giovanni, but Gentile gathered together such a disorderly rabble, including some of the heretical Fraticelli, that the privilege was withdrawn (1354), he was expelled from the order (1355), and cast into prison. Amongst his faithful adherents was Paoluccio Vagnozzi of Trinci, who was allowed by the general to return to Brugliano in 1368. As a protection against the snakes so numerous in the districts, wooden slippers (*calepodia*, *zoccoli*) were worn by the brothers, and, as their use continued in the order, the Observants were long known as the *Zoccolanti* or *lignipedes*. In 1373 Paoluccio's followers occupied ten small houses in Umbria, to which was soon added San Damiano at Assisi. They were supported by Gregory XI, and also, after some hesitation, by the superiors of the order. In 1388, Enrico Alfieri, the general, appointed Paoluccio commissary general of his followers, whom he allowed to be sent into all the districts of Italy as an incentive to the rest of the order. Paoluccio died on 17 September, 1390, and was succeeded by John of Stroncone (d. 1418). In 1414, this reform possessed thirty-four houses, to which the Porziuncola was added in 1514.

In the fourteenth century there were three Spanish provinces: that of Portugal (also called Santiago), that of Castile, and that of Aragon. Although houses of the reformers in which the rule was rigidly observed existed in each of these provinces about 1400, there does not appear to have been any connexion between the reforms of each province—much less between these reforms and the Italian Observance—and consequently the part played by Peter of Villacreces in Silos and Aguilera has been greatly exaggerated.

Independent also was the Reform or Observance in

France, which had its inception in 1358 (or more accurately in 1388) in the cloister at Mirabeau in the province of Touraine, and thence spread through Burgundy, Touraine, and Franconia. In 1407 Benedict XIII exempted them from all jurisdiction of the provincials, and on 13 May, 1408, gave them a vicar-general in the person of Thomas de Curte. In 1414 about two hundred of their number addressed a petition to the Council of Constance, which thereupon granted to the friars of the *stricta observantia regularis* a special provincial vicar in every province, and a vicar-general over all, Nicolas Rodolphe being the first to fill the last-mentioned office. Angelo Salvetti, general of the order (1421-24), viewed these changes with marked disfavour, but Martin V's protection prevented him from taking any steps to defeat their aim. Far more opposed was Salvetti's successor, Antonio de Massa (1424-30). The ranks of the Observants increased rapidly in France and Spain in consequence of the exemption. The Italian branch, however, refused to avail themselves of any exemption from the usual superiors, the provincial and the general.

In Germany the Observance appeared about 1420 in the province of Cologne at the monastery of Gouda (1418), in the province of Saxony in the Mark of Brandenburg (1425); in the upper German province first at the Heidelberg monastery (1426). Cloisters of the Observants already existed in Bosnia, Russia, Hungary, and even in Tataria. In 1430 Martin V (1417-31) summoned the whole order, Observants and Conventuals, to the General Chapter of Assisi (1430), "in order that our desire for a general reform of the order may be fulfilled". William of Casale (1430-42) was elected general, but the intellectual leader of Assisi was St. John Capistran. The statutes promulgated by this chapter are called the "Constitutiones Martinianæ" from the name of the pope. They cancelled the offices of general and provincial vicars of the Observants and introduced a scheme for the general reform of the order. All present at the chapter had bound themselves on oath to carry out its decisions, but six weeks later (27 July, 1430) the general was released from his oath and obtained from Martin V the Brief "Ad statum" (23 August, 1430), which allowed the Conventuals to hold property like all other orders. This Brief constituted the Magna Charta of the Conventuals, and henceforth any reform of the order on the lines of the rule was out of the question.

The strife between the Observants and the Conventuals now broke out with such increased fury that even St. John Capistran laboured for a division of the order, which was however still longer opposed by St. Bernardine of Siena. Additional bitterness was lent to the strife when in many instances princes and towns forcibly withdrew the ancient Franciscan monasteries from the Conventuals and turned them over to the Observants. In 1438 the general of the order named St. Bernardine of Siena, first Vicar-General of the Italian Observants, an office in which Bernardine was succeeded by St. John Capistran in 1441. At the General Chapter of Padua (1443), Albert Berdini of Sarteano (q.v.), an Observant, would have been chosen general in accordance with the papal wish had not his election been opposed by St. Bernardine. Antonio de Rusconibus (1443-50) was accordingly elected, and, until the separation in 1517, no Observant held the office of general. In 1443 Antonio appointed two vicars-general to direct the Observants—for the cismontane family (i. e. for Italy, the East, Austria-Hungary, and Poland) St. John Capistran, and for the ultramontane (all other countries, including afterwards America) Jean Perioche of Maubert. By the so-called Separation Bull of Eugene IV, "Ut sacra ordinis minorum" (11 January, 1446), outlined by St. John Capistran, the office of the vicar-general

of the Observants was declared permanent, and made practically independent of the minister general of the order, but the Observants might not hold a general chapter separate from the rest of the order. After the canonization in 1450 of Bernardine of Siena (d. 1444), the first saint of the Observants, John Capistran with the assistance of the zealous cardinal, Nicholas of Cusa (d. 1464), extended the Observance so greatly in Germany, that he could henceforth disregard the attacks of the lax and time-serving sections of the order. At the Chapter of Barcelona, in 1451, the so-called "Statuta Barchinonensia" were promulgated. Though somewhat modified these continued in force for centuries in the ultramontane family.

The compromise essayed by St. James of the March in 1455 was inherently hopeless, although it granted to the vicars of the Observants *active* voting power at the general chapters. On this compromise was based the "Bulla concordia" of Callistus III (2 February, 1456), which Pius II withdrew (11 October, 1458). The Chapter of Perugia (1464) elected as general Francesco della Rovere (1464-69), who was elevated to the cardinalate in 1468, and later elected pope under the title of Sixtus IV (1471-84). Sixtus granted various privileges to the Franciscans in his Bull "Mare magnum" (1474) and his "Bulla aurea" (1479), but was rather more kindly disposed towards the Conventuals, to whom he had belonged. The generals Francesco Nanni (1475-99), to whom Sixtus gave the sobriquet of Samson to signalize his victory in a disputation on the Immaculate Conception, and Egidio Delfini (1500-06) displayed a strong bias in favour of the reform of the Conventuals, Egidio using as his plea the so-called "Constitutiones Alexandrinæ" sanctioned by Alexander VI in 1501. His zeal was far surpassed in Spain by that of the powerful Minorite, Francisco Ximenes de los Cisneros, who expelled from the cloisters all Conventuals opposed to the reform. At Paris, Delfini won the large house of studies to the side of the reformers. The *Capitulum generalissimum* at Rome in 1506 was expected to bring about the union of the various branches, but the proposed plan did not find acceptance, and the statutes, drawn up by the chapter and published in 1508 under the title "Statuta Iulii II", could not bridge the chasm separating the parties. After long deliberations had taken place under generals Rinaldo Graziani (1506-09), Philip of Bagnacavallo (1509-11), and Bernardino Prato da Chieri (1513-17), the last general of the united order, Leo X summoned on 11 July, 1516, a *capitulum generalissimum* to meet at Rome on the feast of Pentecost (31 May), 1517. This chapter first suppressed all the reformed congregations and annexed them to the Observants; declared the Observants an independent order, the true Order of St. Francis, and separated them completely from the Conventuals. The General of the Observants received the title of *Minister Generalis totius ordinis Fratrum Minorum*, with or without the addition *regularis Observantia*, and was entrusted with the ancient seal of the order. His period of office was limited to six years, and he was to be chosen alternately from the *familia cismontana* and the *familia ultramontana*—a regulation which has not been observed. For the other family a *Commissarius generalis* is always elected. In processions, etc., the Observants take precedence of the Conventuals.

B. *Second Period (1517-1909)*.—Christoforo Numai of Friuli was elected first General of the Reformed Order of Franciscans (*Ordo Fratrum Minorum*), but was raised a month later to the cardinalate. Francesco Lichetto (1518-20) was chosen as his successor by the Chapter of Lyons (1518), where the deliberations centred around the necessary rearrangement of the order in provinces and the promulgation of new general constitutions, which were based on the statutes of Barcelona (1451, cf. *supra*). Lichetto and his

successors—Paul of Soncino (1520–23), who died in 1523, and Francisco de Angelis Quiñones (1523–28), a Spaniard, diligently devoted themselves to establishing the Observance on a firm basis. Quiñones was named cardinal in 1528, and the new general, Paolo Pisotti (1529–33), unfortunately disregarding the ideal of his predecessors and failing entirely to grasp the significance of the reforms afoot at the time (for example that of the Capuchins), was deposed in 1533. In 1547 the Chapter of Assisi prescribed grey as the colour of the Franciscan habit, in accordance with the custom of the Observants, and forbade the wearing of beards. At the General Chapter of Salamanca (1554), Clemente Dolera of Moneglia, the general in office, promulgated new statutes for the cismontane family. On the preferment of Clemente to the cardinalate in 1557, Francesco Zamora, his successor (1559–65), defended at the Council of Trent the order's rule of poverty, which was then sanctioned by the council for the Observants and Capuchins. Under Luigi Pozzo (Puteus), the next general (1565–71), the Spanish Conventuals were united with the Observants by command of the pope, and a general reunion of the separated branches of the order seemed imminent. The two succeeding generals, Christophe de Cheffontaines, a Frenchman (1571–79), and Francisco Gonzaga (1579–87), laboured industriously for the rigorous observance and the rule of poverty, which was rather loosely interpreted, especially in France. Gonzaga reformed the great convent of studies at Paris and, in 1581, was appointed, in opposition to his wishes, Bishop of Cefalù (Sicily) and afterwards of Mantua, where he died in the odour of sanctity, in 1620. The process for his beatification is pending at Rome. Francis of Toulouse (1587–93) and Bonaventura Secusi of Caltagirone (Sicily, 1593–1600) were employed frequently on embassies by the popes, and revised the constitutions of the order, in which, however, the alterations were too frequent. Finally at the Chapter of Segovia in 1621, the minister general, Benignus of Genoa (1618–25), approved the "Statuta Segoviensia" for the ultramontane family, with suitable additions both for the French and for the German-Belgian nation. Thereafter the latter nation adhered most perseveringly to the principles of these statutes; that their consistency in this respect has proved a source of prosperity, vigour, and inner strength is universally known.

About this period the so-called Counter-Reformation was bursting into vigorous life in the North, and the order entered on a new period of strenuous vitality. The Reformation had dealt a terrible blow to the Franciscans in these parts, annihilating in many instances entire provinces. Supported now by the emperor and the Catholic princes, they advanced to regain their old position and to found new cloisters, from which they could minister to their flocks. To bring into subjection the four rather lax French provinces which were known as the *Provinciae confederatae* and were thenceforward always too much inclined to shelter themselves behind the government, the general, Bernardine of Sena (Portugal, 1625–33), obtained from Urban VIII the Bull of 1 October, 1625. The French, indeed, justly complained that the general of the order was always chosen from Italy or from Spain. The privilege usurped by the Spanish kings, of exerting a certain influence in the election and indeed securing that the general should be alternately a Spaniard and an Italian (but one from the Crown lands of Spain), was in contradiction to all Franciscan statutes and laws. The Spanish generals, furthermore, resided usually at Madrid, instead of at Rome, and most of the higher offices were occupied by Spaniards—an anomalous situation which aroused great resentment amongst the friars of other nations, especially France and in Italy, and continued until 1834. This introduction of national politics into the

government of the order proved as noxious to the interests of the Friars Minor as the established churches of the eighteenth century did to the cause of Christianity.

Generals Juan Merinero of Madrid (1639–45), Giovanni Mazzara of Naples (1645–48), and Pedro Manero (1651–55) tried without success to give definite statutes to the cismontane family, while the "Constitutiones Sambucanæ", drawn up by General Michele Buongiorno of Sambuca (1658–64) at the order of the general chapter, did not remain long in force. Ildefonso Salizanes (1664–70) and Francesco Maria Rhini (1670–74) were both raised to the episcopate. José Ximenes Samaniego (1676–82) zealously eradicated abuses which had crept into the order, especially in Spain and France, and died as Bishop of Placencia in Spain (1692). Ildefonso Biezma (1702–16) and José García (1717–23) were appointed by papal Briefs. The next general was the famous Lorenzo Cozza (1723–27) who, as Custos of the Holy Land, had obviated a schism of the Maronites. He was created cardinal by Benedict XIII. At the Chapter of Milan (1729), Juan Soto was elected general (1729–36), and during his period of office had the statutes of the order collected, rearranged, and then published in 1734. Raffaello de Rossi (1744–50) gave the province (otherwise known as the custody) of the Holy Land its definitive constitution. From 1700 to 1723 no general chapter could be held in consequence of the continuous state of unrest caused by the wars and other dissensions. These disputes made their appearance even in the order itself, and were fanned to a flame by the rivalry between the nations and between the different reform branches, the most heated contention being between the Observants and the Reformati. The domestic discipline of the order thus became very slack in certain districts, although the personale of the Friars Minor was at this time unusually high. Benedict XIII vainly endeavoured in 1727 to cement a union between the various branches (Observants, Reformati, Recollects, and Discalced). The general chapter of 1750, at which Benedict XIV presided and warmly praised the order, elected Pedro Joannetio of Molina (1750–56)—the only Discalced who has been general. Clemente Guignoni of Palermo followed (1756–62), and then Joannetio was elected general for the second time (1762–68), this occurrence being absolutely unique in the history of the order. Paschale Frosconi (1768–91) of Milan tried in vain on several occasions to hold a general chapter. During his long period of office, the Spaniards endeavoured to break away from the order (1774), and the evil effects of Gallicanism and Febronianism were being already universally felt, kings and princes suppressing many of the cloisters or forbidding intercourse with Rome. In 1766 Louis XV established in France the *Commission des Réguliers*, which, presided over by Cardinal de Brienne and conducted with the greatest perfidy, brought about in 1771 a union between the Conventuals and the French Observants. The former had but three provinces with forty-eight monasteries, while the latter had seven provinces and 287 monasteries. The French Observants, however, were always somewhat inclined towards laxity, particularly in regard to the rule of poverty, and had obtained in 1673 and 1745 a papal Brief, which allowed them to retain real estate and vested incomes. The French Revolution brought about the annihilation of the order in France.

In Bavaria (1769) and many other German principalities, spiritual and secular, the order was suppressed, but nowhere more thoroughly than in the Austrian and Belgian states of Joseph II and in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (1788) then ruled by Ferdinand IV. On the death of Pasquale (1791) Pius VI appointed as general a Spaniard, Joachim Company (1792–1806). In 1804, the Spanish Franciscans effected, with the

assistance of the King of Spain, their complete separation from the order, although the semblance of unity was still retained by the provision of Pius VII, that the general should be chosen alternately from the Spaniards and the other nations, and that, during his term of office, the other division of the order should be governed by an autonomous vicar-general. During 1793 and 1794 the order was extinct in France and Belgium; and from 1803 in most districts in Germany; from 1775 on, it was sadly reduced in Austria, and also in Italy, where it was suppressed in 1810. The devastation of the order and the confusion consequent on it were deplorable. The generals appointed by the pope, Ilario Cervelli (1806-14), Gaudenzio Patrignani (1814-17), Cirillo Almeda y Brea (1817-24), and Giovanni Tecca of Capistrano (1824-30), ruled over but a fraction of the order, even though prospects were somewhat brighter about this period. In 1827, Tecca published the statutes which had been drawn up in 1768. Under the Spanish general, Luis Iglesias (1830-34), the formal separation of Spanish Franciscans from the main body of the order was completed (1832), but in 1833 most of their monasteries were destroyed during the Peasants' War and the revolution. The general, Bartolomé Altemir (1834-38), was banished from Spain and died at Bordeaux in 1843, Giuseppe Maria Maniscalco of Alessandria (1838-44) being named his successor by Gregory XVI. The pope also appointed the two succeeding generals, Luigi di Loreta (1844-50) and Venanzio di Celano (1850-56). The former, in 1849, named Giuseppe Aréso Commissary of the Holy Land. In 1851, Aréso opened the first monastery at Saint-Palais.

About this period Benigno da Valbona introduced the Reformati into France, and in 1852 founded their first monastery at Avignon, while Venanzio as general laboured indefatigably for the resuscitation of the Observants in the same country, founding new missions and raising the standard of studies. In Russia and Poland, however, many monasteries were suppressed in 1831 and 1842, a general strangulation being afterwards effected by the ukase of 1864. In 1856, at the general chapter in the Ara Coeli at Rome, under the personal presidency of Pope Pius IX, Bernardino Trionfetti of Montefranco was elected general (1856-62). The monasteries of Italy were suppressed by the Piedmontese in 1866, during the generalship of Raffaello Lippi of Ponticello (1862-69) and in 1873 their fate was shared by the houses of the previously immune Roman province. Bowed with grief and years, the general abdicated (1869), and, as a general chapter was impossible, Pius IX preferred one of the Reformati, Bernardino del Vago of Portogruaro (Portu Romatino) to the generalship (1869-89). This general did much to raise the status of the order, and founded, in 1880, an official organ for the whole order (the "Acta Ordinis Minorum"), which contains the official decrees, decisions, and publications and also many works on canon law and ascetic theology for the discipline of the order. During his term of office the Prussian *Kulturkampf* expelled the majority of the German Franciscans (1875), most of whom settled in North America, and the French monasteries were suppressed (1880), the scattered Franciscans reassembling in Italy. The Ara Coeli monastery, the ancient seat of the general's curia, having been seized by the Italian Government to make room for the national monument of Victor Emmanuel, the general was obliged to establish a new mother-house. The new Collegio di S. Antonio near the Lateran was made the seat of the minister general; it is also an international college for the training of missionaries and lectors (i. e. professors for the schools of the order). Bernardino also founded the Collegio di S. Bonaventura at Quaracchi, near Florence, which contains the printing press of the order, and is principally intended for the publication of the writings of the great

Franciscan scholars, and other learned works. On the retirement of Bernardino in 1889, Luigi Canali of Parma was elected general (1889-97) and prepared the way for the union of the four reform branches of the order at the General Chapter of Assisi in 1895. The reunion is based on the constitutions which were drawn up under the presidency of Aloysius Lauer and approved on 15 May, 1897. Leo XIII completed the union by his Bull "Felicitate quadam" of 4 October, which removed every distinction between the branches, even the difference of name, and consequently there exists to-day one single, undivided Order of Friars Minor (*Ordo Fratrum Minorum*, O. F. M.). On the resignation of Canali as general, Leo XIII appointed Aloysius Lauer (4 Oct., 1897) of Katholisch-Willenroth (province of Kassel, Prussia), who introduced the principles of the union gradually but firmly, as it involved many changes, especially in Italy and Austria. On his death (21 August, 1901) Aloysius was succeeded as vicar-general by David Fleming, an Irish friar attached to the English province. At the general chapter of 1903, Dionysius Schuler, of Schlatt, in Hohenzollern, who belonged, like Father Lauer, to the province of Fulda (Thuringia) and had laboured in the United States from 1875, was elected general. He also devoted himself to the complete establishment of the union, and prepared the way for the general reunion of the Spanish Franciscans with the order. At the General Chapter (or more correctly speaking the *Congregatio media*) of Assisi on 29 May, 1909, the order celebrated the seventh centenary of its glorious foundation.

At present (1909) the Order of Friars Minor includes among its members: (1) two cardinals: José Sebastião Neto, Patriarch of Lisbon; created in 1883 (resigned in 1907); Gregorio Aguirre y García, Archbishop of Burgos, created in 1907; (2) six archbishops, including Monsignor Diomede Falconio, Apostolic Delegate to the United States since 1907; (3) thirty-two bishops and one prelate *nullius* (of Santarem in Brazil); (4) three prefects Apostolic.

II. THE REFORM PARTIES.—A. *First Period* (1226-1517).—All Franciscan reforms outside of the Observants were ordered to be suppressed by papal decree in 1506, and again in 1517, but not with complete success. The Clareni are dealt with under ANGELO CLARENO DA CINGULI; the Fraticelli and Spirituals under their respective headings. The so-called Caesarines, or followers of Caesar of Speyer (q.v.) (c. 1230-37), never existed as a separate congregation. The Amadeans were founded by Pedro João Mendez (also called Amadeus), a Portuguese nobleman, who laboured in Lombardy. When he died, in 1482, his congregation had twenty-eight houses but was afterwards suppressed by Pius V. The Caperolani, founded also in Lombardy by the renowned preacher Pietro Capero (q.v.), returned in 1480 to the ranks of the Observants. The Spiritual followers of Anthony of Castelvoganni and Matthias of Tivoli flourished during the period 1470-1490; some of their ideas resembled those of Kaspar Waler in the province of Strasburg, which were immediately repressed by the authorities. Among the reforms in Spain were that of Pedro de Villacreces (1420) and the sect called *della Capucciola* of Felipe Berbegal (1430), suppressed in 1434. More important was the reform of Juan de la Puebla (1480), whose pupil Juan de Guadalupe increased the severities of the reform. His adherents were known as *Guadalupenses*, *Discalced*, *Capuciati*, or *Fratres de S. Evangelio*, and to them belonged Juan Zumarraga, the first Bishop of Mexico (1530-48), and St. Peter of Alcántara (d. 1562, cf. below). The Neutrales were wavering Conventuals in Italy who accepted the Observance only in appearance. Founded in 1463, they were suppressed in 1467. This middle position between the Observants and Conventuals was also taken by the Martinianists, or Martinians, and the

Reformati (Observants) *sub ministris* or *de Communitate*. These took as their basis the decrees of the Chapter of Assisi (1430), but wished to live under provincial ministers. They existed mostly in Germany and France, and in the latter country were called Coletani, for what reason it is not quite clear (cf. COLETTE, SAINT). To this party belonged Boniface of Ceva, a sturdy opponent of the separation of the Conventuals from the Observants.

B. *Second Period (1517-1897)*.—Even within the pale of the Regular Observance, which constituted from 1517 the main body of the order, there existed plenty of room for various interpretations without prejudicing the rule itself, although the debatable area had been considerably restricted by the definition of its fundamental requirements and prescriptions. The Franciscan Order as such has never evaded the main principles of the rule, has never had them abrogated or been dispensed from them by the pope. The reforms since 1517, therefore, have neither been in any sense a return to the rule, since the Order of Friars Minor has never deviated from it, nor have they been a protest against a universal lax interpretation of the rule on the part of the order, as was that of the Observants against the Conventuals. The later reforms may be more truly described as repeated attempts to draw nearer to the exalted ideal of St. Francis. Frequently, it is true, these reforms dealt only with externals—outward exercises of piety, austerities in the rule of life, etc., and these were in many cases gradually recast, mitigated, had even entirely disappeared, and by 1897 nothing was left but the name. The Capuchins are treated in a separate article; the other leading reforms within the Observance are the Discalced, the Reformati, and the Recollects. The Observants are designated by the simple addition of *regularis observantia*, while these reformed branches add to the general title *strictioris observantia*, that is, “of the stricter Observance”.

(1) *The Discalced*.—Juan de la Puebla has been incorrectly regarded as the founder of the Discalced Friars Minor, since the province of the Holy Angels (de los Angeles), composed of his followers, has ever remained a province of the Observants. The Discalced owe their origin rather to Juan de Guadalupe (cf. above). He belonged indeed to the reform of Juan de la Puebla, but not for long, as he received permission from Alexander VI, in 1496, to found a hermitage with six brothers in the district of Granada, to wear the Franciscan habit in its original form, and to preach wherever he wished. These privileges were renewed in 1499, but the Spanish kings, influenced by the Observants of the province, obtained their withdrawal. They were again conferred, however, by a papal Brief in 1503, annulled in 1507, while in 1515 these friars were able to establish the custody of Estremadura. The union of 1517 again put an end to their separate existence, but in 1520 the province of St. Gabriel was formed from this custody, and as early as 1518 the houses of the Discalced friars in Portugal constituted the province de la Pietade. The dogged pertinacity of Juan Pasqual, who belonged now to the Observants and now to the Conventuals, according to the facilities afforded him to pursue the ideas of the old Egyptian hermits, withstood every attempt at repression. After much difficulty he obtained a papal Brief in 1541, authorizing him to collect companions, whereupon he founded the custody of Sts. Simon and Jude, or custody of the Paschalites (abolished in 1583), and a custody of St. Joseph. The Paschalites won a strong champion in St. Peter of Alcántara, the minister of the province of St. Gabriel, who in 1557 joined the Conventuals. As successor of Juan Pasqual and Commissary General of the Reformed Conventual Friars in Spain, Peter founded the poor and diminutive hermitage of Pedrosó in Spain, and in 1559 raised the custody of St. Joseph to the dignity of

a province. Heforbad even sandals to be worn on the feet, prescribed complete abstinence from meat, prohibited libraries, in all of which measures he far exceeded the intentions of St. Francis of Assisi. From him is derived the name Alcantarines, which is often given to the Discalced Friars Minor. Peter died in October, 1562, at a house of the Observants, with whom all the Spanish reforms had entered into union in the preceding spring. The province of St. Joseph, however, did not rest until it had redeveloped all its old peculiarities. In 1572 the members were first called in papal documents *Discalceati* or *Excalceati*, and in 1578 they were named *Fratres Capucini de Observantiâ*. Soon other provinces followed their example, and in 1604 the Discalced friars petitioned for a vicar-general, a definitor general, and a general chapter of their own. In 1621 Pope Gregory XV, captivated by the eloquence of the lay brother Paul of Madrid, appointed a vicar-general, although many were opposed to the appointment. On Gregory's death (8 July, 1623) his concessions to the Discalced friars were reversed by Urban VIII, who, however, in 1642 recognized their provinces as interdependent. They were not under the jurisdiction of the ultramontane commissary general, and received in 1703 their own procurator general, who was afterwards chosen (alternately) for them and the Recollects. They never had general statutes, and, when such were prepared in 1761, by Joannetto, a general from their own branch, the provinces refused to accept them. The Discalced gradually established houses in numerous provinces in Spain, America, the Philippines, the East Indies and the Kingdom of Naples, which was at this period under Spanish rule. The first houses established in Naples were handed over by Sixtus V to the Reformed Conventuals in 1589. In addition to the above, a house in Tuscany and another in London must be mentioned. This branch was suppressed in 1897.

(2) *The Reformati*.—The proceedings of the general Pisotti against the houses of the Italian Recollects led some of the friars of the Stricter Observance under the leadership of Francis of Jesi and Bernardine of Asti to approach Clement VII, who by the Bull “In suprema” (1532) authorized them to go completely barefoot and granted them a separate custody under the provincial. Both these leaders joined the Capuchins in 1535. The Reformati ate cooked food only twice in the week, scourged themselves frequently, and recited daily, in addition to the universally prescribed choir-service, the Office of the Dead, the Office of the Blessed Virgin, the Seven Penitential Psalms, etc., which far exceeded the Rule of St. Francis, and could not be maintained for long. In 1579 Gregory XIII released them entirely from the jurisdiction of the provincials and almost completely from that of the general, while in Rome they were given the renowned monastery of S. Francesco a Ripa. In the same year (1579), however, the general, Gonzaga, obtained the suspension of the decree, and the new Constitutions promulgated by Bonaventure of Caltagirone, general in 1595, ensured their affiliation with the provinces of the order. Although Clement VIII approved these statutes in 1595, it did not deter him, in 1596, from reissuing Gregory XIII's Brief of 1579, and granting the Reformati their own procurator. At the suit of two lay brothers, in 1621, Gregory XV not only confirmed this concession, but gave the Reformati their own vicar-general, general chapter, and definitors general. Fortunately for the order, these concessions were revoked in 1624 by Urban VIII, who, however, by his Bull “Injuncti nobis” of 1639, raised all the custodies of the Reformati in Italy and Poland to the dignity of provinces. In 1642 the Reformati drew up their own statutes; these were naturally composed in Italian, since Italy was always the home of this branch of the Friars Minor. In 1620 Antonio Arrigoni a



Galbatio was sent by the Reformati into Bavaria, and, despite the opposition of the local Observants, succeeded in 1625 in uniting into one province of the Reformati the monasteries of the Archduchy of Bavaria, which belonged to the Upper German (Strasburg) province. The new province thenceforth belonged to the cismontane family. Arrigoni also introduced in 1628 the reform into the province of St. Leopold in the Tyrol, into Austria in 1632, and into Bohemia in 1660, and succeeded in winning these countries entirely over to his branch, Carinthia following in 1688. After many disappointments, the two Polish custodies were raised to the status of provinces of the Reformati in 1639. In the course of time, the proximity of houses of the Reformati and the Observants gave rise to unedifying contentions and rivalry, especially in Italy. Among the heroic figures of the Reformati, St. Pacificus of San Severino calls for special mention. St. Benedict of San Fidelfo cannot be reckoned among the Reformati, as he died in a retreat of the Recollects; nor should St. Leonard of Port Maurice, who belonged rather to the so-called *Riformella*, introduced into the Roman Province by Bl. Bonaventura of Barcelona in 1662. The principal house of the *Riformella* was that of S. Bonaventura on the Palatine. St. Leonard founded two similar monasteries in Tuscany, one of which was that of Incontro near Florence. These were to serve as places of religious recollection and spiritual refreshment for priests engaged in mission-work among the people. Like the Discalced, the Reformati ceased to have a separate existence in 1897.

(3) *The Recollects (Recollecti)*.—(a) The foundation of "recollecion-houses" in France, where they were badly needed even by the Observants, was perhaps due to Spanish influence. After the bloody religious wars, which exercised an enervating effect on the life of the cloister, one house of this description was founded at Cluys in 1570, but was soon discontinued. The general of the order, Gonzaga, undertook the establishment of such houses, but it was Franz Dozieck, a former Capuchin, who first set them on a firm basis. He was the first custos of these houses, among which that of Rabastein was the most conspicuous. Italian Reformati had meanwhile been invited to Nevers, but had to retire owing to the antipathy of the population. In 1595 Bonaventura of Caltagirone, as general of the order, published special statutes for these French houses, but with the assistance of the Government, which favoured the reforming party, the houses obtained in 1601 the appointment of a special commissary Apostolic. The members were called the *Récollets*—since *Réformés* was the name given by the French to the Calvinists—and also the *Cordeliers*, the ancient name for both the Observants and Conventuals. As regards the interpretation of the rule, there were rather important differences between the Cordelier-Observants and the *Récollets*, the interpretation of the latter being much stricter. From 1606 the *Récollets* had their own provinces, amongst them being that of St-Denis (Dionysius), a very important province which undertook the missions in Canada and Mozambique. They were also the chaplains in the French army and won renown as preachers. The French kings, beginning with Henry IV, honoured and esteemed them, but kept them in too close dependence on the throne. Thus the notorious *Commission des Réguliers* (1771) allowed the *Récollets* to remain in France without amalgamating with the Conventuals. At this period the *Récollets* had 11 provinces with 2534 cloisters, but all were suppressed by the Revolution (1791).

(b) Recollection-houses are, strictly speaking, those monasteries to which friars desirous of devoting themselves to prayer and penance can withdraw to consecrate their lives to spiritual recollection. From the very inception of the order the so-called hermitages

for which St. Francis made special provision served for this object. These always existed in the order and were naturally the first cloisters of which reformers sought to obtain possession. This policy was followed by the Spanish Discalced, for example in the province of S. Antonio in Portugal (1639). They had vainly endeavoured (1581) to make themselves masters of the recollection-houses of the province of Tarragona, where their purpose was defeated by Angelo de Paz (1581), and of the province of Catalonia (1622). As Martial Bouchier had in 1502 prescribed the institution of these houses in every province of the Spanish Observants, they were found everywhere, and from them issued the Capuchins, the Reformati, and the Recollects. The specific nature of these convents was opposed to their inclusion in any province, since even the care of souls tended to defeat their main object of seclusion and sequestration from the world. The general chapter of 1676 ordained the foundation of three or four such convents in every province—a prescript which was repeated in 1758. The *ritiro* (*ritiro*, a house in which one lives in retirement), introduced into the Roman Province of the Observants towards the end of the seventeenth century, were also of this class, and even to-day such houses are to be found among Franciscan monasteries.

(c) The Recollects of the so-called German-Belgian nation have nothing in common with any of the above-mentioned reforms. The province of St. Joseph in Flanders was the only one constituted of several recollection-houses (1629). In 1517 the old Saxon province (Saxonia), embracing over 100 monasteries, was divided into the Saxon province of the Observants (Saxonia S. Crucis) and the Saxon province of the Conventuals (Saxonia S. Johannis Baptistæ). The province of Cologne (Colonia) and the Upper German or Strasburg (Argentina) province were also similarly divided between the Observants and the Conventuals. The proposed erection of a Thuringian province (Thuringia) had to be relinquished in consequence of the outbreak of the Reformation. The Saxon province was subsequently reduced to the single monastery of Halberstadt, which contained in 1628 but one priest. The province of Cologne then took over the Saxon province, whereupon both took on a rapid and vigorous growth, and the foundation of the Thuringian Province (Fulda) became possible in 1633. In 1762 the last-named province was divided into the Upper and the Lower Thuringian provinces. In 1621 the Cologne province had adopted the statutes of the recollection-houses for all its monasteries, although it was not until 1646 that the friars adopted the name *Recollecti*. This example was followed by the other provinces of this "nation", and in 1682 this evolution in Germany, Belgium, Holland, England, and Ireland, all of which belonged to this nation, was completed without any essential changes in the Franciscan rule of life. The Recollects preserved in general very strict discipline. The charge is often unjustly brought against them that they have produced no saints, but this is true only of canonized saints. That there have been numerous saints amongst the friars of this branch of the Franciscan Order is certain, although they have never been distinguished by canonization—a fact due partly to the sceptical and fervourless character of the population amongst which they lived and partly to the strict discipline of the order, which forbade and repressed all that singles out for attention the individual friar.

The German-Belgian nation had a special commissary general, and from 1703 a general procurator at Rome, who represented also the Discalced. They also frequently maintained a special agent at Rome. When Benedict XIII sanctioned their national statutes in 1729, he demanded the relinquishment of the name of Recollects and certain minor peculiarities in their habit, but in 1731 the Recollects obtained from

Clement XII the withdrawal of these injunctions. In consequence of the effects of the French Revolution on Germany and the Imperial Delegates' Enactment (1803), the province of Cologne was completely suppressed and the Thuringian (Fulda) reduced to two monasteries. The Bavarian and Saxon provinces afterwards developed rapidly, and their cloisters, in spite of the *Kulturkampf*, which drove most of the Prussian Franciscans to America, where rich harvests awaited their labours, bore such fruit that the Saxon province (whose cloisters are, however, mostly situated in Rheinland and Westphalia), although it has founded three new provinces in North America and Brazil, and the custody of Silesia was separated from it in 1902, is still numerically the strongest province of the order, with 615 members. In 1894 the custody of Fulda was elevated to the rank of a province. The Belgian province was re-erected in 1844, after the Dutch had been already some time in existence. The separate existence of the Recollects also ceased in 1897.

Great Britain and Ireland.—The Franciscans came to England for the first time in 1224 under Blessed Agnellus of Pisa, but numbers of Englishmen had already entered the order. By their strict and cheerful devotion to their rule, the first Franciscans became conspicuous figures in the religious life of the country, developed rapidly their order, and enjoyed the highest prestige at court, among the nobility, and among the people. Without relaxing in any way the rule of poverty, they devoted themselves most zealously to study, especially at Oxford, where the renowned Robert Grosseteste displayed towards them a fatherly interest, and where they attained the highest reputation as teachers of philosophy and theology. Their establishments in London and Oxford date from 1224. As early as 1230 the Franciscan houses of Ireland were united into a separate province. In 1272, the English province had 7 custodies, the Irish 5. In 1282, the former (*Provincia Angliæ*) had 58 convents, the latter (*Provincia Hiberniæ*) 57. In 1316 the 7 English custodies still contained 58 convents, while in Ireland the custodies were reduced to 4 and the convents to 30. In 1340, the number of custodies and houses in Ireland were 5 and 32 respectively; about 1385, 5 and 31. In 1340 and 1385, there were still 7 custodies in England; in 1340 the number of monasteries had fallen to 52, but rose to 60 by 1385. Under Elias of Cortona (1232–39) Scotland (*Scotia*) was separated from England and raised to the dignity of a province, but in 1239 it was again annexed to the English province. When again separated in 1329, Scotland received with its six cloisters only the title of *vicaria*. At the request of James I of Scotland, the first Observants from the province of Cologne came to the country about 1447, under the leadership of Cornelius von Zirksee, and founded seven houses. About 1482 the Observants settled in England and founded their first convent at Greenwich. It was the Observants who opposed most courageously the Reformation in England, where they suffered the loss of all their provinces. The Irish province still continued officially but its houses were situated on the Continent at Louvain, Rome, Prague, etc., where fearless missionaries and eminent scholars were trained and the province was re-established in spite of the inhuman oppression of the government of England. By the decision of the general chapter of 1625, the direction of the friars was carried on from Douai, where the English Franciscans had a convent, but in 1629 it was entrusted to the general of the order. The first chapter assembled at Brussels on 1 December, 1630. John Gennings was chosen first provincial, but the then bruited proposal to re-establish the Scottish convents could not be realized. The new province in England, which, like the Irish, belonged to the Recollects, gave many glorious and intrepid martyrs to the order and the

Church. In 1838, the English province contained only 9 friars, and on its dissolution in 1840, the Belgian Recollects began the foundation of new houses in England and one at Killarney in Ireland. On 15 August, 1887, the English houses were declared an independent custody, and on 12 February, 1891, a province of the order. At the present day (1909) the English province comprises in England and Scotland 11 convents, with 145 friars, their 11 parishes containing some 40,000 Catholics; the Irish province comprises 15 convents with 139 brothers.

III. STATISTICS OF THE ORDER (1260–1909).—The Order of St. Francis spread with a rapidity unexpected as it was unprecedented. At the general chapter of 1221, where for the last time all members without distinction could appear, 3000 friars were present. The order still continued its rapid development, and Elias of Cortona (1232–39) divided it into 72 provinces. On the removal of Elias the number was fixed at 32; by 1274 it had risen to 34, and it remained stable during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. To this period belongs the institution of the *vicariæ*, which, with the exception of that of Scotland, lay in the Balkans, Russia, and the Far East. It has been often stated that about 1300 the Franciscans numbered 200,000, but this is certainly an exaggeration. Although it is not possible to arrive at the exact figure, there can scarcely have been more than 60,000 to 90,000 friars at this period. In 1282 the cloisters were about 1583 in number. In 1316 the 34 provinces contained 197 custodies and 1408 convents; in 1340, 211 custodies and 1422 convents; in 1384, 254 custodies and 1639 convents. The Observants completely altered the conformation of the order. In 1455 they alone numbered over 20,000; in 1493, over 22,400 with more than 1200 convents. At the division of the order, in 1517, they formed the great majority of the friars, numbering 30,000 with some 1300 houses. In 1520 the Conventuals were reckoned at 20,000 to 25,000. The division brought about a complete alteration in the strength and the territories of the various provinces. In 1517 the Conventuals still retained the 34 provinces as before, but many of them were enfeebled and attenuated. The Observants, on the other hand, founded 26 new provinces in 1517, retaining in some cases the old names, in other cases dividing the old territory into several provinces.

The Reformation and the missionary activity of the Minorites in the Old, and especially in the New, World soon necessitated wide changes in the distribution, number, and extent, of the provinces. The confusion was soon increased by the inauguration of the three great reformed branches, the Discalced, the Reformati, and the Recollects, and, as these, while remaining under the one general, formed separate provinces, the number of provinces increased enormously. They were often situated in the same geographical or political districts, and were, except in the Northern lands, telescoped into one another in a most bewildering manner—a condition aggravated in the South (especially in Italy and Spain) by an insatiate desire to found as many provinces as possible. The French Revolution (1789–95), with its ensuing wars and other disturbances, made great changes in the conformation of the order by the suppression of a number of provinces, and further changes were due to the secularization and suppression of monasteries which went on during the nineteenth century. The union of 1897 still further reduced the number of provinces, by amalgamating all the convents of the same district into one province.

The whole order is now divided into twelve circumscriptions, each of which embraces several provinces, districts, or countries. (1) The first circumscription includes Rome, Umbria, the March of Ancona, and Bologna, and contains 4 provinces of the order, 112 convents, and 1443 friars. (2) The second embraces

Tuscany and Northern Italy and contains 8 provinces, 138 convents, and 2038 religious. (3) The third comprises Southern Italy and Naples (except Calabria), with 4 provinces, 93 convents, and 1063 religious. (4) The fourth includes Sicily, Calabria, and Malta, and has 7 provinces, 85 convents, and 1045 religious. (5) The fifth embraces the Tyrol, Carinthia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Albania, and the Holy Land, with 9 provinces, 282 convents, and 1792 religious. (6) The sixth comprises Vienna, Hungary, Transylvania, Croatia, Galicia, and Bohemia, with 7 provinces, 160 convents, and 1458 friars. (7) The seventh, which is numerically the strongest, includes Germany, Holland, and Belgium, with 7 provinces, 129 convents, and 2553 members. (8) The eighth comprises France, Corsica, Great Britain, and Canada, with 7 provinces, 63 convents, and 975 religious. (9) The ninth comprises Portugal and Northern Spain with 5 provinces, 39 convents, and 1124 religious. (10) The tenth embraces Southern Spain and the Philippines, with 4 provinces, 48 houses, and 910 religious. (11) The eleventh includes Central and South America, with 12 provinces, 97 convents, and 1298 members. (12) The twelfth comprises Mexico and the United States, with 7 provinces (including the Polish commissariate at Pulaski, Wisconsin), 187 convents, and 1195 religious. The total figures for the order are consequently (4 October, 1908), 81 provinces, 1413 convents and 16,894 Franciscans. In 1905 the Franciscans numbered 16,842 and their convents 1373. For the second last decade of the nineteenth century the lowest figures are recorded, the figures announced at the general chapter of 1889 being: Observants 6228, Reformati 5733, Recollects 1621, Discalced 858—that is a total of 14,440 Franciscans. That only the Recollects had increased since 1862 may be seen from the figures for that year: Observants 10,200, Reformati 9889, Recollects and Discalced together 1813—a total of 21,902 Minorites. The year 1768 gives the highest figures—about 77,000 in 167 provinces. In 1762, the Observants had 87 provinces, 2330 convents, and 39,900 members; the Reformati 19,000 members with 37 provinces and 800 convents; the Recollects 11,000 members, 490 convents, 22 provinces; the Discalced 7000 members, 430 convents, 20 provinces. Total, 76,900 Minorites, 4050 cloisters, 166 provinces. In 1700 the total was 63,400 Minorites, 3880 convents, and 154 provinces; about 1680, 60,000 Minorites, 3420 convents, and 151 provinces.

IV. THE VARIOUS NAMES OF THE FRIARS MINOR.—The official name, *Fratres Minores (Ordo Fratrum Minorum)* (O.F.M.), or Friars Minor, was variously translated into the popular speech of the Middle Ages. In England the Friars Minor were commonly known as “the Grey Friars” from the colour of their habit. This name corresponds to the *Gråbrødrene* of Denmark and Scandinavia. In Germany they were usually known as the *Baarfusser* (*Baarfuozzen*, *Barruzzen*, *Barvoten*, *Barfüzzen*, etc.), that is, “Barefooted” (wearing only sandals). In France they were usually called the *Cordeliers* from their rope-girdle (*corde*, *cordelle*) but were also known as the *Frères Menours* (from *Fratres Minores*). After the fifteenth century the term *Cordeliers* was applied to both the Conventuals and the Observants, but more seldom to the Récollets (Recollects). Their popular name in Italy was the *Frati Minori*, or simply the *Frati*. The Observants were long known in that country as the *Zoccolanti*, from their foot-wear.

V. THE HABIT.—The habit has been gradually changed in colour and certain other details. Its colour, which was at first grey or a medium brown, is now a dark brown. The dress, which consists of a loose-sleeved gown, is confined about the loins by a white cord, from which is hung, since the fifteenth century, the Seraphic rosary with its seven decades (see CROWN, FRANCISCAN). A long or short under-habit of the

same or a different colour and trousers are also worn. Shoes are forbidden by the rule, and may be worn only in case of necessity; for these sandals are substituted, and the feet are bare. Around the neck and over the shoulders hangs the cowl, quite separate from the habit, and under it is the shoulder-cape or mozetta, which is round in front and terminates in a point at the back. The Franciscans wear no head-dress, and have the great tonsure, so that only about three finger-breadths of hair remain, the rest of the scalp being shaved. In winter they wear about their necks between the cowl and the habit the round mantle which almost reaches the knees.

VI. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ORDER (see FRANCIS, RULE OF ST.).—During the lifetime of St. Francis of Assisi, everything was directed and influenced by his transcendent personality. The duration of offices was not defined, and consequently the constitution was at first juridically speaking, absolute. From 1239, that is after the experiences of the order under Elias of Cortona, the order gradually developed a monarchical constitution. The chapter of definitors for the whole order (thirteenth century), the chapter of custodies in each province, the *discretus* sent by the subordinate convents to the provincial chapter, etc. are institutions which have long ceased to exist. To the past also belongs the custody in the sense of a union of several convents within a province. To-day a custody signifies a few cloisters constituting a province which has not yet been canonically erected.

The present constitution is as follows: The whole order is directed by the minister general, elected by the provincial ministers at the general chapter, which meets every twelve years. At first his term of office was indefinite, that is, it was for life; in 1517 it was fixed at six years; in 1571, at eight; in 1587, again at six; and finally the twelve-year period of office was settled on by Pius IX in 1862. The general resides at the Collegio S. Antonio, Via Merulana, Rome. The order is divided into provinces (that is, associations of the convents in one country or district), which prescribe and define the sphere of activity of the various friars within their sphere of jurisdiction. Several provinces together form a circumscription, of which there are twelve in the order. Each circumscription sends one definitor general, taken in turn from each province, to Rome as one of the counsellors to the minister general. These definitors are elected for six years at the general chapter and at the *congregatio intermedia* (also called frequently, by an abuse of the term, a general chapter), summoned by the general six years after his election. The general chapter and the *congregatio intermedia* may be convened by the general in any place. The provinces of the order are governed by the provincials (*ministri provinciales*), who are elected every three years at the Provincial chapter and constitute the general chapter. Their term of office, like that of the general, was at first undefined; from 1517 to 1547 it was three years; from 1547 to 1571, six years; from 1571 to 1587, four years; since 1587, three years. While in office, the provincial holds every year (or every year and a half) the intermediate chapter (*capitulum intermedium*), at which the heads of all the convents of the province are chosen for a year or a year and a half. The local superiors of houses (*conventus*) which contain at least six religious, are called guardians (earlier wardens); otherwise they receive the title *praeses* or superior. The provincial has to visit his own province and watch over the observance of the rule; the general has to visit the whole order, either personally or by means of visitors specially appointed by him (*visitatores generales*). The individual convents consist of the Fathers (*Patres*), i.e. the regular priests, the clerics studying for the priesthood (*fratres clerici*) and the lay brothers engaged in the regular service of the house (*fratres laici*). Newly received candidates must first

make a year's novitiate in a convent specially intended for this end. Convents, which serve certain definite purposes are called colleges (*collegia*). These must not, however, be confounded with the Seraphic colleges, which are to be found in modern times in most of the provinces, and are devoted to the instruction of youthful candidates in the humanities, as a preparation for the novitiate, where the students first receive the habit of the order. No friar, convent, or even the order itself can possess any real property. (Cf. FRANCIS, RULE OF ST.)

The duties of the individual Fathers vary, according as they hold offices in the order, or are engaged as lecturers (professors) of the different sciences, as preachers, in giving missions, or in other occupations within or, with the permission of the superiors, without the order. The cardinal-protector, introduced in the order by St. Francis himself, exercises the office and rights of a protector at the Roman Curia, but has no power over the order itself.

VII. GENERAL SPHERE OF THE ORDER'S ACTIVITY.—As a religious order in the service of the Catholic Church, and under her care and protection, the Franciscans were, according to the express wish of their founder, not only to devote themselves to their own personal sanctification, but also to make their apostolate fruitful of salvation to the people in the world. That the former of these objects has been fulfilled is clearly indicated by the number of Friars Minor who have been canonized and beatified by the Church. To these must be added the army of friars who have in the stillness of retirement led a life of virtue, known in its fullness to God alone, a mere fraction of whose names fill such volumes at the "Martyrologium Franciscanum" of Father Arthur du Monstier (Paris, 1638 and 1653) and the "Menologium trium ordinum S. P. Francisci" of Fortunatus Hüber (Munich, 1688), containing the names of the thousands of martyrs who have laid down their lives for the Faith in Europe and elsewhere under the heathen and heretic.

Like all human institutions, the order at times fell below its first perfection. Such a multitude of men, with their human infirmities and ever-changing duties, could never perfectly translate into action the exalted ideals of St. Francis, as, the more supernatural and sublime the ideas, the ruder is their collision with reality and the more allowance must be made for the feebleness of man. That an aspiration after the fundamental glorious ideal of their founder has ever distinguished the order is patent from the reforms ever arising in its midst, and especially from the history of the Observance, inaugurated and established in the face of such seemingly overwhelming odds. The order was established to minister to all classes, and the Franciscans have in every age discharged the spiritual offices of confessor and preacher in the palaces of sovereigns and in the huts of the poor. Under popes, emperors, and kings they have served as ambassadors and mediators. One hundred have already been nominated to the Sacred College of Cardinals, and the number of Franciscans who have been appointed patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, is at least 3,000. The popes elected from the Observants are: Nicholas IV (1288-92); Alexander V (1409-10). Sixtus IV (1471-84) was a Conventual of the period before the division of the order. Sixtus V (1585-90) and Clement XIV (1769-74) were chosen from the Conventuals after the division. The popes have often employed the Minorites as legates and nuncios, e. g. to pave the way for and carry through the reunion of the Greeks, Tatars, Armenians, Maronites, and other schismatics of the East. Many Minorites have also been appointed grand penitentiaries, that is, directors of the papal penitentiaries, and have served and still serve in Rome as Apostolic penitentiaries and as confessors to the pope himself or in the principal basilicas of the city. Thus the Observants are in

charge of the Lateran Basilica in Rome. As inquisitors against heresy, the Franciscans were in the immediate service of the Apostolic See.

Observing a much stricter rule of poverty and renunciation of the world than all other orders, the Franciscans exercised during the Middle Ages a most salutary social influence over the enslaved and unprivileged classes of the population. The constant model of a practical poverty was at once consoling and elevating. The vast contributions of their monasteries towards the maintenance of the very poor cannot be indicated in rows of figures, nor can their similar contributions of to-day. They also exerted a wide social influence through their third order (see THIRD ORDER). They tended the lepers, especially in Germany; the constantly recurring pests and epidemics found them ever at their post, and thousands of their number sacrificed their lives in the service of the plague-stricken populace. They erected infirmaries and foundling-hospitals. The Observants performed most meritorious social work especially in Italy by the institution of *montes pietatis* (*monti de Pietà*), in the fifteenth century, conspicuous in this work being Bl. Bernardine of Feltre (q. v.) the renowned preacher. In England they fought with Simon de Montfort for the liberty of the people and the ideal of universal brotherhood, which St. Francis had inculcated in sermon and verse, and to their influence may be partly traced the birth of the idea of popular government in Italy and elsewhere in Europe.

VIII. THE PREACHING ACTIVITY OF THE ORDER.—St. Francis exercised great influence through his preaching, and his example has been zealously followed by his order throughout the centuries with conspicuous success, evident not only in popular applause but in the profound effects produced on the lives of the people. At first all the friars were allowed to deliver simple exhortations and, with the permission of St. Francis, dogmatic and penitential sermons. This privilege was restricted in 1221, and still further in 1223, after which year only specially trained and tested friars were allowed to preach. The Franciscans have always been eminently popular preachers, e. g. Berthold of Ratisbon (q. v.), a German, who died in 1272; St. Anthony of Padua (d. 1231); Gilbert of Tournai (d. about 1280); Eudes Rigault, Archbishop of Rouen (d. 1275); Leo Valvassori of Perego, afterwards Bishop of Milan (d. 1263); Bonaventure of Jesi (d. about 1270); Conrad of Saxony (or of Brunswick) (d. 1279); Louis, the so-called Greculus (c. 1300); Haymo of Faversham (d. 1244); Ralph of Rosa (c. 1250). The acme of Franciscan preaching was reached by the Observants in the fifteenth century, especially in Italy and Germany. Of the many illustrious preachers, it will be sufficient to mention St. Bernardine of Siena (d. 1444); St. John Capistran (d. 1456); St. James of the March (d. 1476); Bl. Albert Berdini of Sarteano (d. 1450); Anthony of Rimini (d. 1450); Michael of Carcano (Milan) (d. 1485); Bl. Pacificus of Ceredano (d. 1482); Bl. Bernardine of Feltre (d. 1494); Bernardine of Busti (d. 1500); Bl. Angelo Carletti di Chivasso (d. 1495); Andrew of Faenza (d. 1507). In Germany we find: John of Minden (d. 1413); Henry of Werl (d. 1463); John of Werden (d. 1437), author of the renowned collection of sermons "Dormi secure"; John Brugman (d. 1473); Dietrich Coelde of Münster (d. 1515); Johann Kannemann (d. about 1470), a preacher on the Passion; Johann Kannegieser, "the trumpet of Truth" (d. about 1500); Johann Gritsch (d. about 1410); Johann Mäder; Johann Pauli (d. about 1530), whose work "Schimpf und Ernst" was long a favourite among the German people; Heinrich Kastner; Stephan Fridolin (d. 1498). In Hungary: Pelbart of Temesvar (d. about 1490). In Poland: Bl. Simon of Lipnica (d. 1482); Bl. John of Dukla (d. 1484); Bl. Ladislaus of Gielnow (d. 1505). In France: Olivier Maillard (d. 1502); Michel Minot

(d. about 1522); Thomas surnamed Illyricus (d. 1529); Jean Tisserand (d. 1494); Etienne Brulefer (d. about 1507). The following illustrious Spanish theologians and preachers of the sixteenth century were Friars Minor: Alphonsus de Castro (d. 1558); Didacus de Estella (d. 1575); Luis de Carvajal (d. about 1560); John of Carthage (d. 1617); St. Peter of Alcántara (d. 1562). Renowned Italian Franciscans were: Francesco Panigarola (d. 1594); Bartholomew of Saluthio (d. about 1630); St. Leonard of Port Maurice (d. 1751); Bl. Leopold of Gaiches (d. 1815); Luigi Parmentieri of Casovia (d. 1885); Luigi Arrigoni (d. 1875), Archbishop of Lucca, etc. Other well-known French Franciscans were: Michel Vivien (seventeenth century), Zacharie Laselve etc.; and of the Germans mention may be made of Heinrich Sedulius (d. 1621), Fortunatus Hueber (d. 1706) and Franz Ampferle (d. 1646). Even to-day the Friars Minor have amongst their number many illustrious preachers, especially in Italy.

**IX. INFLUENCE OF THE ORDER ON THE LITURGY AND RELIGIOUS DEVOTIONS.**—St. Francis prescribed for his order the abridged Breviary then reserved for the Roman Curia. As this and the Missal were revised by the general, Haymo of Faversham, at the command of Gregory IX, and these liturgical books have by degrees, since the time of Nicholas III (1277–80), been universally prescribed or adopted, the order in this alone has exercised a great influence. The Breviary of General Quiñonez (1523–28) enjoyed a much shorter vogue. To the Franciscan Order the Church is also indebted for the feasts of the Visitation of the B. V. M. (2 July), the Espousals of the B. V. M. (22 now 23 January), the Holy Name of Jesus, and to some extent for the feast of St. Joseph (19 March) and that of the Blessed Trinity. The activity of the Franciscans in promoting devotion to the Immaculate Conception, since Scotus (d. 1308) defended this doctrine, is well known. St. Francis himself laboured earnestly to promote the adoration of Our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, and Cherubino of Spoleto founded a sodality to accompany the Blessed Sacrament to the houses of the sick. In 1897 Leo XIII declared Paschal Baylon (d. 1592) patron of Eucharistic Leagues. The Christmas crib was introduced and popularized by the order (see CRIB) to which—especially to St. Leonard of Port Maurice (d. 1751)—is also due the spreading of the devotion known as “the Stations of the Cross”. The ringing of the Angelus morning, noon, and evening, was also inaugurated by the Franciscans, especially by St. Bonaventure and Bl. Benedict of Arezzo (d. about 1250).

**X. FRANCISCAN MISSIONS.**—St. Francis devoted himself to missionary labours from 1219 to 1221, and devoted in his rule a special chapter (xii) to missions. In every part of the world, the Franciscans have laboured with the greatest devotion, self-sacrifice, enthusiasm and success, even though, as the result of persecutions and wars, the result of their toil has not always been permanent. The four friars sent to Morocco in 1219 under Berard of Carbio (q. v.) were martyred in 1220. Electus soon shared their fate, and in 1227 Daniel with six companions was put to death at Ceuta. The bishops of Morocco were mostly Franciscans or Dominicans. In 1420 the Observants founded a convent at Ceuta, and here St. John of Prado died at the stake in 1632. This mission was entrusted to the province of S. Diego in 1641, and to the province of Santiago (Galicia, Spain) in 1860, after it had been constituted a prefecture Apostolic in 1859. In Oran, Libya, Tunis, Algiers, as well as throughout Egypt, Franciscans have laboured since the thirteenth century, and signaled their exertions by a glorious array of martyrs in 1288, 1345, 1358, 1370, 1373, etc. This mission was under the jurisdiction of that in the Holy Land. In 1686 Upper Egypt was separated, and became in 1697 an inde-

pendent prefecture Apostolic. Lower Egypt continued its connexion with the Holy Land until 1839, when both (with Aden, which was again separated in 1889) were formed into a vicariate Apostolic, in which state they still remain. In Lower Egypt there are now sixteen monasteries, controlling parishes and schools. In Upper Egypt, from which the Copts were separated in 1892, are eight monasteries with parishes connected.

In 1630 the Congregation of Propaganda sent Fathers Mark of Scalvo and Edward of Bergamo to Tripoli, and in 1643 appointed Paschal Canto, a Frenchman, Prefect Apostolic of Barbary—an office which still exists. The activity of this mission, like the others in these countries, is not so much directed to the conversion of Mohammedans as to the support and help of the Catholic settlers. Abyssinia (Ethiopia, Habesh) was first visited by John of Montecorvino (c. 1280). Later, Bl. Thomas of Florence was sent thither by Albert of Sarteano, and Sixtus IV, after the other missions had failed, sent Girolamo Tornelli. Many missionaries were put to death, and in 1687 a special prefecture was instituted for the conversion of the Copts. This was reconstituted in 1815, and in 1895 a special hierarchy was erected for the same object. In 1700 Father Krump undertook the foundation of a new mission in Ethiopia, when in 1718 three missionaries were stoned to death.

The two Genoese ships which circumnavigated Africa in 1291 had two Minorites on board. Others accompanied Vasco da Gama. In 1446 the Franciscans visited Cape Verde where Roger, a Frenchman, zealously preached the Gospel. In 1459 they reached Guinea, of which Alphonsus of Bolano was named prefect Apostolic in 1472. They thence proceeded to the Congo, where they baptized a king. In 1500 they went to Mozambique under Alvarez of Coimbra. The French Recollects laboured here during the seventeenth century, but since 1898 the Portuguese Franciscans have had charge of the mission. At the beginning of the sixteenth century Friars Minor settled in Melinda and on the Island of Socotra near Aden. In 1245 John of Plano Carpinis (Piano di Carpine) was sent by Innocent IV to the Great Khan in Tatar, and penetrated thence into Mongolia. By order of Louis IX William of Rubruck (Rubruquis) proceeded thence through Armenia and Central Asia to Karakoram. The accounts of the travels of the last-mentioned two intrepid missionaries enjoy a well-earned historical and geographical renown. In 1279 Nicholas III sent five Franciscans to China, among them John of Montecorvino, who preached on the outward journey in Armenia, Persia, and Ethiopia and on his return journey in the same countries and in India. Having converted thousands and translated the New Testament and the Psalms into Chinese, he completed in 1299 a beautiful church in Peking. In 1307 Clement V appointed him Archbishop of Cambaluc and Primate of the Far East and gave him six suffragan bishops, only three of whom reached Peking (1308). (See CHINA, Vol. III, 669–70.) From 1320 to 1325 Odoric of Pordenone laboured in Persia, India, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Canton, Tibet, and China. In 1333 John XXII dispatched twenty-seven Franciscans to China, Giovanni Marignola of Florence following them in 1342. In 1370 William of Prato was sent as archbishop to Peking with twenty fellow-Minorites. The appearance of the Ming dynasty in 1368 brought about the ruin of all the missions. On 21 June, 1579, Franciscans from the Philippines penetrated to China once more, but the real founder of the new mission in China was Antonio de S. Maria (d. 1669), who was sent to China in 1633, and later laboured in Cochinchina and Korea. China was also visited in 1661 by Bonaventura Ibañez (d. 1691) with eight friars. Henceforward Franciscan missions to China were constant. In 1684 came the Italian fathers under the



renowned Bernardino della Chiesa (d. 1739), including Basilio Rollo da Gemona (d. 1704) and Carlo Orazio da Castorano. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the Italian Franciscans began missions in the interior of China—first in Shen-si, then in Shan-si, Shan-tung, etc.; numbers were martyred, particularly towards the close of the century. Despite the edict of persecution, Ludovico Besi began in 1839 a new mission to Shan-tung. The Franciscans continued to work persistently in most of the districts in China, where, in spite of persecution, they now hold nine of the thirty-eight vicariates. Every land, almost every province, of Europe and many divisions of America are represented in China by one or more missionaries. Of the 222 Franciscans at present (beginning of 1909) labouring there, 77 are Italians, 27 Dutch, 25 Germans, 25 Belgians, 16 French.

The first missionaries reached the Philippines in 1577 and founded the province of St. Gregory. Their leaders were Pedro de Alfaro (1576–79), Pablo a Jesu (1580–83), and St. Peter Baptist (1586–91), the first Franciscan martyr in Japan. From the Philippines they extended their field of labour to China, Siam, Formosa, Japan, Borneo. In the Philippines their activity was tireless; they founded convents, towns, and hospitals; instructed the natives in manual labour—the planting of coffee and cocoa, the breeding of silk-worms, weaving; and planned streets, bridges, canals, aqueducts, etc. Among the best-known Franciscan architects may be included Lorenzo S. Maria (d. 1585), Maximo Rico (d. 1780), and a Joseph Balaguer (d. 1850). Here as elsewhere they studied the languages and dialects of the natives, and even to the present day continue to compile much-sought-after and highly prized grammars, dictionaries, etc. The occupation of the Philippines by the United States brought many alterations, but the missions are still under the province of S. Gregorio in Spain.

On 26 May, 1592, St. Peter Baptist set out from Manila for Japan with some associates, erected in 1594 a church and convent in Meaco, but on 5 February, 1597, suffered martyrdom on the cross with twenty-five companions, of whom three were Jesuits. The missions of the Franciscans were thus interrupted for a time, but were repeatedly renewed from the Philippines, and as often the list of martyrs added to (e. g. in 1616, 1622, 1628, 1634, etc.). In 1907 some Franciscans again settled at Sappora on the Island of Yezo, thus forming a connecting link with the traditions of the past.

In 1680 Australia was visited by Italian Franciscans, who also preached in New Zealand, but in 1878 the missions were transferred to the Irish Franciscans. From 1859 to 1864, Patrick Bonaventure Geoghegan was Bishop of Adelaide, and was succeeded by another Franciscan, Luke Bonaventure Sheil (1864–72).

In Northern Europe, which in the thirteenth century was not yet completely converted to Christianity, the Franciscans established missions in Lithuania, where thirty-six were butchered in 1325. The first Bishop of Lithuania was Andreas Vazilo. During the fifteenth century John, surnamed "the Small", and Blessed Ladislaus of Glielnow laboured most successfully in this district. In Prussia (now the Provinces of West and East Prussia), Livonia, and Courland (where the Minorite Albert was Bishop of Marienwerder (1260–90) and founded the town of Reisenburg), as well as in Lapland, the inhabitants of which were still heathens, the Reformation put an end to the labours of the Friars Minor. Their numerous houses in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, which formed the province of Denmark (Dania, Dacia), and the provinces of England, Scotland, and to some extent those of Holland and Germany, were also overthrown. After the year 1530, the Franciscans could work in these lands only as missionaries, in which capacity they laboured there from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century and still continue to a certain extent.

A few words may here be devoted to those Friars Minor who stood forth as fearless defenders of the Faith in the Northern countries during the Reformation period. The Franciscans and Dominicans supplied the greatest number and the most illustrious champions of the Church, and comparatively few yielded to temptation or persecution and deserted their order and their Faith. As in the case of the scholars, artists, missionaries, and holy men of the order, only a few names can be mentioned here. Among the hundreds of names from Great Britain may be cited: John Forest of London, burned at the stake in 1538, Godfrey Jones (d. 1598), Thomas Bullaker (d. 1642), Henry Heath (d. 1643), Arthur Bell (d. 1643), Walter Colman (d. 1645), whose heroism culminated in every case in death. Similarly in Ireland we find Patrick O'Hely (d. 1578), Cornelius O'Devany (d. 1612), Boetius Egan (d. 1650), etc. Among the most distinguished Danish defenders of the Faith is Nikolaus Herborn (Ferber), mockingly called "Stagefyr" (d. 1535); in France, Christophe de Cheffontaines (d. 1595) and François Feuardent; in Germany Thomas Murner (d. 1537), Augustin von Alfeld (d. 1532), Johannes Ferus (Wild) (d. 1554), Konrad Kling (d. 1556), Ludolf Namann (d. 1574), Michael Hillebrand (d. about 1540), Kaspar Schatzgeyer (d. 1527), Johann Nas (d. 1590), etc. Between 1520 and 1650 more than 500 Minorites laid down their lives for the Church.

On the Black and Caspian Seas the Franciscans instituted missions about 1270. The following Franciscans laboured in Greater Armenia: James of Rusano in 1233; Andrew of Perugia in 1247; Thomas of Tolentino in 1290. King Haito (Ayto) II of Lesser Armenia, and Jean de Brienne, Emperor of Constantinople, both entered the Franciscan Order. Franciscans were in Persia about 1280, and again after 1460. About this time Louis of Bologna went through Asia and Russia to rouse popular sentiment against the Turks. The Franciscans were in Further India by 1500, and toiled among the natives, the St. Thomas Christians, and the Portuguese, who made over to them the mosque of Goa seized in 1510. The order had colleges and schools in India long before the arrival of the Jesuits, who first came under the Franciscan Archbishop of Goa, João Albuquerque (1537–53).

Since 1219 the Franciscans have maintained a mission in the Holy Land, where, after untold labours and turmoil and at the expense of hundreds of lives, they have, especially since the fourteenth century, recovered the holy places dear to Christians. Here they built houses for the reception of pilgrims, to whom they gave protection and shelter. Friars from every country compose the so-called custody of the Holy Land, whose work in the past, interrupted by unceasing persecutions and massacres, constitutes a bloody but glorious page in the history of the order. In the territory of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, reconstituted in 1847, the Franciscans have 24 convents and 15 parishes; in Syria (the Prefecture Apostolic of Aleppo), to which also belong Phœnicia and Armenia, they have 20 convents and 15 parishes, while in Lower Egypt they occupy 16 convents and 16 parishes. As all these (with numerous schools) are included in the custody of the Holy Land, the total for the mission is: 58 convents, 46 parishes, and 942 religious. The Catholics of Latin Rite in these districts number 74, 779; of Oriental Rites 893.

Under the greatest difficulties and frequently with small fruit, in consequence of the recurrent devastating wars and insurrections, the Franciscan missionaries have laboured in south-eastern Europe. Albania, Montenegro, Bosnia, and Bulgaria received many Minorites in the thirteenth century, about which period many of the order occupied the archiepiscopal See of Antivari, and in 1340, Peregrinus of Saxony was nominated first Bishop of Bosnia. In these dis-

tricts the Franciscans worked earnestly to reconcile the schismatics with Rome. Nicholas IV, himself a Franciscan, sent missionaries of the order to Servia in 1288, and another mission followed (1354) under Friar Bartholomew, Bishop of Trau (Tragori). In 1389, Bajazet I destroyed almost all these missions, while those which were re-established in 1402 fell into the hands of the Turks, who definitely took possession of Servia in 1502. In 1464 the courageous Franciscan Angelus Zojezdovitch, obtained from Mohammed II a charter of toleration for Catholics, and progress was also made by the Franciscan missions in Bulgaria, Wallachia, Moldavia, and Podolia. In Black Russia Nikolaus Melsat of Crosna with twenty-five friars began a mission about 1370, Moldavia being visited about the same time by Anthony of Spalato (and later by Fabian of Bacia and James of the March), but their work was interrupted in 1460 by the Turks, who in 1476 cast 40,000 Christians from these districts into prison. Boniface IX transferred the episcopal see to Bakau, Benedict XIV to Sniatyn. At the beginning of the seventeenth century Bishop Bernardino Quirino was murdered by the Turks, and, on the death of the last bishop (Bonaventura Berardi) in 1818, the mission in Moldavia and Rumania was entrusted to the Conventuals, who still retain it.

The Franciscans were settled in Constantinople as early as the thirteenth century. In 1642 this and the subordinate missions were united into a prefecture Apostolic, from which the Prefecture of Rhodes was separated in 1897. The former now occupies seven convents, while the latter has seven churches and houses. In 1599, the convents of the Albanian mission were erected into a province, which, on 9 October, 1832, was divided into five prefectures Apostolic (Epirus, Macedonia, Servia, Pulati, and Kastrati), which are almost entirely worked by Franciscans, and were on 31 January, 1898, placed by the general, Aloysius Lauer, under a commissary general, with the authority of a provincial. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was separated from the Bosnian province in 1847 and elevated to the rank of a province in 1892, the Franciscans were the first missionaries and pastors, and these countries are still almost entirely under the spiritual guidance of the order, practically all the bishops having been Franciscans. When it was proposed in 1886 to erect a see at Antivari in Montenegro, Simon Milinović of the Franciscan Order was designated Archbishop of Antivari and Primate of Servia. In Montenegro the Friars Minor administer ten of the eleven parishes.

According to the statistics of 4 October, 1907, the present condition of the Franciscan missions, which are distributed over the five continents, is as follows: Total number of Friars Minor, 4689, including 2535 priests, 620 clerics, 1396 lay brothers, and 138 novices. These are assisted in their work by 12,572 Franciscan sisters, chiefly members of the Third Order of St. Francis.

XI. CULTIVATION OF THE SCIENCES.—The order has always devoted itself diligently to the cultivation of sciences, and, although St. Francis is to be numbered rather amongst the divinely enlightened than among the academically trained, he was neither a declared enemy nor a despiser of learning. To qualify themselves for the tasks assigned in ever-increasing numbers to their rapidly spreading order—which was revered by rich and poor, was employed by popes and kings on missions of every description, and was to labour for the social betterment of every section of the community—the Franciscans were early compelled to take advantage of every possible source of scientific culture, and, within thirty or forty years after their founder's death, they shared with the Dominicans the most prominent place in the revival of learning. This place has been retained for centuries with distinction and brilliancy, especially in the

domain of theology and philosophy. A list of Franciscan scholars and their works would fill volumes, while many of their writings have exercised an abiding influence in the realms of science, on the religious life of the people, and on the whole human race. Mention may be made of only a few of the eminent dogmatic and moral theologians, philosophers, writers on ethics, historians, linguists, philologists, artists, poets, musicians, geographers, etc., whom the order has produced. Formerly Franciscans lectured in many universities, e. g. Paris, Oxford, Bologna, Cambridge, Cologne, Toulouse, Alcalá, Salamanca, Erfurt, Vienna, Heidelberg, Fulda. We may here mention: Alexander of Hales (d. 1245); John of Rupella (La Rochelle) (d. 1245); Adam of Marsh (Marisco) (d. 1258); John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1292); Cardinal Matthew of Aquasparta (d. 1302); Johannes Gualensis (John of Wales) (d. about 1300); Richard of Middleton (de Mediavilla) (d. about 1305); John Duns Scotus (d. 1308), the most subtle of all Scholastics; William of Occam (d. 1349); William Vorriol (Vorlongus) (d. 1464); Nicolas d'Orbellis (d. 1465); Monaldus (d. about 1290); John of Erfurt (d. about 1310); Nicholas of Lyra (d. about 1340), the most influential exegete of the Middle Ages; David of Augsburg, mystic (d. 1272) Artesanus of Asti (c. 1317), author of the famous "Summa Casuum", called the "Artesana"; Nicholas of Osimo (d. about 1450); Pacificus of Ceredano (d. 1482), author of the "Summa Pacifica"; Baptista Trovama de Salis (c. 1485), author of the "Baptistiniana", also called the "Rosella"; Angelo Carletti di Chivasso (d. 1495), author of the "Summa Angelica"; Dietrich (Theodore) Coelde (d. 1515), author of the "Christenspiegel"; Francesco Lichetti (d. 1520); François Feuardent (d. 1612), controversialist and exegete; Luke Wadding (d. 1658); Florence Conry (d. 1629); Anthony Hickey (Hyquæus) (d. 1641); Pierre Marchant (d. 1661); William Herinx (d. 1678); Friedrich Stummel (d. 1682); Patritius Sporer (d. 1683); Benjamin Eubel (d. 1756); Anacletus Reiffenstuel (d. 1703); De Gubernatis (d. about 1689); Alva y Astorga (d. 1667); Jean Ponce (d. 1660); Bonaventura Dernoys (d. 1653); Jean de la Haye (d. 1661); Lorenzo Cozza (d. 1729); Amanus Hermann (d. 1700); Claude Frassen (d. 1711); François Assermet (d. 1730); Jerome of Montefortino (d. about 1740); Luca Ferraris (d. about 1750); Giovanni Antonio Bianchi (d. 1758); Sigmund Neudecker (d. 1736); Benedetto Bonelli (d. 1773); Kilian Kazenberger (d. about 1729); Vigilius Greiderer (d. 1780); Polychronius Gassmann (d. about 1830); Herculanus Oberrauch (d. 1808); Ireneo Affò (d. 1797); Sanctantonio Cimarosto (d. 1847); Adalbert Waibel (d. 1852); Chiaro Vascotti (d. 1860); Gabriele Tonini (d. about 1870); Antonio Maria of Vicenza (d. 1884); Melchior Stanislaus of Cerreto (d. 1871); Petrus von Hötzel (d. 1902 as Bishop of Augsburg); Bernard van Loo (d. 1885); Fidelis a Fanna (d. 1881); Ignatius Jeller (d. 1704); Marcellino da Civezza (d. 1906).

The Franciscans did not, like other orders, confine themselves to any particular Scholastic school (system). They were more attached to the teachings of Duns Scotus, perhaps, than to the School of St. Bonaventure, but there was no official compulsion in the matter.

Among the many naturalists, artists, and poets of the order may be mentioned: Thomas of Celano (d. about 1255), author of the "Dies Iræ"; Giacomino of Verona (c. 1300), a precursor of Dante; St. Bonaventure (d. 1274); Jacopone of Todi (d. 1306), author of the "Stabat Mater"; John Brugman (d. 1473); Gregor Martić (d. 1905), the Croatian poet. Among the musicians: Julian of Speyer (d. about 1255); Bonaventura of Brescia (fifteenth century); Pietro Canuzzi; Luigi Grossi di Viadana (d. 1627); Domenico Catenacci (d. about 1791); David Moretti (d. 1842); Petrus Singer (d. 1882). Among the naturalists may be mentioned: Roger Bacon (d. 1294); the so-called

Schwarzer (Black) Berthold (c. 1300), the reputed discoverer of gunpowder; Luca Pacioli (d. about 1510); Elektus Zwinger (d. 1690); Charles Plumier (d. 1704).

For writers on the history of the order, the reader may be referred to the bibliography, since the vast majority of the books cited have been written by Franciscans. In recent times—to some extent since 1880, but mainly since 1894—the investigation of the history of the Friars Minor, especially during the first centuries succeeding the foundation of the order, has aroused a keen and widespread interest in the leading civilized lands and among scholars of every religious denomination and belief.

**XII. SAINTS AND BEATI OF THE ORDER.**—The number of Friars Minor who have been canonized or beatified, is—even if we exclude here as throughout this article, the members of the other orders of St. Francis (Conventuals, Poor Clares, Tertiaries, and Capuchins)—extraordinarily high. In this enumeration we further confine ourselves to those who are officially venerated throughout the Church, or at least throughout the whole order, with canonical sanction. These exceed one hundred in number, the names, dates of decease, and feasts of the best-known being as follows (1) *Saints*.—Francis of Assisi, d. 3 Oct., 1226 (4 Oct.); Berard of Carbio and four companions, martyred 1220 (16 Jan.); Peter Baptist and twenty-five companions, martyred at Nagasaki, Japan, 1597 (5 Feb.); John Joseph of the Cross, d. 1734 (5 March); Benedict of San Philadelphia, d. 1589 (3 April); Peter Regalada, d. 1456 (13 May); Paschal Baylon, d. 1592 (17 May); Bernardine of Siena, d. 1444 (20 May); Anthony of Padua, d. 1231 (13 June); Nicholas Pick, hanged by *les Gueux* at Gorcum (Holland) in 1572 with eighteen companions, of whom eleven were Franciscans (9 July); Bonaventure of Bagnorea, d. 1274 (15 July); Francis Solanus, the Apostle of South America, d. 1610 (24 July); Louis of Angou, Bishop of Toulouse, d. 1297 (19 Aug.); Pacificus of San Severino, d. 1721 (25 Sept.); Daniel, and seven companions, martyred at Ceuta 1227 (13 Oct.); Peter of Alcántara, d. 1562 (19 Oct.); John Capistran, d. 1456 (23 Oct.); Didacus (Diego), d. 1463 (12 Nov.); Leonard of Port Maurice, d. 1751 (26 Nov.); James of the March (Monteprandone), d. 1476 (28 Nov.).

*Beati*.—Matthew of Gergenti, d. 1455 (28 Jan.); Andreas de' Conti di Signa, d. 1302 (1 Feb.); Odoric of Pordenone, d. 1331 (3 Feb.); Anthony of Stroncone, d. 1461 (7 Feb.). Ægidius Maria of St. Joseph, d. 1812 (9 Feb.); Sebastian of Apparizio, d. 1600 (25 Feb.); John of Triora, martyred in China, 1816 (27 Feb.); Thomas of Cora, d. 1720 (28 Feb.); Peter of Treia, d. 1304 (14 March); Salvator of Orta, d. 1567 (18 March); John of Parma, d. 1289 (20 March); Benvenuto, Bishop of Osimo, d. 1282 (22 March); Rizzorius of Mucia, d. about 1240 (26 March); Peregrinus of Fallerone, d. about 1245 (27 March); Marco Fantuzzi of Bologna, d. 1479 (31 March); Thomas of Tolentino, martyred in Further India, 1321 (6 April); Benivoglio de Bonis, d. about 1235 (2 April); Julian of San Augustino, d. 1606 (8 April); Archangelo of Calatafimo, d. 1460 (9 April); Carlo of Sezze, d. 1670 (10 April); Angelo Carletti di Chivasso, d. 1495 (12 April); Andreas Hibernan, d. 1602 (18 April); Conrad of Ascoli, d. 1290 (19 April); Leopold of Gaiche, d. 1815 (20 April); Ægidius of Assisi, d. 1262 (23 April); James of Bitetto, called Illyricus, d. about 1490 (27 April); Agnellus of Pisa, d. 1236 (8 May); Francis of Fabriano, d. 1322 (14 May); Benvenuto of Recanati, d. 1289 (15 May); John Forest, martyred at London, 1538 (22 May); John of Prado, martyred in Morocco, 1631 (29 May); Ercolane de Plagario (Piagale), d. 1451 (29 May); James Stepar, d. 1411 (1 June); Andrew of Spello, d. 1254 (3 June); Pacificus of Ceredano, d. 1482 (5 June); Stephen of Narbonne and Raymond of Carbonna, murdered by the Albigensians, 1242 (7 June); Bartolomeo Pucci, d. 1330 (8 June); Guido of Cortona,

d. about 1250 (12 June); Benvenuto of Gubbio, d. about 1232 (27 June); Simon of Lipnica, d. 1482 (18 July); John of Dukla (like the preceding, a Pole), d. 1484 (19 July); John of Laverna, d. about 1325 (9 Aug.); Peter of Molleano (Mogliano), d. 1490 (13 Aug.); Sanctes of Montefabri (Urbino), d. 1385 (14 Aug.); John of Perugia and Peter of Sassoferrato, martyred at Valencia in Spain, 1231 (3 Sept.); Gentilis of Matelica, martyred in Persia 1430 (5 Sept.); Vincent of Aquila, d. 1504 (6 Sept.); Apollinaris with thirty-nine companions of the First and Third Orders, martyred in Japan, 1617–32 (12 Sept.); Bernardine of Feltre, d. 1494 (28 Sept.); John of Penna (Penne), d. 1271 (5 Oct.); Ladislaus of Gielniow, d. 1505 (22 Oct.); Francis of Calderola, d. 1407 (25 Oct.); Theophilus of Corte, d. 1740 (30 Oct.); Liberato de Loro (Lauro), d. about 1306 (30 Oct.); Thomas of Florence, d. 1447, Rainerius of Arezzo, d. 1304 (5 Nov.); Bernardine of Aquila (Fossa), d. 1503 (7 Nov.); Gabriele Ferretti, d. 1456 (14 Nov.); Humilis of Bisignano, d. 1637 (5 Dec.); Conrad of Offida, d. 1306 (19 Dec.); Nicholas Factor, d. 1583 (23 Dec.). To these might be added long lists of Blessed, who enjoy a cultus sanctioned by the Church, but whose cultus is only local, i.e. limited to their native or burial-places or to the dioceses with which they were connected. If these be included in the reckoning, the number of saints and *beati* in all the orders of St. Francis exceeds 300.

At the present time (1909), the *postulatura* of the order at Rome, whose office is to collect evidence concerning the candidates for beatification and canonization, is urging the cause of about ninety members of the First, Second, and Third Orders of St. Francis. This list includes some names belonging to later and even recent times, and it will thus be seen that the Order of Friars Minor never ceases to produce members whose holiness entitles them to the highest ecclesiastical honour—that of the altar. That the spirit of Jesus Christ, which St. Francis laboured so uninterruptedly to revive in the world and instilled into his institutions, still lives in his order to the glorification of the Divine Name, the great efficiency of the Friars Minor in our day is sufficient proof.

(1) GENERAL HISTORY OF THE ORDER (SOURCES, ETC.).

*Note*.—As elsewhere throughout this article, only relative completeness is here aimed at; all special monographs concerning a particular point, question, person, etc., are omitted, and none but general works, and of these only a selection, are cited. *Chronica Fr. Jordani de Yano in Analecta Franciscana* (An. Fr.), I (Quaracchi, 1885), 1–19, written in 1262, new complete ed. by BORNER (Paris, 1908) in *Collection d'Etudes* by SABATIER; *Dialogus de Vitis Sanctorum Fratrum Minorum* (c. 1245), ed. LEMMENS (Rome, 1902); T. ECCLESTON (c. 1264), *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. BREWER, *Monumenta Franciscana*, I (Cl. S., London, 1858); supplement in *Monum. Franc.*, II (London, 1882); complete ed. in *An. Fr.*, I, 217–57; abridgment in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Script.* (M. G. SS.), XVIII, 560–9; BERNARD OF BESSE, *Liber de Laudibus S. Francis* (c. 1280), ed. in *An. Fr.*, III (Quaracchi, 1897), 666–92; ed. FELDNER (Rome, 1897); *Catalogus Generalium Ministrorum O. F. M.* (begun in 1305), ed. in *An. Fr.*, III, 693–708; ed. HOLDER-EGGER in *M. G. SS.*, XXXII, 653–74; EHRLICH in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, VIII (Innsbruck, 1856), 322 sqq.; ADAM OF PARMA, ed. SALMBEKE, *Chronica*, written 1282–88 (Parma, 1857), ed. HOLDER-EGGER in *M. G. SS.*, XXXII (1905–09); ANGELO CLARENCO, *Chronica septem Tribulationum ordinis Minorum* (c. 1314–23), portion ed. by DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge zur Sektengesch.*, II (Munich, 1890); EHRLICH in *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengesch. des M. A.* (A. L. K. G.), I–III (Berlin, 1885–7); TOCCO (Rome, 1908); *Catalogus Sanctorum Fratrum Minorum* (c. 1335), ed. LEMMENS (Rome, 1903); *Provinciale ordinis S. Francis Antiquissimum* (c. 1343), ed. EUBEL (Quaracchi, 1892); *Chronica XXIV Generalium Ministrorum* (c. 1375), ed. in *An. Fr.*, III, 1 sqq.; BARTHOLOMEW OF PISA, *De Conformitate Vitae B. Francis ad Vitam Domini Jesu* (c. 1385), (Milan, 1510, 1513; Bologna, 1590, 1610), also in *An. Fr.*, IV and V (Quaracchi, 1906, 1910); BERNARDINE OF FOSSA, *Chronica Fratrum Minorum Observantia* (c. 1480), ed. LEMMENS (Rome, 1902); MARIANUS OF FLORENCE, *Compendium Chronicarum O. F. M.* (c. 1515), ed. in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* (A. F. H.), I–III (Quaracchi, 1908–10); *Speculum Vitae S. Francis et Sociorum eius* (Paris, s. d.; Venice, 1504; Metz, 1509; Antwerp, 1620; Cologne, 1623; Raab, 1732); *Monumenta Ordinis Minorum* (Salamanca, 1506, 1510, 1511; Barcelona, 1523); *Firmamentum Trum Ordinum S. Francis* (Paris, 1512; Venice, 1513); GLASSBERGER (c. 1508), *Chronica ordinis Min.* (Obs.) in *An. Fr.*, II (Quaracchi, 1887), 1 sqq.; JOHN OF KOMEROVO (d. 1536), *Tractatus Chronica O. F. M.*, ed. ZEISS-

BERG in *Archiv für Oesterreichische Gesch.*, XLIX (Vienna, 1872), 314-25; IDEM, *Memoriale O. F. M.* (an amplification of the last-mentioned work) in *Monumenta Polonica Historica*, V (Lemberg, 1888), 64 sq.; MARK OF LISBON, *Chronica de la orden des los Frayles Menores* (Lisbon, 1556, etc., 1613; Salamanca, 1626, etc.), It. tr. DIOLA (Brescia, 1581, etc.; Milan, 1609; Venice, 1585, etc.; Naples, 1680, etc.); FR. tr. (Paris, 1600, etc.); Ger. tr. (Constance, 1604); RIDOLFI (TOSSIGNANO), *Historiarum seraphicæ religionis libri tres* (Venice, 1586); GONZAGA, *Historia originis seraphicæ religionis, etc.* (Rome, 1587, 2nd ed., Venice, 1603).

The principal work on the history of the order is *Annales Minorum*, in 8 fol. vols. (Lyons and Rome, 1625-54), of WADDING (d. 1658). To this DE MELLISSANO wrote a supplement (Turin, 1710); HAROLD wrote an abstract, *Epitome Annalium Ord. Min.*, in 2 fol. vols. (Rome, 1662). A 2nd ed. of the *Annales*, with the supplement of DE MELLISSANO, was issued in 16 fol. vols. (Rome, 1731-36), vol. XVII (Rome, 1741) is an index only. Several continuations (Rome, Naples, Quaracchi, 1740-1886) bring the history up to 1622, in 25 vols. Other works are: DE GUBERNATIS, *Orbis seraphicus seu historia de tribus ordinibus, etc.*, 5 fol. vols. (Rome and Lyons, 1682-89), vol. VI (Quaracchi, 1887); DE ALVA ET ASTORGA, *Monumenta altissimi seraphici* (Louvain, 1664); IDEM, *Indiculus Bullarum Franciscanarum* (Rome, 1655); SANNIG, *Chronik der drei Orden S. Francisci* (3 vols., Prague, 1689, etc.); HUBER, *Dreyfache Chronik von dem dreyfachen Orden dess H. . . Francisci* (Munich, 1686); VAN DEN HAUTE, *Brevis Historia Ord. Minorum* (Rome, 1777); RANIER-MARCZIC (pseudonym of MARRACCONTI), *Apologia per l'ordine di Fratri Minor* (Luca, 1748-50), 3rd vol. by DA DECIMO, who also edited the *Scritti Seraphici* in 1757; KRESSLINGER, *Ortus et progressus Ord. Min. Monachii* (Munich, 1732); DA VICENZA, *Storia cronologica dei tre ordini di S. Francesco* (Venice, 1760-1); DA LATERRA, *Manuale de' Fratri Minorum* (Rome, 1776); BENOFFI, *Compendio di storia Minoritica* (Pesaro, 1829); PAPINI, *Storia di S. Francesco*, 2 vols. (Foligno, 1825); PANTILLO DA MAGLIANO, *Storia compendiosa di S. Francesco e de' Franciscanti*, extending only to 1414 (2 vols., Rome, 1874-76), vol. I, Ger. tr. (Munich, 1883); JEILER, in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Franciscanorden*; PATREM, *Tableau synoptique de l'histoire de l'ordre de St. François de 1208 à 1878* (Paris, 1878), continued to 1909 (Paris, 1909); tr. into Latin under title *Manuale Historia O. F. M.*, . . . *latine reditum a F. Gallo Haselbeck* (Freiburg, 1909); PALOMES, *Storia di S. Francesco*, 7th ed. (2 vols., Palermo, 1879); IDEM, *Dei Fratri Minor et delle loro denominazioni* (Palermo, 1897).

The collection *Analeto Franciscana seu Chronica alique varia documenta ad Historiam Fratrum Minorum Spectantia* (vol. I, Quaracchi, 1885; II, 1887; III, 1897; IV, 1906; V, 1910) contains the important chronicles, etc., of the order. A special journal, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* (A. F. H.), (vol. I, 1908; II, 1909, etc.), was started in 1908 for the investigation of the history of the order. The same purpose is served—though much less comprehensively—by the *Miscellanea Franciscana* published by FALOCI-PULIGNANI (10 vols., Foligno, 1886-1908); *Etudes Franciscaines* (20 vols., Paris, 1899-1908), especially from vol. XII, see also C. EUBEL, *Die avignonesische Obediens der Mendikantenorden* (Paderborn, 1900); *Das Archiv für Lit. und Kirchengesch.* (A. L. K. G.), cf. supra; WIESHOFF, *Die Stellung der Bettelorden in den deutschen freien Reichsstädten in M. A.* (Leipzig, 1905); HOLZAPFEL, *Die Anfänge der Montes Pietatis*, 1462-1515 (Munich, 1903), tr. Rocca (San Casciano, 1905); FOCO, *Studi Franciscani* (2 vols., Naples, 1909); HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Congregationen der kath. Kirche*, II (2nd ed., Paderborn, 1907), 307-387, 424-475, where an excellent bibliography is given. The best, and the only complete, manual of the order's history is the *Handbuch der Gesch. des Franciscanerordens* (Freiburg and St. Louis).

(2) BULLS, GENERAL CONSTITUTIONS OF THE ORDER.—*Monumenta ord. Min. Firmament*, ed. WADDING in *Annales O. M.*, each volume of which contains a rich appendix of documents; SBARALEA (SBARAGLIA), *Bullarium Franciscanum* (1219-1302), (4 vols., Rome, 1759-68), continued by EUBEL, *Bull. Franc.* (1303-1431), V-VII (Rome, 1898, 1902, 1904); EUBEL, *Bullarii Franciscani Epitome . . . addito Supplemento* (Quaracchi, 1908), a digest of all the bulls of SBARALEA (Bull. Fr., I-IV), with supplement; DA LATERRA, *Supplementum ad Bullarium Franciscanum* (Rome, 1780), intended to remove the "conventional" interpretation of SBARALEA. The different constitutions of the order since 1506 have usually been issued separately; the latest is *Regula et Constitutiones generales Fratrum Min.* (Rome, 1897). Concerning the earliest constitutions see EHRLER in A. L. K. G., VI, 1-138; A. F. H., II (1909), 269 sq.; LITTLE, *Decrees of the General Chapters of the Friars Minor* (1260-82) in *English Historical Review*, XIII (London, 1898), 703 sqq. The largest collection is to be found in *Chronologia historico-legalis Ordinis Fratrum Min.* (4 vols., Naples, Venice, and Rome, 1650-1795). The official decrees of the pope, the Roman Congregations and General Curia since 1880 are collected in the *Acta Ordinis Minorum* (28 vols., Quaracchi, 1882-1909).

(3) HISTORY OF THE PROVINCES OF THE ORDER.—(i) Italy:—ANT. A. TERINCA, *Theatrum Etrusco-Minoriticum* (Florence, 1682); ANT. AB ORVETO, *Chronologia della provincia seraphica rif. dell' Umbria* (Perugia, 1717); ANT. DA NOLA, *Cronica della rif. prov. di Napoli* (Naples, 1718); PETERUS TONOLETTO, *Paradiso seraphico di Sicilia* (Palermo, 1667); FLAM. BOTTARDI, *Memorie Storiche dell' Osservanza Prov. di Bologna* (Bologna, 1760, etc.); AL. A. PEDELLAMA, *Parva Chronica Prov. Seraphicæ Ref.* (Assisi, 1886); SPILA DA SUBIACO, *Memorie Storiche della Prov. Romana Ref.* (3 vols., Rome, 1890-96); MARCUS CERVONE DA LANCIANO, *Compendio di Storia de' Fratri Minor nei tre Abruzzi* (Lanciano, 1893); PICCONATO CANTALOPO, *Cenni biografici sugli uomini illustri della prov. ossero di Bologna*, I (Cima, 1894); IDEM, *Atti capi-*

*tolari della minoritica Provincia di Bologna* (1458-1905), 2 vols. (Parma, 1901-05); IDEM, *Serie cronologica-biografica dei Ministri . . . e della prov. di Bologna* (Parma, 1908). (ii) France:—*Chronica 24 Generalium Ord. Min. in A. F.*, III, 1 sqq.; *Firmamentum* (cf. supra) (1512); FODÉRE, *Narration historique et topographique des couvents de St. François . . . de Bourgogne* (Lyons, 1619); RAPINE, *Histoire générale de l'ordre et progrès des Freres Mineurs . . . appelés . . . Récollets* (Paris, 1631); LE FEBVRE, *Histoire chronologique de la province des Récollets de Paris* (Paris, 1677); ED. D'ALENÇON, *Essai de Martyrologe de l'Ordre des Freres Mineurs pendant la révolution française 1792-1800* (Paris, 1892); CHÉRANCE, *Nos Martyrs* (Paris, 1908); DE KERYAL, *St. François d'Assise et l'ordre seraphique* (Vannes, 1898); VILLERFET, *Les Freres Mineurs de France en face du Protestantisme* (Vannes, 1902); DAUX, *L'ordre franciscain dans le Montalbanais* (Montauban, 1903); DE BARENTON, *Les Franciscains en France*—only 64 pp., 6th ed. (Paris, 1903); OTTON DE PAVIE, *L'Aquitaine Seraphique* (4 vols., Vannes, Tournai, 1900-07). (iii) Spain:—ANT. HEBBERA, *Chronica de la Provincia de Aragón* (Zaragoza, 1703-5); AL. DE TORRES, *Chronica de la Provincia de Granada* (Madrid, 1683); FRANC. DE JESUS MARIA, *Chronica de la Provincia de S. Diego en Andalucía*, I (Seville, 1724); JOS. DE JESUS MARIA, *Chronica de Santa Provincia de la Immaculada Concepción de Portugal* (Lisbon, 1760, etc.). (iv) Germany and North Europe:—JORDANS A YANO; GLASSBERGER (cf. supra), *Chronica anonyma in A. F.*, I, 279-300; HUBER, *Dreyfache Chronik* (cf. supra); PLACIDIUS HERZOG, *Cosmographia Franciscano-Austriaca Provincie S. Bernardini* (1732), ed. in A. F., I, 41-213; IDEM, *Cosmog. Provincie S. Joan. a Capistrano* (Cologne, 1740); FRIDRICH, *Historia . . . Prov. Hungariae ord. min. SS. Salvatoris* (Kosovo, 1759); BIERNACKI, *Speculum Minorum seu . . . prot. Sarmaticæ et Vicarie Russiæ* (Cracow, 1688); GREIDERER, *Germania Franciscana* (2 vols., Innsbruck, 1777-81); KNUDSEN, *En gammel Krønike om Graabroedrens Udgjælse af deres Klostre i Danemærk* (Copenhagen, 1851), Ger. tr. (Münster, 1863); FR. tr. (Brussels, 1861); It. tr. (Florence, 1862); WOKER, *Gesch. der norddeutschen Franziskanermissionen der sächsischen Provinz von hl. Kreuz* (Freiburg, 1880); GUGGENBUCHLER, *Beiträge zur Kirchengesch. des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts. Bedeutung und Verdienste des Franziskanerordens im Kampfe gegen den Protestantismus* (Bozen, 1880), only vol. 1 issued (2nd ed., Bozen, 1881); C. EUBEL, *Gesch. der oberdeutschen (Strassburger) Minoritenprovinz* (Würzburg, 1880); LEMMENS, *Niedersächsische Franziskanerkloster im Mittelalter* (Hildesheim, 1896); FRIESS, *Gesch. der Oesterreichischen Minoritenprovinz in Archiv für österreichische Gesch.*, LXIV (Vienna, 1882), 79 sqq.; MINGES, *Gesch. der Franziskaner in Bayern* (Munich, 1896); SCHLAGER, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der kühischen Franziskaner-Ordensprovinz in M. A.* (Cologne, 1904); C. EUBEL, *Gesch. der kölnischen Minoriten-Ordensprovinz* (Cologne, 1896); BÜHL, *Gesch. des Franziskanerklosters Frauenberg zu Fulda* (Fulda, 1907); REISCH, *Gesch. des Klosters S. Dorothea in Breslau* (Breslau, 1908); RANT, *Die Franziskaner der österreichischen Provinz ihr Wirken in Niederösterreich, Steiermark und Krain* (1219-1586) (Stein in Carolina, 1908); GOLICHOVSKI, *Materyaly do Historji O. O. Bernardynów we Polsce* (Cracow, 1899); VAN BERO, *L'Ordre des Freres Mineurs en Belgique, 1253-1908* (Mechlin, 1908). (v) Great Britain and Ireland:—ECCLESTON (cf. supra), English version by CUTBERT, *The Friars and how they came to England* (London, 1903); LITTLE, *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (Oxford, 1892); *Historical Sketch of the Order in England*, appendix to LEON, *Lives of the Saints* (cf. infra), IV (Taunton, 1887); PARKINSON, *Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica, or a Collection of the Antiquities of the English Franciscans*, I (London, 1726); ANGELUS A. S. FRANCISCO (MASON), *Certaines seraphicum provincie Anglia* (Douai, 1649; 2nd ed., Quaracchi, 1885); BOUTCHIER, *Historia de Martyrio Fratri Minorum in Anglia* (Ingolstadt, 1583); BREWER AND HOWLETT, *Monumenta Franciscana*, 2 vols., R. S. (London, 1858, 1882); THADDEUS (HERMANS), *The Franciscans in England, 1600-1850* (London, 1898); MEEHAN, *The Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries* (Dublin, 1877); EDWARDS, *The Grey Friars and their first houses in Scotland* (Aberdeen, 1907).

(4) HISTORY OF THE MISSIONS.—WADDING, *Annales*; DE GUBERNATIS, *Orbis Seraphicus* (cf. supra); DA CIVEZZA, *Storia Universale delle Missioni Franciscane* (11 vols., Rome, Prato, Florence, 1857-95); IDEM, *Saggio di bibliografia* (cf. supra), containing an extensive bibliography; VICTOR-BERN. DE ROUEN, *Histoire universelle des Missions Franciscaines* (4 vols., Paris, 1898), a French translation of portion of the monumental work of DA CIVEZZA; JUAN FRANC. DE S. ANTONIO, *Cronica de la apostólica prov. de S. Gregorio en las islas Filipinas* (3 vols., Manila, 1738-41); AMERICAN Catholic Quarterly Review, XXX (1905), 672 sqq.; GRÖTCKEN in *Historisch-polit. Blätter*, CXLII (Munich, 1908), 587 sqq.; IDEM in *Pastor Bonus* (Trier, 1908), XX, 456 sqq. (China); IDEM, loc. cit., XX, 81 sqq. (Morocco); CASTELLANOS, *Apostolado seraphico en Marruecos* (Madrid and Santiago, 1896); DA CIVEZZA AND DOMENICHELLI, *La Palestina ed i rimanti Missioni Franciscane* (Florence, 1890); GOLUBOVICH, *Bibliotheca bio-biografica della Terra Santa e dell' Oriente franciscano*, I (Quaracchi, 1906); *Archivum Franc. Historicum* (Quaracchi, 1908), I sqq.; FERNANDEZ, *Conspectus Omnium Missionum ordinis Fratrum Minorum an. 1904-1905* (Quaracchi, 1905).

(5) PARTICULAR BIBLIOGRAPHY.—MARIANUS OF FLORENCE, RIDOLFI TORS. (cf. supra); WILLOT, *Athenae Orthodoxorum Sodalitatis Franciscanæ* (Liège, 1598); WADDING, *Scriptores Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1650; 2nd ed., Rome, 1806; 3rd ed., Rome, 1906); JOHANNES A. S. ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Franciscana* (3 vols., Madrid, 1732-33); SBARALEA, *Supplementum et Castigatio ad Scriptores Ord. S. Francisci* (2 vols., Rome, 1806; 2nd ed., 1908-



9); FARKAS, *Scriptores ord. Min. Prov. Hungariæ Reformate*, nunc *S. Mariæ* (Presburg, 1879); DA GIVEZZA, *Saggio di Bibliografia geografica, storica, etnografica Sanfrancescana* (Prato, 1879); ANT. MAR A VICTORIA, *Scriptores Provinciarum Ref. S. Antonii in An. Fr.*, I, 331 sqq.; AL. DE PEDELAMA, *Scriptores Prov. Ref. Seraphicæ*, loc. cit., I, 408 sqq.; LITTLE, *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (1892); DIRKS, *Histoire littéraire . . . des Frères Mineurs de l'Observance en Belgique et dans les Pays Bas* (Antwerp, 1885); MORIZZO, *Scrutini Franciscani Reformati del Trentino* (Trent, 1890); FELDER, *Gesch. der wissenschaftlichen Studien im Franziskanerorden bis um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg, 1904), Fr. tr. (Paris, 1908); *Archiv. Franc. Hist.*, I sqq.

(6) HAGIOGRAPHY.—Cf. DIALOGUS, CATALOGUS, BARTHOLOMEW OF PISA, MARIANUS OF FLORENCE, WADDING, etc. (cf. supra), ARTHURUS DE MONASTERIO (MONSTIER), *Martyrologium Franciscanum* (Paris, 1638 and 1653; abridgment, Venice, 1879); HUBER, *Menologium . . . ordinum . . . S. Francisci* (Munich, 1698); SIGISMUND DA VENEZIA, *Biografia serafica* (Venice, 1846); *Le palmier sérapique* (12 vols., Bar-le-Duc, 1872—); LÉON DE CLARY, *L'Aurèle sérapique* (4 vols., Paris, 1882); tr., *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the three orders of St. Francis* (4 vols., Taunton, 1885—87); It. tr., *L'Aureola serafica* (4 vols., Quaracchi, 1898—1900); SCHOUTENS, *Martyrologium Minoritico-Belgicum* (Hoogstraeten, 1902); ORTOLANI, *De causis Beatorum et Servorum Dei Ord. Minorum* (Quaracchi, 1905).

MICHAEL BIHL.

FRIARS MINOR IN AMERICA.—The very discovery of America is due, under God, to the children of St. Francis, inasmuch as Christopher Columbus, the discoverer, and Queen Isabella, who furnished the means, were members of the Third Order, and Father Juan Perez, the counsellor of both, was the superior of the Franciscan monastery of La Rábida in Andalusia. Father Juan Perez, with other Franciscan friars, moreover, accompanied his illustrious friend on the second voyage in 1493. A few miles west of Cap Haitien, most probably on 8 December, he celebrated the first Mass in the New World in a chapel constructed of boughs. At the town of Isabella he erected the first convent. In 1496 the place was abandoned, and a monastery of stone was ordered built by Columbus at Nueva Isabella, afterwards replaced by Santo Domingo. It was finished in 1502. A second Franciscan convent arose in the interior at La Vega about the same time. In connexion with both houses the first schools in America were opened, where Indian boys were taught reading, writing, and singing. While the secular clergy attended to the spiritual needs of the Spaniards, the Franciscans and a few Hieronymites devoted themselves to the conversion of the natives. Cardinal Ximenes, himself a Franciscan, sent thirteen of his brethren to Hispaniola in 1502. They took with them the first bells and the first organ. Before the lapse of ten years after the discovery, nineteen Friars Minor had landed on the Isle of Hispaniola. About the year 1500 the Franciscans passed over to the island of Cuba, and founded the first monastery in honour of St. James (Santiago) for the conversion of the Indians. At the general chapter of the order held at Tours, France, in 1505, the convents of Hispaniola and Cuba were united in a province under the title of Santa Cruz. It was the first organization of its kind in the Western Hemisphere. At the request of the king, Pope Julius II, on 15 November, 1504, appointed the Franciscan Friar García de Padilla first Bishop of Santo Domingo, the first diocese in the New World. The bishop-elect was consecrated in May, 1512, but died on 12 November, 1515, before reaching his see. In 1511 the king sent twenty-three Friars Minor to the island of San Juan or Porto Rico. Before the end of the same year the Indian missions of the Greater Antilles and most of the Lesser Antilles were in charge of the Franciscans. Their first martyrs fell victims of apostolic zeal among the cannibal Caribs in 1516, when Fathers Fernando Salcedo and Diego Botello, with an unknown lay brother, were captured, killed, and devoured by the savages.

The Franciscans were also the first religious on the mainland or continent of America, as they landed on the Isthmus about the year 1512. When King Ferdinand heard of it, he named the Franciscan Father Juan de Quevedo Bishop of Santa María de la Antigua

(Darien) and sent him with a band of his brethren to the newly erected diocese. Pope Leo X, on 28 August, 1513, approved the nomination. Quevedo reached the scene of his future activity on 12 April, 1514. Fathers Juan de Aora and Juan de Tecto entered Honduras with Cortés about the year 1525, and the first convent was erected there in 1526 or 1527. Father Toribio de Benavente (Motolinia) reached Guatemala about 1533. Thereafter missions and convents arose at various places, until in 1550 they were organized into a custody under the title of Nombre de Jesús. In 1565 the custody, comprising 7 monasteries and 30 friars, was made a province. During the years 1571—1573, 66 friars arrived there from Spain, and in 1600 the province reported 22 convents. Father Motolinia is said to have visited Nicaragua before 1530. The first bishop of the country was the Franciscan Pedro de Zúñiga. The twelve convents of Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Talamanca were organized into the province of San Jorge (St. George) in 1576. Yucatan received the first Friars Minor in 1534. The custody of San José was established in 1550, and it became a province in 1565. In 1600 the report showed the existence of 6 regular monasteries and 16 minor houses. The first Bishop of Yucatan, Juan de la Puerta, was a member of the Franciscan Order.

In 1516 the King of Spain sent fourteen Friars Minor to the northern coast of South America, later called New Granada and now known as Colombia. In 1550 the convents of this district were united in a custody, and in 1565, when there were twelve monasteries, the general chapter raised the custody to the rank of a province under the title of Santa Fé de Bogotá. Even at this early date there were two convents of Poor Clares in that region; they were subject to the jurisdiction of the Franciscan provincial. In 1587 this province reported 25 convents and 44 Indian missions. In 1519 some Franciscan friars reached the coast of Paria or Venezuela, founded missions, and opened schools for Indian boys whom they taught reading, writing, and singing. The famous Father Marcos de Niza, who with Francisco Pizarro penetrated to Ecuador and Peru in 1532, founded the first convent at Cuzco. It was in this country that St. Francis Solanus laboured among the Indians and Spaniards from about 1589 to 1610 when he died. Eleven of the religious houses of Peru were organized into the province of San Francisco de Quito in 1565. A convent of Conceptionist Sisters, a branch of Poor Clares, existed within the jurisdiction of this province. Another province, that of the Twelve Apostles of Lima, was formed of eleven other monasteries and seven minor convents among the Indians in 1565. It had been a custody since 1553. Both provinces are still in existence. The first Franciscan community in Chile was founded at Santiago in 1535. The first Bishop of Santiago, Martín Robleda, of the Friars Minor, was the founder. A custody was organized in 1553, and in 1565 the twelve convents of the country were united into the province of Santísima Trinidad. A convent of tertiaries existed at the same time. The territory along the Río de la Plata (Argentina and Paraguay) became the scene of Franciscan activity as early as 1538. The Franciscan Juan Barrott was appointed first Bishop of Río de la Plata in 1554. In 1592 a custody was organized, and in 1612 it was raised to the rank of a province under the invocation of Nuestra Señora de la Asunción. Brazil is said to have been visited by Portuguese Franciscans as early as 1499 or 1501. Certain it is that three Friars Minor reached that country in April, 1584, and a custody was organized in the same year. In 1657 it became a province under the protection of San Antonio. In 1678 the province of the Immaculate Conception was established in the same territory. At present the order there is in a most flourishing condition. Bolivia was entered by the Friars Minor in 1606. A monastery was founded at Tarija in



honour of St. Francis. A missionary college for the training of missionaries for the Indians was erected in the same city in 1755. Distant Patagonia saw the first Friars Minor in 1578. There are no reports extant.

The Franciscans first landed in the Philippines on 24 June, 1577. Nine years later they had erected six monasteries and reported fourteen missions among the natives. These houses were united in the province of San Gregorio in 1586.

Father Pedro Melgarejo appears to have been the first Franciscan to enter Mexico. He arrived during the siege of the capital in 1521, but returned to Spain in the next year to defend Cortés. The first missionary work among the Indians was done by the three Flemish Franciscans, Fathers Juan de Tecto and Juan de Aora and Brother Pedro de Gante, who arrived in 1523. Father Martín de Valencia, with eleven friars, came from Spain to the Mexican capital on 13 May, 1524. These are known as the Twelve Apostles of Mexico. The impression they made all over New Spain was so deep that the natives were accustomed to date occurrences from the arrival of these twelve friars, under the caption "the year when the Faith came". Two months after landing, Father Martín, as Apostolic delegate, convoked the first ecclesiastical council in the New World. Five secular priests, seventeen Franciscans, six secular doctors of canon law, and Hernando Cortés himself took part in the deliberations which opened on 2 July, 1524. On the same occasion the Franciscans were organized in the custody of the Holy Gospel, the first on the mainland, and the whole country divided into four missionary districts, which were Mexico, Texcoco, Huexocingo, and Tlascala. To each of these Father Martín assigned four friars. The secular priests as usual confined themselves to the spiritual wants of the Spaniards. In connexion with the principal convents the Fathers conducted the first schools in Mexico for Indian boys. A part of the buildings was generally set apart for the boys who made their home with the friars. Oftentimes as many as 600 and 800 children received instruction, food, and clothing from these religious. The instruction, besides Christian doctrine, comprised reading, writing, singing, instrumental music, and mechanical arts. These institutions were the first free boarding and manual labour schools on the American Continent. One of the Franciscan pupils, Father Alonzo de Molina, O.F.M., whose mother was a Spaniard, in 1555 published the "Vocabulario Castellano-Mexicano". This work, containing 518 folio pages, is still regarded as a standard. Father de Gante himself translated hymns into the language of the Aztecs. The spiritual fruit was so abundant that Solórzano y Pereira, according to Father Harold, claims that every one of the original twelve friars baptized no fewer than 100,000 Indians. Down to the year 1531, according to a report sent to the general chapter at Toulouse, one million natives had been baptized. The first high school for Indian youths was erected by the Franciscans at the Indian town of Tlatelulco, now a part of the capital. In the course of time the number of friars grew so rapidly all over Mexico that about the close of the sixteenth century the following fully organized provinces existed: Santo Evangelio de México, established in 1534; San José de Yucatan, organized in 1559; San Pedro y San Pablo de Michoacan, formed in 1565; San Francisco de Zacatecas, organized in 1603; San Diego de México (Alcantarines), established in 1606; and Santiago de Xalisco, organized in 1608. Fifty years later these provinces together reported two hundred monasteries and convents.

The peculiar character of the natives demanded missionaries specially trained. For this reason Apostolic colleges or seminaries were founded independent of the jurisdiction of the provinces but with the sanction of the Holy See. The first missionary college

established and governed under rules approved by the pope was opened in the grand monastery of Santa Cruz at Querétaro, which for that purpose was set apart by the province of Michoacan in 1682. Another was founded at Guadalupe, Zacatecas, in 1707, by the Venerable Antonio Margil, the Apostle of Texas and Guatemala, and a third at the monastery of San Fernando in the City of Mexico in 1734. These three colleges furnished the heroic men who Christianized the Indians of Texas, Arizona, Sonora, and California. Other missionary colleges were those of Orizaba, Zapopan near Guadalajara, Pachuca in the State of Mexico, and Cholula in the State of Puebla. At the present time, owing to the anti-Christian laws prevailing in Mexico, which forbid religious to live in community, the Franciscan provinces and colleges have dwindled so that the number of friars scarcely exceeds the number of convents in the days of religious freedom. Mexico enjoys the distinction of having possessed the first nuns in America. The first convent of Tertiary Sisters was founded at the capital as early as 1525 for the purpose of teaching Indian girls. The Poor Clares were brought over from Spain in 1530 by the wife of the great conqueror Cortés. They occupied convents in the City of Mexico, Texcoco, and at Huexocingo. These Sisters conducted academies for the education of young girls, who in turn made themselves useful as teachers or Tertiary Sisters, or in taking care of altars in their native villages. The first Bishop of Mexico was the learned Juan de Zumárraga of the Franciscan Order. He had been nominated by Charles V on 12 December, 1527, and approved by Pope Clement VII. It was he who, late in 1537 or early in 1538, brought the first printing press to Mexico. The first book, a compendium of the Christian doctrine in both the Mexican and Spanish languages, was printed by his order in 1539. From that date to the close of the year 1600, 118 books were published in Mexico. Of this number the Franciscans alone brought out forty-one, comprising works on Christian doctrine, morals, history, and Indian-Spanish vocabularies or dictionaries. The remainder were published by Dominicans, Augustinians, secular priests, and others. Mexico also produced two Franciscan saints: St. Philip of Jesus, martyred in Japan, and Blessed Sebastian, whose remains are venerated at Puebla. From the earliest days the numerous Friars Minor were engaged in literary work. The most noted writers are Toribio de Benavente (Motolinia), Alonzo de Molina, Bernardino de Sahagún, and Gerónimo de Mendieta in the sixteenth century; Augustín de Vetancurt, Antonio Tello, Juan de Torquemada (the Livy of New Spain), Baltasar de Medina, and Pablo de Beaumont in the seventeenth century; Francisco de Ayeta, Isidro Felix de Espinoza, José Arlegui, Hermenegildo de Vilaplana, Juan Domingo Arricivita, and Francisco Paláu in the eighteenth century.

Father Juan Suárez (Juárez, Xuárez), one of the Twelve Apostles of Mexico, was the first Franciscan to set foot within the present territory of the United States. He had been named Bishop of Florida and Río de las Palmas in 1527 along with the first Bishop of Mexico, and on 14 April, 1528, landed on the north-western coast of Florida with three companions, for the purpose of converting the Indians. The whole expedition, which consisted of six hundred men under Pánfilo de Narvaez, was destroyed, and only four men are known to have escaped. The bishop-elect and his companions were most probably drowned in the gulf. In 1538 the Franciscan Juan de Torres, who had joined De Soto with eight secular priests, two Dominicans, and one Trinitarian, perished in the same territory like the others of that unhappy expedition. The Dominicans and Jesuits by turns made heroic efforts to win the natives, but after several of their number had been massacred by the savages, they abandoned the task as hopeless. The Friars Minor, beginning

with the year 1573, made renewed attempts and laboured with such success that in 1610 the numerous missionary houses were united with those of Cuba in a custody, which two years later was elevated to the rank of province under the title Santa Helena de la Florida. It was the first organization of its kind in America north of Mexico. Juan de Copila was chosen first provincial. In 1634 there were reported 35 friars in charge of 44 Indian missions and mission stations, around which gathered as many as 30,000 converted Indians. This result was not achieved without much hardship and loss of life. Five of the Fathers were killed at their post by the savages, and one was held as a slave. In 1646 there were fifty friars scattered all over Florida. In 1702 and 1704 Governor Moore of the English Protestant colony of Georgia fell upon the flourishing missions, destroyed the buildings, killed or scattered the converts, or carried them into slavery, and butchered seven of the devoted missionaries in such a horrible manner that the historian John Gilmary Shea exclaims: "The martyrdom of the Franciscans of Ayubale has no parallel in our annals, except in the deaths of Fathers Brébeuf, Lalemant, Daniel, and Garnier in the Huron country; but the butcheries perpetrated there were not enacted before the very eyes and by the order of the governor of a Christian (?) colony." In 1763 Spain ceded Florida to England to recover Havana. The destruction of the Indian missions, which "under the rule of the Franciscans had been the diadem of the Church in Florida", as Shea declares, and the subsequent cession of the territory to the hostile English, forced the Franciscans to leave the country along with most of the Spanish colonists. A few reappeared later, but no permanent settlement was again established. Their principal monastery in the city of St. Augustine had been confiscated, and is now a United States Government barracks. The last friar seems to have resided in Florida about the year 1795. These missionaries are also noted for the fact that one of their number, Francisco Pareja, in 1612 published a catechism in the language of the Timuquanan Indians. A "Confesario" by him was printed in the next year; a grammar in the Indian tongue followed in 1614, and an abridgment of Christian doctrine in 1627, the first books printed in the language of North American Indians, with the exception of Fr. Zumárraga's Compendium mentioned above.

In 1685 three French Franciscans and three Sulpicians accompanied Robert de la Salle into Texas as the first missionaries; the friars came exclusively for the Indians. With the exception of Father Athanasius Douay, the Rev. Cavalier, and a few of the men who escaped to Canada, all the members of this expedition were massacred, and the buildings destroyed. In 1689 the Spanish Franciscan Damian Mazanet arrived with a guard of soldiers. In the course of time a large number of missions were established on the Gulf coast, in the region of San Sabá, and notably on the Río San Antonio, but the War of Mexican Independence put an end to these establishments. The most noted among the friars were Antonio Margil, declared Venerable by Pope Gregory XVI, in 1836, and Isidro Espinoza, the author of the "*Crónica Seráfica y Apostólica*", the standard work on the missions of Texas. Altogether about 160 Fathers and lay brothers toiled among the Texans under the most disheartening circumstances down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Six of the friars were killed by the savages, and six are said to have perished in prairie fires. Since then the mission buildings have been deserted or turned to the use of parishes, and the Indian converts have disappeared.

Father Marcos de Niza, the same who founded the missions of Peru, discovered the territories of Arizona and New Mexico in the very heart of the continent in 1539, eighty-eight years before any English settlement was made on the sea-coast. One year later the

same Father, in company with Fathers Juan de Padilla, Juan de la Cruz, and Brother Luis de Escalona, led Francisco Vázquez de Coronado to Zuñi and to the Río Grande del Norte near the present city of Santa Fé. When Coronado and his soldiers, disgusted at not finding the precious metal in quest of which they had come, abandoned the country in 1542, Padilla, La Cruz, and Escalona remained behind and established missions near Bernalillo and Pecos. Father Padilla after some success proceeded to the north-east and was killed by savages, possibly on the banks of the Platte River. Father Juan de la Cruz and Brother Escalona were murdered at the instigation of medicine men. Two Fathers and Brother Rodríguez re-entered New Mexico from the south in 1581 only to obtain the crown of martyrdom at the hands of some Pueblo Indians near Bernalillo. It was Brother Rodríguez who gave to the territory the name of New Mexico. At the end of the sixteenth century concerted efforts on the part of the Franciscans protected by military guards resulted in numerous missions all over the territory and in northern Arizona among the Moquis. At most of these places the Fathers conducted schools for the Indian boys. During the revolt of August, 1680, sixteen Franciscans were massacred at their post in New Mexico and four others were put to death by the Indians of northern Arizona. Twelve years later other friars of the same province of the Holy Gospel, Mexico, succeeded in restoring most of the destroyed missions, but not till six of their number had been martyred by the treacherous savages. In all thirty-eight of the friars were killed for the Faith in New Mexico and northern Arizona. Three others were lost and probably suffered the same fate. From 1539 to about 1840 upwards of three hundred Franciscans laboured among the Indians in that territory. In October, 1897, at the request of the Most Rev. Peter Bourgade, the Cincinnati province accepted missions in New Mexico, and at present these Fathers are stationed among the Navaho Indians, among the Pueblos at Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, and Jemes. In addition they have charge of parishes at Peña Blanca, Carlsbad, and Roswell. In southern Arizona the Fathers of the missionary college of Santa Cruz, Querétaro, took charge of the Indian missions after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767. In 1780 the famous Father Francisco Garces with three companions founded two missions near the mouth of the Gila River on the California side of the Río Colorado; but all four were horribly butchered by the savages in July, 1781. Other friars, however, continued the missions among the Papago below Tucson, and towards the close of the eighteenth century erected the beautiful church at Del Bac which still commands the admiration of travellers. When Mexico won independence, the leaders, who hated the religious and more particularly the Franciscans, insisted on the expulsion of those of Spanish birth, and thus wrecked the missions, as nearly all the missionaries were Spaniards. The Franciscan province of St. Louis towards the close of 1895 agreed to the urgent appeal of the Right Rev. Peter Bourgade, Vicar Apostolic of Arizona, and accepted the parish in the city of Phoenix with all the surrounding missions among the Pima and other Arizona tribes. They conduct a large and flourishing school on a reservation near the Salt River.

California after the secularization (see CALIFORNIA MISSIONS) retained most of the Fathers until their death. The missions fell into ruins or later came into the hands of the secular clergy. In 1840 the first Bishop of the two Californias was appointed in the person of the Franciscan García Diego y Morena. In 1884 only the mission of Santa Bárbara was still in charge of the friars who conducted a college there. To prevent the community from dying out it was incorporated into the province of the Sacred Heart of St. Louis. Since then the houses and friars have multi-

plied so that on the Pacific Coast the commissariat, which was organized in 1898, comprises 3 monasteries, 8 residences, 1 classical college for aspirants to the order, 1 orphanage for boys, 50 Fathers, 15 professed clerics, 45 lay brothers, and 4 novices.

The bigotry of some of the English settlers prevented the Franciscans from securing a foothold in the Thirteen Colonies, though at the invitation of the Jesuits several friars came from England between the years 1672 and 1699. Persecutions at home made it impossible to train and supply successors. Individual friars found their way to New York, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky, but no permanent foundation was effected. Michael Egan, who became first Bishop of Philadelphia, arrived from Ireland in 1803 and tried to establish a house, but failed for want of subjects. A convent of Poor Clares enjoyed a short life at Pittsburgh early in the thirties. In the great North-West and West, Belgian Franciscans penetrated to Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois, but they too disappeared after a time, except at Detroit, where they continued until the close of the eighteenth century, and where one became a martyr.

Not till near the middle of the nineteenth century did the sons of the seraphic saint find it practicable to branch out from Austria, Germany, and Italy into the States. In 1844 the province of St. Leopold, Tyrol, resolved to grant the petition of the Right Rev. J. B. Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati, and sent Father William Unterthiner. He was given charge of the newly organized German parish of St. John the Baptist. Many other Fathers and Brothers joined him, so that on 4 October, 1858, St. Francis College could be founded for the education of aspirants to the order. In the following year the ten existing convents were united in an independent custody under the invocation of St. John the Baptist. In 1885 it became a province which at present numbers 5 monasteries, 31 residences, 137 Fathers, 50 professed clerics, 80 lay brothers, and 7 novices. The Fathers conduct an ecclesiastical college attended by 75 students, and are in charge of 84 parishes, 22 mission stations, including several Indian missions in New Mexico and Arizona, 41 parish schools attended by 9000 pupils and one Indian boarding school. They also publish "*Der Sendbote*", a German monthly periodical for the Apostleship of Prayer, "*Der Franziskusbote*", "*St. Anthony's Messenger*" for the German and English-speaking members of the Third Order, and "*The Sodalist*", a monthly for the young.—At the urgent request of the Right Rev. Henry Damian Juncker, Bishop of Alton, Illinois, the province of the Holy Cross, Germany, in 1858 sent three Fathers and six lay brothers to Teutopolis. In the course of time many others followed, notably in consequence of the persecution inaugurated by Bismarck in Prussia, so that in 1879 the various convents were separated from the jurisdiction of the mother province and formed an independent province under the title of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus. The mother-house is at St. Louis, Missouri. At present the province, including the commissariat of California which has convents in California, Arizona, and Oregon, is one of the largest in the order. It comprises 13 monasteries, 33 residences, 250 priests, 80 professed clerics, 190 lay brothers, and 12 novices. The Fathers are in charge of 42 parishes, 110 mission stations, including the Indian missions of Michigan, Wisconsin, California, and Arizona, 2 ecclesiastical colleges, with about 200 students, 1 classical and commercial college, attended by 150 students, 97 parish schools frequented by 17,500 children, 1 boys' orphanage which cares for 250 children, 5 Indian boarding schools, and 4 Indian day schools. In addition to their missionary and scholastic labours, several Fathers have been engaged in literary work. They have published catechisms and prayer books in the languages of the Chippewa and Menominee, a Chip-

pewa Indian grammar and exercise book, books of devotion, biographical works, several historical volumes, and a well-known Latin ceremonial. They also publish at Harbor Springs, Michigan, from their own press, the "*Anishinabe Enamiad*" in the language of the Chippewa, and "*The Messenger of the Holy Childhood*". Both are eight-page monthlies.—Owing to the persecution of religious in Prussia, a number of friars from the province of St. Elisabeth, Thuringia, settled at Paterson, New Jersey, in 1875. In 1901 the several communities, joined by the English-speaking friars of the Italian custody, were united in a province under the protection of the Holy Name of Jesus. It now has 4 monasteries, 7 residences, 64 priests, 19 professed clerics, 46 lay brothers, and 3 novices. The Fathers are in charge of 10 parishes, 30 mission stations, 1 seminary and college (Allegany, N. Y.), 1 college for postulants, the College and Commissariat of the Holy Land, Washington, D. C., and 10 parish schools attended by 2200 children. They publish the "*Pilgrim of Palestine*" and "*St. Anthony's Almanac*". Father Paschal Robinson of the province published "*The Writings of St. Francis*", "*The Sayings of Blessed Giles*", "*Introduction to Franciscan Literature*", and "*The Life of St. Francis*".—At the request of the Right Rev. John Timon, Bishop of Buffalo, some Italian friars arrived at Buffalo in 1855. They established several convents in the States of New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. The custody of the Immaculate Conception was organized in 1861. It now comprises 2 monasteries, 5 residences, 28 Fathers, 1 professed cleric, and 4 lay brothers, in charge of 7 parishes, 7 mission stations, and 5 parish schools attended by 2400 pupils. The most noted of these Fathers was the Father Pamfilo da Magliano, the author of "*St. Francis and the Franciscans*". He also founded the Missionary Sisters of St. Francis, who follow the Rule of the Third Order of St. Francis.—The Commissariat of Polish Franciscans in Wisconsin is composed of 8 Fathers, 2 professed clerics, 20 lay brothers, and 3 novices, who occupy 1 monastery and 2 residences. The Fathers have charge of 3 parishes, 1 mission station, 1 college attended by 25 students, and 4 parish schools frequented by 650 children.

The Franciscans (Recollects) first appeared in Canada in June, 1615, when the French Fathers Joseph le Caron, Denis Jamet, Jean d'Olbeau, and Brother Pacificus du Plessis arrived at Quebec. They at once devoted themselves to mission work among the Algonkin and Wyandot or Hurons along the Great Lakes. For commercial reasons the French traders were opposed to the civilization of the natives and gave the missionaries considerable trouble. After labouring amid incredible hardships, and finding that their forces were too weak, the friars invited the Jesuits to share the field with them. The first Jesuit missionaries arrived in 1625 and toiled side by side with the Franciscans. One of the friars, Nicholas Viel, was killed by a savage and thus became the protomartyr of Canada. In 1629 the English captured Quebec and forced both the Franciscans and Jesuits to leave the country. Brother Gabriel Sagard, who had come in 1623, composed an Indian vocabulary of 132 pages, and described the country and its missions in two volumes. Some Franciscans in 1619 started a mission in Acadia or Nova Scotia. A few were still serving there in 1633, but nothing more is on record. Near the middle of the seventeenth century several French-Belgian Franciscans arrived in Canada, the most noted of whom, Father Louis Hennepin, passed Niagara Falls in December, 1678, and was the first to describe them in his "*Description de la Louisiane*" (Paris) and "*Nouvelle Découverte*" (Amsterdam). Hennepin penetrated beyond the Mississippi and in 1680 discovered St. Anthony's Falls. Father Emanuel Crespel and others came to Canada in 1726. He passed Great Falls and travelled as far as Fox River in Wis-

consin. He seems to have been among the last Franciscans who toiled in Canada during the Colonial period. In 1888 the Very Rev. Frederic De Ghyvelde, of the French province, and one lay brother arrived at Three Rivers. Other Fathers followed, and now the three monasteries of Three Rivers, Montreal, and Quebec number 46 Fathers, 38 professed clerics, 47 lay brothers, and 7 novices. The Fathers are engaged in giving missions among the faithful.

WADDING, *Annales*, XVI (Rome, 1740); GONZAGA, *De Origine Seraphica Religionis*, II, pt. IV (Rome, 1587); PERUSINI, *Chronologia Historico-Legalit*, I (Naples, 1650); HAROLD, *Epitome Annalium* (Rome, 1662), sec. 2; MENDIETA, *Historia Eclesiastica Indiana* (Mexico, 1870); TORQUEMADA, *Monarquia Indiana* (3 vols., Madrid, 1723); VETANCURT, *Crónica* (Mexico, 1697); IDEM, *Menologio Seráfico* (Mexico, 1697); TELLO, *Crónica Miscelanea*, II (Guadalajara, 1891); MEDINA, *Crónica* (Mexico, 1682); BEAUMONT, *Crónica* (4 vols., Mexico, 1873-74); ARLEGUI, *Crónica* (Mexico, 1851); ESPINOZA, *Crónica Seráfica* (Mexico, 1746); IDEM, *Crónica de Michoacan* (Mexico, 1899); ARRIOVITA, *Crónica Apostólica* (Mexico, 1792); VILAPLANA, *Vida del Fr. Ant. Margil* (Madrid, 1775); ICAZBALCETA, *Fr. Juan de Zumárraga* (Mexico, 1881); BARCIA, *Ensayo Cronológico* (Madrid, 1723); VEGA, *La Florida* (Madrid, 1723); COLL, *Colón y La Rábida* (Madrid, 1892); SAGARD, *Grand Voyage* (Paris, 1632); IDEM, *Histoire du Canada* (Paris, 1636); HENNEPIN, *Description of Louisiana* (tr. New York, 1880); MARCELINO DA CIVEZZA, *Storia Universale delle Missioni Francescane*, V-VII (Rome, Prato, Florence, 1861-1894); VILLORESI, *Il Collegio Francescano di Tarija* (Quarachi, 1885); MAGLIANO, *St. Francis and the Franciscans* (New York, 1867); SHEA, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886); IDEM, *Catholic Missions* (New York, 1854); ENGELHARDT, *The Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, 1897); IDEM, *The Franciscans in Arizona* (Harbor Springs, 1899); IDEM, *The Missions and Missaries of California* (San Francisco, 1908).

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

**Fribourg (SWITZERLAND), UNIVERSITY OF.**—From the sixteenth century, the foundation of a Catholic university in Switzerland had often been canvassed among the Catholic cantons. The need of such an institution was with the passage of time ever more keenly felt, as the fact that higher educational institutions existed only in the Protestant cantons ensured for the Protestants a certain intellectual ascendancy. In spite of the pressing nature of the case, however, the want of the necessary means and the jealousy among the Catholic cantons combined to prevent any solution of the question being arrived at. From the very beginning, the inhabitants of Fribourg had laboured most zealously for the establishment of a university in their town. Out of their own resources, they founded in 1763 a school of law, which was continued till 1889 and then merged in the juristic faculty of the university. During the nineteenth century, the Catholic movement in Switzerland, making the Swiss "Fius-Verein" its rallying-centre, reinaugurated the agitation for a Catholic university. The Catholic Conservative Government of Fribourg finally took the matter in hand, and George Python, State Councillor for Fribourg and from 1886 Director of Public Education, who enjoyed the fullest confidence of the people, effected the foundation of the university. It was certainly a bold undertaking for a little state of only 119,000 (in 1909, 130,000) inhabitants, but the energy and political acumen of Python coupled with the unselfish liberality of the legislative council were a certain guarantee of success. The conversion of the public debt under favourable conditions in 1886 resulted in a saving of 2,500,000 francs (500,000 dollars), and on 24 December of the same year the supreme council resolved to set aside this sum as a foundation fund for the proposed university. On 4 October, 1889, a second resolution was passed, appropriating the interest on this capital to the foundation of the first faculties, which were opened in the following November, the juristic faculty (the extended school of law) with nine professors and the philosophical (for philosophy, literature, and history) with eighteen.

The town of Fribourg, seat of the university, contributed half a million francs towards the funded capital of the university, and in the autumn of 1890 the theological faculty was instituted with seven pro-

fessors. In accordance with an agreement between the Government of Fribourg and Father Larocca, General of the Dominicans, this faculty was with the sanction of Leo XIII entrusted to the Dominican Order, and placed directly under the care of the Holy See. Many secular priests, however, have held chairs in the theological faculty, which has received from Rome the privilege of granting academical degrees (baccalaureate, licentiate, doctorate) in theology. The other faculties confer only the degrees of licentiate and doctorate. By the appropriation to the university of the profit on the public supply of water and electricity, and of a fixed annual sum from the newly-founded state bank, the further development of these three faculties and the establishment of the faculty of mathematical physics were made possible. The new faculty was opened in 1895 with eleven professors, and, as the institution of infirmaries has already been some years in progress, the establishment of the medical faculty—the only story now needed to crown the academical edifice—may be expected at an early date. Meanwhile, chairs of physiology and bacteriology have been instituted in connexion with the faculty of mathematical physics.

Despite many difficulties, including the crisis caused by the wanton dismissal of eight German professors in 1898, the development of the University of Fribourg has been steadily maintained. As a cantonal public institution, it stands on the same legal footing as the other universities of Switzerland. The supreme authority is vested in the Cantonal Department of Public Education (i.e. the State Council), practically all the expenses being borne by the canton. The general constitution of the university is regulated by the Charter of 1 December, 1899. Leo XIII viewed its foundation with a great satisfaction to which he gave personal expression in many letters to the authorities of the Canton, to the university itself, and to the Swiss episcopate. The main sources of revenue, according to the cantonal budget for 1909, are as follows: Interest on foundation fund, 125,000 francs; yearly contributions from state bank, 80,000 frs.; profits arising from the electric and water works, 150,000 frs.; lease, 2,580 frs. To this sum of 357,580 frs. must be added 7700 frs. for the legal chairs, and other endowments (especially the "Grivel" and the "Westermaier"). Many funds have been established for the assistance of students, and the institution of prizes.

In accordance with the wishes of its founder, the university has always maintained an international character, which consists not alone in the appointment of native professors to teach the history and literature of their native lands, but also in the various nationalities of the students attracted to the university. The lectures are delivered in Latin, French, and German. In the winter term of 1908-9, the teaching staff consisted of 70 lecturers from ten different lands, but especially from Switzerland, Germany, France, and Austria. Their distribution among the faculties was as follows: Theology, 13 ordinary and 2 extraordinary professors; Law, 14 ordinary and 4 extraordinary professors; Philosophy, 19 ordinary and 3 extraordinary professors; Mathematical Physics, 10 ordinary and 3 extraordinary professors with 2 *Privatdozenten*. The increase in the attendance at the university may be judged from this table of matriculated students:

Winter Term.	1890-1	1900-1	1908-9
Theology.....	64	127	202
Law.....	46	65	124
Philosophy.....	28	54	107
Mathematical Physics.....	...	80	135
Total.....	138	326	568

Of the 568 students in the winter term of 1908-9, 181 were Swiss, 90 Germans, 86 Russians (Poles and Lithuanians), 32 Bulgarians, 31 Italians, 23 from the United States, 21 from Austria-Hungary, and the remainder from eleven other lands.

The university is governed by the rector, elected each year at the general meeting of the ordinary professors. He is assisted by the senate, which consists of the rector, pro-rector, and the deans and assistant deans of the separate faculties. At the head of each faculty stands the dean, who also holds office for a single year. The professors are appointed by the Council of State on the recommendation of the members of the faculty concerned, except that in the appointment of professors of theology due attention is always paid to the requirements of ecclesiastical law and the terms of the agreement with the Dominican Order. Candidates are recognized as matriculated students on the production of a certificate which can be procured by following a certain course of academical studies in their native towns. Since 1905, women are allowed to matriculate, and, in addition to the regular students, permission may be given by the rector to other persons to attend particular lectures. As such persons numbered 119 in the winter term 1908-9, the total number of students who attended lectures during this period was 687. All the matriculated students are enrolled in a general association, called the "Akademia", and also contribute to an academic sick-fund. Many societies have been founded by the students of various lands for the promotion of social and intellectual intercourse. Thus, the "Columbia" has been instituted by the students from the United States, and publishes its own bulletin "The Columbia". There are three colleges for theological students: the Albertinum, Salesianum, and Canisianum. A special university society has been inaugurated to further the interests of the university. The university library is associated with that of the canton (which contains 140,000 volumes, 16,000 brochures, 534 manuscripts, and 350 incunabula), a new building for the accommodation of both libraries having been opened in 1908. The library expends an annual sum of 16,500 frs. in the purchase of books and journals. There are separate libraries for the different academical courses and institutes, 7650 frs. being spent annually on those in connection with the theological, legal, and philosophical faculties, and 30,000 frs. for those of the faculty of mathematical physics. The university has its own scientific publication, the "Collectanea Friburgensia", for which only contributions from professors are accepted, and in which twenty-five works have already appeared in three series. The list of the publications of the university lecturers, which is appended to the rector's annual report, gives one a good idea of the activity of the professors in other directions.

WEYRICH, *The University of Freiburg in Switzerland, in The Irish Rosary* (1905); *Die katholische Universität zu Freiburg in der Schweiz in Historisch-Politische Blätter*, CXI (1893), 569 sqq.; MOREL, *L'Université de Fribourg* (2d ed., Fribourg, 1895); *Rapports annuels des Recteurs de l'Université de Fribourg*; MAYER (=BAUMGARTEN), *L'Université di Friburgo in Svizzera*, tr. from the *Grenzboten* (Rome, 1902).

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Friday, Good.** See GOOD FRIDAY.

**Fridelli** (properly FRIEDEL), XAVER EHRENBERT, Jesuit missionary and cartographer, b. at Linz, Austria, 11 March, 1673; d. at Peking, 4 June, 1743. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1688 and in 1705 arrived in China. Fridelli was an important contributor to the cartographical survey of the Chinese Empire, begun in 1708 and completed in 1718 (according to others, 1715). Baron Richthofen says that this work is "the most comprehensive cartographical feat ever performed in so short a space of time" ("China", Berlin, 1877, I, 661, see 631 sq.). Together with Fathers Régis, Jartoux, and others, he designed the maps of

Chi-li, the Amur districts, Kahlkhas (Mongolia), Szech'wan, Yun-nan, Kwei-chow, and Hu-kwang (Hu-nan and Hu-pe), for which purpose they traversed the whole empire from south to north. At the time of his death Fridelli had been rector for many years of the Southern or Portuguese church (Nan-t'ang), one of the four Jesuit churches at Peking.

Five letters in *N. Welt-Bott* (Augsburg, 1726, and Vienna, 1758), nos. 103, 106, 194, 589, 674; MSS. report in the Vienna State Library, no. 1117; Dr HALDE, *Description de l'Empire de la Chine* (The Hague, 1736), I, preface; HUONDER, *Deutsche Jesuitenmissionare* (Freiburg im Br., 1899), 87, 186.

A. HUONDER.

**Frideswide** (FRIDESWIDA, FREDESWIDA, Fr. FRÉVISSE, Old Eng. FRIS), SAINT, virgin, patroness of Oxford, lived from about 650 to 735. According to her legend, in its latest form, she was the child of King Didan and Saffrida, and was brought up in holiness by Algiwa. She refused the proffered hand of King Algar, a Mercian, and fled from him to Oxford. It was in vain that he pursued her; a mysterious blindness fell on him, and he left her in her cell. From this eventually developed the monastery, in which she died on 19 October (her principal feast), and was buried. The earliest written life now extant was not composed until four hundred years after her death, but it is generally admitted that the substance of the tradition has every appearance of verisimilitude. From the time of her translation in 1180 (commemorated 12 Feb.) from her original tomb to the great shrine of her church, her fame spread far and wide; for the university was now visited by students from all parts, who went twice a year in solemn procession to her shrine and kept her feasts with great solemnity. Cardinal Wolsey transformed her monastery into Christ Church College, King Henry made her church into Oxford cathedral, but her shrine was dismantled, and her relics, which seem to have been preserved, were relegated to some out-of-the-way corner. In the reign of Edward VI, Catherine Cathie was buried near the site of her shrine. She was a runaway nun, who had been through the form of marriage with Peter Martyr, the ex-friar. The Catholics, as was but natural, ejected her bones in the reign of Queen Mary. But after Elizabeth had reinstated Protestantism, James Calphill, appointed Canon of Christ Church in 1561, dug up Cathie's bones once more, mixed them up (in derision of the Catholics) with the alleged remaining relics of the saint, and buried them both together amid the plaudits of his Zwinglian friends in England and Germany, where two relations of his exploit, one in Latin and one in German, were published in 1562. The Latin relation, which is conveniently reprinted in the Bollandists, is followed in the original by a number of epitaphs on the theme *Hic jacet religio cum superstitione*, but it does not seem that these words were incised on the tomb, though it is often said that they were. The episode strikingly illustrates the character of the continuity between the ancient faith and the reformed religion of England.

Acta SS., Oct., VIII, 533-584; MABILLON, *Acta SS. Ben.* (1672), III, 1, 561; HOLE in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; HUBERT, *Historia Bucerii, Fagii, item C. Vermilii* (1562); PARKER, *Early Oxford, 727-1100* (1885); PLUMMER, *Elizabethan Oxford* (1887).

J. H. POLLEN.

**Fridolin**, SAINT, missionary, founder of the Monastery of Säkingen, Baden (sixth century). In accordance with a later tradition, St. Fridolin is venerated as the first Irish missionary who laboured among the Alamanni on the Upper Rhine, in the time of the Merovingians. The earliest documentary information we possess concerning him is the biography written by Balther, a Säkingen monk, at the beginning of the eleventh century (Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. rer. Merov., III, 350-69). According to this life, Fridolin (or Fricold) belonged to a noble family in Ireland (Scottia inferior), and at first laboured as a missionary in his



native land. Afterwards crossing to France, he came to Poitiers, where in answer to a vision, he sought out the relics of St. Hilarius, and built a church for their reception. St. Hilarius subsequently appeared to him in a dream, and commanded him to proceed to an island in the Rhine, in the territories of the Alamanni. In obedience to this summons, Fridolin repaired to the "Emperor" Clovis, who granted him possession of the still unknown island, and thence proceeded through Helion, Strassburg, and Coire, founding churches in every district in honour of St. Hilarius. Reaching at last the island of Säckingen in the Rhine, he recognized in it the island indicated in the dream, and prepared to build a church there. The inhabitants of the banks of the Rhine, however, who used the island as a pasturage for their cattle, mistook Fridolin for a cattle-robber and expelled him. On his production of Clovis's deed of gift, he was allowed to return, and to found a church and monastery on the island. He then resumed his missionary labours, founded the Scottish monastery in Constance, and extended his mission to Augsburg. He died on 6 March, and was buried at Säckingen. The writer of this legend professes to have derived his information from a biography, which he discovered in the cloister of Helera on the Moselle, also founded by Fridolin, and which, being unable to copy from want of parchment and ink, he had learned by heart.

This statement sounds very suspicious, and makes one conclude that Balther was compelled to rely on verbal tradition for the information recorded in his work. Not a single ancient author mentions Fridolin, the life has no proper historical chronological arrangement, and the enumeration of so many wonders and visions awakens distrust. Consequently, most modern historians justly reject the life as unauthentic, and as having no historical foundation for the facts recorded, while the older historians believed that it contained a germ of truth. In the early Middle Ages, there was certainly some connection between Säckingen and Poitiers, from which the former monastery received its relics, and this fact may have made the author connect Fridolin with the veneration of St. Hilarius of Poitiers, and the churches erected in his honour. The only portion of the life that can be regarded as historically tenable, is that Fridolin was an Irish missionary, who preached the Christian religion in Gaul, and founded a monastery on the island of Säckingen in the Rhine. Concerning the date of these occurrences, we have no exact information. The monastery, however, was of great importance in the ninth century, since the earliest extant document concerning it states that on 10 February, 878, Charles the Fat presented to his wife Richardis the Monasteries of Säckingen, of St. Felix and of Regula in Zurich.

*Vita Fridolini, auctore Balthero monacho*, in the following works: COLGAN, *Acta Sancti Hibernie* (Louvain, 1645), I, 481 sq.; MONE, *Quellensammlung der badischen Landesgeschichte* (Karlsruhe, 1845), I, ed. KRUSCH in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Script. rer. Meroving.*, III, 351-69; *Acta SS.*, March, I, 433-441. FORTMEYER, *Bibliotheca historica mediæ ævi* (Berlin, 1896), II, 1322-23. *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, ed. BOLLANDISTS, I, 478. WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, I (7th ed., Berlin, 1904), 155. HEFFEL, *Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums in Südwestl. Deutschland* (Tübingen, 1837); LITWOLF, *Die Glaubensboten der Schweiz vor St. Gallus* (Lucerne, 1871), 267 sq.; LEO, *Der hl. Fridolin* (Freiburg im Br., 1886); HEER, *St. Fridolin, der Apostel Alemanniens* (Zürich, 1889); VON KNONAU, *Nochmals die Frage St. Fridolin in Anzeiger für Schweizergesch.* (1889), 377-81; SCHULTE, *Beiträge zur Kritik der Vita Fridolini*, *Jahrbuch für Schweizergesch.*, XVIII (1893), 134-152.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Friedrich von Hausen** (HUSEN), mediæval German poet, one of the earliest of the minnesingers; date of birth unknown; d. 6 May, 1190. His name is mentioned frequently in legal documents, for the first time in one from Mainz dated 1171. He was born in middle Rhenish territory, as is shown by his dialect, especially by his rhymes, but several towns claim the honour of being his birthplace, and the question cannot be defi-

nately decided. In 1175 he was in Italy, and again in 1186 in the suite of Henry VI. The next year he was present when Frederick I (Barbarossa) and Philip Augustus met between Mouzon and Yvois, and in 1188 he was at Worms in the company of Count Baldwin V of Hennegau. He accompanied the Emperor Frederick, by whom he was held in high esteem, on the crusade of 1189, and met his death at the battle of Philomelium, when he fell with his horse while pursuing the enemy. His popularity was great; the whole army, we are told, mourned his death.

Friedrich von Hausen is one of the earliest of the minnesingers who are known to have imitated French models, with which he became acquainted on his travels through Burgundy and Provence. Together with Veldeke he introduced the Romance element into the minnesong. The Provençal influence is especially evident in the dactylic rhythm of his verses, which resulted from the adoption into German of a Romance ten-syllable line with four or five stresses. His rhymes are still occasionally imperfect and his songs contain more than one strophe. Hausen's poetry is not at all popular, but rather artificial in form and often abstruse in spirit. He is fond of dallying with a word. Like most of the troubadours or minnesingers he sings chiefly of love's pangs, but he never degenerates into effeminacy. Friedrich von Hausen's poems are printed in F. H. von der Hagen's "Minnesinger" (Leipzig, 1838, 4 vols.), I, 212-217; a selection may also be found in K. Lachmann and M. Haupt, "Des Minnesangs Frühling" (Leipzig, 1888), 42 sqq.; in Friedrich Pfaff, "Der Minnesang des 12 bis 14 Jahrhunderts" (Kürschners Deutsche National-Litteratur, VIII, pt. I, 17-24); and in Karl Bartsch, "Deutsche Liederdichter des 12 bis 14 Jahrhunderts" (4th edition, by W. Golther, Berlin, 1901).

LEHFELD, *Ueber Friedrich von Hausen* in PAUL and BRAUNE, *Beiträge*, II, 345-405; SPIRGATIS, *Die Lieder Friedrichs von Hausen* (Tübingen, 1876), and the critical introductions to the above-mentioned editions.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

**Friends**, SOCIETY OF (QUAKERS), the official designation of an Anglo-American religious sect originally styling themselves "Children of Truth" and "Children of Light", but "in scorn by the world called Quakers". The founder of the sect, George Fox, son of a well-to-do weaver, was born at Fenny Drayton in Leicestershire, England, July, 1624. His parents, upright people and strict adherents of the established religion, destined him for the Church; but since the boy, at an early period, felt a strong aversion to a "hiring ministry", he was, after receiving the bare rudiments of education, apprenticed to a shoemaker. He grew to manhood a pure and honest youth, free from the vices of his age, and "endued", says Sewel, "with a gravity and stayedness of mind seldom seen in children". In his nineteenth year, while at a fair with two friends, who were "professors" of religion, he was so shocked by a proposal they made him to join them in drinking healths, that he abandoned their company. Returning home, he spent a sleepless night, in the course of which he thought he heard a voice from heaven crying out to him: "Thou seest how young men go together into vanity, and old people into the earth; thou must forsake all, young and old, keep out of all, and be a stranger unto all." Interpreting the injunction literally, Fox left his father's house, penniless and with Bible in hand to wander about the country in search of light. His mental anguish at times bordered on despair. He sought counsel from renowned "professors"; but their advice that he should take a wife, or sing psalms, or smoke tobacco, was not calculated to solve the problems which perplexed his soul. Finding no food or consolation in the teachings of the Church of England or of the innumerable dissenting sects which flooded the land, he was thrown back upon himself and forced to accept his

own imaginings as "revelations". "I fasted much," he tells us in his Journal, "walked abroad in solitary places many days, and often took my Bible and sat in hollow trees and lonesome places until night came on; and frequently in the night walked mournfully about by myself. For I was a man of sorrows in the first working of the Lord in me." This anguish of spirit continued, with intermissions, for some years; and it is not surprising that the lonely youth read into his Bible all his own idiosyncrasies and limitations.

Founding his opinions on isolated texts, he gradually evolved a system at variance with every existing form of Christianity. His central dogma was that of the "inner light", communicated directly to the individual soul by Christ "who enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world". To walk in this light and obey the voice of Christ speaking within the soul was to Fox the supreme and sole duty of man. Creeds and churches, councils, rites, and sacraments were discarded as outward things. Even the Scriptures were to be interpreted by the inner light. This was surely carrying the Protestant doctrine of private judgment to its ultimate logical conclusion. Inconvenient passages of Holy Writ, such as those establishing Baptism and the Eucharist, were expounded by Fox in an allegorical sense; whilst other passages were insisted upon with a literalness before unknown. Thus, from the text "Swear not at all", he drew the illicitness of oaths, even when demanded by the magistrate. Titles of honour, salutations, and all similar things conducive to vanity, such as doffing the hat or "scraping with the leg", were to be avoided even in the presence of the king. War, even if defensive, was declared unlawful. Art, music, drama, field-sports, and dancing were rejected as unbecoming the gravity of a Christian. As for attire, he pleaded for that simplicity of dress and absence of ornament which later became the most striking peculiarity of his followers. There was no room in his system for the ordained and salaried clergy of other religions, Fox proclaiming that every man, woman or child, when moved by the Spirit, had an equal right to prophesy and give testimony for the edification of the brethren. Two conclusions, with disagreeable consequence to the early Friends, were drawn from this rejection of a "priesthood"; the first was, that they refused to pay tithes or church rates; the second, that they celebrated marriage among themselves, without calling in the services of the legally appointed minister.

Impelled by frequent "revelations", Fox began the public preaching of his novel tenets in 1647. It was not his intention to increase the religious confusion of the time by the addition of a new sect. He seems to have been persuaded that the doctrine by means of which he himself had "come up in spirit through the flaming sword into the paradise of God" would be greeted alike by Christian, Turk, and heathen. The enthusiasm and evident sincerity of the uncouth young preacher gained him numerous converts in all parts of Britain; whilst the accession of Margaret, wife of Judge Fell, afterwards of Fox himself, secured to the Friends a valuable rallying-point in the seclusion of Swarthmoor Hall, Lancashire. In an incredibly short time, a host of unordained apostles, male and female, were scouring the two hemispheres, carrying to the ends of the earth the gospel of Fox. One enthusiast hastened to Rome to enlighten the pope; a second went to the Orient to convert the sultan. The antagonistic religions dominant in England before and after the Restoration, Presbyterianism and the Established Church, made equally determined efforts, through the aid of the civil power, to crush the growing sect. From the detailed record which the Friends, in imitation of the primitive Christians, kept of the sufferings of their brethren, we gather that during the reign of Charles II, 13,562 "Quakers" were imprisoned in various parts of England, 198 were transported

as slaves beyond seas, and 338 died in prison or of wounds received in violent assaults on their meetings. They fared still worse at the hands of the Puritans in Massachusetts, who spared no cruelty to rid the colony of this "cursed sect of heretics", and hanged four of them, three men and a woman, on Boston Common. What marked them out for persecution was not so much their theory of the inward light or their rejection of rites and sacraments, as their refusal to pay tithes, or take the oaths prescribed by law, or to have anything to do with the army; these offences being aggravated in the estimation of the magistrates by their obstinacy in refusing to uncover their head in court and "thouing and theeing" the judges. The suffering Friends found at last a powerful protector in the person of their most illustrious convert, William, son of Admiral Penn, who defended his coreligionists in tracts and public disputes, and, through his influence with the last two Stuart kings, was frequently successful in shielding them from the violence of the mob and the severity of the magistrates. Penn furthermore secured for them a safe refuge in his great colony of Pennsylvania, the proprietorship of which he acquired from Charles II in liquidation of a loan advanced to the Crown by his father. With the accession to the throne of James II the persecution of the Friends practically ceased; and by successive Acts of Parliament passed after the Revolution of 1688, their legal disabilities were removed; their scruples about paying tithes and supporting the army were respected; and their affirmation was accepted as equivalent to an oath.

Meanwhile, Fox, in the intervals between his frequent imprisonments, had laboured to impart the semblance of an organization to the society; whilst the excesses of some of his followers compelled him to enact a code of discipline. His efforts in both these directions encountered strong opposition from many who had been taught to regard the inward light as the all-sufficient guide. However, the majority, sacrificing consistency, acquiesced; and before the death of Fox, 13 Jan., 1691, Quakerism was established on the principles which it has since substantially preserved.

Although the Friends repudiate creeds as "external" and "human", yet they, at least the early Quakers and their orthodox modern followers, admit the fundamental dogmas of Christianity as expounded in the Apostles' Creed. Rejecting as non-Scriptural the term *Trinity*, they confess the Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the doctrine of the Redemption and salvation through Christ; and the sanctification of souls through the Holy Spirit. Their ablest apologists, as Robert Barclay and William Penn, have not been able to explain satisfactorily in what respect the "inward light" differs from the light of the individual reason; neither have they reconciled the doctrine of the supreme authority of the "inner voice" with the "external" claims of Scripture and the historic Christ. These doctrinal weaknesses were fruitful germs of dissensions in later times.

Though one of the earliest of Fox's "testimonies" was in reprobation of "steeple-houses", that is, the stately edifices with which Catholic piety had covered the soil of England, nevertheless, as his adherents grew in numbers, he was forced to gather them into congregations for purposes of worship and business. These "particular meetings" assembled on the first day of the week. They worshipped without any form of liturgy and in silence until some man, woman, or child was moved by the Spirit to "give testimony", the value of which was gauged by the common sense of the assembly. By a process of development, a form of church government came into being, which has been described as follows:—

"The whole community of Friends is modelled somewhat on the Presbyterian system. Three gradations of meetings or synods—monthly, quarterly, and

yearly—administer the affairs of the Society, including in their supervision matters both of spiritual discipline and secular policy. The monthly meetings, composed of all the congregations within a definite circuit, judge of the fitness of new candidates for membership, supply certificates to such as move to other districts, choose fit persons to be elders, to watch over the ministry, attempt the reformation or pronounce the expulsion of all such as walk disorderly, and generally seek to stimulate the members to religious duty. They also make provision for the poor of the Society, and secure the education of their children. Overseers are also appointed to assist in the promotion of these objects. At monthly meetings also marriages are sanctioned previous to their solemnization at a meeting for worship. Several monthly meetings compose a quarterly meeting, to which they forward general reports of their condition, and at which appeals are heard from their decisions. The yearly meeting holds the same relative position to the quarterly meetings that the latter do to the monthly meetings, and has the general superintendence of the Society in a particular country." (See Rowntree, Quakerism, Past and Present, p. 60.) All the yearly meetings are supreme and independent, the only bond of union between them being the circular letters which pass between them. The annual letter of London Yearly Meeting is particularly prized. With the passing away of its founders and the cessation of persecution, Quakerism lost its missionary spirit and hardened into a narrow and exclusive sect. Instead of attracting new converts, it developed a mania for enforcing "discipline," and "disowned" that is, expelled, multitudes of its members for trifling matters in which the ordinary conscience could discern no moral offence. In consequence, they dwindled away from year to year, being gradually absorbed by other more vigorous sects, and many drifting into Unitarianism.

In the United States, where, in the beginning of the last century, they had eight prosperous yearly meetings, their progress was arrested by two schisms, known as the Separation of 1828 and the Wilburite Controversy. The disturbance of 1828 was occasioned by the preaching of Elias Hicks (1748-1830), an eloquent and extremely popular speaker, who, in his later years, put forth unsound views concerning the Person and work of Christ. He was denounced as a Unitarian; and, although the charge seemed well founded, many adhered to him, not so much from partaking his theological heresies, as to protest against the excessive power and influence claimed by the elders and overseers. After several years of wrangling, the Friends were split into two parties, the Orthodox and the Hicksite, each disowning the other, and claiming to be the original society. Ten years later the Orthodox body was again divided by the opposition of John Wilbur to the evangelistic methods of an English missionary, Joseph John Gurney. As the main body of the Orthodox held with Gurney, the Wilburite faction set up a schismatic yearly meeting. These schisms endure to the present day. There is also a microscopical sect known as "Primitive" Friends, mainly offshoots from the Wilburites who claim to have eliminated all the later additions to the faith and practice of the early founders of the society.

In the fields of education, charity, and philanthropy the Friends have occupied a place far out of proportion to their numbers. There exist in the United States many important colleges of their foundation. They are exemplary in the care of their poor and sick. Long before the other denominations, they denounced slavery and would not permit any of their members to own slaves. They did not, however, advocate the abolition of slavery by violent measures. They have also been eminently solicitous for the welfare and fair treatment of the Indians.

According to Dr. H. K. Carroll, the acknowledged authority on the subject of religious statistics (*The Christian Advocate*, Jan., 1907), the standing of the various branches of Friends in the United States is as follows.—

	Ministers	Churches	Communicants
Orthodox	1302	830	94,507
Hicksite	115	183	19,545
Wilburite	38	53	4,468
Primitive	11	9	232

SCHAFF, *Creeds of Christendom* (New York, 1884), I, III; THOMAS, ALLAN C. and RICHARD H., *History of the Society of Friends in America in American Church History Series* (New York, 1894), XII—contains excellent bibliography; SMITH, JOSEPH, *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books* (London, 1867, supplement, London, 1893); IDEM, *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana, A Catalogue of Books Adverse to the Society of Friends* (London, 1873); JANNEY, *History of the Religious Society of Friends from the Rise to the year 1828* (2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1837-50). The *Works of FOX* were published at London, 1694-1706; the *Works of BARCLAY* were edited by WILLIAM PENN (London, 1892).

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

**Friends of God** (Ger. GOTTESFREUNDE), an association of pious persons, both ecclesiastical and lay, having for its object the cultivation of holiness; its name alludes no doubt to John, xv, 14, 15. The circle of the "Friends of God" appears to have had its origin in Basle between the years 1339 and 1343, and to have thence extended down the Rhine even as far as the Netherlands, the cities most prominent in its history being Basle, Strasburg, and Cologne. Seeing the disturbed state of society in the large territory, the holy associates united in their efforts to counteract the many evil influences of the time, by applying themselves zealously to the practices of the interior life, and working diligently for the conversion of sinners. From this group of ascetics, whose sole bond of union was their common desire for holiness, the great school of German mystics took its rise. They aimed at becoming saints, and at giving edification at Catholic devotion, not heterodox enthusiasm; at affective contemplation, not arid speculation. Their great leaders were two Dominicans, the eloquent preacher John Tauler (c. 1300-1361), and the contemplative writer Blessed Henry Suso (c. 1300-1365); to these must be added Henry of Nördlingen, Conrad of Kaiserheim, and the Dominicans John of Tambach (a celebrated theologian), John of Sternengassen, Dietrich of Colmar, and Nicholas of Strasburg. Among those whom they directed in the path of perfection were several communities of nuns, chiefly Dominican (e. g. in Unterlinden, Engelthal). Of these Dominicanesses, the most renowned for sanctity are the mystical writers Christina and Margaretha Ebner. Among their disciples living in the world, the following may be mentioned: Rulman Merswin, a wealthy merchant of Strasburg (1382), Henry of Rheinfelden, and the knight of Landsberg. The sermons, treatises, and letters of the "Friends of God" are remarkable for beauty of style, those of Suso constituting the best prose of the fourteenth century, the correspondence of Henry of Nördlingen and Margaretha Ebner being the earliest examples of epistolary literature in the German language, and the sermons of Tauler being masterpieces of eloquence.

As long as the association remained under the guidance of men like Suso and Tauler, masters in the spiritual life, it was preserved from blemish. Suso was the founder of the Children of Mary, and, in an age that witnessed the decadence of scholasticism or scientific theology, both friends based all their mysticism on Catholic doctrine, particularly on the solid system of St. Thomas. As Suso's "Book of the Eternal Wisdom" was composed for spiritual reading, so was his "Book of Truth" written to refute the errors and fanatic excesses of the Beghards and the Brethren

of the Free Spirit. On his part, Tauler opposed the false mysticism of the Fraticelli and the schismatical tendencies of Louis of Bavaria. But the glory of the "Gottesfreunde" soon came to an end. A lay member of the association, Rulman Merswin, through either ignorance or fraud, brought the whole group of German mystics into disrepute. The doctrine of his alleged guide and master in the spiritual life—the mysterious layman of the Oberland (Der Gottesfreund vom Oberland), the "Friend of God" *par excellence*, to whom Merswin, in his posthumous work "Das Buch von den neun Felsen", ascribes revelations, prophecies of impending chastisements, and a divine mission to purify the Church—was diametrically opposed to that of Suso, Tauler, and the others. Denifle has proved conclusively that Merswin's great unknown is a myth, but, as the "Great Friend of God" had previously been regarded as the reformer of the hierarchy and a precursor of Luther, the recluse of the Oberland (Alsace) was much lauded and often quoted by those Protestant writers who asserted that true German mysticism was incompatible with Roman supremacy, scholastic theology, etc. After Rulman Merswin's death, Nicholas of Basle became the leader of the pseudo-Friends of God, but was eventually condemned as a Beghard and burned at Vienna in 1409. Another prominent member of this sect, his disciple Martin of Mainz, had suffered a like punishment sixteen years before in Cologne, for submitting unreservedly to a layman and maintaining several heretical propositions. From the beginning of the fifteenth century, the "Friends of God", whether orthodox or heterodox, disappear from the pages of history. (See TAULER, JOHN; HENRY SUSO, BL.; NICHOLAS OF BASLE; MYSTICISM.)

HERGENROTHER-KIRSCH, *Kirchengesch.* (Freiburg, 1904), II, 790 sqq.; DENIFLE in *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum* (1880-1881); IDEM, *Das Buch von der geistlichen Armuth* (Munich, 1887); EARLE in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (1881), XXI, 38, 252; GREITH, *Die deutsche Mystik im Predigerorden* (Freiburg, 1861); *Das Buch von den neun Felsen von R. Merswin* (Leipzig, 1859); JUNOD, *Les amis de Dieu au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1876); IDEM, *Rulman Merswin et l'ami de Dieu de l'Oberland* (Paris, 1890); BEVAN, *Three Friends of God: Records from the lives of John Tauler, Nicholas of Basle, and Henry of Suso* (London, 1887); BÖHRINGER, *Die deutschen Mystiker* (2nd ed., Zurich, 1877); TAULER, *Predigten* (Leipzig, 1498, and Cologne, 1543); SCRIVUS, Latin Paraphrase of same (Cologne, 1548); *Die deutschen Schriften des seligen Heinrich Seuse*, ed. DENIFLE (Munich, 1880). On Rulman Merswin, in particular, see STRAUCH in the *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol.*, XVII, 203; BIEHMMEYER in *BUCHBERGER'S Kirchl. Handlex.*, s. v. *Gottesfreunde und Merswin*.

REGINALD WALSH.

**Frigento.** See AVELLINO, DIOCESE OF.

**Frigolet, ABBEY OF.**—The monastery of St. Michael was founded, about 960, at Frigolet, by Conrad the Pacific, King of Arles, on one of the numerous hills which lie between Tarascon and Avignon, France. Successively occupied by the Benedictines of Montmajour, the Augustinians, the Hieronymites, and finally by the Reformed Augustinians, it was, together with all the monasteries in France, suppressed and sold by the French Republic. From that time it changed hands frequently, and was acquired, at length, by Rev. Edmund Boulbon, who purchased it from Rev. T. Delestrac. Edmund Boulbon, b. 14 January, 1817, entered the Abbey of Our Lady of La Trappe at Briquebec, in 1850. Of a robust faith, and burning with zeal for souls, he wished to lead a more active life. Acting on the advice of his superiors, he left the Trappists and undertook the restoration, in France, of the Order of St. Norbert, the constitution of which seemed to be better adapted to his active disposition. On 6 June, feast of St. Norbert, he received the white habit from the hands of Mgr de Gassignies, Bishop of Soissons, at Prémontré. Pius IX approved the project in an audience which he granted to Father Edmund, 4 December, 1856. With the consent of Mgr de Chalandon, Archbishop of Aix, Father Edmund took possession of Frigolet, and, having admitted several novices, he commenced the community life there. In

honour of Our Lady Conceived without Sin he erected a magnificent church, which was solemnly consecrated on 6 Oct., 1866. The monastery was canonically erected as a priory on 28 August, 1868; and as an abbey in Sept., 1869, the Right Rev. Edmund Boulbon being its first abbot. On 8 Nov., 1880, the abbey of Frigolet was seized and the religious expelled. Eventually, however, they were permitted to return. Abbot Boulbon was spared the miseries of a second expulsion, for he died 2 March, 1883.

His successor, Paulinus Boniface, named abbot on 10 June, 1883, undid by his bad administration the good work so nobly begun by Abbot Boulbon; but after a canonical visitation by Mgr Gouthe-Soulard, Archbishop of Aix, he was deposed, and the direction of the abbey entrusted to the Rev. Denis Bonnefoy, a prudent and saintly religious. Up to this time, the Abbey of Frigolet, with the priories founded by it, had formed as it were a separate congregation with an organization of its own, having no connexion with the other abbeys or the general chapter of the order. This state of affairs was remedied by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, dated 17 Sept., 1898; and the congregation of Frigolet was incorporated with the order. Unfortunately, the Right Rev. Denis Bonnefoy, who was made abbot on 21 March, 1899, died on 20 Sept. of the same year. The religious of Frigolet chose for their abbot Godfrey Madelaine, then prior of the Abbey of Mondaye, Calvados, France, the distinguished author of "L'histoire de S. Norbert" and other books. Meanwhile the French Republic had framed new laws against all religious institutions, and on 5 April, 1903, the religious, expelled from their abbey, took refuge in Belgium. There, having bought what was left of the former Norbertine Abbey of Leffe near Dinant, they restored it; and continued in the conventual life, in the hope that some day the fathers might be permitted to return to France. The Abbey of Frigolet had founded the priories of Conques and Etoile in France, and of Storrington and Bedworth in England. It has also sent missionaries to Madagascar.

F. M. GEUDENS.

**Fringes (IN SCRIPTURE).**—This word is used to denote a special kind of trimming, consisting of loose threads of wool, silk, etc., or strips of other suitable material, along the edge of a piece of cloth. The English Bible uses it to designate a particular appendage of the Jewish costume. In the Mosaic legislation, which is embodied in the Pentateuch, mention is made of a peculiar ordinance. "The Lord also said to Moses: Speak to the children of Israel, and thou shalt tell them to make to themselves *fringes* in the corners of their garments, putting in them ribands of blue: that when they shall see them, they may remember all the commandments of the Lord" (Num., xv, 37-39). "Thou shalt make *strings* [A. V. and R. V.: *fringes*] in the hem at the four corners of thy cloak" (Deut., xxii, 12). The description contained in these two passages is anything but clear, at least in the English Bibles; but it may be supplemented by a close reading of the original text, a knowledge of Eastern customs, and the details to be found in the rabbinical literature.

The word "fringes" is here an inaccurate rendering of the Hebrew; "strings" is slightly more exact. The Hebrew word *gedilim* means literally "twisted cords"; *çîth* would be best translated by "tassel". It is indeed an ornament of this description, fastened to the four corners of the upper garment, which is the object of the above regulations. This upper garment, the "cloak" of Deut., xxii, 12, seems to have been a large square piece of cloth, resembling the *abā* of the modern bedouin, and worn like the *pallium* or *ιμάτιον* of the Greeks, the four corners sometimes hanging in front (*ἐπιβλημα*), and sometimes one of the corners cast over the left shoulder (*περιβλημα*). It was very

likely the tassel of the corner thus thrown over Our Lord's shoulder that the woman with the issue of blood touched ("behind him"), in the circumstance recorded in Matt., ix, 20, and Luke, viii, 44. We should perhaps go back to a very ancient custom, the significance of which was lost sight of, to account for the wearing of these ornaments. At any rate, a new meaning was attached to them by the lawgiver of Israel.

Of these "fringes", or tassels, nothing more is said in the O. T., than that they should contain "ribands of blue"; more exactly, "a cord, or thread of purple". But the rabbinical literature contains most minute prescriptions with regard to these ornaments. Owing to the difficulty of procuring the purple dye, the custom prevailed of using only white threads of wool. They should be four in number, one being considerably longer than the others, spun expressly for the purpose, passed through an eyelet at the corner of the cloak, twisted a certain number of times, and tied by five knots. According to Deut., the *ciṯṯh* were intended to remind the people of the commandments of the Law. We may easily understand, therefore, why the Pharisees were wont to "enlarge their fringes" (Matt., xxiii, 5). This connexion led people to attach to the *ciṯṯh* and its various parts mystic significations, and to the statement that the wearing of it is the most important precept of the Law; nay more, is of equal merit with the observance of the whole Law.

The practice of wearing the *ciṯṯh* is still scrupulously followed by the Jews. The tassels are a part of the large *tállith*, or prayer-shawl, used universally during religious services: this garment is worn in such a way that the *ciṯṯh* are visible in front. Pious Jews, moreover, devised, since the Dispersion, an article of clothing, the small *tállith*, that would enable them to observe the Law at all times. This *tállith* is similar in shape to a large scapular, with the tassels fastened to the four corners, and is worn as an undergarment. Men only are to wear the *tállith* and the *ciṯṯh*.

*Talmud of Jerusalem*, Treat. *Ciṯṯh* (Venice, 1522-1523; French transl. by Schwab, Paris, 1871-1890); MAIMONIDES, *Yad Ha-hazakah* (1st ed. without place or date; 3d ed., Constantinople, 1509); BUXTORF, *Lexicon Talmudicum*, s. v. *Ciṯṯh* (Basle, 1639; Leipzig, 1859-1875); IDEM, *Synagoga Judaica*, 160-170 (Basle, 1603); HILLER, *Dissertatio de vestibus fimbriatis Hebræorum* in UGOLINI, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum*, XXI (Venice, 1744-1769).

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

**Frisians, CONVERSION OF THE.** See WILLIBRORD, SAINT.

**Fritz, SAMUEL**, a Jesuit missionary of the eighteenth century noted for his exploration of the Amazon River and its basin; b. at Trautenau, Bohemia, in 1654; d. 20 March, 1728. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1673. In 1684 he was sent to Quito as a missionary. For forty-two years Fritz acted in this capacity among the Indians of the Upper Marañon. He succeeded in converting among others the powerful tribe of Omaguas (Omañas) and in concentrating into civilized settlements the savages of forty different localities, in the country between the Rivers Napo and Negro. An adept in technical arts and handicraft, he also was endowed with extraordinary linguistic abilities, supplemented by the rare gift of knowing intuitively how to treat the Indians. These qualifications enabled him to accomplish prodigious work among them, and merited for him the respect not only of the savages but also of the Spanish Government, to which he rendered valuable service in its boundary dispute with the Portuguese. At the instance of the Real Audiencia of Quito he began (1687) the cartographical delineation of the disputed missionary territory on the Upper Marañon between Peru and Quito. In 1689 he undertook, in a primitive *piroque*, a daring expedition down the Amazon to Pará, where he was captured and imprisoned for two years on the suspicion of being a

Spanish spy. Although only imperfectly equipped with the necessary instruments, he completed a comparatively accurate chart of the river's course. This was the first approximately correct chart of the Marañon territory. He was also the first to follow the Tunguragua instead of the Gran Pará (Ucayali) and prove it the real source of the Marañon.

A Protestant, Wappaeus, writes of him in his "Handbuch der Geographie und Statistik" (Leipzig, 1863-70, 1. pt. III, 595) as follows: "The great respect justly shown at that time by European scientists for the geographical work of the Jesuits led to the admission into their ranks of Father Fritz by acclamation." In 1707 this map was printed at Quito and extensively copied, e. g. in the "Lettres Edifiantes" (Paris, 1781), VIII, 284, and the "N. Welt-Bott" (Augsburg, 1726, I), also in Condomine, "Relation abrégée d'un voyage fait dans l'intérieur de l'Amérique Mérid." (Paris, 1745), which contains the revised chart of Father Fritz for comparative study. The chart was reprinted in Madrid, in 1892, on the occasion of the fourth centenary of the discovery of America. There was another reprint in the "Recueil de voyage et de documents pour servir à l'hist. de la géogr.," ed. by Schéfer and Cordier (Paris, 1893). Three of his letters are incorporated in the "N. Welt-Bott" (Augsburg, 1726), III, nos. 24, 25; according to Condomine an original report of his travels is to be found in the archives of the Jesuit college at Quito.

PLATZWEG, *Lebensbilder deutscher Jesuiten* (Paderborn, 1882), 137; HUONDER, *Deutsche Jesuiten Missionare im 17. u. 18. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg, 1889); BORDA, *Hist. de la C. de J. en la Nueva Granada* (Poissy, 1872), I, 72; CHANTRE Y HERRERA, *Hist. de las Misiones de la C. d. J. en el Marañon Español* (Madrid, 1901), VI, ix, 296 sq.; WOLF, *Geogr. y Geología del Ecuador* (Leipzig, 1892), 566; ULLOA, *Viage á la América Merid.* (Madrid, 1748), I, vi, c. 5. For the linguistic abilities of Fritz, see ADELUNG, *Mythrid.* (Berlin, 1806), III, ii, 611.

A. HUONDER.

**Froissart, JEAN**, French historian and poet, b. at Valenciennes, about 1337, d. at Chimay early in the fifteenth century. The exact dates of his birth and death are unknown, as well as the family from which he sprang. In 1361, after receiving ecclesiastical tonsure, he went to England to present to Queen Philippa of Hainault an account in verse of the battle of Poitiers. This marked the beginning of the wandering life which led him through the whole of Europe and made him the guest of the chief personages of the end of the fourteenth century. His sojourn in England lasted till 1367. Queen Philippa received him well and inspired him with the idea of writing his chronicles. He travelled through England and visited Scotland where he met David Bruce. In 1367 he accompanied the Black Prince to Bordeaux, returned to London, and in 1368 accompanied the Duke of Clarence to Milan where the duke was to wed the daughter of Galeazzo Visconti. From Italy Froissart returned to Valenciennes where he learned of the death of Queen Philippa in 1369. He was then successively under the protection of Duke Wenceslaus of Brabant (1369-1381), and Comte Guy de Blois, seigneur of Beaumont, who bestowed on him the parish of Lestines-au-Mont and a canonicate at Chimay (1384). Froissart accompanied Count Guy into Flanders and to Blois. Then, to secure information concerning the Spanish wars, he visited the court of Gaston Phébus, Comte de Foix, and quitted it in 1389 in the company of Jeanne de Boulogne, the affianced bride of the Duc de Berry. In 1390 and 1391 he wrote his history at Valenciennes. He was at Paris in 1392, whence he went again to London, where he offered his poems to Richard II. Having quarrelled with Guy de Blois he found a new protector in Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. Little is known of his latter years, which were possibly passed at Chimay.

Froissart composed many poems of love and adventure, such as "l'Épinette Amoureuse", in which



he relates the story of his own life, and "Méliador", a poem in imitation of the Round Table cycle, etc. His chief work is the "Chroniques de France, d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, de Bretagne, de Gascogne, de Flandre et lieux circonvoisins", an account of European wars from 1328 till 1400. In the numerous manuscripts of the "Chronicles" three recensions of the first book are recognizable. The first, written between 1369 and 1379 brings the narrative to 1378 (the beginning is borrowed from the "Chronicle" of Jean le Bel, a canon of Liège). The tone of this recension is favourable to the English. The second recension, represented by the Amiens and Valenciennes MSS., was written under the inspiration of Guy de Blois and is favourable to the French. The third recension (Vatican MS.), written after 1400, is frankly hostile to England, but the MS. stops with the year 1340. The second, third, and fourth books of the "Chronicles" were written between 1387 and 1400.

The "Chronicles" contain many errors and are very partial, but despite these faults no work conveys so lively an impression of the men and things of the fourteenth century as this history of Froissart. His graceful and naïve style and the picturesque turn which he gives to his recollections make him the king of chroniclers. The "Chronicles" were much copied; one of the most beautiful manuscripts of Froissart is at Breslau, copied in 1469 by Aubert de Hesdin, and admirably illustrated with miniatures (S. Reinach, *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, May, 1905). Among the modern editions are those of: Buchon, "Pantheon littéraire", 3 vols. (Paris, 1835 and 1846), defective in the first book; Kervyn de Lettenhove, 29 vols. (Brussels, 1867-1877), gives the various recensions of each chapter; Siméon Luce began to publish in 1869 the edition of the Société de l'Histoire de France, 8 vols. (Paris, 1869-1888); G. Raynaud, commissioned to continue this undertaking, published volumes IX to XI, which contain part of Book II (Paris, 1897-1899). The poem "Méliador" was edited by A. Longnon for the Société des Anciens Textes Français (Paris, 1895).

KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE, *Froissart, étude littéraire sur le XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1857); DARMESTETER, *Froissart in Coll. des Grands écrivains français* (Paris, 1894), tr. POYNTER (London, 1895); MOLINIER, *Les Sources de l'Histoire de France*, s. v. *Les Valois*, IV, 5-18 (Paris, 1904); SAINTSBURY, *History of French Literature*; JOHNS, *Memoirs of the Life of Froissart*, etc. (London, 1801); see CHEVALIER, *Bio-bibl.*, s. v., for an extensive bibliography.

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

**Fromentin**, EUGÈNE, French writer and artist; b. at La Rochelle, 24 October, 1820; d. at Saint-Maurice, near La Rochelle, 26 August, 1876. His father, a distinguished physician and art connoisseur, intended him for the bar. After a brilliant course of studies, the young man came to Paris, in November, 1839, to follow the lectures in law. In 1843 he became associated with Maître Dénormandie, an attorney-at-law. But his literary and artistic inclinations gradually rendered his profession insupportable. Marilhat's exhibition of 1844 definitely decided him to devote himself to painting. He became a pupil of Cabat,

who was, with Flers, Huet, Corot, and Rousseau, one of the restorers of modern landscape painting. A short journey to Algeria, in 1846, showed him more clearly the line he was to follow. In 1848 and 1852 he again visited that country, to garner material for his work. He exhibited at the Salon in 1847. In 1850 he sent in eleven paintings, and was awarded a second-class medal. The only other notable events in his life were a voyage to Egypt, in the autumn of 1869, in the company of Napoleon III, at the time of the opening of the Suez Canal; and a short stay of some weeks in Holland, in July, 1875, where he obtained matter for his book, "Les Maîtres d'autrefois".

He was made chevalier of the Legion of Honour in 1859, and officer in 1869. He married in 1851.

In his lifetime, it was as a painter rather than as a writer that he became renowned. Orientalism was then in vogue. It suited the romantic tastes of the age, and satisfied the general curiosity for exotic customs. Great painters like Decamps, Delacroix, and Marilhat, had already made a specialty of it. Moreover, all thoughts were turned towards Algeria, a new, mysterious country, only half-conquered, which had just been the scene of a long colonial war. The public were never weary of hearing about it. Since the land has become so well known, this interest has ceased; and it must be admitted that Fromentin's reputation has suffered in consequence. Such is the penalty of a success partly based on the informative and teaching qualities of the

painter's art. The actuality has ceased to interest us; and the glory of the artist who depended on it must necessarily fade. But Fromentin is far from deserving the obscurity into which he is now relegated. His work, as a painter, is that of a charming artist, the work of a landscapist and a painter of customs, who had the secret ambition of becoming an historical painter, and who, wisely enough, selected in the modern world subjects and plan best accommodated to his ambition and his ability. Fromentin's art, either by the nature of his paintings or the dimensions, rarely surpasses the "genre" properly so called; and yet there is something naturally impressive in the beauty of the Arab life and manners, in that nomadic, feudal, warlike existence, the majestic simplicity of the desert spaces, and the immutable tranquillity of the Orient. Finally, one cannot fail to recognize the distinctive mark of Fromentin's art. He is not a faultless painter, but he is one of exquisite delicacy. After 1860, especially, under the influence of Corot, he becomes one of the cleverest modern "harmonists". His blue slate-coloured Algerian pictures, with their remarkable greyish tints, have not been excelled. As a painter of the Arab horse, in the "Curée" of the Louvre, he has no rival. Sometimes he is eloquent, as in the "Simoun", the "Soif", or the famous "Rue d'El Aghouat". But the works that show his art at its best are those that depict both customs and scenery, as the "Passage du Gué" (New York), the "Chasse au Faucon" (Chantilly); in these he is a kind of modern Wouverman, more elegant and poetic than the former. And one



JEAN FROISSART

After a picture in the Arras Library

may anticipate the day when, Africa in its turn having been subjected to civilization, industry, and uniformity, these pictures will be the sole witness of its ancient customs, and will then assume their historic significance.

It is, however, as a writer that Fromentin is rising more and more to fame. His work is very varied. As a result of his travels, he published, under the titles of: "Un été dans le Sahara" (Paris, 1856); and "Une année dans le Sahel" (Paris, 1858), the souvenirs of his two last sojourns in Algeria. In these he inaugurates a new method of description, much less "literary" than Chateaubriand's, less "technical" than Gautier's, a method which, in French tradition, marks the transition from Bernardin de Saint-Pierre to Loti. "Dominique" appeared later (Paris, 1862). This autobiography and transparent history of a pure youthful love is, together with "Adolphe" and the "Princesse de Clèves", one of the masterpieces of the French "roman d'analyse". But the work that will transmit Fromentin's name to posterity is his "Maitres d'autrefois" (Paris, 1876). This book is composed from the notes made during a journey through Belgium and Holland to study the old painters; or rather, this journey was the occasion of the work. For the author, in connexion with the paintings he saw, discusses, in passing, the questions of æsthetic moment which he raises. It may be said that this book really originated artistic criticism. As a critic Diderot is purely literary, Hegel metaphysical, Ruskin religious, moral, or apocalyptic, Taine historical, or philosophical; but Fromentin made criticism strictly "artistic"; that is to say, he seeks the secret of the significance, value, and beauty of a picture solely in an examination of the work, its style, and its methods of execution. It is through the painting thus understood and examined that he succeeds in determining the personality and the moral characteristics of the author. Here Fromentin is a great creator and a great writer, who really invents everything: methods, systems, and terminology. Some of his descriptions of paintings are the last word in the art of writing. Certain of his analyses, such as those of Rubens and Rembrandt, are definitive, and fix, forever, both the rules of the style or class, and the portraits of these great men. If to *understand* is to *equal*, it is by such pages that this distinguished writer, who has won a place among the first prose-writers of the last century, has really added something to the art of painting—that is to say—the manner of expressing it in writing.

SAINT-BEUVE, *Fromentin in Nouveaux lundis*, VII (Paris); GONSE, *Eugène Fromentin* (Paris, 1881), with letters and important inedited fragments; *Les dessins d'Eugène Fromentin* (London, 1877, folio); BLANCHON, *Lettres de Jeunesse de Fromentin* (Paris, 1909); BRUNETIERE, *Variétés Littéraires* (Paris, s. d.); GILLET, *Eugène Fromentin et Dominique in Revue de Paris* (1 Aug., 1905).

LOUIS GILLET.

**Frontal.** See ALTAR, sub-title *Altar-Frontal*.

**Frontenac**, COUNT LOUIS DE BUADE, a governor of New France, b. at Paris, 1622; d. at Quebec, 28 Nov., 1698. His father was captain of the royal castle of St-Germain-en-laye; his mother, née Phélypeaux, was the daughter of the king's secretary of state; Louis XIII was his godfather. By his valour and skill he won the rank of marshal of the king's camps and armies. He served in Holland, France, Italy, and Germany, and also in Candia where Turenne had sent him to command a contingent against the Turks. A brilliant military reputation, therefore, preceded him to Canada. During his first administration (1672–1682) he built a fort at Cataracouy (now Kingston) to awe the Iroquois and facilitate communications with the West. To explore the course of the Mississippi, previously discovered by Joliet and Marquette, he sent Cavellier de La Salle, who named the country watered by that river Louisiana, in honour of Louis XIV. Although intelligent and magnanimous, brave

and unflinching in peril, he was proud, imperious, and ready to sacrifice all to personal animosity. He quarrelled with most of the officials of the colony over petty questions: with his councillors, with the intendant (Duchesneau), with the Governor of Montreal (Perrot), and with Mgr de Laval, whose prohibition of the liquor-traffic with the Indians he judged harmful to commercial interests. The king, after vainly trying to curb his haughtiness, recalled him in 1682.

In 1689, when the uprising of the Iroquois and the Lachine massacre, in retaliation of Governor Denonville's treacherous dealing, threatened the existence of the colony, Frontenac was sent to the rescue and was hailed as a deliverer. He had to fight the allied Iroquois and English; but his bravery and ability were equal to the task. After d'Iberville's brilliant exploits in Hudson Bay, Frontenac divided his forces into three corps, which captured Corlar (Schenectady), Salmon Falls (N. H.) and Casco (Me.). When, to avenge these disasters, Boston sent a fleet against Quebec (1690), Frontenac's response to the summons of Phipps's envoy was: "Go tell your master that we shall answer him by the mouths of our guns"—a threat which was made good by the enemy's defeat. In 1696 Frontenac wisely disregarded the instructions of France to evacuate the upper country, which would have ruined the colony, and merely observed a defensive attitude. He dealt the Iroquois power a severe blow, burned the villages of the Onnontagués and Onneyouts, and devastated their country. By his orders d'Iberville razed Fort Pemquid in Acadia, captured St. John's, Newfoundland, and nearly the entire island, and took possession of all Hudson Bay Territory. Frontenac died sincerely regretted by the whole colony which he had saved from ruin. His character was a mixture of good and bad qualities. The latter were less evident during his second administration and his talents rendered eminent services. He found Canada weakened and attacked on all sides; he left it in peace, enlarged, and respected. He has been justly called "saver of the country". In spite of his Jansenistic education and prejudices against the bishop, the Jesuits, and even the Sulpicians, he possessed a rich fund of faith and piety. He was a faithful friend of the Recollects, and was buried in their church.

HOPKINS, *Canada, An Encyclopedia of the Country* (Toronto, 1890); GARNEAU, *Histoire du Canada* (Montreal, 1882); FERLAND, *Cours d'histoire du Canada* (Quebec, 1882); ROCHE-MONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1896); CHAPUIS, *Jean Talon* (Quebec, 1904); GAUTHIER, *Histoire du Canada* (Quebec, 1876).

LIONEL LINDSAY.



COUNT LOUIS DE BUADE  
FRONTENAC  
Philippe Hébert, Quebec

**Frowin**, BLESSED, Benedictine abbot, d. 11 March, 1178. Of the early life of Frowin nothing is known, save that he is claimed as a monk of their community by the historians of the two great Benedictine abbeys of Einsiedeln in Switzerland and St. Blasius in Baden. The first authentic fact in his career is his election as

abbot, about the year 1142, to succeed St. Adelhelm in the newly established monastery of Engelberg (q.v.) in the Canton of Unterwalden, Switzerland. As abbot Frowin was conspicuous for sanctity, learning, and administrative ability. Through his efforts the possessions and privileges, civil and ecclesiastical, of the abbey were greatly increased, while its renown as a home of learning, art, and piety spread far and wide. Himself a man of great intellectual endowments, thoroughly versed in all the science, sacred and profane, of his time, he established a famous school in his abbey, in which besides the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, philosophy and theology were likewise taught. The library which he collected possessed, for those days, a vast number of manuscripts. According to a list that he himself has left us, it contained Homer, Cicero, Cato, Ovid and other authors of antiquity. This rich collection perished in 1729, when the abbey was destroyed by fire. Blessed Frowin not only copied books for his library, but composed several. Two of these, a commentary on the Lord's Prayer, and a treatise in seven books, "De Laude Liberi Arbitrii" ("In Praise of Free Will", but in reality a discussion of the chief theological questions of his day, directed, it is thought, against the errors of Abelard) are still extant, having been discovered by Mabillon in the archives of Einsiedeln. Frowin's other works, Commentaries on the Ten Commandments and various parts of Holy Scripture, are lost. Though never formally beatified, Frowin has commonly been styled "Blessed" by the chroniclers (see "Act. SS.", March, IX, 683). Pétin ("Dictionnaire Hagiographique", I, iii) gives 7 March as his feast day, and credits him with many miracles.

P. L., CLXXIX, 1801; GOTTWALD in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Fructuosus of Braga**, SAINT, Archbishop, d. 16 April, c. 665. He was the son of a Gothic general, and studied in Palencia. After the death of his parents, he retired as a hermit to a desert in Galicia. Numerous pupils gathered around him, and thus originated the monastery of Complutum (Compludo), over which he himself at first presided; later, he appointed an abbot and again retired into the desert. In the course of time, he founded nine other monasteries, also one for 80 virgins under the saintly abbess Benedicta. In 654, Fructuosus was called to the Bishopric of Dumium, and on 1 December, 656, to the Archbishopric of Braga. The life of this greatest of Spanish monastic bishops was written by Abbot Valerius, and based on the accounts of his pupils. In 1102, his relics were transferred to Compostela. The feast day is the 16 of April. Fructuosus is depicted with a stag, which was devoted to him, because he had been saved by Fructuosus from the hunters. There are still extant two monastic rules written by Fructuosus. The first (25 chapters) was destined for the monastery of Complutum; it has an appendix (called *pactum*), containing the formulæ of consecration and the vows. The second, called the "common" rule, which consists of 20 chapters and refers to a union of monasteries governed by an abbot-bishop, is addressed chiefly to superiors of monasteries.

GAMS, *Kirchengesch. von Spanien* (1874), II, 152-158; HERWEGEN, *Das Pactum des hl. Fructuosus v. Braga; zur Geschichte des Monachthums* (Stuttgart, 1907). The rules of Fructuosus are in P. L., LXXXVII, 1099-1130. See ZÖCKLER, *Askese und Mönchthum*, 2nd ed. (1897), 378-81.

GABRIEL MEIER.

**Fructuosus of Tarragona**, SAINT, bishop and martyr; d. 21 Jan., 259. During the night of 16 Jan., he, together with his deacons Augurius and Eulogius, was led into prison, and on 21 Jan. tried by the judge Æmilianus. He confessed that he was a Christian and a bishop, whereupon all three were sentenced to be burnt alive. They underwent the ordeal courageously,

and, praying and with outstretched hands, gave up the ghost. In this position they are also depicted. St. Augustine mentions them in one of his sermons (celxxiii), and the Spanish poet Prudentius has celebrated them in a hymn (Peristephanon, hymn 6).

Acta SS., Jan., II, 340; RUTINART, *Acta Martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1857); GAMS, *Kirchengesch. von Spanien* (1862), I, 265-276. GABRIEL MEIER.

**Frumentius, SAINT.** See EDESIUS AND FRUMENTIUS.

**Fuchs, JOHANN NEPOMUK VON**, chemist and mineralogist; b. at Mattenzell, near Bremberg, Lower Bavaria, 15 May, 1774; d. at Munich, 5 March, 1856. He originally studied medicine, but after the year 1801 devoted himself to chemistry and mineralogy. Following the custom of his country, he pursued his studies at various universities: Heidelberg, Berlin, Freiburg, and Paris. In 1805 he taught chemistry and mineralogy at the University of Landshut, and at Munich in 1826. In 1823 he was nominated a member of the Academy of Sciences, and in 1854 conservator of the Museum of Mineralogy of Munich; two years before his death, the honour of nobility was conferred upon him by the King of Bavaria. He received many other honours. His memoirs, which are numerous, and play an important part in the development of the sciences of mineralogy and chemistry, are given in the collections of the Munich Academy, in Kastner's "Archives", Poggendorff's "Annalen", Dingler's "Journal", and other publications.

He wrote several books, among others one "On the Present Influence of Chemistry and Mineralogy" (Munich, 1824); one on the "Theories of the Earth" (Munich, 1824); "Natural History of the Mineral Kingdom" (Kempten, 1842); and a work on the preparation, properties, and uses of soluble glass (Munich, 1857). His name is to this day associated with soluble glass, an alkaline silicate used in a special kind of fresco painting, called stereochromy, so much so that sometimes it is called Fuchs's soluble glass. To-day soluble glass is also used in the application of bandages in surgery. His discovery of water glass was published in 1823. He pursued his researches in other departments of technical knowledge, his work on cement being particularly valuable. He retired from active life in 1852.

His collected works, produced by the committee of the central administration of the polytechnic union in the Kingdom of Bavaria, were edited, with his necrology, by Kaiser (Munich, 1856). His work included investigations on the replacement of one chemical group by another in minerals; the discovery of the amorphous state of several bodies; the artificial production of ultramarine and improvements in the dyeing industry, in the manufacture of beet-root sugar, and in brewing. A variety of muscovite, containing nearly four per cent of chromium (chrome mica), is named "Fuchsite" after him. Fuchs, who owed his early education to Fraenzell and the suppressed Jesuits at Ratisbon, was throughout his life a practical and earnest Catholic.

KNEILLER, *Das Christenthum u. die Vertreter der neueren Naturwissenschaft*, 241-244; KOBELL, *Memorial oration on Johann Nepomuk von Fuchs*, read in the public meeting of the Royal Academy of Sciences, 22 March, 1856 (Munich, 1856); *Catalogue of Scientific Papers of the Royal Society* (London, 1868).

T. O'CONOR SLOANE.

**Führich, JOSEPH**, b. 1800; d. 1876, was as Catholic in his art as in his life. He was fond of avowing his principles on art with great emphasis; he declares that religion, art, and nature are harmoniously combined in his mind, that he does not admit that ecclesiastical art is its own end, but that its end is to be serviceable in God's house, not as mere decoration, but as a means of instruction, in order to manifest to the heart as far as possible by means of the senses the life of faith. As a painter his works, like Overbeck's, were inspired

by piety, while in his conceptions and their expression he resembles Cornelius. As the son of a poor painter in the Bohemian town of Kratzau, he learned the elements of the art in his father's workshop and practised drawing while keeping his flock, the Christ-Child and the adoration of the shepherds being his favourite subject. His father brought him at the age of sixteen to the painter Bergler in Prague.

This artist was so well pleased with two compositions assigned by him to the novice, that he advised him to exhibit some of his pictures. Two of them were actually bought, and several art patrons procured for him the funds necessary to attend the academy. The reading of Romantic poets soon made a Romanticist of him. Cornelius's illustrations of "Faust" and Overbeck's sketch of Tasso confirmed this tendency. On his journeys to Dresden and Vienna he became fond of Dürer's creations. He illustrated the Lord's Prayer in nine etchings and Tieck's "Genoveva" in fifteen. To the recommendation of some Romanticists he was indebted for the means for a journey to Rome, which he began towards the end of 1826. In Italy he studied the works of different periods of art, above all acquired the historical style, studied the representation of the great Christian mysteries, and modified his method by the study of the works of Raphael and Michelangelo. Of course he did not fail to become acquainted with Fra Angelico, a spirit congenial to his own. In Rome he immediately joined the Nazarene School, learned monumental technique, and completed the Tasso cycle in the Villa Massimo by adding three frescoes: "Armida and Rinaldo", "Armida in the Enchanted Forest", and "The Crusaders at the Holy Sepulchre." The year 1829 saw him again in Prague, but in 1834 he went to Vienna, where he lived till his death.

It is noteworthy that two of his early pictures, painted shortly after his return, viz. "Jacob and Rachel" and "Mary's Journey over the Mountains", sold for five times the original price, even during his lifetime. In 1841 he became professor in the academy of Vienna and was raised to the order of knighthood in 1854, and was henceforth commonly called Ritter von Führich. Executed with the same care as the paintings just mentioned, are "Booz and Ruth", "St. Guldula", "Christ in Limbo", "Christ on His Way to the Garden". He painted religious pictures almost exclusively; of Old-Testament subjects we may mention: "God writes the Commandments upon the Tables of Stone", "Josue and the Destruction of Jericho", "The Sorrowing Jews"; of New-Testament pictures: "Joseph's Dream", "Joseph and Mary on their Way to Jerusalem", "The Birth of Christ", "The Storm on the Sea", "The Miraculous Draught of Fishes". These pictures prove the grandeur and loftiness of religious themes and testify to the moral and mystical conception of the artist. Purity in form and energy in expression, a simple beauty in movement and dress, without pretension and affectation, are their unmistakable excellencies. The artist's desire to apply the monumental fresco-technic in his native country was fulfilled twice. In 1844-46 he painted the Stations of the Cross in the church of St. John Nepomucene in Vienna. The work was appreciated on all sides, and copies of it have reached America and the most distant missions.

In 1854-61 he painted, together with others, the church of Altlerchenfeld in Vienna. The artist himself has explained to us the plan of this Christian epos. Christ's activity as the Saviour before, during, and after his earthly career, is presented here to the eyes of the faithful as in a great picture Bible; in the vestibule, what precedes the creation of man; on the walls of the entrance and in the aisles, the prototypes of the Old Testament; in the nave, scenes from the New Testament; the pictures in the transept represent the proximate preparation for the redemption; over the main

altar, the Crucifixion, and in the choir, Christ's life in His Church. The plan, as well as the composition, is magnificent; in the execution he was aided by less skilful hands, and the colouring is at times imperfect, as is the case in most of the works of the Nazarenes. But Führich acquired his greatest fame as a draughtsman. Though we may miss at times individuality, characters drawn from life, and dramatic movement, a fact which will not astonish us, considering the ideal character of his subjects, still he meets the essential requirements of his theme, often enraptures us by his *naïveté* and piety, by his noble lines and thoughtful invention. His cyclical pictures have become the joy of the Christian people. The master here achieves his ideal of the artist's work. The artist must be a man of meditation and a man of enthusiasm, who can translate the element of instruction from the purely intellectual sphere into that of the imagination, turn mere inspection into contemplation. The Christmas cycle or "The Way to Bethlehem" in its twelve numbers contains the most beautiful pictorial idylls. Full of charm and touching is the symbolical figure of the human soul, whose attention is first called by the personification of Christian art to the mystery of the Incarnation and which then follows the events with the light of meditation and the inspiration of art. The fifteen pictures of the Easter cycle, "He is Risen", surprise us by the fertility of ideas, by the astonishing skill in the use of symbolical language, by their dignified earnestness and deep truth. Equally imperishable works of art are the eleven drawings and etchings entitled "Christ's Triumph". In "Thomas à Kempis" (to the text of Guido Görres) Führich found an opportunity to throw the principal tenets of our religion into poetical form, and at the same time to reveal the wealth of his Christian heart.

To these works must be added "The Life of Mary", "The Legend of St. Wendelin", "The Psalter", "Poor Henry", and "Memorials for Our Time". Most of these drawings were made for woodcuts, "The Prodigal Son" and "Ruth" for copperplate engravings. Führich's Catholic principles of aesthetics are laid down in his beautiful booklet "Von der Kunst", also in "Kunst und ihre Formen". Moreover, we have from his pen "Briefe aus Italien" and an autobiography; a new edition of the latter, prepared by friends and enriched with additions, appeared in 1875 in Vienna.

LUKAS FÜHRICH, the son of the artist, in the *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, vol. XCII, 625 sqq., wrote an account of the master's residence in Vienna and of the friends who used to meet there; IDEM, a biography in *Graphische Künste*, VIII (Vienna, 1886), 1-3; VALENTIN in DOHME, *Kunst und Künstler* (Leipzig, 1885); BRUNNER in *Frankfurter Broschüren* (1888).

G. GIETMANN.

**Fulbert of Chartres**, bishop, b. between 952 and 962; d. 10 April, 1028 or 1029. Mabillon and others think that he was born in Italy, probably at Rome; but Pfister, his latest biographer, designates as his birthplace the Diocese of Laudun in the present department of Gard in France. He was of humble parentage and received his education at the school of Reims, where he had as teacher the famous Gerbert who in 999 ascended the papal throne as Sylvester II. In 990 Fulbert opened a school at Chartres which soon became the most famous seat of learning in France and drew scholars not only from the remotest parts of France, but also from Italy, Germany, and England. Fulbert was also chancellor of the church of Chartres and treasurer of St. Hilary's at Poitiers. So highly was he esteemed as a teacher that his pupils were wont to style him "venerable Socrates". He was a strong opponent of the rationalistic tendencies which had infected some dialecticians of his times, and often warned his pupils against such as extol their dialectics above the teachings of the Church and the testimony of the Bible. Still it was one of Fulbert's pupils, Berengarius of Tours, who went farthest in subjecting



MARY'S JOURNEY THROUGH THE HILL COUNTRY—FÜRCH





faith to reason. In 1007 Fulbert succeeded the deceased Rudolph as Bishop of Chartres and was consecrated by his metropolitan, Archbishop Leutheric of Sens. He owed the episcopal dignity chiefly to the influence of King Robert of France, who had been his fellow student at Reims. As bishop he continued to teach in his school and also retained the treasurership of St. Hilary. When, about 1020, the cathedral of Chartres burned down, Fulbert at once began to rebuild it in greater splendour. In this undertaking he was financially assisted by King Canute of England, Duke William of Aquitaine, and other European sovereigns. Though Fulbert was neither abbot nor monk, as has been wrongly asserted by some historians, still he stood in friendly relation with Odilo of Cluny, Richard of St. Vannes, Abbo of Fleury, and other monastic celebrities of his times. He advocated a reform of the clergy, severely rebuked those bishops who spent much of their time in warlike expeditions, and inveighed against the practice of granting ecclesiastical benefices to laymen.

Fulbert's literary productions include 140 epistles, 2 treatises, 27 hymns, and parts of the ecclesiastical Office. His epistles are of great historical value, especially on account of the light they throw on the liturgy and discipline of the Church in the eleventh century. His two treatises are in the form of homilies. The first has as its subject: "Misit Herodes rex manus, ut affligeret quosdam de ecclesiâ" etc. (Acts, xii, 1); the second is entitled "Tractatus contra Judæos" and proves that the prophecy of Jacob, "Non auferetur sceptrum de Judâ" etc. (Gen., xlix, 10), had been fulfilled in Christ. Five of his nine extant sermons are on the Blessed Virgin Mary, towards whom he had a great devotion. The life of St. Aubert, Bishop of Cambrai (d. 667), which is sometimes ascribed to Fulbert, was probably not written by him. Fulbert's epistles were first edited by Papire le Masson (Paris, 1585). His complete works were edited by Charles de Villiers (Paris, 1608), then inserted in "Bibl. magna Patrum" (Cologne, 1618), XI, in "Bibl. maxima Patrum" (Lyons, 1677), XVIII, and with additions, in Migne, P. L., CXLI, 189-368.

PISTIER, *De Fulberti Carnotensis episcopi vitâ et operibus* (Nancy, 1886); *Histoire littéraire de la France*, VII, 261-279, reprinted in P. L., CXLI, 167-184. For a critical valuation of his epistles see WERNER, *Gerbert von Aurillac* (Vienna, 1881), 273-286.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Fulcran, SAINT**, Bishop of Lodève; d. 13 February, 1006. According to the biography which Bernard Guidonis, Bishop of Lodève (d. 1331), has left us of his saintly predecessor, Fulcran came of a distinguished family, consecrated himself at an early age to the service of the Church, became a priest, and from his youth led a pure and holy life. When in 949 Theoderich, Bishop of Lodève, died, Fulcran, notwithstanding his unwillingness, was chosen as his successor and was consecrated by the Archbishop of Narbonne on 4 February of the same year. He was untiring in his efforts to conserve the moral life within his diocese, especially among the clergy and the religious orders; he rebuilt many churches and convents, among them the cathedral dedicated to St. Genesis and the church of the Holy Redeemer with the Benedictine monastery attached to it. The poor and the sick were the objects of his special care; for their support he founded hospitals and endowed others already existing. The following anecdote from his life is worthy of mention. A bishop of Gaul had fallen away from the Faith and had accepted Jewish teachings. When the news reached Fulcran, he exclaimed in an excess of zeal: "This bishop should be burned!" Shortly afterwards the renegade prelate was actually seized by his incensed flock and delivered up to death by fire. Fulcran was then filled with remorse that by his utterance he should have been the cause of the apostate's death,

and, after doing severe penance, he made a pilgrimage to Rome, there to receive absolution for his supposed guilt. After his death he was buried in the cathedral of Lodève and honoured as a saint. His body, which had been preserved intact, was burned by the Huguenots in 1572, and only a few particles of his remains were saved. He is the second patron of the Diocese of Lodève, and his feast falls on 13 February.

BERNARD GUIDONIS, *Vita Fulcranni in Speculum Sanctorale* in *Acta S.*, Feb., II, 710-17; *Testamentum S. Fulcranni*, *ibid.*, appendix, 897-900; DE BOSQUET, *Vie de saint Fulcran, évêque de Lodève* (Paris, 1651; new ed., Lodève, 1836); BAC, *Vie de Saint Fulcran* (Lodève, 1853); BORTY, *Vie de Saint Fulcran* (Montpellier, 1865); REYNIS, *Les reliques de Saint Fulcran de Lodève* (Lodève, 1861).

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Fulda, DIOCESE OF (FULDENSIIS).**—This diocese of the German Empire takes its name from the ancient Benedictine abbey of Fulda. To systematize the work of evangelizing Germany, St. Boniface organized a hierarchy on the usual ecclesiastical basis; in Bavaria the Dioceses of Salzburg, Freising, Ratisbon, and Passau; in Franconia and Thuringia, Würzburg, Eichstätt, Buraburg near Fritzlar, and Erfurt. To facilitate missionary work farther north, especially among the Saxons, he sought a suitable spot for the location of a monastery. He chose for this mission St. Sturm, who, after journeying far and wide, found an appropriate place in the great forest of Buchonia, in the district of Grabfeld on the Fulda. Boniface sanctioned this choice of a location, and petitioned Carloman, to whom the country round about belonged, to grant him the site for a monastery. Carloman yielded to the saint's request, and also induced the Frankish nobles who had estates in the vicinity to bestow a part of them on the Church. On 12 March, 744, St. Sturm took solemn possession of the land, and raised the cross. The wilderness was soon cleared, and the erection of the monastery and church, the latter dedicated to the Most Holy Redeemer, begun under the personal direction of St. Boniface. He appointed St. Sturm first abbot of the new foundation, which he intended to surpass in greatness all existing monasteries of Germany, and to be a nursery for priests. The rule was modelled on that of the Abbey of Monte Cassino, as Sturm himself had gone to Italy (748) for the express purpose of becoming familiar with it. To secure absolute autonomy for the new abbey, Boniface obtained from Pope Zachary a privilege, dated 4 November, 751, placing it immediately under the Holy See, and removing it from all episcopal jurisdiction. The authenticity of this document has frequently been called into question, but on the whole it is considered as well established. (For further details see Tangl in "Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung", 1899; and B. Sepp, "Die Fuldaer Privilegienfrage", Ratisbon, 1908.) In 753 Pepin gave the royal sanction to this exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. Boniface showed his love for Fulda when he charged that his remains should be laid to rest there.

Under the prudent administration of St. Sturm (d. 779), the monastery soon rose to greater splendour; from an early period the tomb of St. Boniface made it a national sanctuary for Christian Germany. Great success crowned the agricultural work of the monks, and small colonies which were established in different places gradually became the centres of villages and civil communities. Soon Fulda was the mother-house of a number of smaller monasteries, which were later administered by provosts under the superintendence of the abbot. The gifts of German princes, nobles, and private individuals increased the landed possessions of the abbey so rapidly that they soon extended over distant parts of Germany; there were estates in Thuringia, Saxony, Hesse, Bavaria, Lorraine, Swabia; possessions along the Rhine, in

East Frisia, and even at Rome (the church of Sant' Andrea). Even in artistic and literary lines Fulda rose to great importance. On the site of the first church, which had been artistically decorated by Sturmian, there rose under Abbots Baugulf (779–802), Ratgar (802–17), Eigil (818–22), and Rabanus Maurus (822–42) a magnificent edifice which roused the admiration of contemporaries, and even of posterity, and exerted a lasting influence on architectural and artistic activity in distant places. In addition to architecture, sculpture and painting were zealously cultivated. The monastic school established by Sturmian began to flourish during the time of Charlemagne and Alcuin, and, under Rabanus Maurus, particularly, was the chief nursery of civilization and learning in Germany, and became celebrated throughout Europe. It was open not only to theological students, but also to young men desiring to embrace secular careers. The curriculum embraced the subjects usually taught during the Middle Ages: the seven liberal arts (grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetic, geometry, physics, and astronomy), the different branches of theology, and the German language. Among the most renowned pupils of this school were: Rabanus Maurus, Walafried Strabo, Servatus Lupus, Otfried of Weissenburg, Rudolfus Fuldensis, William, Probus, and Meginhard; among the laity: Einhard, Bernhard, King of Italy, and Ulrich von Hutten. Rabanus also founded a library to familiarize the Germans with religious and classical literature, and the zeal of the monks soon produced rich treasures of valuable manuscripts. Unfortunately the greater part of this library disappeared during the looting of the abbey by the Hessians in 1631, and has not since been discovered.

Gradually the monastery rose to a commanding position in the German Empire. From 968 the abbot was primate of all the Benedictine monasteries of Germany and Gaul; from the time of Otto I, arch-chancellor of the empress, whom he crowned jointly with the Elector of Mainz; from the twelfth century he was a prince of the empire; from 1184 had the privilege of sitting at the left of the emperor; and from 1360 the imperial banner was borne before him by a knight. This glory, however, was not wholly without shadows. The monastic discipline was relaxed to such a degree that Abbot Marquard (1150–65) undertook to carry out a reform by introducing the regulations in force at Hirsau (*Consuetudines Hirsauenses*). The importance of the school as a centre of learning also declined. The great wealth of the abbey in landed possessions, tithes, revenues, and regalia drew an increasing number of nobles to the monastery. By the twelfth century the monks of noble birth had monopolized the seats of the chapter and, in the course of time, practically all the important offices of the abbey itself, as well as the provostships of the dependent houses, were held by members of the German nobility. The difficulty of administering the vast landed possessions caused the abbots to grant certain sections in fief, which eventually resulted in great losses to the abbey; for the feudatories frequently turned their positions to their own personal interests, and sought to convert the fiefs into private property. One of the most notable illustrations of the greed of these monastic stewards is shown by the action of Count Johann von Ziegenhain in the fourteenth century, who, in an insurrection of the burghers of the city of Fulda against Abbot Heinrich VI von Hohenberg (1315–53), headed the attack on the monastery. Not infrequently, too, the obligations of the abbots as princes of the empire, and the demands made upon them by the state proved most detrimental to the interests of the monastery and its inmates. In 1294, on application of the convent, the pope enjoined a separation of the abbatial and the conventual tables, which was put into effect in 1300 under Abbot Hein-

rich V von Weilnau (1288–1313) (cf. Rubsam, "Heinrich V. von Weilnau, Fürstabt von Fulda", Fulda, 1879). Imperial capitulations, of which there are records as early as the time of Heinrich VII von Kranlucken (1353–72), especially those of Johann I von Merlau (1395–1440), the "Old Statutes of 1395", restricted to a considerable degree the authority of the abbot over the convent, and raised correspondingly the independent status of that institution. In the mother-house the dean eventually replaced the abbot for all practical purposes. For centuries the chapter preserved this independence, which involved the almost complete exclusion of the abbot from the ecclesiastical organization of his monastery.

At a comparatively early date the teachings of the Reformers found access to the chapter of Fulda, with which, in 1513, the Abbey of Hersfeld had been united; and Abbot Johannes III von Henneberg (1521–41) was forced to consent to a decree of reform favouring the spread of the new doctrines. The zealous Abbot Balthasar von Dermbach (1570–1606) proved an earnest restorer of discipline in the chapter, vigorously inaugurating the work of the Counter-Reformation. Banished by the members of the chapter and their colleagues in 1576, he was unable to return to his abbey until 1602, great progress having been made meanwhile by the imperial administrators in restoring the Catholic Faith. The foundation of a Jesuit college in 1571 was the signal for the renaissance of the school, which had sunk to comparative insignificance. In addition to the Jesuit gymnasium, Gregory XIII founded (1584) a papal seminary, which he placed under the direction of the Jesuits. Both of these institutions have contributed largely to the maintenance and spread of the Catholic Faith in Germany. A similar zeal for reform was displayed by Balthasar's second successor, Johann Bernhard Schenk von Schwensberg (1623–32), whose exertions, together with the decrees of several papal visitors, particularly Pietro Luigi Caraffa (1627), restored to the abbot a certain measure of his proper authority, over against that of the chapter and the professors of noble birth. The decrees of reform issued by Caraffa, against which the provosts rebelled after the nuncio's departure, were repeatedly confirmed by the Holy See. The capitulars and provosts of noble birth still retained the privilege of admitting into the chapter only such as could show a certain number of noble ancestors, and this prerogative received papal confirmation in 1731. During the Thirty Years War the chapter was again menaced; in 1631, Landgrave Wilhelm V of Hesse, by virtue of a treaty with Gustavus Adolphus, received the abbey in fief to Sweden, and sought gradually to make Protestantism predominant. After the battle of Nördlingen, however, he no longer had power over Fulda. When the turmoil of the war had ceased, the abbey experienced a period of peace and prosperity. In 1732 the Jesuit and Benedictine schools were united, enlarged, and converted into a university. Benedict XIV raised the abbey to the rank of a bishopric (5 Oct., 1752), with the retention of its monastic organization. The first prince-bishop was Amand von Buseck (1737–56), the collegiate chapter of one dean and fourteen capitulars being now the cathedral chapter.

By the Imperial Delegates' Enactment (*Reichsdeputationshauptschluss*) of 1802 the abbey was secularized, and bestowed on the Prince of Orania as a secular principality; it embraced at this time forty sq. miles, with a population of 100,000. Under Napoleon, in 1809, it was ceded to the Grand Duchy of Frankfurt; in 1815, to Hesse-Kassel, with which, in 1866, it passed to Prussia. The university was closed under the law of secularization, and the papal seminary was converted into an episcopal seminary. The last prince-bishop, Adalbert III von Harstall (1788–1802), died in 1814.

In accordance with the Bulls "Provida solersque" of 1821 and "Ad dominici gregis custodiam" of 1827, the Diocese of Fulda was re-established in 1829, and made suffragan to the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, the first bishop being Johann Adam Rieger (1829-31).

In 1857 and 1871 the boundaries of the new diocese were so altered as to define the territory now embraced within it. It was seriously affected by the Kulturkampf, the see being vacant from 1873 to 1881, and the seminary closed between 1873 and 1886; some of the religious communities suppressed at that time have never been re-established. The present bishop (1909) is Joseph Damian Schmitt, consecrated in 1907.

**Statistics.**—The Diocese of Fulda embraces the Prussian administrative district of Kassel of the province of Hesse-Nassau, Bockenheim (a section of the civic circle of Frankfurt-on-the-Main in the administrative district of Wiesbaden), the Grand Duchy of Saxe-Weimar, and one parish of the Grand Duchy of Hesse; Catholic population in 1900 was 167,306, in 1909 about 200,000. It comprises the exempt civic district of Fulda, with 3 parishes and 14 deaneries; for the care of souls, 150 parishes and curacies; 40 chaplaincies and posts as assistants; 53 administrative and teaching positions. The bishop is elected by the cathedral chapter, which consists of a dean, 4 capitulars and 4 prebends. The clergy employed in the care of souls in 1909 number 226 secular and 26 regular priests, giving a total of 252 active clergy, including pastors, curates, chaplains, and assistant priests, as well as priests engaged in the work of teaching and administrative offices. The following orders and congregations are represented in the diocese: Franciscans, at Fulda and Salmunster, with (1907) 35 fathers, and 40 brothers; Oblates of Mary Immaculate, at Hunfeld, with 28 fathers, and 29 brothers; Brothers of Mercy, at Fulda, with 6 brothers. Communities of women are: 1 abbey of Benedictine nuns at Fulda, with 35 sisters; 1 monastery of the English Ladies at Fulda, with 36 sisters; Ursulines at Fritzlar, 32 sisters; Sisters of Mercy of St. Vincent de Paul, 44 communities, with 363 sisters; Poor Servants of Christ, at Frankfurt-Bockenheim, 18 sisters; Grey Nuns of St. Elizabeth, at Eisenach, 9 sisters; Vincentians at Kassel, 27 sisters; School Sisters of Divine Mercy at Kassel, 26 sisters.

The diocesan institutions are: the episcopal seminary at Fulda, with eight professors of theology; the episcopal gymnasium or preparatory seminary at Fulda; the episcopal Latin schools at Amöneburg, Geisa, Hunfeld, and Orb; the school for orphaned boys at Sannerz; a similar institution for girls at Maberzell, near Fulda; the reform school for young women at Horas near Fulda; St. Joseph's House for Orphans and First Communicants at Hünfeld; the Lioba Hospital for Incurables at Fulda; and the asylum for imbeciles at Fulda. The most important church of the diocese is the cathedral at Fulda, in the style of the Renaissance, erected by Prince-Abbot Adalbert von Schleifras (1704-12) on the site of the church built by Abbot Baugulf and his successors. It contains precious altars, a rich treasury, and, as its most important shrine, the tomb of St. Boniface, at which the bishops of Prussia, Baden, and Württemberg gather once a year (cf. Pfaff, "Der Dom zu Fulda", 2nd ed., Fulda, 1855). Mention should also be made of the church of St. Michael at Fulda, dating from Carolingian times; the church on the Petersberg near Fulda; the church of St. Peter at Fritzlar, erected early in the thirteenth century; and the Protestant church of St. Elizabeth at Marburg, a noble specimen of the thirteenth century Gothic. The most popular place of pilgrimage in the diocese is the tomb of St. Boniface.

BROUWER, *Fuldensium antiquitates libri IV* (Antwerp, 1612); SCHANNAT, *Corpus traditionum Fuldensium* (Leipzig, 1724);

IDEM, *Fuldischer Lehn-hof* (Frankfurt-on-the-Main, 1726); IDEM, *Vindiciae quorundam archivi Fuldensis diplomatum* (Frankfurt-on-the-Main, 1728); DRONKE, *Traditiones et antiquitates Fuldenses* (Kassel, 1844); IDEM, *Codex diplomaticus Fuldensis* (Kassel, 1850; index, 1862); ARND, *Geschichte des Hochstifts Fulda* (Frankfurt, 1862); GEGENBAUER, *Das Kloster Fulda im Karolingerzeitalter* (2 vols., 1871, 1873); KOMP, *Die zweite Schule Fuldas und das päpstliche Seminar* (Fulda, 1877); IDEM in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; LOTZ, *Die Hochschule zu Fulda, in Hessenland*, XII (1898); HEYDENREICH, *Das älteste Fuldaer Cartular* (Leipzig, 1899); RICHTER, *Die ersten Anfänge der Bau- und Kunsttätigkeit des Klosters Fulda* (Fulda, 1900); IDEM, *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Abtei und der Diözese Fulda*, I-III (Fulda, 1904-07); *Schematismus der Diözese Fulda* (Fulda, 1904; new ed., 1909); *Festgabe zum Bonifatius-jubiläum*, 1905 (Fulda, 1905); a collection of original documents relating to Fulda is in the course of preparation.

JOSEPH LINS.

**Fuldensis Codex.** See MSS. OF THE BIBLE.

**Fulgentius**, SAINT, Bishop of Ecija (Astigi), in Spain, at the beginning of the seventh century. Like his brothers Leander and Isidore, two holy Archbishops of Seville, of whom the first was older and the second younger than Fulgentius, he consecrated himself to the service of the Church. A sister of the three was St. Florentina (q.v.). Their father Severianus lived at first in Cartagena; he was a Roman, and, according to later though doubtful information, an imperial prefect. Exact data regarding the life of Fulgentius are wanting, as he is mentioned only occasionally in contemporary sources. Leander, in his "Libellus" on the religious life written for his sister Florentina, states that he has sent Fulgentius back to his native town of Cartagena, which he now regrets as he fears that harm may befall him, and he requests Florentina to pray for him. What the danger was to which Fulgentius was exposed we have no means of knowing. Probably through the influence of Leander, who was made Archbishop of Seville in the year 584 and who played an important part in the affairs of the Visigothic kingdom, Fulgentius became Bishop of Astigi (Ecija), in the ecclesiastical province of Seville. As Leander died in 600 and Pegasius is shown to have still been Bishop of Ecija in 590, we may safely assume that Fulgentius was chosen bishop between 590 and 600; at all events, he already occupied the see in 610. Isidore, who succeeded to the Archbishopric of Seville upon the death of his brother Leander, dedicated to Fulgentius, "his lord, the servant of God", his work on the offices of the Church, "De ecclesiasticis officiis". In fact it was at the solicitation of Fulgentius that he wrote this account of the origin and authors of the Church services, i.e., of the Liturgy.

At the second synod of Seville (619), for which Isidore had assembled the bishops of the province of Bætica, a controversy between the Bishop of Astigi and the Bishop of Cordova regarding a church which was claimed by each as belonging to a parish in his diocese was brought up for settlement; a commission was appointed, and it was declared that thirty years' undisturbed possession should constitute a legal title. Fulgentius attended the synod in person, his name being found among the signatures to the Acts of the council. This is the last event in the life of Fulgentius for which we have positive proof. In any case, he died before the year 633, as one Marcellinus is shown to have then been Bishop of Astigi. Fulgentius, like his sister and brothers, was revered as a saint. In Spain his feast was celebrated on different days; in the "Acta Sanctorum" of the Bollandists it is on 14 January. He is frequently confused in medieval writings with Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe; some works have also been attributed to him, of which, however, no traces remain. It is said that long after their deaths the bones of St. Fulgentius and those of his sister, St. Florentina, were carried for safety into the Sierra de Guadalupe, and that in the fourteenth century they were found in the village of Berzocana in those mountains.

*Acta SS.*, Jan., I, 971-974 (translation of the *Biography* by QUINTANADUEÑAS); FLOREZ, *España sagrada*, X, 89; GAMS, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, II, 2 (Ratisbon, 1874).

J. F. KIRSCH.

**Fulgentius**, **FABIUS CLAUDIUS GORDIANUS**, SAINT, b. 468; d. 533; Bishop of Ruspe in the province of Byzacene in Africa, eminent among the Fathers of the Church for saintly life, eloquence and theological learning. His grandfather, Gordianus, a senator of Carthage, was despoiled of his possessions by the invader Genseric, and banished to Italy, his two sons returned after his death, and, though their house in Carthage had been made over to Arian priests, they recovered some property in Byzacene. Fulgentius was born at Telepte in that province. His father, Claudius, soon died, and he was brought up by his mother, Mariana. He studied Greek letters before Latin "*quo facilius posset, victurus inter Afros, locutionem Græcam, servatis aspirationibus, tamquam ibi nutritus exprimere*". We learn from these words of his biographer that the Greek aspirates were hard for a Latin to pronounce. We are told that Fulgentius at an early age committed all Homer to memory, and throughout his life his pronunciation of Greek was excellent. He was also well trained in Latin literature. As he grew older, he governed his house wisely in subjection to his mother. He was favoured by the provincial authorities, and made procurator of the fiscus. But a desire of religious life came over him: he practised austerities privately in the world for a time, until he was moved by the "Enarrationes" of St. Augustine on Psalm xxxvi to betake himself to a monastery which had been founded by a bishop named Faustus near his episcopal city, from which like other Catholic bishops he had been exiled by the Vandal king, Hunneric. The fervent appeal of the young man won his admission from Faustus, to whom he was already well known. His mother clamoured with tears at the door of the monastery to see her son; but he gave no sign of his presence there. He became ill from excessive abstinence, but recovered without renouncing it. His worldly goods he made over to his mother, leaving his younger brother dependent on her.

But Faustus was obliged to fly from renewed persecution, and by his advice Fulgentius sought a small monastery not far off, whose abbot, Felix, had been his friend in the world. Felix insisted upon resigning his office to Fulgentius. A contest of humility ended in the agreement of all that Fulgentius should be co-abbot. Felix cared for the house, and Fulgentius instructed the brethren; Felix showed charity to the guests, Fulgentius edified them with discourse. A raid of Moors made it necessary to remove to a safer spot, and a new retreat was started at Idida in Mauretania, but Fulgentius soon left Felix, having conceived an ardent desire to visit the monasteries of Egypt, for he had been reading the "Institutiones" and "Collationes" of Cassian, and he also hoped to be no longer superior, and to be able to keep yet stricter abstinence. He took ship at Carthage for Alexandria with a companion named Redemptus. On his arrival at Syracuse, the holy bishop of that city, Eulalius, told him, "The lands to which you wish to travel are separated from the communion of Peter by an heretical quarrel". Fulgentius therefore stopped a few months with Eulalius, and then sought further advice from an exiled bishop of his own province, who was living as a monk on a tiny island off the coast of Sicily. He was recommended to return to his own monastery, but "not to forget the Apostles". In consequence, he made a pilgrimage to Rome, where he was present at a speech made by Theodoric before the senate, and had an opportunity of despising all the magnificence the court of the Gothic king could show. His return was hailed with joy in Africa, and a nobleman of Byzacene gave him fertile land on which he established a new monastery. But Fulgentius retired from his position as

superior in order to live a more hidden life in a large and strict abbey which flourished on a rocky island. Here he worked, read, and contemplated. He was an accomplished scribe, and could make fans of palm leaves. Felix, however, refused to submit to the loss of his brother abbot, and he got Bishop Faustus to claim Fulgentius as his own monk and to order his return to Felix. The bishop ensured his continuance as abbot by ordaining him priest.

At this time the Arian King Thrasimund (496-523), though not so cruel a persecutor as his predecessors, allowed no Catholic bishops to be elected in Africa. It was decided in 508 by such bishops as could manage to meet together that it was necessary to brave this law, and it was decreed that elections should take place quietly and simultaneously in all the vacant sees, before the Government had time to take preventive measures. Fulgentius was nominated in several cities; but he had fled into hiding, and could not be found. When he thought all the appointments had been made, he reappeared, but the seaport of Ruspe, where the election had been delayed through the ambition of a deacon of the place, promptly elected him; and against his will he was consecrated bishop of a town he had never seen. He insisted on retaining his monastic habits. He refused all ease and continued his fasts. He had but one poor tunic for winter and summer; he wore no *orarium*, but used a leathern girdle like a monk; nor would he wear clerical shoes, but went barefoot or with sandals. He had no precious chasuble (*casula*), and did not permit his monks to have any. Under his chasuble he wore a grey or buff (?) cloak. The same tunic served day and night, and even for the holy Sacrifice, at which, said he, the heart and not the garment should be changed. His first care at Ruspe was to get the citizens to build him a monastery, of which he made Felix abbot, and he never lived without monks around him. But very soon all the new bishops were exiled. Fulgentius was one of the juniors among the 60 African bishops collected in Sardinia, but in their meetings his opinion was eagerly sought, and the letters sent in the name of all were always drawn up by him. He also frequently composed pastoral letters for individual colleagues to send to their flocks. Fulgentius had brought a few monks with him to Sardinia, and he joined with two other bishops and their companions in a common life, so that their house became the oracle of the city of Calaris, and a centre of peace, consolation, and instruction.

It was perhaps about the year 515 that Thrasimund issued a series of ten questions as a challenge to the Catholic bishops, and the reputation of Fulgentius was now so great that the king sent for him to Carthage to speak in the name of the rest. The saint, during his stay in that city, gave constant instructions in the faith of the Holy Trinity, and reconciled many who had been rebaptized by the Arians. He discussed with many wise persons the replies to be made to the ten questions, and at length submitted to the king a small but able work which we still possess under the title of "*Contra Arianos liber unus, ad decem objectiones decem responsiones continens*". The king then proposed further objections, but was anxious to avoid a second reply as effective as the former one. He took the unfair and tyrannical course of having the new questions, which were expressed at great length, read aloud once to Fulgentius, who was not allowed to have a copy of them, but was expected to give direct answers; though the public would not know whether he had really replied to the point or not. When the bishop pointed out that he could not even recollect the questions after hearing them but once, the king declared that he showed a want of confidence in his own case. Fulgentius was therefore obliged to write a larger work, "*Ad Trasimundum regem Vandalorum libri tres*", which is a very fine specimen of careful and orthodox theological argument.



Thrasimund seems to have been pleased with this reply. An Arian bishop named Pinta produced an answer which, with Fulgentius's refutation of it, is lost to us. The work now entitled "Adversus Pintam" is spurious. The king wished to keep Fulgentius at Carthage, but the Arian bishops were afraid of his influence and his power of converting, and therefore obtained his exile. He was put on board ship at night, that the people of Carthage might not know of his departure. But contrary winds obliged the vessel to remain several days in port, and nearly all the city was able to take leave of the holy bishop, and to receive Holy Communion from his hand. To a religious man who was weeping he privately prophesied his speedy return and the liberty of the African Church.

Fulgentius was accompanied to Sardinia by many of his monastic brethren. Instead, therefore, of proceeding to his former abode, he obtained permission from the Bishop of Calaris to build an abbey hard by the Basilica of St. Saturninus, and there he ruled over forty monks, who observed the strictest renunciation of private property, while the abbot saw to all their wants with great charity and discretion; but if any monk asked for anything, he refused him at once, saying that a monk should be content with what he is given, and that true religious have renounced their own will, "parati nihil velle et nolle". This severity in a particular point was no doubt tempered by the saint's sweetness of disposition and charm of manner, with which was associated a peculiarly winning and moving eloquence. He wrote much during his second exile. The Scythian monks, led by John Maxentius at Constantinople, had been trying to get their formula approved at Rome: "One of the Trinity was crucified". At the same time they were attacking the traces of Semipelagianism in the works of Faustus of Riez. On the latter point they had full sympathy from the exiles in Sardinia, whose support they had asked. Fulgentius wrote them a letter in the name of the other bishops (Ep. 15), and composed a work "Contra Faustum" in seven books, which is now lost. It was just completed when, in 523, Thrasimund died, and his successor, Hilderic, restored liberty to the Church of Africa.

The exiles returned, and new consecrations took place for all the vacant sees. When the bishops landed at Carthage, Fulgentius had an enthusiastic reception, and his journey to Ruspe was a triumphal progress. He returned to his beloved monastery, but insisted on Felix being sole superior; and he, who was consulted first among all the bishops of the province, asked leave in the monastery for the least things from the abbot Felix. He delivered in writing to the abbey a deed by which it was perpetually exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops of Ruspe. This document was read in the Council of Carthage of 534. It was in fact the custom in Africa that monasteries should not of necessity be subject to the local bishop, but might choose any bishop at a distance as their ecclesiastical superior. Fulgentius now gave himself to the care of his diocese. He was careful that his clergy should not wear fine clothes, nor devote themselves to secular occupations. They were to have houses near the church, to cultivate their gardens with their own hands, and to be particular about correct pronunciation and sweetness in singing the psalms. He corrected some with words, others with scourging. He ordered fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays for all clergy and widows, and for those of the laity that were able. In this last period of St. Fulgentius's life he published some sermons, and ten books against the Arian Fabianus, of which only fragments remain. A year before his death he was moved to great compunction of heart; he suddenly quitted all his work, and even his monastery, and sailed with a few companions to the island of Circe, where he gave himself to reading, prayer, and fasting in a monastery which he had previously caused to be constructed on a

small rock. There he mortified his members and wept in the presence of God alone, as though he anticipated a speedy death. But complaints were made of his absence, and he returned to his labours. He shortly fell into a grievous sickness. In his sufferings he said ceaselessly: "O Lord, give me patience here, and forgiveness hereafter." He refused, as too luxurious, the warm bath which the physicians recommended. He summoned his clergy and in the presence of the monks asked pardon for any want of sympathy or any undue severity he might have shown. He was sick for seventy days, continuing in prayer and retaining all his faculties to the last. His possessions he gave to the poor, and to those of his clergy who were in need. He died on 1 January, 533, in the sixty-fifth year of his life and the twenty-fifth of his episcopate.

Besides the works already mentioned, we still possess of St. Fulgentius some fine treatises, sermons, and letters. The best known is the book "De Fide", a description of the true Faith, written for a certain Peter, who was going on a pilgrimage to the schismatic East. The three books "Ad Monimum", written in Sardinia, are addressed to a friend who understood St. Augustine to teach that God predestinates evil. St. Fulgentius is saturated with St. Augustine's writings and way of thinking, and he defends him from the charge of making God predestinate evil. He himself makes it a matter of faith that unbaptized infants are punished with eternal fire for original sin. No one can by any means be saved outside the Church; all pagans and heretics are infallibly damned. "It is to think unworthily of grace, to suppose that it is given to all men", since not only not all have faith, but there are still some nations which the preaching of the Faith has not yet reached. These harsh doctrines seem to have suited the African temperament. His last work against Semipelagianism was written at Ruspe and addressed to the leaders of the Scythian monks, John and Venerius: "De veritate prædestinationis et gratiæ Dei", in three books. To these we may add the two books, "De remissione peccatorum". He wrote much on the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation: "Liber contra Arianos", "Liber ad Victorem", "Liber ad Scarilam de Incarnatione". To St. Augustine's doctrine of the Trinity, Fulgentius adds a thorough grasp of the doctrine of the Person of Christ as defined against Nestorianism and Eutychianism. His thought is always logical and his exposition clear, and he is the principal theologian of the sixth century, if we do not count St. Gregory. His letters have no biographical interest, but are theological treatises on chastity, virginity, penance, etc. His sermons are eloquent and full of fervour, but are few in number.

The chief authority for the life of St. Fulgentius is the biography by a disciple, almost certainly FERRANDUS, the canonist; it is prefixed to his works, and is also in *Acta SS.*, 1 Jan. See REYNOLDS in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, who refers also to SCHROECKH, *Kirchengeschichte*, xvii, xviii, and WIGGESS, *Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, II; there is an excellent summary of his works in FESSLER-JUNGSMANN, *Patrologia*, II; WÖRTER, *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus*, III (Münster, 1900); FICKER, *Zur Würdigung des Vita Fulgentii* (*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, 1900, 9); HELM identifies St. Fulgentius with the grammarian Fabius Furius Fulgentius Planciades (*Rhein. Mus. Philol.*, 1897, 177; *Philologus*, 1897, 253; see TEUFFEL-SCHWABE, *Gesch. der rom. Lit.*, 5th ed., pp. 1238 sqq.). On the collection of 80 spurious sermons appended to St. Fulgentius's works (first publ. by Raynaldus, Lyons, 1652) see G. MORIN, *Notes sur un MS. des homélies du Pseudo-Fulgence* (*in Revue Bénéd.*, April, 1909). The best edition of St. Fulgentius is that of DESPREZ (Paris, 1684), reprinted in Migne, P. L., LXXV. Cf. BARDENHEWER, *Patrology* (tr., St. Louis, 1908).

JOHN CHAPMAN.

**Fulgentius Ferrandus**, a canonist and theologian of the African Church in the first half of the sixth century. He was a deacon of Carthage and probably accompanied his master and patron, Fulgentius of Ruspe, to exile in Sardinia, when the bishops of the African Church were banished from their sees by the Arian King of the Vandals, Thrasamund. After the death of Thrasamund and the accession of Hilderic, in

523, the exiles were permitted to return, and Fulgentius, although only a deacon, soon gained a position of great importance in the African Church. He was frequently consulted in regard to the complex theological problems of the time and was known as one of the most redoubtable champions of orthodoxy in Western Christendom. His works are mostly of a doctrinal character. He defended the Trinitarian doctrines against the Arians and dealt besides with the question of the two natures in Christ, with baptism, and with the Eucharist. He drew up a "Breviatio Canonum Ecclesiasticorum" in which he summarized in two hundred and thirty-two canons the teaching of the earliest councils, Nicæa, Laodicea, Sardica, etc., concerning the manner of life of bishops, priests, deacons and other ecclesiastics, and of the conduct to be observed towards Jews, heathens and heretics. He also wrote at the request of the Comes Reginus (who was probably military governor of North Africa) a treatise on the Christian rule of life for soldiers, in which he laid down seven rules which he explained and inculcated, and in which he gave evidence of his piety and practical wisdom. Through no desire of his own, he was forced to take an active part in the controversy brought about through the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" by the Emperor Justinian. At the request of Pope Vigilius the Roman deacons Pelagius and Anatolius submitted the questions involved in the emperor's censure of the works of Theodore of Mopuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, to their Carthaginian confrère, requesting him at the same time to lay the matter before the African bishops. Ferrandus at once declared himself in the most emphatic manner against yielding to the schemes of the emperor (Ep. vi, ad Pelagium et Anatolium diaconos). His decision met with the approval of Rusticus, Archbishop of Carthage, and was subsequently ratified by the council of African bishops over which Rusticus presided, and in which it was agreed to sever all relations with Pope Vigilius. Ferrandus died shortly after this event and before the Council of Constantinople was convened. (For his works see P. L., LXVII.)

AUDOLENT, *Carthage Romaine* (Paris, 1901), 555 sqq., 743 sqq.; MAASSEN, *Gesch. d. Quellen und Litt. des kanon. Rechts* (Graz, 1870), I, 799-802; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br.; St. Louis, 1908), 618.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

**Fullerton**, LADY GEORGIANA CHARLOTTE, novelist, b. 23 September, 1812, in Staffordshire; d. 19 January, 1885, at Bournemouth. She was the youngest daughter of Lord Granville Leveson Gower (afterwards first Earl Granville) and Lady Harriet Elizabeth Cavendish, second daughter of the fifth Duke of Devonshire. She was chiefly brought up in Paris, her father having been appointed English ambassador there when she was twelve years old. Her mother, a member of the Anglican Church, was a woman of deep religious feeling and Lady Georgiana was trained to devotion. In 1833 she married in Paris an attaché of the embassy, Alexander George Fullerton, who was of good Irish birth and had previously been in the Guards. In 1841, when Lord Granville retired from the embassy, Lady Georgiana and her husband travelled for some time in France, Germany, and Italy. Two years later, Mr. Fullerton was received into the Church, after long and thoughtful study of the religious questions involved in this step. In 1844 his wife published her first book, "Ellen Middleton", a tragic novel, of some power and showing markedly "High Anglican" religious views, so that Lord Brougham pronounced it "rank Popery". It was well received, and was criticized by Mr. Gladstone in "The English Review". Two years after, in 1846, the author placed herself under the instruction of Father Brownhill, S. J., and was received by him into the Church on Passion Sunday. In 1847 she published her second book, "Grantley Manor", which is largely a

study of character, and is usually considered an advance, from a literary point of view, upon the first. There was then a pause in her published work, which was continued, in 1852, with the story of "Lady Bird". In 1855 her only son died, a loss she never quite recovered from, and henceforth she devoted herself to works of charity. In 1856 she joined the Third Order of St. Francis. She and her husband eventually settled in London and her literary work became a large part of her life. She not only wrote novels, but a good deal of biography, some poetry, and made translations from French and Italian. All her books have distinction and charm. Some of her chief works are: "Ellen Middleton" (London, 1844); "Grantley Manor" (London, 1854); "Lady Bird" (London, 1855); "La Comtesse de Bonneval", written in French (Paris, 1857); the same translated into English (London, 1858); "Laurentia", a tale of Japan (London, 1904); "Constance Sherwood" (Edinburgh and London, 1908); "Seven Stories" (London, 1896).

LEE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; CRAVEN, *Lady G. Fullerton, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1888), English version by COLERIDGE (London, 1888); YONGE, *Women Novelists of Queen Victoria's Reign* (London, 1897); *The Inner Life of Lady G. Fullerton* (London, 1899).

KATE M. WARREN.

**Fullo** (THE FULLER). See PETER FULLO.

**Fumo**, BARTOLOMEO, theologian, b. at Villon near Piacenza; d. 1545. At an early age he entered the Dominican Order and made great progress in all the ecclesiastical sciences, but especially in canon law. He was distinguished as an inquisitor at Piacenza, but is best known for his work, "Summa casuum conscientiae, aurea armilla dicta". This work, which was dedicated to Bishop Catelan of Piacenza, went through many editions, the two most important and best known being those of Antwerp (1591) and Lyons (1594). It was held in high esteem by all the canonists of the time, especially because it contained, in brief and compendious form, a digest of all similar explanations since the thirteenth century. In one or two places, by a series of clear and clean cut sentences, he refutes all the errors of probabilism. The authorship of the work has been disputed by one or two, but without reason. He is also the author of "Expositio compendiosa in epistolas Pauli et canonicas", and a book entitled, "Poemata quædam". His first work, "Philothea, opus immortalis animi dignitatem continens", was dedicated to Catalan before he became bishop.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. O. P.*, II, 123; SCHERER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

H. J. SMITH.

**Funchal**, DIOCESE OF (FUNCHALENSIS), in the Madeira Islands. Both in neo-Latin and in Portuguese the name of the town signifies "fennel" (Lat. *feniculum*). Madeira, the Purpuraria of the Romans, situated in the extreme west of the ancient world, about 440 miles from the coast of Morocco, was discovered in 1344 by the famous Bristol lovers (*Amantes de Bristol*), Anna Dorset and Robert O'Machin; later it was abandoned. In 1419 Joan Gonçalves and Tristan Vaz took possession of the island. In 1445 were first planted the vines (brought from Crete) that have since rendered Madeira so famous. The Christian inhabitants were subject at first to the Bishop of Tangier, until Leo X (16 June, 1514) made Funchal an episcopal see. In the interest of the vast territories in Africa and Asia then subject to Portugal, Clement VII (8 July, 1539) raised Funchal to archiepiscopal rank, and gave it for suffragans Angra, Cabo Verde, Goa, and Santo Thomé. In 1551, however, it was reduced to simple episcopal rank, and in 1570 was made a suffragan of Lisbon, which it is to the present.

Funchal is delightfully situated on the south side of the Madeira Islands, and was therefore the first halting place for Portuguese and Spanish ships on their way to

the New World. Owing to this natural advantage the island soon became a great centre of wealth and foreign trade, likewise an important centre for the spread of the Gospel whose missionaries found the islands convenient as a resting-place going and coming. Funchal was once to the Portuguese what Gibraltar, St. Helena, and Malta now are to the English. Therefore they garrisoned the city, though naturally defended by its rugged cliffs, and built there four impregnable fortresses. Its churches and monasteries no longer exhibit their former architectural splendour, though, as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century, the lintels and jambs of the windows in many houses were of massive silver, and the church vessels of solid gold (chalices, pyxes, monstrances) were thickly studded with pearls, diamonds, and other precious stones. Funchal has long been a favourite resort of invalids, especially those suffering from diseases of the lungs. Its white villas and edifices, embowered in rich tropical vegetation, charm the traveller as he approaches from the sea. The roads and streets are quite steep and the usual means of transportation is by ox-sled. The population of the city is (1909) about 20,000. According to the "Annuaire Pontifical" for 1906, the diocese contains about 150,000 Catholics, with 50 parish churches, 80 public and two conventual chapels, all ministered to by 93 priests.

ANTONIO DE SOUSA, *Catalogo dos Bispos da Igreja de Funchal* (1721); GAMS, *Series episcoporum ecclesie Catholicae* (Ratisbon, 1873), 471; *Gerarchia Catholica* (Rome, 1908); BRIDLE, *The Land of the Wine* (Philadelphia, 1901); BROWN, *Madeira and the Canary Islands* (London, 1901).

F. FITA.

**Fundamental Articles.**—This term was employed by Protestant theologians to distinguish the essential parts of the Christian faith from those non-essential doctrines, which, as they believed, individual churches might accept or reject without forfeiting their claim to rank as parts of the Church universal. During the seventeenth century, the view that doctrines might be thus distinguished into two classes was widely current in the various reformed bodies; and several well-known divines endeavoured to determine the principle of the division. In some cases their aim was mainly practical. They hoped in this way to find a dogmatic basis for union between the separated churches. More often, however, the system was used controversially to defend the position of the Protestant bodies against the arguments of Catholics.

The first to advance the theory seems to have been George Cassander (1513–66), a Catholic by religion, but apparently little versed in theology. In his work "De officio pii ac publice tranquillitatis vere amantissimum viri in hoc religionis dissidio" (1561), he maintained that in the articles of the Apostles' Creed we have the true foundations of the Faith; and that those who accept these doctrines, and have no desire to sever themselves from the rest of Christendom are part of the true Church. He believed that thus it might be possible to find a means of reuniting Catholics, Greeks, and Protestants. But the proposal met with no favour on either side. The Louvain professors, Hesselius and Ravesteyn, showed that the theory was irreconcilable with Catholic theology; and Calvin no less vehemently repudiated a system so little hostile to Rome. Among Protestants, however, the view soon reappeared. It seemed to afford them some means of reply to two objections which they were constantly called on to meet. When Catholics told them that their total inability to agree amongst themselves was itself a proof that their system was a false one, they could answer that though differing as to non-essentials they were agreed on fundamentals. And when asked how it could be maintained that the whole Christian world had for centuries been sunk in error, they replied that since these errors had not destroyed the fundamentals of the faith, salvation was possible

even before the gospel of reform had been preached. It is asserted that the first to take up this standpoint was Antonio de Dominis, the apostate Archbishop of Spalatro, who, during the reign of James I, sojourned some years in England. Whether this was so or not, it is certain that from this period the distinction becomes a recognized feature in English Protestant polemics, while on the other hand Catholic writers are at pains to show its worthlessness. It fills an important place in the controversy between Father Edward Knott, S.J., and the Laudian divine, Christopher Potter. At this time, the term *fundamentals* was understood to signify those doctrines an explicit belief in which is necessary to salvation. Thus, Potter in his "Want of Charity justly charged on all such Romanists as dare affirm that Protestancy destroyeth Salvation" (1633) says: "By Fundamental doctrines we mean such Catholique verities as are to be distinctly believed by every Christian that shall be saved" (p. 211). Knott had no difficulty in showing how hopelessly discrepant were the views of the more eminent Protestants as to what was fundamental. His attack forced his opponents to change their ground. Chillingworth, who replied to him in the notable book, "The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation" (1637), while defining fundamental articles in a manner similar to Potter (op. cit., c. iii, n. 20), nevertheless conceded that it was impossible to draw up any list of fundamental doctrines. He urged indeed that this mattered little, since the Bible constitutes the religion of Protestants, and he who accepts the Bible knows that he has accepted all the essentials of the Faith (op. cit., c. iii, n. 59). Yet it is plain that if we do not know which doctrines are fundamental, salvation cannot be conditional on the explicit acceptance of these particular truths.

The doctrine of fundamentals was destined to become notable not merely in England, but in Germany and France also. In Germany it assumed prominence in connexion with the Syncretist dispute. The founder of the Syncretist school was the eminent Lutheran theologian, George Calixt (1586–1656). A man of wide culture and pacific disposition, he desired to effect a reconciliation between Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists. In a treatise entitled "Desiderium et studium concordie ecclesiasticae" (1650), he argued that the Apostles' Creed, which each of these three religions accepted, contained the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, and that the points on which they were at variance were no insuperable bar to union. These differences, he held, might be composed, if it were agreed to accept as revealed truth all that is contained in Scripture, and further all that is taught by the Fathers of the first five centuries. This eirenicon brought down upon him the most vehement attacks from the extreme party of his coreligionists, above all from Calovius, the representative of rigid Lutheranism. The keenest interest was aroused in the question, and on both sides it was warmly debated. The effort, though well meant, proved quite abortive.

The most famous by far of the controversies on this subject, however, was that between Bossuet and the Calvinist Jurieu. Jurieu's book, "Le Vray Système de l'Eglise" (1686), marks a distinct stage in the development of Protestant theology; while the work in which Bossuet replied to him was one of the most effective attacks ever levelled against Protestantism and its system. "Le Vray Système" was an attempt to demonstrate the right of the French Protestants to rank as members of the Church Universal. With this aim Jurieu propounded an entirely novel theory regarding the Church's essential constitution. According to him all sects without exception are members of the Body of Christ. For this nothing is necessary but "to belong to a general confederation, to confess Jesus Christ as Son of God, as Saviour of the world, and as Messiah; and to receive the Old and New Testaments

as the rule and Law of Christians" (Système, p. 53). Yet among the various portions of the Church we must, he tells us, distinguish four classes: (1) the sects which have retained all the truths taught in the Scriptures; (2) those which, while retaining the more important truths, have mingled with them superstitions and errors; (3) those which have retained the fundamental truths, but have added doctrines which are incompatible with them; and (4) those which have set the fundamental verities altogether aside. This last class are dead members of the mystical body (ibid., p. 52). Those who have retained the fundamental articles of the faith are, one and all, living parts of the Church. When he comes to define precisely which doctrines are, and which are not, fundamental, Jurieu bids us fall back on the rule of Vincent of Lérins: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Wherever all bodies of Christians still existing, and possessing some importance in the world, agree in accepting a dogma, we have, in that agreement, a criterion which may be considered infallible. Among truths so guaranteed are, e. g., the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, of the Redemption, the satisfaction, original sin, creation, grace, the immortality of the soul, the eternity of punishment (ibid., 236-237). This work was followed, in 1688, by another entitled "Traité de l'unité de l'Eglise et des articles fondamentaux", written in reply to Nicole's criticisms. In the same year appeared Bossuet's famous "Histoire des Variations des Eglises protestantes". The Bishop of Meaux pointed out that this was the third different theory of the Church advanced by Protestant theologians to defend their position. The first reformers had accepted the Scriptural doctrine of an indefectible visible Church. When it was demonstrated that this doctrine was totally incompatible with their denunciations of pre-reformation Christianity, their successors took refuge in the theory of an invisible Church. It had been made patent that this was contrary to the express words of Scripture; and their controversialists had, in consequence, been compelled to look for a new position. This Jurieu had provided in his theory of a Church founded upon fundamental articles. Bossuet's polemic was the death-blow of the new theory. Jurieu, it is true, replied; but only involved himself in yet further difficulties. He argued against the main thesis of the "Variations" by contending that changes of dogma had been characteristic of the Christian Church from its earliest days. Bossuet, in his "Avertissement aux Protestants sur les lettres de M. Jurieu", was not slow in pointing out that if this were true, then the principle, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—according to Jurieu the criterion of a fundamental article—had ceased to possess the smallest value. (Avertissement, I, n. 22.)

In regard to the relation of the fundamental doctrines to salvation, Jurieu is in agreement with the English divines already quoted. "By fundamental points" he says, "we understand certain general principles of the Christian religion, a distinct faith and belief in which are necessary to salvation" (Traité, p. 495). Precisely the same view is expressed by Locke in his "Reasonableness of Christianity". After enumerating what he regards as the fundamental articles of faith, he says: "An explicit belief of these is absolutely required of all those to whom the Gospel of Jesus Christ is preached, and salvation through his name proposed" (Works, ed., 1740, I, 583). Waterland's "Discourse of Fundamentals" should perhaps be mentioned, since it is the only work by an Anglican divine explicitly devoted to this subject. Its professed aim is to determine a basis for intercommunion among various Christian bodies. But the whole treatment is quite academic. It had become patent how impossible was the task of determining which articles were fundamental. No one could decide what should be the principle of selection. Waterland

enumerates no less than ten different views on this point, which he rejects as inadequate. "We have", he says, "almost as many different rules for determining fundamentals as there are different sects or parties." Needless to say, his own principle has as little authority as those which he rejects. The theory had, in fact, been weighed and found wanting. It afforded neither a basis for reunion nor a tenable doctrine as to the constitution of the Church. From this time it appears to have ceased to occupy the attention of Protestant writers. Doubtless the ideas which the theory embodies still have a wide range. There are numbers to-day who still think that while the differences between the various bodies of Christians are unessential, there is a residuum of fundamental truth common to all the principal groups of believers. From time to time, this view has taken effect in efforts after partial reunion among certain of the sects. These events, however, fall outside our scope: for they stand in no historic connexion with that doctrine of fundamental articles, which in the seventeenth century filled so important a place in Protestant theology.

It remains briefly to notice the manner in which the theory conflicts with Catholic dogma. For a formal refutation the reader is referred to those articles in which the Catholic doctrines in question are expressly treated. (1) In the first place the theory is repugnant to the nature of Christian faith as understood by the Church. According to her teaching, the essential note of this faith lies in the complete and unhesitating acceptance of the whole *depositum* on the ground that it is the revealed word of God. The conscious rejection of a single article of this deposit is sufficient to render a man guilty of heresy. The question is not as to the relative importance of the article in question, but solely as to whether it has been revealed by God to man. This is clearly put by St. Thomas Aquinas in the "Summa Theol.", II-II, Q. v, a. 3: "In a heretic who rejects a single article of the faith, there remains not the virtue of faith whether as united with charity [*formata*], or as severed from charity [*informis*]. . . . The formal object of faith is the Supreme Truth in so far as revealed in the Holy Scriptures and in that doctrine of the Church which proceeds from the Supreme Truth. Hence if anyone does not hold to the doctrine of the Church as to an infallible and divine rule, . . . he does not possess the virtue of faith." The Church does not deny that certain truths are of more vital moment than others. There are some as to which it is important that all the faithful should possess explicit knowledge. In regard to others explicit knowledge is not necessary. But it denies emphatically that any Christian may reject or call in question any truth, small or great, revealed by God. On the other hand, the system of Fundamental Articles, in each and all of its forms, involves that while some truths are of such importance that they must of necessity be held, there are others of less importance which an individual Christian or body of Christians may freely deny without forfeiture of grace. (2) No less complete is the disagreement as to what is requisite in order that a body of Christians may be a part of the true Church of Christ. In the system under review it is maintained that all the sects which accept the fundamental articles of the faith are partakers in this privilege. The Catholic Church knows of one and only one test to determine this question of membership in Christ's body. This test does not lie in the acceptance of this or that particular doctrine, but in communion with the Apostolic hierarchy. Such is the unanimous teaching of the Fathers from the earliest times. By way of illustration the words of Saint Irenæus may here be cited: "They who are in the Church", he writes, "must yield obedience to the presbyters, who have the succession from the Apostles, and who with the succession of the episcopate have received . . . the sure gift of truth."

Let them hold in suspicion those who sever themselves from the succession. These have all of them fallen from the truth" (Adv. Hær., IV, xxvi, 2). The theory which finds the one requisite in the acceptance of a series of fundamental articles is a novelty without a vestige of support in Christian antiquity. (3) It is manifest that the theory is destructive of that unity in faith and in corporate communion, which Christ Himself declared should for ever be the guarantee of the Divine origin of the Church (John, xvii, 21), and which the Catholic Church has ever exemplified and taught. Jurieu, it may be noted, frankly owned that on his theory the separate sects might be in a position of mutual excommunication, and yet remain members of the Church.

To sum up: the system of fundamental articles is repugnant to the religion of Christ. It is a stage in the disintegration of religion, consequent on the admission of the principle of private judgment in matters of faith; and it is a stage which is necessarily destined to lead on to the complete rejection of revealed truth.

KNOTT, *Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained* (St-Omer, 1634); *Infidelity Unmasked* (Ghent, 1652); CHILLINGWORTH, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation* (Oxford, 1637); CALIXTUS, *Desiderium et studium concordæ ecclesiasticæ* (Helmstadt, 1650); VELTHUYSIUS, *Tractatus de fundamentalibus in Opera* (Rotterdam, 1680), I, 693-825; PFENDERDORF, *The Divine Feudal Law, or Covenants with Mankind represented* (tr., London, 1703); TURBETIN, *Discourse concerning Fundamentals* (tr., London, 1720); WATERLAND, *A Discourse of Fundamentals* (1735) in *Works*, V (Oxford, 1843).

G. H. JOYCE.

#### Funeral. See BURIAL.

**Funeral Dues**, the canonical perquisites of a parish priest receivable on the occasion of the funeral of any of his parishioners. This right of the parish priest is twofold: first, the right to an offering when a parishioner is buried within the limits of the parish to which he belonged; second, the right to a fourth (*quarta funeralis*) of the dues when a parishioner is buried outside the limits of the parish. (The ancient episcopal *quarta funeralis* has fallen into desuetude.) The right to the *quarta funeralis* is founded on the obligations of a parish priest to his parishioners during life, and the correlative duties of those to whose care he ministers; since the labourer is worthy of his hire, it is but just that should the parishioner elect to be buried in a parish other than that to which he canonically belongs, the parish priest should not altogether be deprived of emolument for his past services. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, cap. xiii) gives the "fourth portion" the name of "quarta funeralium"; but other designations were common in earlier times, e. g. "portio canonica" (canonical portion), "quarta portio" (fourth share), "justitia" (justice) since it was considered a just reward for the work of a parish priest in his care of souls. That these funeral dues are not of recent origin is clear from ancient ecclesiastical enactments (Cap. Cum Quis, II, De sepulchretis, in VI<sup>o</sup>). Leo III (Nos instituta) refers to this ancient discipline of the Church: "Do not break away from the old rules which our forefathers have laid down for us". Still earlier, in 680, in the Anglo-Saxon Church we find that there were four payments which the Church could legally claim; and among them was the payment called "soul-shot". This payment was the mortuary charge ordered to be fixed for the dead, while the grave was yet open, or to be reserved for the church to which the deceased belonged, if his body were buried in any place out of his "shriftshire", i. e. his proper parish (Lingard, "Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church", I, iv).

As a price for burial, the parish priest can demand nothing without incurring the suspicion of simony. Burial is a spiritual right belonging to the faithful; and the parish priest, in virtue of his office, is bound to perform this duty for his parishioners. Nevertheless, if there is a legitimate custom which allows offerings to

be made, or if the bishop should have established a fixed scale of offerings, the parish priest may demand such fees provided he in no way incurs suspicion of extortion. Also, in case of funerals with more than the ordinary burial service, a demand for payment for extra labour or to cover expenses is quite in accordance with canon law. The Roman Ritual (tit. vi, De exsequiis, n. 6) lays down that the amount to be charged for funeral services is to be fixed by the bishop; it also insists that in all cases of the poor who die with little or no property the parish priest is bound to bury them without charge (ibid., n. 7). This is in keeping with the immemorial affection of the Church for the poor (Tert., "Apol.", xxxix; Ambrose, "De Off.", II, cxlii; Schultze, "De Christ. veter. rebus sepulchr.", Gotha, 1879, 24). Emperor Constantine created at Constantinople a special association for the burial of the poor (Lex, "Begräbnissrecht", 208). The medieval Church granted indulgences for the burial of the poor, and her synods and bishops frequently inculcated the same as a work of mercy. While the parish priest is not bound to offer Mass on that occasion, he is warmly recommended to do so by Benedict XIV (Instr. 36) and other ecclesiastical authorities (Lex, op. cit., 209-11).

The Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, Decret. de obser. et evit. in celeb. Missæ) in very clear words points out the duty of the bishops to determine specifically all offerings on the occasion of the Holy Sacrifice, so that there may be no opportunity for suspecting simony on the part of any ecclesiastic. The bishop is authorized to prescribe, in regard to funerals, what portion should belong to the parish priest and to others assisting at the altar; how much should be given to those who accompany the body to the grave; to those who toll the bells; likewise the number and weight of the candles used during the burial service, the remuneration for the use of funeral ornaments, etc. If the parishioner is buried outside his parish, the parish priest, as has been already said, is entitled to a fourth of the burial fees. This fourth has to be paid by the church of the parish in which the burial takes place, and it includes that proportion of all the emoluments that come to the church by reason of the funeral up to the thirtieth day after the funeral. In the case of the funeral of a canon, the "quarta funeralis" is due, not to the parish priest of the cathedral, but to the parish priest of the deceased canon's domicile. As a matter of practice at the present day there are many churches exempt from the payment of the quarta funeralis, such exemption being obtained either by pontifical privilege, custom, or prescription. Many monasteries, and indeed whole orders, have been exempted by pontifical privilege (St. Pius V, Etsi Mendicantium, 16 May, 1567; Paul V, Decret Romanum, 20 Aug., 1605). Benedict XIII, in 1725, annulled all exemptions, so far as Italy and the adjacent islands were concerned. By custom or prescription the obligation of paying the quarta funeralis has been done away with in most places, although it still exists, for instance, in the Diocese of Paris (France). With regard to the fees for burial in our own time, there is no customary uniform fee, and the enactments of provincial synods contain nothing very definite on the matter. Generally speaking, if a church has a cemetery attached a scale of fees is drawn up and approved by the bishop for that church, the charges varying according to the degree of solemnity with which the funeral is carried out. In cemeteries not attached to a church, and which are wholly Catholic, the administrators pay a fixed fee for each funeral, or more commonly a yearly stipend to the cemetery chaplain. Where the cemetery is controlled by secular authority, the funeral fees are arranged for and paid by the local authority; but the amount of the fee varies according to the locality.

TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1904); FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca promptia*, s. v. *Sepultura*; MANT, *De Locis Sacris* (Paris, 1904); BOVIX, *De parochia*; VECCHIOTTI, *Institutiones canonice*; ALBERTI, *De Sepultura eccles.* (1901); LEX, *Begräb-*



*nissrecht* (Ratisbon, 1904); MOULART, *L'Eglise et l'Etat* (4th ed., Louvain, 1895); ZEMA, *Quest canonico-liturgica de Sepult. reg.* (1903); RULAND, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Leichenfeier* (Ratisbon, 1904).

DAVID DUNFORD.

**Funeral Pall**, a black cloth usually spread over the coffin while the obsequies are performed for a deceased person. It generally has a white cross worked through its entire length and width. The Roman Ritual does not prescribe its use in the burial of a priest or layman, but does so for the absolution given after a requiem when the body is not present. Still the Congregation of Sacred Rites supposes its existence, since it forbids ecclesiastics, especially in sacred vestments, to act as pall-bearers for a deceased priest (3110, 15). It also forbids the use of a white transparent pall fringed with gold in the funeral of canons (3248, 3). The "Cereemoniale Episcoporum" orders a black covering on the bed of state for a deceased bishop. It was once customary specially to invite persons to carry the pall, or, at least, to touch its borders during the procession. These pall-bearers frequently had the palls made of very costly materials and these were afterwards made into sacred vestments. Formerly dalmatics or even coverings taken from the altar were used as a pall for a deceased pope, but, on account of abuses that crept in, this practice was suppressed. In the Council of Auxerre (578, can. xii) and in the statutes of St. Boniface the pall hiding the body was forbidden.

In the English Church the funeral pall was regularly employed. Thus we read that, at the funeral of Richard Kellowe, Bishop of Durham (d. 1316), Thomas Count of Lancaster offered three red palls bearing the coat of arms of the deceased prelate. On the same occasion Edward II of England sent palls of gold cloth. At the burial of Arthur, son of Henry VII, Lord Powys laid a rich cloth of gold on the body. Similar rich palls were used in the obsequies of Henry VII and of Queen Mary.


ROCK, *Church of Our Fathers* (London, 1904), III, 23; *Cereemoniale Episcoporum*.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Fünfkirchen** (Hungarian Pécs), DIOCESE OF (QUINQUE ECCLESIE NSIS), in Hungary, in the ecclesiastical province of Gran. Christianity was introduced into this part of the ancient province of Pannonia (called *Valeria* since the time of Diocletian) before the fall of the Roman Empire. In Fünfkirchen itself, formerly the Roman colony of *Sopianæ*, there has been found an underground sepulchral chamber dating from early Christian times; it is still preserved, and contains religious paintings belonging to the second half of the fourth century (Henszlmann, "Die altchristliche Grabkammer in Fünfkirchen" in "Mitteilungen der Zentralkommission", Vienna, 1873, 57 sq. de Rossi, "Buletino di arch. crist.", 1874, 150-152). It is probable that even at this early day a house of Christian worship existed where the cathedral now stands. During the "migration of the nations", city and country were devastated; in the ninth century, this territory formed part of the kingdom of the Christian Slavic prince Privina, and Archbishop Liupramm of Salzburg (836-859) consecrated the church of St. Peter in the city even then called "Ad quinque Basilicas" because of its five churches. By King Stephen I of Hungary Fünfkirchen was made a bishopric in the year 1009. The first bishop was the Frank, Bonipert, a Benedictine monk. His successor, Maurus (1036-1070), erected a cathedral, the original foundations of which still stand, on the site of the old church of St. Peter (restored, 1877-1896). Maurus is the first ecclesiastical writer in the kingdom of Hungary, and is honoured as a saint in this diocese, as well as by the Benedictines.

Of the succeeding bishops, the following are worthy of mention: Calanus (1188-1218), who, on account of

his services in defending the Church against the Patarini, was permitted by Clement III to wear the pallium and to have the cross borne before him, a custom which led to many difficulties with the Archbishops of Gran, but was nevertheless confirmed by Benedict XIV (1754); Wilhelm (1360-1374), during whose episcopate the cathedral school was raised to the rank of a university (1367), which flourished for a time, but which ceased to exist after the defeat in battle of Louis II by Solymán I in 1526; Anton Vrančics (1553-1557) and Georg Draskovich (1557-1563) who worked zealously for the reform of the religious life and were elevated to the cardinalate. After the conquest of the city by the Turks in 1543, the cathedral was transformed into a mosque, and it was only



THE CATHEDRAL, FUNFKIRCHEN (PÉCS)

in 1687, after the expulsion of the Turks, that it was again opened for Christian worship. Under Bishops Franz Nesselrode (1703-1732) and Georg Girk (1853-1868), diocesan synods were held. Bishop Ignatius von Szepeszy (1828-1838) founded a lyceum with a faculty of theology and law. A restoration of the cathedral in approved style was made by Ferdinand Dulánszky. The cathedral chapter numbers ten canons, six honorary canons and two prebendaries. The diocese is divided into two archdiaconates and twenty-two vice-diaconates; it embraces 178 parishes, with 258 dependent churches and stations, and six curacies. Of the parishes 33 are German, 54 Magyar and the rest composed of mixed nationalities. The number of Catholics in the diocese amounted in 1906 to 503,981. In the same year, there were 306 secular priests and 40 religious. The following orders of men exist in the diocese: Cistercians (1 monastery, with a college); Franciscans (7 monasteries); Brothers of Mercy (1 convent); Orders and congregations of women: Canonesses of Our Lady (1 convent); Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul (11 convents); Sisters of Providence, of the Holy Redeemer, of the Holy Cross (1 convent each). The territory of the diocese embraces the counties of Baranya and Tolna, and part of the counties of Somogy and Verőce.

KOLLAR, *Historia episcopatus Quinqueecclesiensis*, 7 vols. (Budapest, 1732-1812); GERECZE, *Der Dom zu Fünfkirchen* (Fünfkirchen, 1894); *Die katholische Kirche unserer Zeit* (Munich, 1900), II, 590-593.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Funk**, FRANZ XAVER VON, church historian, b. in the small market-town of Abtsgemünd in Württemberg, 12 October, 1840; d. at Tübingen, 24 February, 1907. The son of an inn-keeper, Franz first attended the gymnasium at Ellwangen, and, on finishing his course of secondary studies, proceeded in 1859 to the University of Tübingen. Residing at the theological house of studies called *Wilhelmstift* he studied philosophy and theology, and also found time to attend courses on classical philology and political economy with such profit that in 1862 he gained the prize offered by the

faculty of political science for the best essay on the theme. "Was verstand man im 18. Jahrhundert unter Polizei?" (What signification had the word *police* in the 18th century?). Some of his earlier publications treated subjects connected with political economy. Having received his doctorate of philosophy in 1863, he devoted a year in the ecclesiastical seminary to moral theology and preparation for the priesthood. He was ordained at Rottenburg, 10 August, 1864, and his first work was in the care of souls; he felt, however, that the whole bent of his mind lay in the direction of intellectual labour. In October, 1865, he obtained permission to proceed to Paris to pursue further the study of political economy; the journey through France and his residence at Paris acted as a great mental stimulus. On his return in 1866, he was appointed tutor at the Wilhelmsstift, where his duty was to direct the personal studies and preparation for examinations of the theological students. When Hefele, then professor of church history at Tübingen, was called to Rome in 1868 as consulor during the preparation for the Vatican Council, Funk acted as substitute. Hefele did not return to his chair, being appointed Bishop of Rottenburg on 17 June, 1869, and Funk was appointed his successor. In 1870 Funk was named extraordinary, and in 1875 ordinary professor of church history, patrology, and Christian archæology, an office which he filled till his death.

His life was henceforth entirely devoted to his professorial duties and historical researches, especially to the various branches of the history of the early Church. His first important publications belong to the sphere of political science and the history of economics, and include the two treatises, "Zins und Wucher, eine moraltheologische Abhandlung" (Tübingen, 1868), and "Geschichte des kirchlichen Zinsverbotes" (Tübingen, 1878). Other articles on the same subject written by him either during this or a later period are: "Klemens von Alexandrien über Familie und Eigentum" [Theologische Quartalschrift" (1871), 427-449; reprinted in "Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen", II, 45 sqq.]; "Handel und Gewerbe im christlichen Altertum" [in "Theol. Quartalschrift" (1876); reprinted in "Kirchengesch. Abhand. u. Untersuch.", II, 60 sqq.]; "Ueber Reichtum und Handel im christlichen Altertum" [Ibid., III, 150 sqq., first published in "Histor.-politische Blätter" (1902), II]. Funk's professorial duties and his early study of classical philology soon led him into the province of early Christian literature and church history, and in these departments he accomplished his most important work as a scholar. In the former department his task consisted principally in the issuing of new editions of texts, prepared in accordance with the rules of historical and textual criticism. His predecessor Hefele had issued a scholarly edition of the works of the Apostolic Fathers, "Opera patrum apostolicorum", but the last edition was that of 1855, and the discovery of important manuscripts rendered a new edition necessary. Funk undertook the task, and the "Opera patrum apostolicorum" appeared in two volumes (Tübingen, 1878-1881), the first containing the authentic and the second the apocryphal writings. After the discovery of the Didache, a new edition of the first volume was issued in 1887; a fresh edition (the second) of the whole work appeared in 1901. The "Sammlung von Quellenschriften" (Tübingen, 1901; 2nd ed., 1906) contains a synopsis with the text of the authentic writings. Funk also published separately the Didache and certain of the early writings connected with this work ("Doctrina XII apostolorum", "Canones apostolorum ecclesiastici ad reliquæ doctrinæ de duabus viis expositiones veteres", Tübingen, 1887). His studies of the "Apostolic Constitutions" led Funk to the conviction that the existing editions of the "Constitutiones apostolicæ" and of the Syrian "Didascalia apostolorum" were

unsatisfactory. He devoted many years to the preparation of a new edition, which was given to the public in 1905 ("Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum", ed. F. X. von Funk, 2 vols. Paderborn, 1905), and was received with the greatest commendation by the learned world. He also published three works connected with early Christian literature. In the treatise "Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe" (Tübingen, 1883), he successfully refuted the attacks made on these important sub-apostolic writings, and demonstrated conclusively the authorship of St. Ignatius of Antioch.

For many years his attention was almost exclusively devoted to a group of writings, which constitute the principal source of information as to early Christian liturgy and discipline, namely the Didache, the Didascalia, the Apostolic Constitutions, the "Canones Hippolyti", the Egyptian Church Order, and the "Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi" discovered by Rahmani. In opposition to the somewhat different views of other investigators, Funk sought to establish the connexion between these writings, and from this the date of their origin. The two works, which Funk devoted to this object, are: "Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen" (Tübingen, 1891), and "Das Testament unseres Herrn und die verwandten Schriften" (Mainz, 1901). Similar investigations in the field of literary history and numerous questions touching on the liturgy, discipline and religious life of early Christian times form the subject of the numerous articles which Funk contributed to various periodicals during the many years of his academic activity. Most of these articles were published in the "Tübinger theologische Quartalschrift", the "Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft", the "Historisch-politische Blätter" or in the "Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique", and the majority are included, in more or less revised form, in the collection: "Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen" (3 vols., Paderborn, 1897, 1899, 1907). Among the most important of these writings are those dealing with the above-mentioned pseudo-Apostolic works and their relations to one another ("Abhandlungen", II, 108 sqq., 236 sqq., 359 sqq., III, 64 sqq., 218 sqq., 275 sqq., 350 sqq., 362 sqq., 381 sqq.); the early Christian penitential discipline and the catechumenate (Ibid., I, 155 sqq., 182 sqq., 209 sqq.; III, 42 sqq., 57 sqq.); celibacy of the clerics in major orders (Ibid., I, 121 sqq.); the Agapæ and the Eucharistic Sacrifice (Ibid., I, 278, 293 sqq., III, 1 sqq., 85 sqq., 134 sqq.). One subject to which he often returned and which involved him in a long controversy with other scholars, especially with Father Kneller, S.J., was the convocation and papal ratification of the oecumenical synods of the early ages [Abhandlungen, I, 39 sqq., 87 sqq., 498 sqq., III, 143 sqq., 406 sqq.; Kneller returned to the subject again in the "Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie" (1908), 75-99]. Of the various contributions to later Church history, which flowed from Funk's industrious pen, may be mentioned the "Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der altbritischen Kirche" (Abhand., I, 421 sqq.), "Gerson und Gersen" (Ibid., II, 473 sqq.), "Der Verfasser der Nachfolge Christi" (Ibid., II, 408 sqq.), "Zur Gallei-Frage" (Ibid., II, 444 sqq.). Funk was an industrious contributor to the second edition of Herder's "Kirchenlexikon", in which are found no less than 136 articles, some of considerable length, from his pen. For Kraus's "Real-Encyclopädie der christlichen Altertümer" he also wrote several articles. The excellence of his "Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte", as a general church history, is universally recognized; the first edition appeared in 1886, the fifth in 1907, shortly before his death, the tireless worker being suddenly cut down in the midst of his labours by an apoplectic stroke. The Tübingen "Theologische Quartalschrift" for 1907 (p. 236 sqq.) contained a posthumous article of Funk's on the reputed writings of St. Hippolytus.

Among the Catholic historians whom Germany has produced in the last three decades Funk was undoubtedly the greatest authority and the chief historical writer on early Christian times. Clear and purely critical in method, his sole aim was the establishment of historical truth. His character was frank and conscientious; his life was blameless, as became a minister of God. As a controversialist he could be severe when an opponent allowed himself to be swayed by any other motive than the demonstration of exact truth. His method has created a school among the Catholic historians of Germany which has been a benefit to the advancement of earnest historical investigation and scholarly criticism.

BHLMAYER, *François Xavier von Funk in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (1907), 620-423.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Furness Abbey**, situated in the north of Lancashire about five miles from the town of Ulverston. Originally a Benedictine monastery of the Savigny Reform it afterwards became Cistercian. Vitalis, the founder of Savigny and the disciple of Robert d'Arbrissel, came to England in 1119, and Stephen, Count of Boulogne and afterwards King of England, offered him land at Tulketh on the Ribble, one mile below Preston. Accordingly, in 1124, Ewan d'Avranches, with a colony of monks, was sent from Savigny to establish the monastery at Tulketh. In 1127 Stephen gave to these monks his forest of Furness in Lancashire and thither they removed. This grant was most munificent, for it included large possessions in woods, pastures, fisheries, and mills, with a large share in the salt works and mines of the district. Development was so rapid that in 1134 a colony of monks was sent forth to establish Calder near the Scotch border. Besides Calder, Swyneshead and Rushin were also colonized, and from Calder the famous Abbey of Byland was founded. By the year 1148 the Cistercian Reform, under the leadership of St. Bernard, was everywhere attracting attention and all the Savigny monks, those of Furness included, became Cistercians. In 1249 the Cistercian General Chapter placed four Irish monasteries under the control of Furness, viz. Fermoy, Wethirlagh, Inislounagh, and Corcumrae. Through the foundation of Rushin there was frequent communication between Furness and the Isle of Man and more than one monk of Furness became Bishop of Man. This, no doubt, was due to the privilege held by the Abbey of Rushin of appointing the bishop, subject to the consent of the Manxmen. Nicholas de Meaux, a native of the Orkneys and once a canon of Wartre, was a monk at Meaux, a monk and Abbot of Furness, and finally Bishop of Man. Jocelin, a monk of Furness and afterwards of Iniscourcy, in Ireland, wrote the life of St. Patrick at the command of Thomas, Archbishop of Armagh; other works attributed to him are: "Book of British Bishops"; "Life of St. Waldeus, Second abbot of Melrose"; "Life of St. Kentigern or Mungo". The names of thirty-two abbots of Furness are known, the last being Roger Pyle. In October, 1535, the royal commissioners visited the abbey; a little later the monks were accused of being implicated in the Pilgrimage of Grace and two of them were imprisoned at Lancaster. The final disruption came on 9 April, 1537, when the abbot, prior, and twenty-eight monks were forced to sign the deed of surrender. The site and lands were at first held by the Crown. Later they were assigned to the Earl of Salisbury and afterwards came into the possession of the Prestons of Preston Patrick. They were next acquired by Lord George Augustus Cavendish, and now belong to the Dukes of Devonshire. The buildings were renowned more for their grandeur than for their richness and beauty; portions of the ruins still remain to show this.

BECK, *A Description of Furness Abbey* (1865); IDEM, *Annales Furnessenses* (London, 1844); WEST, *Antiquities of Furness* (Ulverston, 1813); TANNER, *Notitia Monastica* (London, 1787),

s. v. *Lancashire*; HOPE, *The Abbey of St. Mary in Furness*; DUGDALE, *Monasticon* (London, 1846), V, 244 sqq.

G. E. HIND.

**Furni**, a titular see in Proconsular Africa, where two towns of this name are known to have existed. One discovered in the ruins of El-Msaadin, near Tebourba, had a bishop as early as the third century, Geminus Victor, who died shortly before St. Cyprian. Another bishop, Simeon, assisted at the Council of Carthage in 525. The second Furni was discovered at Henchir-Boudja about seven miles from Zama. A Donatist bishop of the see assisted at the synod held at Carthage in 411. The town was made famous by the courage of the martyr Mansuetus of Urusi, who was burned alive, according to Victor of Vita (*Histor. persec. Vandal.*, I, 3) at the gate of Urusi, also known as the gate of Furni. In 305, during the same persecution, the basilicas of Furni and Zama had been burned. At Henchir-Boudja may be seen the ruins of a Byzantine fortress.

TOULOTTE, *Géographie de l'Afrique Chrétienne Proconsulaire*, 175-77.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Furniss, JOHN**, a well-known children's missionary, b. near Sheffield, England, 19 June, 1809; d. at Clapham, London, 16 Sept., 1865. His father was a wealthy master-cutter. He was educated at Sedgley Park, Oscott, and Ushaw College, where he became a priest in 1834. He was resident priest at Doncaster for five years, but his health having given way he travelled during eight years through Europe and the East, rather as a pilgrim than a tourist. After his return home, 1847, he spent some time at Islington, London, working for the welfare of the waifs and strays, for "Suffer little children to come to me" was his motto then as in after years. He became a professed member of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer at St. Trond, Belgium, 1851, and afterwards gave missions in England and Ireland; but from 1855 until his death he devoted himself wholly to giving missions to children. He was the founder of children's missions and "the children's Mass", and by his writings systematized the philosophy of religious training. These missions lasted sometimes three weeks, and were given not only to school-children, but to working boys and girls. His maxim was that "nothing so disgusted children as monotony", and therefore he had the prayers at Mass and the Rosary sung to simple airs, and his sermons seldom lasted more than twenty minutes. He entered fully into the mode of thought of the child-mind, and, speaking quietly but with great dramatic power from a platform, he always riveted their attention. He was a wonderful story-teller, seldom moving to laughter but often to tears. He spent his spare time writing books for children which, though written with the utmost simplicity of language, are models of good English. His chief works are "The Sunday-School Teacher" and "God and His creatures", which has been published in French. He wrote a scathing answer to an attack on his works by the "Saturday Review", which was then the great organ of unbelief in England. His writings were assailed as "infamous publications" by the rationalist historian Lecky in his "History of European Morals", chiefly on account of the somewhat lurid eschatology of the children's books. More than four millions of his booklets have been sold throughout English-speaking countries.

LIVIS, *Father Furniss and His Work for Children* (London, 1896); BRIDGETT, *Blunders and Forgeries* (London, 1900); DUHAMEL, *Le Missionnaire des enfants* (Tournai).

ALBERT BARRY.

**Furse, SAINT**, Abbot of Lagny, near Paris, d. 16 Jan., about 650. He was the son of Fintan, son of Finloga, prince of South Munster, and Gelgesia, daughter

ter of Aedhfinn, prince of Hy-Briuin in Connaught. He was born probably amongst the Hy-Briuin, and was baptized by St. Brendan the Traveller, his father's uncle, who then ruled a monastery in the Island of Oirbsen, now called Inisquin in Lough Corrib. He was educated by St. Brendan's monks, and when of proper age he embraced the religious life in the same monastery under the Abbot St. Meldan, his "soul-friend" (*anam-chara*). His great sanctity was early discerned, and there is a legend that here, through his prayers, twin children of a chieftain related to King Brendinus were raised from the dead. After some years he founded a monastery at Rathmat on the shore of Lough Corrib which Colgan identifies as Killursa, in the deanery of Annadown. Aspirants came in numbers to place themselves under his rule, but he wished to secure also some of his own relatives for the new monastery. For this purpose he set out with some monks for Munster, but on coming near his father's home he was seized with an apparently mortal illness. He fell into a trance from the ninth hour of the day to cock-crow, and while in this state was favoured with the first of the ecstatic visions which have rendered him famous in medieval literature.

In this vision were revealed to him the state of man in sin, the remedies for sin, the beauty of virtue. He heard the angelic choirs singing "the saints shall go from virtue to virtue, the God of Gods will appear in Sion". An injunction was laid on him by the two angels who restored him to the body to become a more zealous labourer in the harvest of the Lord. Again, on the third night following, the ecstasy was renewed. He was rapt aloft by three angels who contended six times with demons for his soul. He saw the fires of hell, the strife of demons, and then heard the angel hosts sing in four choirs "Holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts". Among the spirits of the just made perfect he recognized Sts. Meldan and Beonan. They entertained him with much spiritual instruction concerning the duties of ecclesiastics and monks, the dreadful effects of pride and disobedience, the heinousness of spiritual and internal sins. They also predicted famine and pestilence. As he returned through the fire the demon hurled a tortured sinner at him, burning him, and the angel of the Lord said to him: "because thou didst receive the mantle of this man when dying in his sin the fire consuming him hath scarred thy body also." The body of Fursey bore the mark ever after. His brothers Foillan and Ultan then joined the community at Rathmat, but Fursey seems to have renounced the administration of that monastery and to have devoted himself to preaching throughout the land, frequently exorcising evil spirits. Exactly twelve months afterwards he was favoured with a third vision. The angel remained with him a whole day, instructed him for his preaching, and prescribed for him twelve years of apostolic labour. This he faithfully fulfilled in Ireland, and then stripping himself of all earthly goods he retired for a time to a small island in the ocean. Then he went with his brothers and other monks, bringing with him the relics of Sts. Meldan and Beonan, through Britain (Wales) to East Anglia where he was honourably received by King Sigeberht in 633. The latter gave him a tract of land at Cnobheresburg on which he built a monastery within the enclosure of a Roman fort—Burghcastle in Suffolk—surrounded by woods and overlooking the sea. Here he laboured for some years converting the Picts and Saxons. He also received King Sigeberht into the religious state. Three miracles are recorded of his life in this monastery. Again he retired for one year to live with Ultan the life of an anchorite.

When war threatened East Anglia, Fursey, disbanding his monks until quieter times should come, sailed with his brothers and six other monks to Gaul. He arrived in Normandy in 648. Passing through Pontthieu, in a village near Mézerolles he found grief and

lamentation on all sides, for the only son of Duke Haymon, the lord of that country, lay dead. At the prayer of Fursey the boy was restored. Pursuing his journey to Neustria he cured many infirmities on the way; by miracles he converted a robber and his family, who attacked the monks in the wood near Corbie, and also the inhospitable worldling Ermelinda, who had refused to harbour the weary travellers. His fame preceded him to Péronne, where he was joyfully received by Erkinold, the Mayor of the Palace to Clovis II, who was then a minor. He baptized the son of Erkinold, and through his prayers obtained the reprieve of six criminals. He was offered any site in the king's dominions for a monastery. He selected Latiniacum (Lagny), close to Chelles and about six miles from Paris, a spot beside the Marne, covered with shady woods and abounding in fruitful vineyards. Here he built his monastery and three chapels, one dedicated to the Saviour, one to St. Peter, and the third, an unpretending structure, afterwards dedicated to St. Fursey himself. Many of his countrymen were attracted to his rule at Lagny, among them Emilian, Eloquius, Mombulus, Adalgisius, Etto, Bertuin, Fredegand, Lactan, Malguil. Having certain premonitions of his end, he set out to visit his brothers Foillan and Ultan who had by this time recruited the scattered monks of Cnobheresburg and re-established that monastery, but his last illness struck him down in the very village in which his prayer had restored Duke Haymon's son to life. The village was thenceforward called Forsheim, that is, the house of Fursey. In accordance with his own wish his remains were brought to Péronne, many prodigies attending their transmission, and deposited in the portico of the church of St. Peter to which he had consigned the relics of Sts. Meldan and Beonan. His body lay unburied there for thirty days pending the dedication of the church, visited by pilgrims from all parts, incorrupt and exhaling a sweet odour. It was then deposited near the altar. Four years later, on 9 February, the remains were translated with great solemnity by St. Eligius, Bishop of Noyon, and Cuthbert, Bishop of Cambrai, to a chapel specially built for them to the east of the altar. In the "Annals of the Four Masters", Péronne is called *Cathair Fursa*.

In art St. Fursey is represented with two oxen at his feet in commemoration of the prodigy by which, according to legend, Erkinold's claim to his body was made good; or he is represented striking water from the soil at Lagny with the point of his staff; or beholding a vision of angels, or gazing at the flames of purgatory and hell. It is disputed whether he was a bishop; he may have been a chorepiscopus. A litany attributed to him is among the MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin. An Irish prophecy is attributed to him by Harris.

COLGAN, *Acta SS. Hüb.*, 16 Jan.; 9 Feb.; *Acta SS.*, 16 Jan.; BEDE, *Ecc. Hist.*, III, xix; MABILLON, *Annales Ord. S. Bened.*; *Ann. of the Four Masters*, ad an. 774; MARQUSS of BUTE ed., *Acta SS. Hüb. ex Cod. Salmant.*, 1888; LANIGAN, *Ecc. Hist.*, II, 448; O'HANLON, *Lives of Irish Saints*, 16 Jan.; ATKINSON, *Essays* (Dublin, 1895), 241; STOKES, *Three Months in the Forests of France* (London, 1895), 81 sqq.; WARE-HARRIS, *Writers of Ireland*, I, iv, 35; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 16 Jan.

C. MULCAHY.

**Fürstenberg**, FRANZ FRIEDRICH WILHELM VON, statesman and educator, b. 7 August, 1729, at Herdringen in Westphalia; d. 16 September, 1810, at Münster. After receiving his early education from private tutors, and from the Jesuits at Cologne, he attended the university there, and at Salzburg, for the study of jurisprudence, which he completed at the Sapienza in Rome in 1753. In 1748 he had become canon at the cathedral of Münster and, later, also at Paderborn, and received minor orders and subdeaconship, though he had no intention of entering the priesthood. During the Seven Years War (1756-1763) he rendered signal services to his country as intermediary between the opposing camps,

and through his influence warded off many a calamity from the city and principality of Münster.

After the death of Clemens August, Elector of Cologne and Prince-Bishop of Münster, on 6 February, 1761, it was chiefly through the influence of Fürstenberg that Maximilian Friedrich von Königseck-Rothenfels, who had succeeded Clemens August at Cologne (6 April, 1761), was also elected Prince-Bishop of Münster in September, 1762. In recognition for these services the new prince-bishop entrusted Fürstenberg with the temporal and spiritual administration of the Prince-Bishopric of Münster. In 1762 he appointed him privy councillor and minister and, in 1770, vicar-general and curator of educational institutions. No better man could have been found to manage the temporal and spiritual affairs of the Prince-Bishopric of Münster which had suffered severely during the Seven Years War. Everybody was deep in debt and all trade and commerce was at a standstill. To restore prosperity to the people he improved agricultural conditions by dividing the land into marks, draining marshes and reclaiming much soil which hitherto had lain idle or in pasturage. He ameliorated the condition of the serfs and gave an impulse to the entire abolition of serfdom. In order to liquidate the public debt he placed a duty on such imported goods as could be easily dispensed with, and for a space of six years levied a moderate capitation tax from which the privileged estates were not exempted. He improved the military and the sanitary system, the former by founding a military academy at Münster and by introducing the "Landwehr", the latter by founding a college of medicine (1773) and inducing its director, the learned Christopher Ludwig Hoffmann, to draw up a code of medicinal regulations which was justly admired throughout Germany as a model of its kind.

The greatest achievement of Fürstenberg was his reform of the educational system. During the latter half of the eighteenth century the higher educational institutions of Germany had become veritable hotbeds of rationalism and irreligion, and not infrequently pronounced freethinkers were engaged to instruct the candidates for the priesthood. These conditions were not only permitted but often directly favoured by a few unworthy but influential prelates, among whom must be numbered Fürstenberg's superior, Max Friedrich, the Elector of Cologne and Prince-Bishop of Münster. To counteract this state of affairs, Fürstenberg planned a reform of the educational institutions in the Diocese of Münster. Luckily he was not hampered in this by his superior, the prince-bishop. He began his reform with the gymnasium, as the basis of the education of the future Catholic priest, whom he considered the chief leader and teacher of the people. After consulting with acknowledged educators, especially the Jesuits who then directed the gymnasium of Münster, he drew up a tentative plan for the gymnasium in 1770, which, after a few changes, was enforced by his famous school ordinance of 1776. According to the new plan great stress was laid on a thorough training in theoretical and practical Christianity, and a course in Catholic philosophy was added to the curriculum. In the same year he turned the recently suppressed convent of Ueberwasser at Münster into a seminary where the hitherto neglected candidates for the priesthood could receive the requisite moral training. Fürstenberg then directed his attention towards the completion of the new University of Münster (approved in 1773) where, as an effectual safeguard against rationalistic tendencies, he appointed to professorial duties only men who had been educated at the schools of his diocese and whom he knew to be firmly grounded in their Faith. To the most talented of these he offered every opportunity to prepare for professorial positions and even gave them the means to pursue special courses at foreign universities.

Fürstenberg's political activity came to a close in

1780, when Maximilian Franz, the brother of Emperor Joseph II of Austria, was elected coadjutor to Maximilian Friedrich as Archbishop of Cologne and Prince Bishop of Münster. Fürstenberg himself had aspired to this position and undoubtedly would have been elected if it had not been for the great influence of the Court of Vienna which favoured the election of Maximilian Franz. Fürstenberg was obliged to resign the ministry but was allowed to retain the office of vicar-general and curator of education. He now turned his entire attention towards the remodelling of elementary education. Through his ordinances for elementary schools in 1782, 1788, and 1801, he freed the system of elementary education of at least the most striking abuses. In order to obtain zealous and competent teachers he founded a normal school in 1783, which he put in charge of the famous educator, Bernard Overberg. After Prussia had taken possession of Münster in 1803, Fürstenberg's influence over the educational system began to decline, and when in 1805 he protested against the appointment of a professor of Protestant theology at the Catholic University of Münster, he was honourably dismissed as curator of education on the plea of old age. In 1807 he also resigned the position of vicar-general. Fürstenberg's renown as an educator had drawn some of the greatest minds of Europe to Münster, among them the Princess Amelia von Gallitzin, in whose return to the Catholic Faith from which she had become estranged in her youth, he was greatly instrumental.

Essen, *Franz von Fürstenberg* (Münster, 1842); Esch, *Franz von Fürstenberg in Bibliothek der kath. Pädagogik* (Freiburg im Br., 1891), IV, 99-310; Galland in *Hist. Pol. Blatter*, LXXXII, LXXXIII, LXXXV, LXXXVI; Nordhoff in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, s. v.; Bruhl, *Die Tätigkeit des Ministers Franz Freiherr von Fürstenberg auf dem Gebiete der innern Politik des Fürstbistums Münster 1763-1780* (Münster, 1895).

MICHAEL OTT.

**Fuschi, MICHAEL.** See MICHAEL OF CESENA.

**Fussola**, a titular see in Numidia. It was a fortified town, inhabited for the most part by Donatists and situated forty miles from Hippo. St. Augustine appointed as its first Catholic bishop, about 416, a young man named Antonius, who afterwards caused him much anxiety (Ceillier, "Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques", Paris, 1861, VIII, 11 sqq.). A certain Melior is known to have been bishop in 484 (Gams, 465, col. 3), and the see still existed in the seventh century (Byzantische Zeitschrift, II, 26). The fortress of Fossala completed the defences of Hippo. S. VALENT.

**Fust** (or FAUST), JOHN, a partner of Gutenberg in promoting the art of printing, d. at Paris about 1466. He belonged to a wealthy family of Mainz, but very little is known of his early life. In 1450 he became a partner of Gutenberg in the establishment of a printing plant at Mainz, Fust furnishing the capital and taking a mortgage on the tools and materials as security. The partners carried on the business for several years, but the partnership was dissolved in 1455, when Fust brought suit against Gutenberg for the money that he had advanced and obtained possession of the printing apparatus. The business was then continued by Fust with his son-in-law, Peter Schöffer, of Gernsheim, as partner. In 1462, when Mainz was sacked, Fust's workmen were scattered, and they carried with them to various countries the printing process which had been guarded as a secret in Mainz. Fust continued the business, however, until about 1466, when he is thought to have gone to Paris and to have died there of the plague. Among the books that were issued from the press of Fust and Gutenberg the best known is the magnificent Latin "Bible of forty-two lines" (see illustration s. v. EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE), so called because it was printed forty-two lines to the page. It is known also as the Mazarin Bible, because the first



known copy of it was discovered in Cardinal Mazarin's library at Paris. It is a fine specimen of the early printer's art. They also printed an indulgence granted by Pope Nicholas V to the King of Cyprus (1454-5). In partnership with Schoffer Fust published a Psalter (1457), the first printed book with a complete date; the "Rationale Divinorum Officiorum" of Durandus (1459); and Cicero's "De Officiis" (1465), the first printed edition of a classical author. Several other books that were printed by Fust and his partners are still extant, some of them very beautiful in their execution.

DE VINNE, *The Invention of Printing* (New York, 1878); VON DER LINDE, *Gesch. der Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst* (Berlin, 1886), I.

EDMUND BURKE.

**Fytch**, WILLIAM BENEDICT, an English Franciscan friar of the Capuchin Reform, whose family name was Filch; b. at Canfield, Essex, in 1563; d. 1610. His parents were of the Puritan party, and he himself pro-

fessed Calvinism until he was sent to study in London, where he embraced the Catholic faith. He went over to Paris and entered the Capuchin Order. In 1599 he was at his own request sent to England; he had hardly landed when he was seized and cast into Wisbeach prison. Here he remained for three years, and whilst there held conferences with the heretics concerning the true Faith. He was at length released through the intervention of the French Ambassador and sent back to France, where he was appointed master of novices. He was held in great reverence at the French Court, and amongst the people on account of his gift of miracles and spirit of prophecy. He wrote several ascetical works, the most famous being his treatise "The Will of God", which was written in English, but speedily translated into various European languages. In 1625 this treatise was translated into Latin by order of the Minister General of the Order.

BOVERIUS, *Annal. ad an. 1610*; *Bibliotheca Script. Ord. Cap.*  
FATHER CUTHBERT.

## G

**Gabala**, a titular see of Syria Prima. Ten bishops of this city are known between 325 and 553, the most famous being St. Hilary, writer and martyr (fourth century), and Severian, first the friend but later the enemy of St. John Chrysostom (see *Echos d'Orient*, IV, 15-17; IX, 220). Since the sixth century Gabala has been an exempt archdiocese directly dependent on the Patriarch of Antioch. The diocese is again noticed in the tenth century (*Echos d'Orient*, X, 97 and 140). When the Arabs took possession of the city in 639, they found there a Byzantine fortress, beside which the Caliph Moavia had erected a second. According to the Arabian geographer Yaquût, the Greeks recovered the city from the Mussulmans in 969, who recaptured it in 1081. The crusaders entered Gabala in 1109, and it was henceforth the seat of a Latin diocese. For the Latin titulars see Le Quien, III, 1169; Ducange, "*Les familles d'outre-mer*", 795-796, and especially Eubel, I, 267; II, 173. Saladin took the city in 1187, and in 1517 it fell into the hands of the Sultan Selim. Gabala, at present called Djebel, is a *caza* of the vilayet of Beirut, and numbers 3000 inhabitants, all of whom are Mussulmans. There are to be seen here a small harbour, numerous ruins, sepulchral chambers, and ancient Christian chapels hewn in the rock, a Roman theatre, baths and mosques, one of which, formerly the cathedral, contains the tomb of the Sultan Ibrahim-Eddem, who died in 778.

CUNNET, *Syrie, Liban et Palestine*, 165-168; BAEDER, *Palestine et Syrie*, 386.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Gabbatha** (Aramaic גבבטה) is the Aramaic appellation of a place in Jerusalem, designated also under the Greek name of Lithostrotos. It occurs only in John, xix, 13, where the Evangelist states that Pontius Pilate "brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment seat, in the place that is called Lithostrotos, and in Hebrew Gabbatha." The name "Gabbatha" is certainly an Aramaic word, for by "Hebrew" St. John, like other New Testament writers, denotes the Aramaic language which was spoken commonly at the time in Judea. It is not a mere translation of "Lithostrotos", which properly means the tessellated or mosaic pavement whereon stood the judgment-seat, but which was extended to the place itself in front of Pilate's prætorium, where that pavement was laid. This is proved by the practice of St. John, who elsewhere gives Aramaic names as distinctly belonging to places, not as mere translations of the Greek. This is proved also by the fact that "Gabbatha" is derived from a root גבב "back", "elevation", which refers, not to the kind of pavement, but to the "elevation" of the place in question. It thus appears that the two names "Lithostrotos" and "Gabbatha" were due to different characteristics of the spot where Pilate delivered Our Lord to death. The Aramaic name was derived from the configuration of that spot, the Greek name from the nature of its pavement. Efforts have been made by commentators to identify "Gabbatha" either with the outer court of the Temple, which is known to have been paved, or with the meeting-place of the Great Sanhedrin, which was half within, half without the Temple's outer court, or again with the ridge at the back of the House of the Lord; but these efforts can-

not be considered as successful. The only thing that can be gathered with certainty from St. John's statement (xix, 13) is that "Gabbatha" denotes the usual place in Jerusalem, where Pilate had his judicial seat, and whither he caused Jesus to be brought forth, that he might deliver in His hearing, and in that of the Jewish multitude, his formal and final sentence of condemnation.

KNABENBAUER, *In Joannem* (Paris, 1898); CALMES, *Évangile selon St. Jean* (Paris, 1904); LE CAMUS, *Life of Christ* (tr., New York, 1908); NESTLE in *Hast., Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. Gabbatha.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

**Gaboon** (GABUN), VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, formerly called the *Vicariate Apostolic of the Two Guineas*.—The name Gaboon (Gabão) was originally given by the Portuguese to the estuary on which stands the town of Libreville, and to a narrow strip of territory on either bank of this arm of the sea. In the days of the slave trade it was merely a trading station on the Coast of Guinea which at that time extended from the Senegal to the mouth of the Congo River. At the present time the name of Guinea for this territory and the ecclesiastical title "The Two Guineas" have gone out of use both in the civil and the religious sense, and Gaboon designates the northern portion of French Congo, south of the Equator and lying between the Atlantic ocean and longitude 12 east of Paris. It is coextensive with the basin of the Ogowai River, to which should be added several small subsidiary streams as the Muni, the Komo, and the Rembo-Nkomi. Its surface though broken and uneven is at no point of great elevation, and is covered by a great dense, tropical forest interrupted only by some rocky plains in the south. The only roads are the tracks used by the natives, along which caravans travel on foot. The rivers are often blocked by rapids, so that navigation is both uncertain and hazardous. The climate is sultry, humid, and subject to storms, but the temperature remains almost stationary; the rainy season lasts from September to May. On the whole it is a healthy climate for men of temperate lives, and the mortality there is one of the lowest on the West-African coast. The population of Gaboon is very mixed, Gaboon being the geographical terminus of the migration drawn from the interior by trade. No doubt many of the races become broken up on the way, but those that reach the coast are slowly absorbed among the earlier settlers there. Indeed many of these tribes are semi-nomadic by habit, and change the sites of their villages as soon as the lands in their vicinity have become exhausted by crop-growing. It thus comes to that pass every four or five years a new ethnographical map of the country is necessary.

However it is possible to divide the peoples into several groups. Under the first group may be included the old slave-trading races that have been established a long time on the Coast. Of these the most important people are the Mpongwe, dwelling along the Gaboon estuary; they are mentioned in the eighteenth century by Dutch navigators. As a race they are intelligent and keen and enjoy an undoubted ascendancy over the other black races. They are, moreover, gentle and hospitable, too hospitable perhaps. They easily fall victims to European vices,

and immorality and alcohol have almost wiped them out. Not more than a few hundred of them remain, many of whom go as traders far into the interior. The point of the Gaboon peninsula is occupied by the Bengas; the creeks or inlets of the Manda and the Muni by the Baseki, usually known as the Boulous (Bulu); both tribes live by fishing and are dying out from alcoholism. Their languages differ from each other and equally from that of the Mpongwe. However the three tribes settled towards the South in the delta of the Ogowai, the Orongous (Orongu), the Galoas, and the Nkomis use a slightly modified form of Mpongwe, follow the same customs, have the same vices as the Mpongwe of the estuary, and engage in the rubber trade as well as in fishing. The second group is made up of one single tribe, the Fans or Pahouins (Pawin) who inhabit all the northern portion of Gaboon as far as the Ivindo, and in places are to be found along the left bank of the Ogowai. They are true barbarians and are an invading race, whose progress towards the coast goes on unceasingly. They do not deserve all that former travellers have said as to their ferocity, but they are very fierce-looking, muscular, warlike, and above all vindictive. They are not, however, slave-dealers, nor do they, properly speaking, own slaves; their wives are really their slaves, and polygamy is more in vogue and more bestial among them than elsewhere. Nevertheless they are not victims to the grosser forms of immorality, in the same measure as other tribes are, but along the great rivers and at the coast alcoholism works terrible havoc among them. Those of them who dwell in the interior still practise cannibalism on their prisoners of war.

A third group of peoples is to be found in the southern part of the country; in this territory live tribes still given over to slavery. Thus, for instance, the Esteiras and the Balkalai, who act as middlemen in trading with the tribes dwelling in the mountains, the Bayakas, Bapunus, Ndjavis, Ishogos, Mbétés, Shakés, Adumas, who in exchange for articles of commerce sell their children as slaves. These slaves are brought secretly to the coast, but are no longer shipped to the Antilles or Brazil, instead they are bought by the Mpongwe and Nkomis who are thus enabled to lead lives of idleness. All these groups of tribes practise fetishism. They believe in a God who made the world, in an immortal soul and in retribution for evil; they worship spirits and ghosts, and are under the sway of sorcerers and secret societies, to which even the authority of their chiefs must yield.

The early evangelization of the country by Capuchins from Italy left no permanent traces. About 1840 an American prelate, Monsignor Barron, was the first to answer the appeal made for a priest of the Catholics among the freed negroes that the United States Government had shipped back to the coast of Africa. Monsignor Barron gave up an important post which he held under the Archbishop of Philadelphia and made two voyages to the Guinea Coast between 1840 and 1843. The Venerable Père Libermann had just at this date founded at Amiens his new congregation of the Sacred Heart of Mary, which later was united with that of the Holy Ghost; he furnished the first missionaries to Monsignor Barron. In the first year six out of seven of the missionaries died as much of starvation as of sickness; the seventh, after incredible adventures, succeeded in reaching Cape Palm on the Gaboon. This was Père Bessieux and the date, 29 September, 1844. The French navy had set up a small fort there intended as a lookout for vessels engaged in the slave trade, and consequently Père Bessieux was able to erect the first station at this spot. The following year brought him many helpers, and among them Père Le Berre. In 1848 a slave dhow was captured by the French and forty-nine slaves were located near the mission station on a little

plateau which was thereupon called Libreville (Free-town). Père Le Berre was given the official title of "Professor of Morals" and began instructing them. The next year the first nuns arrived, the French Sisters of the Immaculate Conception. In 1849 Père Bessieux was recalled to Europe, consecrated bishop, and sent back to Gaboon as Vicar Apostolic of the Two Guineas, with jurisdiction over a coast line 2000 leagues long, where to-day there are twenty-five ecclesiastical divisions.

About this time the Libreville mission made many attempts to set up stations elsewhere; only one was a success, that among the Bengas of Cape Esteiras, and it was called St. Joseph's Mission. To-day nearly all of this small tribe are Catholics. While the Libreville mission was in process of organization, building a suitable church, enlarging its schools, and clearing its grounds, the little government station about a mile away was gradually becoming a small town. In 1860 it became necessary to erect a parish there, and thus was founded the mission of Saint-Pierre, having for special object the conversion of the Mpongwe. The work of the sisters was transferred to this place as well as the school for girls and a native hospital; later the colony built a church and at present the parish contains about 3000 faithful. Monsignor Bessieux died in 1876 after having spent 33 years in Africa; he was succeeded by his early companion, Monsignor Le Berre. Under the new bishop new stations were rapidly founded, and the Congregation of the Holy Ghost continued to supply the necessary missionaries. In 1879 a mission to the Pahouins of the Como was attempted for the first time, and the Station of Saint-Paul de Donghila was opened; after great hardships it is now a flourishing mission counting more than 1000 Catholics. Soon afterwards the missionaries began to move inwards from the coast and the estuary and in 1881 the mission of Saint-François-Xavier was founded at Lambarene on the Ogowai; in 1883 that of Saint-Pierre-Claver among the Adumas, which was afterwards moved to Franceville near the source of that river. In 1886 at Fernando Vaz in the Nkomi country the mission of Sainte-Anne was organized. These three places are now great mission centres and are thoroughly equipped. It would be only fitting to add to this list Monsignor Le Berre's new stations in the Kamerun and in Spanish Guinea; but they now form part of new ecclesiastical divisions. In 1891, after 45 years of missionary life, the holy bishop died. His works had increased tenfold and his memory is blessed. He was succeeded by Monsignor Le Roy. During the three years which the new bishop spent at Gaboon three new stations were created. One arose on the banks of the Rio Muni, first at Kogo, then at Butika, at the present frontier of Spanish Guinea, among the Fans of the north. Another was established below the first rapids of the Ogowai, also in the Fan country. This station was Saint-Michel of Ndjole. The third station, Sainte-Croix, is surrounded by the Esteira peoples of the south-west. At the same time a fresh impulse was given to the evangelizing movement, for this was the period of the principal labour on the languages, of translations, of relations, of very useful journeys of exploration, of ordinances favouring the work of the catechists, of agreements with the tribes concerning the reform of their family customs, etc.

The active direction of Monsignor Le Roy ceased in 1896 when he was elected Superior General of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost. He was replaced at Gaboon by Monsignor Adam, the present bishop, who has established three new stations: Notre-Dame-des-Trois-Épis, at Samba on the Ngume, a tributary of the left bank of the Ogowai, and Saint-Martin, a little further up the same river, both of them in the midst of the mixed populations of the south. The third post, of quite recent foundation, is Okano near

Boue on the Ogowai in the Fan country. More than two hundred missionaries have died in the Gaboon territory and a hundred continue the work. They are divided into priests, brothers, both lay and teaching, and nuns. There are 47 priests; native priests and seminarians, native brothers and sisters, and upwards of a hundred catechists aid in the work of evangelization, and the number of Catholics is more than 12,000. The moral gain is slow but evident; progress is always being made. There have been great obstacles to the spread of the Gospel, obstacles not always due to the barbarism, fetichism, slavery, and cannibalism of the pagan tribes.

M. BRIAULT.

**Gabriel**, גַּבְרִיֵּאל, "Fortitudo Dei", one of the three archangels mentioned in the Bible. Only four appearances of Gabriel are recorded: (a) In Dan., viii, he explains the vision of the horned ram as portending the destruction of the Persian Empire by the Macedonian Alexander the Great, after whose death



THE ARCHANGEL GABRIEL  
Giovanni Barbieri (Guercino), Palazzo Colonna, Rome

the kingdom will be divided up among his generals, from one of whom will spring Antiochus Epiphanes. (b) In chapter ix, after Daniel had prayed for Israel, we read that "the man Gabriel . . . flying swiftly touched me" and he communicated to him the mysterious prophecy of the "seventy weeks" of years which should elapse before the coming of Christ. In chapter x, it is not clear whether the angel is Gabriel or not, but at any rate we may apply to him the marvellous description in verses 5 and 6. (c) In N. T. he foretells to Zachary the birth of the Precursor, and (d) to Mary that of the Saviour. Thus he is throughout the angel of the Incarnation and of Consolation, and so in Christian tradition Gabriel is ever the angel of mercy while Michael is rather the angel of judgment. At the same time, even in the Bible, Gabriel is, in accordance with his name, the angel of the Power of God, and it is worth while noting the frequency with which such words as "great", "might", "power", and "strength" occur in the passages referred to above. The Jews indeed seem to have dwelt particularly upon this feature in Gabriel's character, and he is regarded by them as the angel of judgment, while Michael is called the angel of mercy. Thus they attribute to Gabriel the destruction of Sodom and of the host of Sennacherib, though they also regard him as the angel who buried Moses, and as the man deputed to mark

the figure Tau on the foreheads of the elect (Ezech., 4). In later Jewish literature the names of angels were considered to have a peculiar efficacy, and the British Museum possesses some magic bowls inscribed with Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac incantations in which the names of Michael, Raphael, and Gabriel occur. These bowls were found at Hillah, the site of Babylon, and constitute an interesting relic of the Jewish captivity. In apocryphal Christian literature the same names occur, cf. Enoch, ix, and the Apocalypse of the Blessed Virgin.

As remarked above, Gabriel is mentioned only twice in the New Testament, but it is not unreasonable to suppose with Christian tradition that it is he who appeared to St. Joseph and to the shepherds, and also that it was he who "strengthened" Our Lord in the garden (cf. the Hymn for Lauds on 24 March). Gabriel is generally termed only an archangel, but the expression used by St. Raphael, "I am the angel Raphael, one of the seven, who stand before the Lord" (Tob., xii, 15) and St. Gabriel's own words, "I am Gabriel, who stand before God" (Luke, i, 19), have led some to think that these angels must belong to the highest rank; but this is generally explained as referring to their rank as the highest of God's messengers, and not as placing them among the Seraphim and Cherubim (cf. St. Thomas, I, Q. cxii, a. 3; III, Q. xxx, a. 2, ad 4um).

In addition to the literature under ANGEL and in the biblical dictionaries, see PUSEY, *The Prophet Daniel* (London, 1868); EBERSHEIM, *Jesus the Messiah* (London and New York, 1890), Append. XIII; H. CROSBY, *Michael and Gabriel in Homiletic Review* (1890), XIX, 160-62; BARDENHEWER, *Maria-Verkündigung in Bibl. Studien*, X, 496 sqq.

HUGH POPE.

**Gabriel, BROTHERS OF SAINT.**—The Congregation of the Brothers of Christian Instruction of St. Gabriel was originally founded by Blessed Louis Grignon de Montfort in 1705, but it did not spread much till it was amalgamated with one founded in 1835 by Monsignor Deshayes, Vicar-General of Rennes. It took the anomalous title of the Brothers of St. Gabriel; because the first chapel of the congregation was dedicated to St. Gabriel; this was at Boulogne. The object of the congregation is the Christian education of the young and also of the blind, the deaf, dumb, and the care and education of orphans. The members take no vows, but after making a novitiate of three years they promise to obey the superior and to devote themselves to the works of their institute; they are generally men of sufficient means to support themselves. They are governed by a superior elected by the votes of the whole community for three years: he is assisted by four counsellors elected in the same way. The congregation in 1851 had as many as ninety-one houses mostly in France and in the Diocese of Frankfurt in Germany. Later it had 122 schools in France besides two for the blind and eight for deaf-mutes. The French mother-house was at St. Laurent-sur-Sevre in Vendée: in 1880 it had 790 members. Recent statistics give the congregation 170 schools and colleges, eight asylums for the deaf and dumb, three for the blind, and several homes for orphans. The novitiate for Canada is at Sault-au-Recollet near Montreal. The brothers have a college at Montreal and four schools in the archdiocese, besides three schools in the Diocese of Three Rivers and one at St. Ours in the Diocese of St. Hyacinth.

HEIMBUCHER in *Kirchenlex.*; STEELE, *Monasteries of Great Britain*; *Catholic Directory*; *Canada Ecclesiastique*.  
FRANCESCA M. STEELE.

**Gabriel Bell.** See BELLS.

**Gabriel Biel.** See BIEL.

**Gabriel Possenti**, BLESSED, Passionist student: renowned for sanctity and miracles; b. at Assisi, 1 March, 1838; d. 27 February, 1862, at Isola di Gran Sasso, Province of Abruzzo, Italy; son of Sante Pos-

senti and Agnes Frisciotti; received baptism on the day of his birth and was called Francesco, the name by which he was known before entering religion; educated at the Christian Brothers' School, and at the Jesuit college at Spoleto. Immediately after the completion of his secular education, he embraced the religious state; on 21 Sept., 1856 he was clothed with the Passionist habit, and received the name of *Gabriele dell' Addolorata*. He made his religious profession on 22 Sept., 1857, and then began his ecclesiastical studies as a Passionist student. He was gifted with talent of a high order and with a wonderful memory; and in his religious life he was distinguished to a remarkable degree, even among his fervent companions, for his exact observance of rule, his spirit of prayer, and his fervent devotion to the Passion of our Lord, to the Holy Eucharist, and to the Dolours of the Blessed Virgin. In the sixth year of his religious life he died of consumption; his death was that of the just, holy and edifying, and he was buried in the church attached to the retreat at Isola di Gran Sasso where his remains are still entombed, and where numerous prodigies have been wrought, and numerous conversions effected, through his intercession.

Little was known of Gabriel's extraordinary spiritual gifts during his life. He was not singular, he conformed himself to the community life; he was only a fervent and exemplary Passionist novice and student hidden from the world in the cloister. After death, this young religious in a few years was declared venerable by the Church, thereby testifying that he had practised all the virtues in an heroic degree; and he was beatified and raised to the honours of the altar, by special privilege of the supreme pontiff before he was fifty years dead.

His solemn beatification took place on 31 May, 1908, in the Vatican basilica, in the presence of the cardinals then in Rome, of the Passionist fathers resident in Rome, and of representatives from all the provinces of the congregation. Among those present were many who had known the beatified during his life, including one of his brothers, Father Norbert, C.P., his old spiritual director and confessor and Signor Dominico Tiberi, who had been miraculously cured through his intercession.

The Mass and Office in honour of Blessed Gabriel are allowed to the whole Passionist congregation, and his feast day is celebrated on 31 May. It is the express wish of Leo XIII and Pius X that he should be regarded as the chief patron of the youth of to-day, and especially as the patron of young religious, both novices and professed, in all that concerns their interior lives.

BONACCIA, *Memorie storiche sopra la vita e le virtù del giovane Francesco Possenti* (1868, 1892 and 1894). *Raccolta delle lettere ed altri scritti del ven. Servo di Dio* (Rome, 1900). A life of Blessed Gabriele, written in English by Hyacinth Hage, C.P., was published in America in 1899 and re-issued later in Dublin. The latest and most important of all the biographies is that published at the time of his beatification: *Vita del B. Gabriele dell' Addolorata, da Padre Germano di S. Stanislao Passionista; Blessed Gabriele Possenti in The Tablet* (London, June, 1908).

ARTHUR DEVINE.

**Gabriels, HENRY.** See OGDENSBURG, DIOCESE OF.

**Gabriel Sionita**, a learned Maronite, famous for his share in the publication of the Parisian polyglot of the Bible; b. 1577, at Edden on the Lebanon; d. 1648, at Paris. Though he came to Rome at the age of seven, he always looked upon Arabic as his mother tongue. At Rome he learnt Latin, Syriac, and acquired a slight knowledge of Hebrew; he studied theology, but did not receive the priesthood till much later, in Paris, at the advanced age of 45. Savary de Brèves, once French ambassador to Turkey and interested in Oriental studies, when recalled from Rome, took two Maronites with him to Paris to assist in the publication of the polyglot under the auspices of de Thou, the royal librarian, and Cardinal Duperron.

The two Maronites were Gabriel Sionita and John Hesronita. Gabriel, however, was by far the more prominent of the two. They received an annual stipend of 600 livres, and Gabriel was appointed to the chair of Semitic languages at the Sorbonne. Unfortunately both de Thou and Duperron died within four years, and serious financial difficulties arose. In 1619, it is true, the assembly of French clergy at Blois voted 8000 livres to support the undertaking; but through some malversation of funds, this money was never actually paid; at least such is the accusation brought by Gabriel in his preface to the Syriac Psalter which he published. The Maronites seem to have become involved in pecuniary embarrassments, which led to unseemly feuds with the leaders of the undertaking. In 1619, however, by royal diploma, Gabriel's stipend had been raised to 1200 livres; the following year he received the doctor's degree and two years later the priesthood. Evidently all had been done to honour and support these Eastern scholars; and the blame probably lies largely with Gabriel, who can hardly be excused from idleness and thriftlessness. In 1626, as Gabriel held no classes owing to lack of students, his stipend was curtailed. After some time, however, he was paid on the original basis; and, in 1629, his salary was increased to 2000 livres. In 1630, he recommenced work on the polyglot; but, as he did not apply himself industriously, and was even accused, apparently with some show of reason, of carelessness in the work, he again found himself in difficulties. In the quarrel which ensued, Richelieu supported the editor, Le Jay, against the Maronites; and as it was feared that Gabriel might leave the country, the cardinal had him imprisoned in Vincennes (1640); he was released, however, at the expiration of three months' time, when he had signed an undertaking and given sureties that he would prepare the texts for the polyglot. He had actually completed his great task some time before his death, which occurred at the age of 71. Gabriel's share in the polyglot is as follows: he revised and corrected almost all Syriac and Arabic texts; and he translated the Arabic and Syriac texts into Latin with the exceptions of the Book of Ruth. But he made only a revision and not a fresh translation of the Gospels into Latin, nor did he translate from Syriac into Latin the Sapiential books or the Apocalypse. Together with John Hesronita and Victor Sciala he published, in 1614, a Latin translation of the (Arabic) Psalter; in 1616, he published an Arabic grammar, of which, however, but one division (Liber I) appeared, containing rules for reading. In 1619, appeared his "Geographia Nubiensis", i. e. a translation of the Maronite editions of the same, or rather of Edrisi's geography, with a small treatise as appendix, "De nonnullis Orient. urb. nec non indig. relig. ac. moribus". In 1634, was issued a "Pœma Enigmaticum" in praise of Divine wisdom by an ancient Syrian philosopher; in 1630, "Testamentum et pactiones inter Mohammedem et Christianæ fidei cultores", in Arabic and Latin; and finally (1640-2) three small pamphlets, one in Latin and two in French, containing his defence in the actions of Le Jay and Vitré.

LE LONG, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, ed. MASH, I (Paris, 1778), 350 sqq. ERSCH AND GRUBER, *Allgem. Encycl. d. Wissensch.*, Sect. I (Leipzig, 1818-90); *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1816), s. v.; KNÖRER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

**Gad** (גַּד, fortune, luck).—A proper name which designates in the Bible, (I), a patriarch; (II), a tribe of Israel; (III), a prophet; (IV), a pagan deity.

I. GAD, a patriarch, to wit, the seventh son of Jacob, and the first by Zelpha, Lia's handmaid. He was born to Jacob in Mesopotamia of Syria (Aram), like his full brother, Aser (Gen., xxxv, 26). On his birth, Lia exclaimed: Happily! (גַּד) and therefore called his name Gad (Gen., xxx, 11). The exclamation and the



name given thereupon bespeak a real relation between the name of this son of Jacob, and that of the pagan deity which was also called "Gad"; although the exact nature of this relation is variously estimated at the present day. The patriarch Gad begot seven sons (Gen., xlv, 16). Nothing more is said in Holy Writ concerning him personally.

II. GAD, a tribe of Israel, on the east of Jordan, between eastern Manasses on the north, and Ruben on the south. The territorial possessions of the descendants of Gad cannot be given with perfect exactness. On the west, the portion of Gad abutted on the Jordan, and ran up the Arabah or Jordan valley, in a narrow strip, from the northern end of the Dead Sea to the southern extremity of the lake of Genesareth; but on the other three sides, its boundaries cannot be described with equal certainty. Thus, on the east, the Bible assigns to Gad no distinct limit. On the north, it gives, in one place (Deut., iii, 16), the river Jeboc as the extreme limit of that tribe, while, in two other places (Jos., xiii, 26, 30), it treats as such the locality of Manaim (Heb. Mahanaim) which was to the north of the Jeboc. In like manner, on the south, the sacred text represents in Jos., xiii, 15 sqq., as the boundary between Gad and Ruben, a straight line drawn eastwards from the Jordan and passing exactly northward of Hesebon, a town which it ascribes to Ruben; whereas, it assigns elsewhere (Num., xxxii, 34 sqq.; Jos., xxi, 37), to Ruben several towns north of Hesebon, and to Gad, the very town of Hesebon. From these apparently conflicting biblical data it is natural to infer that the extent of the tribe of Gad varied at different times in Hebrew history, and to consider as simply conventional the definite limits ascribed to Gad on the ordinary maps of Palestine divided among the twelve tribes of Israel. The following are the principal towns mentioned in Jos., xiii, 25 sqq. and Num., xxxii, 34-36, as belonging to the descendants of Gad: Jaser, Ramoth, Masphe, Betonim, Manaim, Betharan, Bethnemra, Socoth, Saphon, Jegbaa, Etroth, Sophan. During the journey through the wilderness, the tribe of Gad counted upwards of 40,000 men and marched with Ruben and Simeon on the south side of Israel. Allowed by Moses to settle on the east side of the Jordan, on condition of aiding in the conquest of western Palestine, the Gadites complied with that condition, took possession of the territory which they had desired as favourable to pastoral pursuits, and formed for centuries the most important Israelite tribe beyond Jordan. They were a warlike race whose valour is highly praised in the parting blessing of Moses (Deut., xxxiii, 20, 21) and in the prophecy of Jacob (Gen. xlix, 19), and were able to hold their own in the raids made against them, chiefly by the children of Ammon. Upon the disruption of Solomon's empire, they formed a part of the northern kingdom, and shared with varying success in the subsequent wars against northern Israel. Their name appears on the Moabite stone (line 10). They were carried into captivity at the same time as the other tribes beyond Jordan by Teglathphalasar (734 B. C.), and in the time of the prophet Jeremias their cities were inhabited by the Ammonites. Their territory comprised the land of Galaad, the fertility and beauty of which are still praised by eastern travellers.

III. GAD, a Hebrew prophet, contemporary with King David. He came to that prince when the latter was hiding in the cave of Odollam (I Kings [Samuel], xxii, 5), and was probably one of the Gadites who joined David there (I Par. [Chronicles], xii, 8). He then began under God's guidance his career of counsellor, which eventually won him the name of "the seer of David" (II Kings, xxiv, 11; I Par., xxi, 9). Gad announced to the king the divine punishment for numbering the people, and advised him to erect an altar to God on Ornan's threshing-floor (II Kings, xxiv, 11 sqq.; I Par., xxi, 9 sqq.). He is referred to as the

author of a book narrating part of David's reign (I Par., xxix, 29) and as having assisted that king in arranging the musical services of the House of the Lord (II Par., xxix, 25).


IV. GAD, a pagan divinity explicitly mentioned in Is., lxxv, 11, where the Hebrew name גַּד, "Gad", is rightly rendered "Fortune" in the Vulgate. As far as is known in the present day, Gad is a word of Chanaanite origin, which, long before the passage of Isaiah just referred to was written, had, from a mere appellative, become the proper name of a deity. Biblical testimony to the ancient worship of Gad in Chanaan is certainly found in the names of such places as Baalgad (Jos., xi, 17; xii, 7; xiii, 5) and Magdalgad "tower of Gad" (Jos., xv, 37). A trace of Gad's worship in Syria may perhaps be found in Lia's exclamation גַּדְגַּד "begad" on the birth of her first son whom she also called "Gad" (Gen., xxx, 11): this was admitted of old by St. Augustine (Quæstiones in Heptateuchum, in P. L., XXXIV, col. 571), and at a much more recent date by Dom Calmet, in his Commentary on Genesis.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

**Gadara**, a titular see of Palæstina Prima; there were two sees of this name, one in Palæstina Prima, the other in Palæstina Secunda; it is therefore difficult to ascertain to which of the two cities the known bishops belonged (Le Quien, III, 597). Gadara in Palæstina Secunda is to-day known as Oum-Keiss, beyond the Jordan, while Gadara in Palæstina Prima, the subject of this article, has not been identified. There was a Gader (Jos., xii, 13) whose king was defeated by Josue, a place which is also mentioned in I Par., ii, 51; Jos., xv, 58. It is to-day called Djédur, half-way between Bethlehem and Hebron. A Gadera (Greek Γάδρα) is mentioned as being in the plain of Sephelah (Jos., xv, 36; I Par., iv, 23) and is to-day called Khirbet-Djedireh, south-west of Amwas, or rather Qatrah, a village of the plain of Sephelah. Perhaps neither of these cities is our Gadara, and it can hardly be identified, as is often done, with Gazara or Gazer, a well-known Scriptural city, now Tell-Djezer, near Amwas. S. VAILLÉ.

**Gaddi**, AGNOLO, GIOVANNI, and TADDEO, Florentine artists, Taddeo being the father of Agnolo and Giovanni. The dates of their birth are very uncertain. Taddeo was probably born about 1300; Agnolo and Giovanni after 1333. The father died in 1366, Giovanni in 1383, Agnolo in 1396, and all three are buried in Santa Croce in Florence. Taddeo was the godson of Giotto, lived with him twenty-four years, and became the most eminent of his numerous scholars. Vasari says that he "surpassed his master in colour", and, in some of his works, "even in expression". Two paintings signed by him are in existence—one in Berlin, dated 1333, and another in the church of Megognano, dated 1355. The best of his extant frescoes are those in the Giugni Chapel, formerly belonging to the Baroncelli family, in the church of Santa Croce, but his most extensive works, in the churches of San Spirito and the Serviti, have all disappeared. Many of his frescoes and several of his most celebrated altar-pieces have entirely disappeared. His principal work was in Florence, but he also executed several examples in Arezzo and in the Casentino. Perhaps he is best known for the fact that he was a distinguished architect, and designed the present Ponte Vecchio in Florence, and also lower down the river a still finer bridge (Ponte Trinità), which was destroyed in the sixteenth century. He was very successful, and amassed great wealth.


His son Agnolo entered the studios of Giovanni da Milano and Jacopo del Casentino; his best work is in the cathedral at Prato, where there are thirteen frescoes illustrating the story of the Holy Girdle, and in the church of Santa Croce at Florence, where there are



PONTE VECCHIO, FLORENCE  
DESIGNED BY TADDEO GADDI (c. 1345)



eight panels by him, commemorating the legend of the Cross. His earliest work, according to Vasari, illustrated the story of Christ raising Lazarus, and was regarded as the most wonderful painting of a dead body that had ever been seen. He was the master of



OR SAN MICHELE, FLORENCE  
Attributed to Taddeo Gaddi

an even more celebrated man, Cennino Cennini, the author of an important treatise on painting in fresco, distemper, and other media, which is the chief source of our information respecting the technic of the early Florentine artists, and also of a book, the importance of which, especially with regard to tempera painting and the application of gold, can hardly be over-estimated. Giovanni Gaddi, the brother and pupil of Agnolo, was a man of much less importance, and hardly any works now remain which can be attributed to him with certainty, as in the rebuilding of San Spirito at Florence most of his work was destroyed.

VASARI, *Le Vite dei Pittori*, ed. MILANESI (Florence, 1878, 1885); also BALDINUCCI, *Notizie de' professori del disegno* (Florence, 1688), and the work by the same author on the architect Giuseppe di Piacenza, issued at Turin in 1768.


GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Gaeta**, ARCHDIOCESE OF (CAIETANA), in the province of Caserta in Campania (Southern Italy). It is the ancient Caieta, situated on the slopes of the Torre di Orlando, a promontory overlooking the Mediterranean. Gaeta was an ancient Ionian colony of the Samians according to Strabo; legend, however, derives its foundation from Caieta, the nurse of Æneas or Ascanius. Among the ancients it was famous for its lovely and temperate climate. Its port was of great importance in trade and in war, and was restored under Antoninus Pius. Among its antiquities is the mausoleum of Lucius Munatius Plancus. As Byzantine influence declined in Southern Italy the town began to grow. In the ninth century (840) the inhabitants of the neighbouring Formiæ fled to Gaeta through fear of the Saracens. Though under the suzerainty of Byzantium, Gaeta had then, like Naples and Amalfi, a republican form of government under a "dux" or lord. It was a strong bulwark against Saracen invasion, and in 847 aided Leo IV in the naval fight at Ostia. Later, however, looking rather to local safety, its dux, Docibilis, entered into treaties with the Saracens. From the end of the ninth century the principality of Capua claimed it, as a title for the younger son of the prince. In 1039 Gaeta, with Amalfi and Naples, acknowledged the rule of Guaimario, Duke of Salerno; about forty years later with the whole duchy of Salerno it became part of Robert Guiscard's new Norman territory.

In the many wars for possession of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Gaeta, owing to its important strategic position, was attacked as often and as bravely as it was defended. In 1194 the Pisans, allies of Henry

VI in the conquest of the kingdom, took possession of the town and held it as their own. In 1228 it rebelled against Frederick II and surrendered to the pope, but after the peace of San Germano (1230) it was given back to the Sicilian kingdom. In 1289 Don Jaime of Sicily tried to gain possession of it, but failed. In 1435 Alfonso V of Aragon (Alfonso I of Naples) besieged it, and displayed great generosity, to his own disadvantage, by succouring those unable to bear arms who had been driven out from the besieged town. After a disastrous naval battle he captured it, and gained control of the kingdom. In 1501 Gaeta was retaken by the French, who, after the defeat of Garigliano (3 Jan., 1504), abandoned it to Gonsalvo de Cordova, Ferdinand the Catholic's general. In the War of the Spanish Succession it was captured (1707) by the Austrian general Daun, after a stubborn resistance made by the Spanish viceroy. In 1806 Masséna took it; finally it became the last refuge of Francis II of Naples. After an heroic defence it capitulated 13 Feb., 1861, thus sealing the annexation of the Kingdom of Naples to the Kingdom of Italy. Cialdini, the Piedmontese general, received the title of Duke of Gaeta.

This city has often been the refuge of illustrious personages: among others, of Gelasius II, who was born there; of Margaret, Queen of Naples (1387); of Gregory XII (1410) after the capture of Rome by Alexander V; finally, of Pius IX (1848), during the Roman revolution. The cathedral contains the relics of St. Erasmus, transferred from Formiæ, and is a handsome building dating from the twelfth century; the campanile, in Norman style, dates from 1279. The church of St. Francis, built by Frederick II, is in



CAMPANILE, CATHEDRAL OF GAETA

very fine Gothic-Italian style, and contains paintings and sculpture by many of the most famous Neapolitan artists. The Chapel of the Crucifix is a curiosity. It is built on a huge mass of rock that hangs like a wedge between two adjoining walls of rock. Legend tells how the rock was thus split at the moment of our Saviour's death. The episcopal see dates from 846, when Constantine, Bishop of Formiæ, fled thither and

established his residence. The See of Formiæ, abandoned since the end of the sixth century, was thereafter united to that of Minturno (Minturnæ). In 1818 Pius VII joined to Gaeta the very ancient See of Fondi. It was once a suffragan of Capua, then directly subject to the pope. Pius IX raised it to archiepiscopal rank, without suffragans. Among its bishops of note were: Francesco Patrizio (1460), friend of Pius II, author of a work in nine books, "De Regno et De Institutione Regis", dedicated to Alfonso, Duke of Calabria; and Tommaso de Vio, better known as the famous Cardinal Cajetan. The Archdiocese of Gaeta has now 42 parishes with 83,600 faithful, 3 monasteries for men, 9 convents for women, and 2 Catholic weekly papers.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (1870), XXI, 334-453; FERRARO, *Memorie religiose e civili di Gaeta* (Naples, 1903); *Codex diplomaticus Cajetanus* (Monte Cassino, 1887-91); CASTELMOLA, *Memorie storiche della città di Gaeta* (Milan, 1879).

U. BENIGNI.

**Gagarin, IVAN SERGEJEVITCH**, of the princely Russian family which traces its origin to the ancient rulers of Starodub, b. at Moscow, 1 Aug., 1814; d. at Paris, 19 July, 1882. Ivan (Johannes) was the son of the Russian state-councillor, Prince Sergius Gagarin, and Barbara Pushkin. He entered the service of the state at an early age, and was first named attaché to his uncle, Prince Gregory Gagarin, at Munich, on whose death, in 1837, he acted as secretary to the legation at Vienna. He was afterwards transferred to the Russian embassy at Paris, where his services were requisitioned in a similar capacity. He frequented the salon of his near relation, Madame Sophie Swetchine, and was on terms of familiar intercourse with Ravignan, Lacordaire's successor in the pulpit of Notre-Dame. Probably this dual influence assisted in bringing about his conversion to Catholicism, in 1842. On 19 April of that year Gagarin made his profession of faith, and was received into the Church by Ravignan, thereby, according to Russian law, putting an end to his diplomatic career, and forfeiting all rights to his inheritance. In the latter half of 1843 he entered the Society of Jesus, and passed his novitiate at Saint-Acheul. He was afterwards employed in professorial work at Brugelettes, where he taught church history and philosophy, at the College of Vaugirard and the school of Ste-Genevieve, and at Laval. He spent some time in Versailles and, in 1855, was back at Paris, from which date onward his pen was ever actively employed in the interests of religion and learning. Gagarin's literary output was considerable; many of his articles which appeared in current reviews and periodicals were afterwards collected and published in book form.

As a polemist Gagarin was thorough, and his work as a religious propagandist was of great importance. His grand object was to extinguish dissension and schism amongst the Slavonic peoples and win over Russia to the Church Universal. In conjunction with Fr. Daniel, Gagarin founded (1856) the journal "Etudes de théologie, de philosophie et d'histoire" (merged into "Etudes religieuses, historiques et littéraires", 1862); he re-established the "Œuvre de Prop. des Sts. Cyrille et Méthode" (1858), to promote corporate union amongst the Churches; and contributed to the "Contemporain", "Univers", "Ami de la Religion", "Précis historiques", "Correspondant", "Revue des questions historiques", etc. The "Polybiblion" (Paris, 1882), another review in which articles appeared from the pen of Gagarin, exhibits (XXXV, 166-188) a long list of his writings. These include: "La question religieuse dans l'Orient" (1854); "La Russie sera-t-elle catholique?" (Paris, 1856), tr. German (Munster, 1857), and rendered into other languages; "De l'Enseignement de la théologie dans l'Eglise russe" (1856); "Un document inédit sur l'expulsion des Jésuites de Moscou" (1857); "Les Starovères, l'Eglise russe et le Pape" (1857); "De la

Réunion de l'Eglise orientale avec l'Eglise romaine" (1860); "Réponse d'un Russe à un Russe" (1860); "Tendances catholiques dans la société russe" (1860); "L'avenir de l'Eglise grecque unie" (1862); "La primauté de Saint-Pierre et les livres liturgiques de l'Eglise russe" (1863). Gagarin also spent several years in Constantinople, where he founded the Society of St. Dionysius the Areopagite, which aims at reuniting the Greek and Latin Churches. With this object, too, he published "L'Eglise roumaine", etc. (1865); "Constitution et situation présente de toutes les Eglises de l'Orient" (Paris, 1865); "Les Eglises orientales unies" (1867), scholarly and comprehensive studies on the Oriental Churches. Amongst works of Gagarin's more mature years are: "Les hymnes de l'Eglise russe" (1868); and the very interesting and discursive "Le Clergé Russe" (new ed. Brussels, 1871; tr. London, 1872). The latter is a collection, in book form, of a series of articles published in the "Etudes religieuses" under the title "La réforme du clergé russe", an indictment of the encroachments of civil aggression on ecclesiastical right. The "Mémoires d'Archetti" (Paris, Brussels, 1872—"Les Jésuites de Russie" (1783-1785)]; and "Religion et Mœurs des Russes", edited by Gagarin (Paris, 1879), are further proofs of his great activity. Almost all the above were published at Paris. A portion of his works were re-issued by Brühl, in "Russische Studien zur Theologie und Geschichte" (Munster, 1857); and by Huttler, in "Katholike Studien" (Augsburg, 1865). When the religious orders were expelled from France, Gagarin went to Switzerland, but soon returned to Paris, where he died.

STREBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; VAPEREAU, *Dict. des Contemp.*, 6th ed. (Paris, 1893), s. v. *Gagarine*; ROSENTHAL, *Conversitenbilder*, III, ii, 194, sqq. See also, for indication as to sources, author's preface to various works.

P. J. MACAULEY.

**Gagliardi, ACHILLE**, ascetic writer and spiritual director; b. at Padua, Italy, in 1537; d. at Modena, 6 July, 1607. After a brilliant career at the University of Padua he entered the Society of Jesus in 1559 with two brothers younger than himself. He taught philosophy at the Roman College, theology at Padua and Milan, and successfully directed several houses of his order in Northern Italy. He displayed indefatigable zeal in preaching, giving retreats and directing congregations, and was held in great esteem as a theologian and spiritual guide by the Archbishop of Milan, St. Charles Borromeo, whom he accompanied on his pastoral visitations, and at whose request he published his popular handbook of religion, "Catechismo della fede cattolica" (Milan, 1584). He is the author of various works on asceticism and mysticism, some of them still unedited. Others were printed; shortly after his death, appeared the "Breve compendio intorno alla perfezione cristiana" (Brescia, 1611), which has been translated into five languages, and more recently the valuable "Commentarii in Exercitia spiritualia S. P. Ignatii de Loyola" (Bruges, 1882), in which he explains very lucidly the author's suggestions for distinguishing between the good and evil external influences or internal motives which inspire or control human conduct.

RIBADENEIRA, *Catalogus scriptorum Soc. Jesu*; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, III, 1095.

PAUL DEBUCHY.

**Gahan, WILLIAM**, priest and author; b. 5 June, 1732, in the parish of St. Nicholas, Dublin; d. there, 6 December, 1804. He entered on his novitiate in the Augustinian Order, 12 Sept., 1748 and made his solemn profession 18 Sept., 1749. Shortly afterwards he was sent to Louvain, where he commenced his ecclesiastical studies, 1 June, 1750. He was ordained priest 25 May, 1755, but remained some years longer in the university to obtain his degree of Doctor of Divinity. In 1761 he returned to Dublin, and the supply of



parochial clergy at the time being insufficient, he was asked by Archbishop Lincoln, and was permitted by his superiors, to take up the work of a curate in St. Paul's Parish. After three years in this capacity he returned to his convent in St. John's Street, where, in the leisure intervals of an ever-active missionary life, he composed the well-known "Sermons and Moral Discourses", on which his literary reputation chiefly rests.

These "Sermons" have gone through several editions (7th ed., Dublin, 1873); they are characterized not so much by exceptional eloquence as by solid learning and genuine piety. Dr. Gahan held the office of prior from 1770 to 1778, and also from 1803 until his death in the following year. In 1783 he was made provincial of his order, an office which he continued to hold for some years. In 1786-7 he travelled through England, France, and Italy. About 1783 he made the acquaintance of Dr. John Butler, Bishop of Cork, who afterwards turned Protestant on his succession to the title and estates of Dunboyne. A frequent and friendly correspondence took place between these two, and the grief which Dr. Gahan felt for the fall of his friend (1787) was turned into joy when he attended Lord Dunboyne on his deathbed, and received him back into the Church (1800). For this, however, he was to suffer. In spite of Dr. Gahan's advice and that of Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, Lord Dunboyne insisted on willing his County Meath estate to the trustees of Maynooth College, recently founded (1795) by the Irish Parliament. But as the will was disputed, and the issue of its validity, according to the law then in force, depended on whether or not the testator had died "a relapsed Papist", Dr. Gahan was compelled to appear as a witness, and was asked to reveal the nature of his ministrations to the dying nobleman. He refused, of course, to do so, and after undergoing six painful examinations in the Chancery office in Dublin, he was committed to jail at the Trim assizes, 24 Aug., 1802, to which the case had been referred for final judgment, his persistent refusal to testify as to the religion in which Dunboyne had died being ruled by the presiding judge, Lord Kilwarden, to constitute contempt of court. This imprisonment, however, lasted only a couple of days, and the remainder of Dr. Gahan's useful life was passed in peace in his convent in Dublin, where he died holding the office of prior. As there were no Catholic cemeteries at the time, his remains were laid to rest in the graveyard attached to St. James's Protestant Church.

Besides the "Sermons" already spoken of, Dr. Gahan published the following works: "A History of the Christian Church"; "The Christian's Guide to Heaven, or complete Manual of Catholic Piety"; "A Short and Plain Exposition of the Catechism"; "Catholic Devotion"; "A Short and Easy Method to Discern the True Religion from all the Sects which undeservedly assume that name"; "Youth Instructed in the Grounds of the Christian Religion"; "The Devout Communicant" (a revision of Father Baker's original); "The Spiritual Retreat, translated from the French of Bourdaloue"; "An Abridgment of the History of the Old and New Testament", i. e. of Reeve's translation from the French of Royamout.

BRENNAN, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (2d ed., Dublin, s. d.), p. 642 sqq.; BATTERSBY, *A History of the Abbeys, Convents, Churches, etc., of the Order, particularly of the Hermits of St. Augustine in Ireland, with biographical sketches, etc.* (Dublin, 1858): in the sketch of Gahan, Brennan's account is supplemented and corrected; GILBERT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. (reproduces Brennan's inaccuracies).

P. J. TONER.

Gaianites. See MONOPHYSITES.

Gaillard, CLAUDE-FERDINAND, a French engraver and painter; b. at Paris, 7 Jan., 1834; d. there, 27 Jan., 1887. His early studies were probably with Hopwood and Lecouturier; but his chief master was Cogniet, with whom he began engraving in 1850. In this year,

he entered the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. At first he had to engrave fashion-plates to make money enough to live, but his determined application to his art brought him the Prix de Rome for engraving, in 1856. At his first public showing in 1860, his prints were called laboured, soft, and flaccid, more like dry-point etchings than burin work, and he was advised to adhere to the established rules of his art. Gaillard had already chosen a new method, and his work was a shock, because not done according to the formulæ that trammelled engravers of that day. He was such an innovator that in 1863 he was among the "refusés", but in their exhibition his portrait of Bellini was hailed by Burty as the work of a master, "who engraved with religious care and showed a high classical talent". Gaillard's manner—the new manner—was to engrave with soft, delicate lines, drawn closely together but not crossing, and to render with vaporous delicacy every fold, wrinkle, or mark on the skin with Van Eyck-like care. Henceforth Gaillard was represented by engravings and paintings at every Salon. He is best known by his "L'Homme à l'Éillet", which brought him only \$100. This masterpiece was completed in eight days—the face in one.

His admirable portraits of Pius IX and Leo XIII, broad in general effect although worked with microscopic zeal and realism, raised "the insubordinate scholar" to the rank of the most celebrated engraver of his day. Another great plate is the St. Sebastian modelled with delicate touches, and showing studied outline, delicate chiaroscuro, and a marvellous relief. "My aim," he said "is not to charm, but to be true; my art is to say all." His marvellous work led many to suspect he had some secret process or mysterious "tour de main", but it was his penetrating mind and observant eye that seized the soul beneath the human face. Gaillard was decorated in 1876, became officer of the "Légion d'Honneur" in 1886, and President of the Société des Graveurs au Burin in 1886. Just before his death the Government ordered him to engrave Leonardo da Vinci's "Last Supper" and "Mona Lisa". As a painter Gaillard was accurate, minute and conscientious; yet his small canvases are effective, exhibit great power of characterization, and are large in their "ensemble". He painted the human face as he engraved it—with the precision and exactitude of the early Flemings. His catalogued engravings number 80; his "Virgin" after Bellini deserves special mention.

MUTHER, *Modern Painting* (New York, 1896), II, 546; BERGALDI, *Les Peintres Graveurs du XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1887), vols. V, VI.

LEIGH HUNT.

Gaius, POPE. See CAIUS AND SOTER.

Gal, SAINT.—Of the ninety-eight bishops who have occupied the see of Clermont-Ferrand (Auvergne) the sixteenth and the twenty-third bore the name of Gal, and both are numbered among the twenty-nine bishops of this church who are honoured as saints. The first and most illustrious was bishop from 527 to 551, the second, from 640 to 650. Born of a senatorial family of Auvergne, the first St. Gal early embraced the monastic life, and then became councillor to St. Quantianus, whom he was to succeed in the See of Clermont. Thierry I, King of Austrasia, having invaded Auvergne, took Gal prisoner and attached him to the oratory of his palace. He regained his liberty some years later and returned to Clermont. Quantianus having died, Gal was chosen as his successor in 527. As bishop he was the intrepid defender of the rights of the Church against Sivigald, the governor appointed by Thierry, and after Sivigald's tragic death, the protector of his children from the prince's wrath. The chief event of his episcopate was the Council of Clermont in 535. Fifteen prelates of the kingdom of Austrasia assisted at it under the presidency of Honoratus, Bishop of Bourges. They drew up seventeen canons,

of which the first sixteen are contained in the *Decretum* of Gratian, and have become laws of the universal Church. The following is a summary of the most remarkable: bishops are prohibited from submitting to the deliberations of councils any private or temporal affairs, before having dealt with matters regarding discipline; clerics are forbidden to appeal to seculars in their disputes with bishops; excommunication is pronounced against bishops who solicit the protection of princes in order to obtain the episcopacy, or who cause forged decrees of election to be signed. The council also declares itself forcibly against the marriages of Christians with Jews, marriages between relatives, and the misconduct of the clergy. In 541 Gal took part in the fourth Council of Orléans, which promulgated energetic decrees for the abolition of slavery, and in 549 in the fifth, which condemned the errors of Eutyches and Nestorius. His feast is celebrated on 3 July.

The second St. Gal succeeded St. Cæsarius; he was a man of great sanctity, and was one of the most eminent bishops in Gaul. Little, however, is known of his life. His feast is kept 1 November.

GREGORY OF TOURS, *Hist. Francorum*, IV, 5, 6, 13; BRANCHE, *Vie des saints et saintes d'Auvergne*; GALLIA CHRISTIANA, II, col. 237-40; MOSNIER, *Les saints d'Auvergne* (Paris, 1898).

A. FOURNET.

**Galatians, EPISTLE TO THE.**—GALATIA.—In the course of centuries, Gallic tribes, related to those that invaded Italy and sacked Rome, wandered east through Illyricum and Pannonia. At length they penetrated through Macedonia (279 B. C.), and assembled in great numbers under a prince entitled Brennus, for the purpose of invading Greece and plundering the rich temple of Delphi. The leaders disagreed and the host soon divided, one portion, under Brennus, marching south on Delphi; the other division, under Leonorius and Luterius, turned eastward and overran Thrace, the country round Byzantium. Shortly afterwards they were joined by the small remnants of the army of Brennus, who was repulsed by the Greeks, and killed himself in despair. In 278 B. C., 20,000 Gauls, under Leonorius, Luterius, and fifteen other chieftains, crossed over to Asia Minor, in two divisions. On reuniting they assisted Nicomedes I, King of Bithynia, to defeat his younger brother; and as a reward for their services he gave them a large tract of country, in the heart of Asia Minor, henceforward to be known as Galatia. The Galatians consisted of three tribes: the Tolistoboi, on the west, with Pessinus as their chief town; the Tectosages, in the centre, with their capital Ancyra; and the Trocmi, on the east, round their chief town Tavium. Each tribal territory was divided into four cantons or tetrarchies. Each of the twelve tetrarchs had under him a judge and a general. A council of the nation, consisting of the tetrarchs and three hundred senators, was periodically held at a place called Drynemeton, twenty miles south-west of Ancyra. That these people were Gauls (and not Germans as has sometimes been suggested) is proved by the testimony of Greek and Latin writers, by their retention of the Gallic language till the fifth century, and by their personal and place names. A tribe in the west of Gaul in the time of Cæsar (Bell. Gall., VI, xxiv) was called Tectosages. In Tolistoboi we have the root of the word Toulouse, and in Boii the well-known Gallic tribe. Brennus probably meant prince; and Strabo says he was called Prausus, which in Celtic means terrible. Luterius is the same as the Celtic Lucterius, and there was a British saint called Leonorius. Other names of chieftains are of undoubted Gallic origin, e. g. Belgius, Achichorius, Gæzato-Diasus, Brogoris (same root as Brogitarius, Allobroges), Bitovitus, Eposognatus (compare Cæsar's Boduognatus, etc.), Combolomarus (Cæsar has Virdomarus, Indutiomarus), Adiorix, Albiorix, Ateporix (like Cæsar's Dumnorix, Ambiorix, Vereingetorix), Brogi-

tarus, Deiotarus, etc. Place names are of a similar character, e. g. Drynemeton, the "temple of the oaks" or The Temple, from *nemed*, "temple" (compare Augostonemetum in Auvergne, and Vernemeton, "the great temple", near Bordeaux), Eccobriga, Rosologiacum, Teutobodiacum, etc. (For a detailed discussion of the question see Lightfoot's "Galatians", dissertation i, 4th ed., London, 1874, 235.)

As soon as these Gauls, or Galatians, had gained a firm footing in the country assigned to them, they began to send out marauding expeditions in all directions. They became the terror of their neighbours, and levied contributions on the whole of Asia Minor west of the Taurus. They fought with varying success against Antiochus, King of Syria, who was called Soter from his having saved his country from them. At length Attalus I, King of Pergamum, a friend of the Romans, drove them back and confined them to Galatia about 235-232 B. C. After this many of them became mercenary soldiers; and in the great battle of Magnesia, 180 B. C., a body of such Galatian troops fought against the Romans, on the side of Antiochus the Great, King of Syria. He was utterly defeated by the Romans, under Scipio Asiaticus, and lost 50,000 of his men. Next year the Consul Manlius entered Galatia, and defeated the Galatians in two battles graphically described by Livy, XXXVIII, xvi. These events are referred to in I Mach., viii. On account of ill-treatment received at the hands of Mithradates I, King of Pontus, the Galatians took the side of Pompey in the Mithradatic wars (64 B. C.). As a reward for their services, Deiotarus, their chief tetrarch, received the title of king, and his dominions were greatly extended. Henceforward the Galatians were under the protection of the Romans, and were involved in all the troubles of the civil wars that followed. They supported Pompey against Julius Cæsar at the battle of Pharsalia (48 B. C.). Amyntas, their last king, was set up by Mark Antony, 39 B. C. His kingdom finally included not only Galatia Proper but also the great plains to the south, together with parts of Lycania, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Phrygia, i. e. the country containing the towns Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe. Amyntas went to Actium, 31 B. C., to support Mark Antony; but like many others he went over, at the critical moment, to the side of Octavianus, afterwards called Augustus. Augustus confirmed him in his kingdom, which he retained until he was slain in ambush, 25 B. C. After the death of Amyntas, Augustus made this kingdom into the Roman province of Galatia, so that this province had been in existence more than 75 years when St. Paul wrote to the Galatians.

**THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH GALATIAN THEORIES.**—St. Paul addresses his letter to the churches of Galatia (Gal., i, 2), and calls them Galatians (Gal., iii, 1); and in I Cor., xvi, 1, he speaks of the collections which he ordered to be made in the churches of Galatia. But there are two theories as to the meaning of these terms. It is the opinion of Lipsius, Lightfoot, Davidson, Chase, Findlay, etc., that the Epistle was addressed to the people of Galatia Proper, situated in the centre of Asia Minor towards the north (North-Galatian Theory). Others, such as Renan, Perrot, Weissäcker, Hausrath, Zahn, Pfeiderer, Gifford, Rendall, Holtzmann, Clemen, Ramsay, Cornely, Page, Knowling, etc., hold that it was addressed to the southern portion of the Roman province of Galatia, containing Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, which were visited by Saints Paul and Barnabas, during their first missionary journey (South-Galatian Theory). Lightfoot was the chief upholder of the North-Galatian theory; but a great deal has become known about the geography of Asia Minor since he wrote, more than fifty years ago, and the South-Galatian Theory has proportionately gained ground. A German Catholic professor, Steinmann (Der Leser-

kreis des Galaterbriefes), has, however, recently (1908) given Lightfoot his strong support, though it must be admitted that he has done little more than emphasize and expand the arguments of Chase. The great coryphaeus of the South-Galatian theory is Prof. Sir W. M. Ramsay. The following is a brief summary of the principal arguments on both sides.

(1) The fact that the Galatians were being changed so soon to another gospel is taken by Lightfoot as evidence of the characteristic fickleness of the Gauls. Ramsay replies that tenacity in matters of religion has ever been characteristic of the Celts. Besides, it is precarious to argue from the political mobility of the Gauls, in the time of Cæsar, to the religious inconsistency of Galatians, whose ancestors left the West four hundred years before. The Galatians received St. Paul as an angel from heaven (Gal., iv, 14). Lightfoot sees in this enthusiastic reception proof of Celtic fickleness of character. In the same way it may be proved that the 5000 converted by St. Peter at Jerusalem, and, in fact, that nearly all the converts of St. Paul, were Celts. Acts (xiii-xiv) gives sufficient indications of fickleness in South Galatia. To take but one instance: at Lystra the multitude could scarcely be restrained from sacrificing to St. Paul; shortly afterwards they stoned him and left him for dead.

(2) St. Paul warns the Galatians not to abuse their liberty from the obligations of the Law of Moses, by following the works of the flesh. He then gives a long catalogue of vices. From this Lightfoot selects two (*μέθαι, κῶλυσις*) as evidently pointing to Celtic failings. Against this it may be urged that St. Paul, writing to the Romans (xiii, 13), exhorts them to avoid these two very vices. St. Paul, in giving such an enumeration here and elsewhere, evidently does not intend to paint the peculiar failings of any race, but simply to reprobate the works of the flesh, of the carnal or lower man; "they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God" (Gal., v, 21).

(3) Witchcraft is also mentioned in this list. The extravagant devotion of Deiotarus, says Lightfoot, "fully bears out the character ascribed to the parent race". But the Emperor Tiberius and many officials in the empire were ardent devotees of augury. Sorcery is coupled by St. Paul with idolatry, and it was its habitual ally not only amongst the Gauls but throughout the pagan world.

(4) Lightfoot says that the Galatians were drawn to Jewish observances; and he takes this as evidence of the innate Celtic propensity to external ceremonial, "appealing rather to the senses and passions than the heart and mind". This so-called racial characteristic may be questioned, and it is a well-known fact that the whole of the aboriginal inhabitants of Asia Minor were given over heart and soul to gross pagan ceremonial. We do not gather from the Epistle that the Galatians were naturally attracted to Jewish ceremonies. They were only puzzled or rather dazed (iii, 1) by the specious arguments of the Judaizers, who endeavoured to persuade them that they were not as perfect Christians as if they adopted circumcision and the Law of Moses.

(5) On the South-Galatian theory it is supposed that the Epistle was written soon after St. Paul's second visit to Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, etc. (Acts, xvi). Lightfoot makes use of a strong argument against this early date. He shows, by a detailed examination, that the Epistle bears a close resemblance, both in argument and language, to parts of the Ep. to the Romans. This he thinks can be accounted for only on the supposition that both were written about the same time, and, therefore, several years later than the date required for the South-Galatian view. To this Rendall (Expositor's Greek Test., London, 1903, p. 144) replies that the coincidence is not due to any similarity in the circumstances of the two communi-

ties. "Still less can the identity of language be fairly urged to prove an approximation of the two epistles. For these fundamental truths formed without doubt the staple of the Apostle's teaching throughout the years of continuous transition from Jewish to Christian doctrine, and his language in regard to them could not fail to become in some measure stereotyped."

(6) The controversy has raged most fiercely round the two verses in Acts, xvi, 6, and xviii, 23, the only places where there is any reference to Galatia in Acts: (a) "And they went through the Phrygian and Galatian region" [*τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*]; (b) "he departed, and went through the Galatian region and Phrygia" [for "Phrygian"] [*τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*]. Lightfoot held that Galatia Proper was meant in the first passage, and Galatia Proper and Phrygia in the second. Other supporters of the North-Galatian theory think that the countries of North Galatia and Phrygia are meant in both cases. Their opponents, relying on the expressions of contemporary writers, maintain that South Galatia was intended in both places. The former also interpret the second part of xvi, 6 (Gr. text) as meaning that the travellers went through Phrygia and Galatia after they had passed through South Galatia, because they were forbidden to preach in Asia. Ramsay, on the other hand, maintains that after they had passed through the portion of Phrygia which had been added to the southern part of the province of Galatia (and which could be called indifferently Galatian or Phrygian) they passed to the north because they were forbidden to preach in Asia. He holds that the order of the verbs in the passage is in the order of time, and he gives examples of similar use of the aorist participle (St. Paul The Traveller, London, 1900, pp. ix, 211, 212). The arguments on both sides are too technical to be given in a short article. The reader may be referred to the following: North-Galatian: Chase, "Expositor", Dec., 1893, p. 401, May, 1894, p. 331; Steinmann, "Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes" (Münster, 1908), p. 191. On the South-Galatian side: Ramsay, "Expositor", Jan., 1894, p. 42, Feb., p. 137, Apr., p. 288, "St. Paul The Traveller", etc.; Knowing, "Acts of the Apostles", Additional Note to ch. xviii (Expositor's Greek Test., London, 1900, p. 399); Gifford, "Expositor", July, 1894, p. 1.

(7) The Galatian churches were evidently important ones. On the North-Galatian theory, St. Luke dismissed their conversion in a single sentence: "They went through the Phrygian and Galatian region" (Acts, xvi, 6). This is strange, as his plan throughout is to give an account of the establishment of Christianity by St. Paul in each new region. Lightfoot fully admits the force of this, but tries to evade it by asking the question: "Can it be that the historian gladly drew a veil over the infancy of a church which swerved so soon and so widely from the purity of the Gospel?" But the subsequent failings of the Corinthians did not prevent St. Luke from giving an account of their conversion. Besides, the Galatians had not swerved so widely from the purity of the Gospel. The arguments of the Judaizers made some of them waver, but they had not accepted circumcision; and this Epistle confirmed them in the Faith, so that a few years later St. Paul writes of them to the Corinthians (I Cor., xvi, 1): "Now concerning the collections that are made for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye also." It was long after the time that St. Paul could thus confidently command the Galatians that Acts was written.

(8) St. Paul makes no mention of this collection in our Epistle. According to the North-Galatian theory, the Epistle was written after the instructions were given for the collection; the omission is, therefore, inexplicable. On the South-Galatian theory it is quite natural, because the Epistle was written several years before the collection was made. In Acts, xx, 4,

etc., a list is given of those who carried the collections to Jerusalem. There are representatives from South Galatia, Achaia, Macedonia, and Asia; but there is no deputy from North Galatia—from the towns of Ancyra, Pessinus, Tivium. The following went to Jerusalem on this occasion, the majority probably meeting at Corinth, St. Paul, St. Luke, and Sopater of Berea (probably representing Philippi and Achaia; see II Cor., viii, 18–22); Aristarchus and Secundus of Macedonia; Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy of Lystra (S. Galatia); and Tychicus and Trophimus of Asia. There is not a word about anybody from North Galatia, the most probable reason being that St. Paul had never been there (see Rendall, *Expositor*, 1893, vol. II, p. 321).

(9) St. Paul, the Roman citizen, invariably employs the names of the Roman provinces, such as Achaia, Macedonia, Asia; and it is not probable that he departed from this practice in his use of "Galatia". The people of South Galatia could with propriety be styled Galatians. Two of the towns, Antioch and Lystra, were Roman colonies; and the other two boasted of the Roman names, Claudio-Iconium, and Claudio-Derbe. "Galatians" was an honourable title when applied to them; but they would be insulted if they were called Phrygians or Lycaonians. All admit that St. Peter named the Roman provinces when he wrote "to the elect strangers dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (I Pet., i, 1).

(10) The manner in which St. Paul mentions St. Barnabas in the Epistle indicates that the latter was known to those for whom the Epistle was primarily intended. St. Barnabas had visited South Galatia with St. Paul (Acts, xiii, xiv), but he was unknown in North Galatia.

(11) St. Paul states (ii, 5) that the reason for his course of action at Jerusalem was "that the truth of the gospel might continue with" the Galatians. This seems to imply that they were already converted. He had visited the southern part of the Galatian province before the council, but not the northern. The view favoured above receives confirmation from a consideration, as appended, of the persons addressed.

THE KIND OF PEOPLE ADDRESSED.—The country of South Galatia answers the conditions of the Epistle admirably; but this cannot be said of North Galatia. From the Epistle we gather that the majority were Gentile converts, that many were probably Jewish proselytes from their acquaintance with the Old Testament, that Jews who persecuted them from the first were living amongst them; that St. Paul had visited them twice, and that the few Judaizers appeared amongst them only after his last visit. We know from Acts, xiii, xiv (and early history), that Jews were settled in South Galatia. During the first missionary journey unbelieving Jews made their presence felt everywhere. As soon as Paul and Barnabas returned to Syrian Antioch, some Jewish converts came from Judea and taught that circumcision was necessary for salvation (Acts, xv, 1). Paul and Barnabas opposed them, and went up to the council, where it was decreed that circumcision and the Law of Moses were not necessary for the Gentiles; but nothing was determined as to the attitude of Jewish converts regarding these things. In Judea they continued to observe them, following the example of St. James, though it was implied in the decrees that they were matters of indifference. This was shown, soon after, by St. Peter's eating with the Gentiles. On his withdrawing from them, and when many others followed his example, St. Paul publicly vindicated the equality of the Gentile Christians. The majority agreed; but there must have been "false brethren" amongst them (Gal., ii, 4) who were Christians only in name, and who hated St. Paul. Some of these, in all probability, followed him to South Galatia, soon after his second

visit. But they could no longer teach the necessity of circumcision, as the Apostolic decrees had been already delivered there by St. Paul (Acts, xvi, 4). These decrees are not mentioned in the Epistle because they did not settle the point now insisted on by the Judaizers, viz. the advisability of the Galatians accepting circumcision and the Law of Moses, for their greater perfection. On the other hand, there is no evidence that there were any Jews settled at this time in North Galatia (see Ramsay, *St. Paul The Traveller*). It was not the kind of country to attract them. The Gauls were a dominant class, living in castles, and leading a half pastoral, half nomadic life, and speaking their own Gallic language. The country was very sparsely populated by the subjugated agricultural inhabitants. During the long winter the ground was covered with snow; in summer the heat was intense and the ground parched; and one might travel many miles without meeting a human being. There were some fertile tracts; but the greater part was either poor pasture land, or barren undulating hilly ground. The bulk of the inhabitants in the few towns were not Gauls. Trade was small, and that mainly in wool. A decree of Augustus in favour of Jews was supposed to be framed for those at Ancyra, in Galatia. It is now known that it was addressed to quite a different region.

WHY WRITTEN.—The Epistle was written to counteract the influence of a few Judaizers who had come amongst the Galatians, and were endeavouring to persuade them that in order to be perfect Christians it was necessary to be circumcised and observe the Law of Moses. Their arguments were sufficiently specious to puzzle the Galatians, and their object was likely to gain the approval of unbelieving Jews. They said that what St. Paul taught was good as far as it went; but that he had not taught the full perfection of Christianity. And this was not surprising, as he was not one of the great Apostles who had been taught by Christ Himself, and received their commission from Him. Whatever St. Paul knew he learned from others, and he had received his commission to preach not from Christ, but from men at Antioch (Acts, xiii). Circumcision and the Law, it is true, were not necessary to salvation; but they were essential to the full perfection of Christianity. This was proved by the example of St. James, of the other Apostles, and of the first disciples, at Jerusalem. On this very point this Paul, the Apostle, placed himself in direct opposition to Cephas, the Prince of the Apostles, at Antioch. His own action in circumcising Timothy showed what he expected of a personal companion, and he was now probably teaching the good of circumcision in other places. These statements puzzled the Galatians, and made them waver. They felt aggrieved that he had left them, as they thought, in an inferior position; they began to observe Jewish festivals, but they had not yet accepted circumcision. The Apostle refutes these arguments so effectively that the question never again arose. Henceforth his enemies confined themselves to personal attacks (see II Cor.).

CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.—The six chapters naturally fall into three divisions, consisting of two chapters each. (1) In the first two chapters, after the general introduction, he shows that he is an Apostle not from men, nor through the teaching of any man, but from Christ; and the gospel he taught is in harmony with the teaching of the great Apostles, who gave him the right hand of fellowship. (2) He next (iii, iv) shows the inefficacy of circumcision and the Law, and that we owe our redemption to Christ alone. He appeals to the experience of the Galatian converts, and brings forward proofs from Scripture. (3) He exhorts them (v, vi) not to abuse their freedom from the Law to indulge in crimes, "for they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God". It is not for love of them, he admonishes, that the Judai-

zers wish the Galatians to be circumcised. If there is virtue in the mere cutting of the flesh, the inference from the argument is that the Judaizers could become still more perfect by making themselves eunuchs—mutilating themselves like the priests of Cybele. He writes the epilogue in large letters with his own hand.

**IMPORTANCE OF THE EPISTLE.**—As it is admitted on all hands that St. Paul wrote the Epistle, and as its authenticity has never been seriously called in question, it is important, not only for its biographical data and direct teaching, but also for the teaching implied in it as being known at the time. He claims, at least indirectly, to have worked miracles amongst the Galatians, and that they received the Holy Ghost (iii, 5), almost in the words of St. Luke as to the events at Iconium (Acts, xiv, 3). It is the Catholic doctrine that faith is a gratuitous gift of God; but it is the teaching of the Church, as it is of St. Paul, that the faith that is of any avail is "faith that worketh by charity" (Gal., v, 6); and he states most emphatically that a good life is necessary for salvation; for, after enumerating the works of the flesh, he writes (v, 21), "Of the which I foretell you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God." In vi, 8, he writes: "For what things a man shall sow, those also shall he reap. For he that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh also shall reap corruption. But he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit shall reap life everlasting." The same teaching is found in others of his Epistles, and is in perfect agreement with St. James: "For even as the body without the spirit is dead; so also faith without works is dead" (James, ii, 26). The Epistle implies that the Galatians were well acquainted with the doctrines of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, Incarnation, Redemption, Baptism, Grace, etc. As he had never to defend his teaching on these points against Judaizers, and as the Epistle is so early, it is clear that his teaching was identical with that of the Twelve, and did not, even in appearance, lend itself to attack.

**DATE OF THE EPISTLE.**—(1) Marcion asserted that it was the first of St. Paul's Epistles. Prof. Sir W. Ramsay (Expositor, Aug., 1895, etc.) and a Catholic professor, Dr. Valentin Weber (see below), maintain that it was written from Antioch, before the council (A. D. 49-50). Weber's arguments are very plausible, but not quite convincing. There is a good summary of them in a review by Gayford, "Journal of Theological Studies", July, 1902. The two visits to Galatia are the double journey to Derbe and back. This solution is offered to obviate apparent discrepancies between Gal., ii, and Acts, xv. (2) Cornely and the majority of the upholders of the South-Galatian theory suppose, with much greater probability, that it was written about A. D. 53, 54. (3) Those who defend the North-Galatian theory place it as late as A. D. 57 or 58.

**DIFFICULTIES OF GAL., II AND I.**—(a) "I went up . . . and communicated to them the gospel . . . lest perhaps I should run, or had run in vain." This does not imply any doubt about the truth of his teaching, but he wanted to neutralize the opposition of the Judaizers by proving he was at one with the others.

(b) The following have the appearance of being ironical:—"I communicated . . . to them who seemed to be something" (ii, 2); "But of them who seemed to be something . . . for to me they that seemed to be something added nothing" (ii, 6); "But contrariwise . . . James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars". Here we have three expressions *τοῖς δοκοῦσιν* in verse 2; *τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι*, and *οἱ δοκοῦντες* in verse 6; and *οἱ δοκοῦντες στῆλοι εἶναι* in verse 9. Non-Catholic scholars agree with St. John Chrysostom that there is nothing ironical in the original context. As the verbs are in the present tense, the translations should be: "those who are in repute"; "who are (rightly) regarded as pillars". It is better to under-

stand, with Rendall, that two classes of persons are meant: first, the leading men at Jerusalem; secondly, the three Apostles. St. Paul's argument was to show that his teaching had the approval of the great men. St. James is mentioned first because the Judaizers made the greatest use of his name and example. "But of them who are in repute (what they were some time, it is nothing to me. God accepteth not the person of man)", verse 6. St. Augustine is almost alone in his interpretation that it made no matter to St. Paul that the Apostles were once poor ignorant men. Others hold that St. Paul was referring to the privilege of being personal disciples of our Lord. He said that that did not alter the fact of his Apostolate, as God does not regard the person of men. Most probably this verse does not refer to the Apostles at all; and Cornely supposes that St. Paul is speaking of the elevated position held by the presbyters at the council, and insists that it did not derogate from his Apostolate.

(c) "*I withstood Cephas*".—"But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was *blamed* [*κατεγνωσμένος*, perf. part.—not, "to be blamed", as in Vulg.]. For before that some came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (ii, 11-14). Here St. Peter was found fault with, probably by the Greek converts. He did not withdraw on account of bodily fear, says St. John Chrysostom; but as his special mission was at this time to the Jews, he was afraid of shocking them who were still weak in the Faith. His usual manner of acting, to which he was led by his vision many years previously, shows that his exceptional withdrawal was not due to any error of doctrine. He had motives like those which induced St. Paul to circumcise Timothy, etc.; and there is no proof that in acting upon them he committed the slightest sin. Those who came from James probably came for no evil purpose; nor does it follow they were sent by him. The Apostles in their letter (Acts, xv, 24) say: "Forasmuch as we have heard, that some going out from us have troubled you . . . to whom we gave no commandment". We need not suppose that St. Peter foresaw the effect of his example. The whole thing must have taken some time. St. Paul did not at first object. It was only when he saw the result that he spoke. The silence of St. Peter shows that he must have agreed with St. Paul; and, indeed, the argument to the Galatians required that this was the case. St. Peter's exalted position is indicated by the manner in which St. Paul says (i, 18) that he went to behold Peter, as people go to view some remarkable sight; and by the fact that in spite of the preaching of St. Paul and Barnabas for a long time at Antioch, his mere withdrawal was sufficient to draw all after him, and in a manner compel the Gentiles to be circumcised. In the expression "when I saw that they walked not uprightly", they does not necessarily include St. Peter. The incident is not mentioned in the Acts, as it was only transitory. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., I, xii) says that St. Clement of Alexandria, in the fifth book of the *Ῥητορικῶς* (Outlines), asserts that this Cephas was not the Apostle, but one of the seventy disciples. Clement here has few followers.

A very spirited controversy was carried on between St. Jerome and St. Augustine about the interpretation of this passage. In his "Commentary on the Galatians", St. Jerome, following earlier writers



such as Origen and St. Chrysostom, supposed that the matter was arranged beforehand between St. Peter and St. Paul. They agreed that St. Peter should withdraw and that St. Paul should publicly reprehend him, for the instruction of all. Hence St. Paul says that he withstood him in appearance (*κατὰ πρῶτον*). Otherwise, says St. Jerome, with what face could St. Paul, who became all things to all men, who became a Jew that he might gain the Jews, who circumcised Timothy, who shaved his head, and was ready to offer sacrifice at Jerusalem, blame St. Peter for acting in a similar manner? St. Augustine, laying stress on the words "when I saw that they walked not uprightly", etc., maintained that such an interpretation would be subversive of the truth of Holy Scripture. But against this it may be said that it is not so very clear that St. Peter was included in this sentence. The whole controversy can be read in the first vol. of the Venetian edition of St. Jerome's works, Epp., lvi, lxvii, civ, cv, cxii, cxv, cxvi.

(d) *Apparent Discrepancies between the Epistle and Acts.*—(1) St. Paul says that three years after his conversion (after having visited Arabia and returned to Damascus) he went up to Jerusalem (i, 17, 18). Acts states that after his baptism "he was with the disciples that were at Damascus, for some days" (ix, 19). He immediately began to preach in the synagogues (ix, 20). He increased more in strength, and confounded the Jews (ix, 22). "And when many days were passed, the Jews consulted together to kill him" (ix, 23); he then escaped and went to Jerusalem. These accounts are not contradictory, as has been sometimes objected; but were written from different points of view and for different purposes. The time for the visit to Arabia may be placed between Acts, ix, 22 and 23; or between "some days" and "many days". St. Luke's "many days" (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*) may mean as much as three years. (See III Kings, i, 38; so Paley, Lightfoot, Knowling, Lewin.) The adjective *ἱκανός* is a favourite one with St. Luke, and is used by him with great elasticity, but generally in the sense of largeness, e. g. "a widow: and a great multitude of the city" (Luke, vii, 12); "there met him a certain man who had a devil now a very long time" (Luke, viii, 27); "a herd of many swine feeding" (Luke, viii, 32); "and he was abroad for a long time" (Luke, xx, 9); "for a long time, he had bewitched them" (Acts, viii, 11). See also Acts, xiv, 3, 21 (Gr. text); xviii, 18; xix, 19, 26; xx, 37. (2) We read in Acts, ix, 27, that St. Barnabas took St. Paul "to the apostles". St. Paul states (Gal., i, 19) that on this occasion, besides St. Peter, "other of the apostles I saw none, saving James the brother of the Lord". Those who find a contradiction here are hard to satisfy. St. Luke employs the word *Apostles* sometimes in a broader, sometimes in a narrower sense. Here it meant the Apostles who happened to be at Jerusalem (Peter and James), or the assembly over which they presided. The objection can be pressed with any force only against those who deny that St. James was an Apostle in any of the senses used by St. Luke (see BRETHREN OF THE LORD).

One of the best critical commentaries on Galatians is CORNELIUS, *Commentarius in S. Pauli Epistolam ad Galatas in the Cursus Scripturae Sacrae* (Paris, 1892). Other useful Catholic commentaries are the well-known works of A. LAPIDE, ESTIUS, BISPING, PALMIERI, MACÉVILLY.

PATRISTIC LITERATURE: There are commentaries on the Epistle by AMBROSIAS, ST. AUGUSTINE, ST. CHRYSOSTOM, ST. JEROME, EUGENIUS, PELAGIUS, PRIMASIVS, THEODORET, THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA (a fragment), and THEOPHYLACT (all in Migne), and by ST. THOMAS AQUINAS (many editions of St. Paul's Epistles).

CRITICAL EDITIONS IN ENGLISH: LIGHTFOOT, *Galatians* (4th ed., London, 1874); RAMSAY, *Historical Commentary on Galatians* (London, 1900); RENDALL, *Galatians in Expositor's Greek Text*, III (London, 1903).

FOR NORTH-GALATIAN THEORY: LIGHTFOOT (supra); CHASE in *Expositor*, Dec., 1893, May, 1894; FINLAY in *Expository Times*, VII; CHEETHAM in *Classical Review*, vol. III (London, 1894); SCHMIDEL, *Galatia in Encyc. Bibl.*; BELSER, *Die Selbstvertheidigung des heiligen Paulus* (Freiburg, 1896); STEIN-

MANN, *Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes* (Munster, 1908) contains a very full bibliography.

FOR SOUTH-GALATIAN THEORY: RAMSAY in *Expositor*, Jan., Feb., Apr., Aug., 1894, July, 1895; IDEM in *Expository Times*, VII; IDEM, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (London, 1900); IDEM, *St. Paul the Traveller* (London, 1900); IDEM, *Historical Commentary on Galatians* (London, 1900); IDEM in *Hast. Dict. of the Bible*; KNOWLING, *Acts of the Apostles* (additional note to ch. xviii) in *Expositor's Greek Test*, (London, 1900); RENDALL, *op. cit.* above; IDEM in *Expositor*, Nov., 1893, Apr., 1894; GIFFORD in *Expositor*, July, 1894; BACON in *Expositor*, 1898, 1899; WOODHOUSE, *Galatia in Encyc. Bibl.*; WEBER, *Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefes von dem Apostelkonzil* (Ratisbon, 1900); IDEM, *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes* (Ratisbon, 1900); IDEM, *Das Datum des Galaterbriefes* (Passau, 1900); IDEM in *Katholik* (1898-99), *Die theol.-prakt. Monatsschrift*, and *Die Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*.

C. AHERNE.

**Galatino**, PIETRO COLONNA, Friar Minor, philosopher, theologian, Orientalist; b. at Galatia (now Cajazzo) in Apulia; d. at Rome, soon after 1539; received the habit as early as 1480, studied Oriental languages in Rome and was appointed lector at the convent of Ara Coeli; he also held the office of provincial in the province of Bari, and that of penitentiary under Leo X. Galatino wrote his chief work "De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis", at the request of the pope, the emperor, and other dignitaries, in 1516, at which time, owing mainly to John Reuchlin's "Augenspiegel", the famous controversy on the authority of the Jewish writings was assuming a very menacing aspect. Galatino took up Reuchlin's defence. Resolved to combat the Jews on their own ground, he turned the Cabbala against them, and sought to convince them that their own books yielded ample proof of the truth of the Christian religion, hence their opposition to it should be branded as obstinacy. He gave his work the form of a dialogue. The two conflicting Christian parties were represented by Capnio (Reuchlin) and the Inquisitor Hochstraten, O. P. In conciliatory terms, Galatino responded to the queries and suggestions of the former, and refuted the objections of the latter. He had borrowed largely from the "Pugio Fidei" of the Dominican Raymond Martini, remodelling, however, the material and supplementing it with copious quotations from the "Zohar" and the "Gale Razayya".

In a long letter to Paul III (MS. Vat. Libr., cod. Ottob. Lat. 2366, fol. 300-308) he vehemently defended himself and his party against the charge of having forged the last-named book, which he firmly held to be the work of "Rabbenu ha-Kadosh". Galatino was aware, no less than his critics, that his "De Arcanis Cath. Ver." had many shortcomings, both in matter and form, and he begged his readers to consider that he was compelled to finish it within the space of a year and a half. The work became very popular and ran through several editions. For the rest, Galatino's extensive knowledge and his thorough acquaintance with Greek, Hebrew, and Jewish Aramaic is fully borne out by his numerous other unpublished writings. In bold language he inveighs against the corruption among the clergy and discusses the question of reform. While engaged on his remarkable work "De Vera Theologia" his strength threatened to fail him by reason of his great age and infirmity, but, having taken a vow to defend in the course of this work the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, he instantly, so he tells us, recovered his strength and health (MSS. 52, 54, 60, St. Isidore's Coll.). In 1539, Paul III, in a special Bull, bequeathed Galatino's works, about thirty in number, to the convent of Ara Coeli and enjoined that special care be taken of them. The MSS. are now preserved in various Roman archives.

WADDING, *Annales*, XVI (2nd ed., Rome, 1736), 447 sq.; IDEM, *Scriptores*, ed. NARDECCIA (Rome, 1906), 187 sq.; BAR-TOLOCCIO, *Biblioth. Magn. Rabb.* (Rome, 1675), passim; IMBONATUS, *Biblioth. Lat.-Hebr.* (Rome, 1694), 193 sq.; WOLF, *Biblioth. Hebr.* (Hamburg, 1715-33), I, III, IV, n. 1827; CLÉMENT, *Biblioth. Curieuse*, IX (Leipzig, 1760), 26 sq.; TIRABOSCHI, *Storia della Letterat. Ital.*, VII, pt. I (Rome, 1784), 344 sq.; SPARALEA, *Supplementum* (Rome, 1806), 594; FABRICIUS-MANSI,

*Biblioth. Lat. Med. Aevi*, III (Florence, 1838), 6 sqq.; ESSER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Petrus Galatinus*.

THOMAS PLASSMANN.

**Galerius**, VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS, a native of Illyria, was made Cæsar 1 March, 293, by Diocletian, whose daughter Valeria he married and who in turn adopted her husband. The latter began his career as an illiterate shepherd, was a man of violent character, fond of pleasure and politically insignificant; but he was an efficient soldier and a loyal and devoted henchman of Diocletian. When about this time the latter divided the empire between the two Augusti, Diocletian and Maximian, and their two Cæsars, Galerius received the countries on the Danube. His official residence was at Sirmium, but he was especially active in the East, Diocletian's share of the empire. From 293 to 295 he conducted campaigns against the Germans on the lower Danube and defeated them repeatedly. On the other hand, he was vanquished at Carrhæ by the Persians, who under King Narses had invaded the Roman territory. He retrieved himself, however, in a second battle to such good purpose that he forced a treaty which gave the Romans the greatest expansion of empire they ever secured in the East. To Galerius are ascribed the four edicts against the Christians published after 303 by Diocletian, who was himself a strong believer in the heathen superstitions. The Christians had been constantly increasing, both among the soldiers and the civil officials. Magnificent churches were being erected in the large cities, and the time seemed not far distant when the new religion would gain the ascendancy over the old. Christianity had, therefore, to be rooted out, the Holy Scriptures abolished, the churches destroyed, and the cemeteries confiscated. The Christians themselves were degraded to the condition of pariahs. The edicts, ever increasing in severity, were enforced much more strictly in the East where Galerius was in command than in the West. It was in the East that the decisive struggle between paganism and Christianity was fought out. When Diocletian voluntarily abandoned the imperial throne at Nicomedia in May, 305, he named Galerius his successor. The latter thenceforth passed most of his time in Illyricum.

Constantius Chlorus, the Cæsar in Gaul, who was older than Galerius, was really his superior in mental gifts. At the death of Constantius in 306 the soldiers in Britain proclaimed his son Constantine, Imperator and Cæsar; consequently Galerius was forced to recognize him. When Maxentius, son of the retired Emperor Maximian, and son-in-law of Galerius, had been chosen Cæsar by the Senate and the Prætorians, dissatisfied with Galerius's extension to Rome of provincial taxation, the latter led an army against Rome to uphold the partition of the empire as ordained by Diocletian. But some of his troops deserted him, and Severus, whom he had appointed ruler of the Western Empire with the title of Augustus, was killed at the instigation of Maxentius. Meanwhile at Carnuntum Valerius Licinianus Licinius, a countryman and friend of Galerius, was proclaimed Cæsar of the Western Empire. Nevertheless, Galerius was unable to master the situation either in Italy or the East, and never attained the supreme imperial dignity which Diocletian had held. One part of the empire after the other rebelled and became autonomous. He finally ceased his persecution of the Christians, for the sanguinary character of which he was personally responsible; it had lasted eight years and had disgusted even the pagan population. Menaced by the alliance between Constantine and Maxentius, he issued an edict 30 April, 311, in Nicomedia permitting the Christians to practise their religion without let or hindrance. A few days later Galerius died on the Danube. The Christian authors of his time, Lactantius in particular, condemned him violently as the author of the last great persecution of the Christians.

CLINTON, *Fasti Romani*, II; GOYAU, *Chronologie de l'empire romain* (Paris —); BERNHARD, *Politische Geschichte Roms von Valerian bis Diocletian*; BURCKHARDT, *Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen* (3d ed., 1898); SCHILLER, *Geschichte der romanischen Kaiserzeit* (2 vols., Gotha, 1883); SEECK, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* (2 vols., Berlin, 1897).

KARL HOEBER.

**Galien**, JOSEPH, Dominican, professor of philosophy and theology at the University of Avignon, meteorologist, physicist, and writer on aeronautics; b. 1699, at Saint-Paulien, near Le Puy, in Southern France; d. 1762 in the Dominican monastery at Le Puy—or, according to other accounts, in 1782 at Avignon. He entered the order at Le Puy. He studied philosophy and theology at the Dominican institution in Avignon with such success that he was sent to Bordeaux as professor of philosophy as early as 1726. From the year 1745 on he held the chair of theology at Avignon, and from 1747 the chair of philosophy. He seems to have resigned his professorship in 1751 to devote his energies entirely to the study of meteorology and physics. He published: "Lettres théologiques touchant l'état de pure nature, la distinction du naturel et du sur-naturel, et les autres matières qui en sont de conséquences" (Avignon, 1745); also the "Explication physique des effets de l'électricité" (Avignon, 1747). But Galien's most important contribution was a booklet that he issued anonymously in 1755 at Avignon under the title: "Mémoire touchant la nature et la formation de la grêle et des autres météores qui y ont rapport, avec une conséquence ultérieure de la possibilité de naviger [sic] dans l'air à la hauteur de la région de la grêle. Amusement physique et géométrique". The second edition of this booklet, this time with the name of its author, appeared as early as 1757. The change in its title renders it easy to discern what made the monograph so interesting. It was now called: "L'art de naviguer dans les airs, amusement physique et géométrique, précédé d'un mémoire sur la formation de la grêle." After propounding his theory regarding hail storms, Galien calculates how large an air-ship would have to be in order to transport an entire army with its equipment to Africa. His scheme was to construct a gigantic cube-shaped vessel of good, strong canvas of double thickness plastered with wax and tar, covered with leather and reinforced in places with ropes and rigging; its edge was to be 1000 *toises* (roughly 6,500 feet), and each surface 1,000,000 sq. *toises* (approx. 42,250,000 sq. feet) in area. In both length and breadth it would be larger than the city of Avignon, and would resemble a fair-sized mountain. This vessel would have to float in the atmospheric strata of the hail belt, as the atmosphere there is a thousand times lighter than water, while in the strata above this, into which the top of the cube would extend, the air is two thousand times lighter than water. For the scientific principles of his proposal Galien relied on Lana, S.J., perhaps also on Schott, S.J. His chief claim to importance lies in the fact that the Montgolfier brothers were acquainted with him, or at least his booklet. His birthplace was very near to theirs, and like Galien the Montgolfiers began with meteorological observations; moreover, the elder of the brothers made a first ascension at Avignon in 1782. In aeronautical works Galien is, for the most part, unfairly treated; as the writers assume that his scheme was meant seriously, contrary to his statement given on the title page.

G. B. WILHELM.

**Galilee** (Sept. and N. T. Γαλιλαία; Heb. גליל), the native land of Jesus Christ, where He began His ministry and performed many of His works, and whence He drew His Apostles. Originally, the Hebrew word *Galil*, derived from *galal*, "to roll", meant a circle or district, and in its feminine and plural forms was applied indifferently to several regions in Pales-

time. The simple term *Gālīl* (Galilee) occurs first in Jos., xx, 7 (cf. Jos., xxi, 32; and I Par., vi, 76), where it denotes that portion of Nephtali lying to the north-east of Lake Merom, in which lay Cedes, one of the six cities of refuge. In III Kings, ix, 11, the expression "land of Galilee" is used to designate the northern part of Palestine, that embraced the twenty cities given by Solomon to Hiram, King of Tyre. Isaias (ix, 1) gives to "the land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephtali" the name "Galilee of the Nations" (D. V. "Galilee of the Gentiles"), undoubtedly on account of the large Gentile population in that region. As early as the Machabean period, the limits of Galilee had extended to Samaria (I Mach., x, 30), without however including the plain of Jezrael and the territory of Ptolemais (I Mach., xii, 47, 49). The New Testament frequently recognizes it as dividing, with the provinces of Samaria and Judea, all of Western Palestine. Josephus and, more accurately, the Talmudists (cf. Neubauer, "La Géographie du Talmud", Paris, 1868) give its boundaries at this period, as Phœnicia and Coele-Syria on the north; the Jordan valley on the east; Samaria, having En Gannim (modern Jennin) at its frontier, on the south; the Mediterranean and Phœnicia on the west. The territory thus described is naturally divided by a high ridge, at the eastern extremity of which was Caphar Hanan (*Kejr 'Anân*), into Upper Galilee, embracing ancient Nephtali and the northern part of Asher, and Lower Galilee, embracing ancient Zabulon and parts of Asher and Issachar. Although mountain ranges extend throughout the territory, rising to a height of 4000 feet in Upper, and to 1800 feet in Lower Galilee, the land is very productive, especially in the southern division where the valleys and plains are greater, and is capable of sustaining a very large population.

Josue (xix, 10-39) names 69 important Canaanite towns and cities, existing in the conquered territory allotted to the Hebrew tribes of Nephtali, Zabulon, Asher, and Issachar. Josephus ("Vita", 45) counted 204 prosperous villages and 15 fortified cities in the Galilee of his time. Now its population is small, and for the most part scattered among miserable villages and mud hamlets. Safed, one of the four sacred cities of Palestine revered by Jews, which has a population of about 15,000, of whom 9000 are Jews, is the principal city in the north. Nazareth, a Christian city (about 10,000), is the chief city in the south. The deportation of Jews by Theglathphalasar (Tiglath-Pileser), 734 B. C., gave an overwhelming predominance to the Gentile elements noted in the population by Isaias. Although the Jews multiplied rapidly in Galilee after the Babylonian exile, they were oppressed by the heathen as late as the Machabean period (I Mach., v, 45-54), and did not prevail until the first century before Christ. As results of their long intercourse with the conquered Canaanites, and Phœnician, Syrian, and Greek immigrants, and their separation from their brethren in Judea by interlying Samaria, they spoke a dialect and had peculiarities in business, family and religious customs, that brought upon them the contempt of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Under the Roman Empire both Christianity and Judaism flourished there, as is evidenced by the ruins of numerous synagogues, churches, and monasteries belonging to that period that were destroyed by the Moslems. There are also notable ruins of churches and monasteries erected by the Crusaders, who restored Christianity in Palestine in the twelfth century, and were not finally overcome until 1291, when Acre in Galilee, their last stronghold, was taken by the Moslems. The territory is now a Turkish possession belonging to the vilayet of Beirut. The people are divided in their religious beliefs. Catholics of the Latin, Greek, and Maronite Rites, Orthodox Greeks, and Druses live side by side with Moslems. Near Safed there are several modern Jewish colonies.

SMITH, *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land* (London, 1885); *Palestine Exploration Fund, Memoirs*, I (1881); MERRILL, *Galilee in the time of Christ* (London, 1891); VON SCHURER, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (New York, 1885); GUÉRIN, *Galilée* (2 vols., Paris, 1880).

A. L. McMAHON.

**Galilei**, ALESSANDRO, an eminent Florentine architect; b. 1691; d. 1737. Having attained some distinction, he was invited by several noblemen to accompany them to England, where he resided seven years. Afterwards he returned to Tuscany and was appointed state architect by the Grand Dukes Cosmo III and Giovanni Gastone. He does not seem to have erected anything remarkable either in England or Tuscany. His abilities, however, were made manifest at Rome, to which place he had been invited by Clement XII. He designed the façade of S. Giovanni de' Fiorentini (1734), and the great façade of S. Giovanni in Laterano. The latter was the result of a competition set on foot by Clement XII. Of twenty-one designs sent in, that of Galilei was accepted and carried out. He also designed the Corsini chapel in the same edifice. Galilei has been much criticized on the ground that his arrangement of the orders was not correct, but his treatment of the ornamental parts is considered admirable. He was well versed in mathematics, and possessed many other valuable acquisitions.


MILIZIA, *Lives of Celebrated Architects*, II, 319; SPOONER, *Biographical History of the Fine Arts*, I, 337; ANDERSSON, *Italian Renaissance Architecture*, 157; *Langham Series: Rome as an Art City*, 74; LONGFELLOW, *Cyclopedia of Architecture in Italy, Greece and the Levant*, 384-6-8; LUBEKE, *History of Art*, II, 334.

THOMAS H. POOLE.

**Galilei**, GALILEO, generally called GALILEO, b. at Pisa, 18 February, 1564; d. 8 January, 1642. His father, Vincenzo Galilei, belonged to a noble family of straitened fortune, and had gained some distinction as a musician and mathematician. The boy at an early age manifested his aptitude for mathematical and mechanical pursuits, but his parents, wishing to turn him aside from studies which promised no substantial return, destined him for the medical profession. But all was in vain, and at an early age the youth had to be left to follow the bent of his native genius, which speedily placed him in the very first rank of natural philosophers.

It is the great merit of Galileo that, happily combining experiment with calculation, he opposed the prevailing system according to which, instead of going directly to nature for investigation of her laws and processes, it was held that these were best learned by authority, especially by that of Aristotle, who was supposed to have spoken the last word upon all such matters, and upon whom many erroneous conclusions had been fathered in the course of time. Against such a superstition Galileo resolutely and vehemently set himself, with the result that he not only soon discredited many beliefs which had hitherto been accepted as indisputable, but aroused a storm of opposition and indignation amongst those whose opinions he discredited; the more so, as he was a fierce controversialist, who, not content with refuting adversaries, was bent upon confounding them. Moreover, he wielded an exceedingly able pen, and unsparingly ridiculed and exasperated his opponents. Undoubtedly he thus did much to bring upon himself the troubles for which he is now chiefly remembered. As Sir David Brewster (*Martyrs of Science*) says, "The boldness, may we not say the recklessness, with which Galileo insisted on making proselytes of his enemies, served but to alienate them from the truth."

Although in the popular mind Galileo is remembered chiefly as an astronomer, it was not in this character that he made really substantial contributions to human knowledge, as is testified by such authorities as Lagrange, Arago, and Delambre, but rather in the field of mechanics, and especially of dynamics, which



FAÇADE, ST. JOHN LATERAN, ROME  
DESIGNED BY ALESSANDRO GALILEI






science may be said to owe its existence to him. Before he was twenty, observation of the oscillations of a swinging lamp in the cathedral of Pisa led him to the discovery of the isochronism of the pendulum, which theory he utilized fifty years later in the construction of an astronomical clock. In 1588, a treatise on the centre of gravity in solids obtained for him the title of the Archimedes of his time, and secured him a lectureship in the University of Pisa. During the years immediately following, taking advantage of the celebrated leaning tower, he laid the foundation experimentally of the theory of falling bodies and demonstrated the falsity of the peripatetic maxim, hitherto accepted without question, that their rate of descent is proportional to their weight. This at once raised a storm on the part of the Aristoteleans, who would not accept even facts in contradiction of their master's dicta. Galileo, in consequence of this and other troubles, found it prudent to quit Pisa and betake himself to Florence, the original home of his family. By the influence of friends with the Venetian Senate he was

nominated in 1592 to the chair of mathematics in the University of Padua, which he occupied for eighteen years, with ever-increasing renown. He afterwards betook himself to Florence, being appointed philosopher and mathematician extraordinary to the Grand Duke of Tuscany. During the whole of this period, and to the close of his life, his investigation of Nature, in all her fields, was unwearied. Following up his experiments at Pisa with others upon inclined planes, Galileo established the laws of falling bodies as they are still formulated. He likewise demonstrated the laws of projectiles, and largely anticipated the laws of motion as finally established by Newton. He studied the properties of the cycloid and attempted the problem of its quadrature; while in the "infinitesimals" which he was one of the first to introduce into geometrical demonstrations, was contained the germ of the calculus. In statics, he gave the first direct and entirely satisfactory demonstration of the laws of equilibrium and the principle of virtual velocities. In hydrostatics, he set forth the true principle of flotation. He invented a thermometer, though a defective one, but he did not, as is sometimes claimed for him, invent the microscope.

Though, as has been said, it is by his astronomical discoveries that he is most widely remembered, it is not these that constitute his most substantial title to fame. In this connexion, his greatest achievement was undoubtedly his virtual invention of the telescope. Hearing early in 1609 that a Dutch optician, named Lippershey, had produced an instrument by which the apparent size of remote objects was magnified, Galileo at once realized the principle by which such a result could alone be attained, and, after a single night devoted to consideration of the laws of refraction, he succeeded in constructing a telescope which magnified three times, its magnifying power being soon increased to thirty-two. This instrument being provided and turned towards the heavens, the discoveries, which have made Galileo famous, were bound at once to follow, though undoubtedly he was quick to grasp their

full significance. The moon was shown not to be, as the old astronomy taught, a smooth and perfect sphere, of different nature to the earth, but to possess hills and valleys and other features resembling those of our own globe. The planet Jupiter was found to have satellites, thus displaying a solar system in miniature, and supporting the doctrine of Copernicus. It had been argued against the said system that, if it were true, the inferior planets, Venus and Mercury, between the earth and the sun, should in the course of their revolution exhibit phases like those of the moon, and, these being invisible to the naked eye, Copernicus had to advance the quite erroneous explanation that these planets were transparent and the sun's rays passed through them. But with his telescope Galileo found that Venus did actually exhibit the desired phases, and the objection was thus turned into an argument for Copernicanism. Finally, the spots on the sun, which Galileo soon perceived, served to prove the rotation of that luminary, and that it was not incorruptible as had been assumed.



GALILEO GALILEI  
Terra-cotta bust, XVII Century, Florence


Prior to these discoveries, Galileo had already abandoned the old Ptolemaic astronomy for the Copernican, but, as he confessed in a letter to Kepler in 1597, he had refrained from making himself its advocate, lest like Copernicus himself he should be overwhelmed with ridicule. His telescopic discoveries, the significance of which he immediately perceived, induced him at once to lay aside all reserve and come forward as the avowed and strenuous champion of Copernicanism, and, appealing as these discoveries did to the evidence of sensible phenomena, they not only did more than anything else to recommend the new system to general acceptance, but invested Galileo himself with the credit of being the greatest astronomer of his age, if not the greatest who ever lived. They were also the cause of his lamentable controversy with ecclesiastical authority, which raises ques-

tions of graver import than any others connected with his name. It is necessary, therefore, to understand clearly his exact position in this regard.

The direct services which Galileo rendered to astronomy are virtually summed up in his telescopic discoveries, which, brilliant and important as they were, contributed little or nothing to the theoretical perfection of the science, and were sure to be made by any careful observer provided with a telescope. Again, he wholly neglected discoveries far more fundamental than his own, made by his great contemporary Kepler, the value of which he either did not perceive or entirely ignored. Since the first and second of his famous laws were already published by Kepler in 1609 and the third, ten years later, it is truly inconceivable, as Delambre says, that Galileo should not once have made any mention of these discoveries, far more difficult than his own, which finally led Newton to determine the general principle which forms the very soul of the celestial mechanism thus established. It is, moreover, undeniable, that the proofs which Galileo adduced in support of the heliocentric system of Copernicus, as against the geocentric of Ptolemy and the ancients, were far from conclusive, and failed to con-

vince such men as Tycho Brahé (who, however, did not live to see the telescope) and Lord Bacon, who to the end remained an unbeliever. Milton also, who visited Galileo in his old age (1638), appears to have suspended his judgment, for there are passages in his great poem which seem to favour both systems. The proof from the phenomenon of the tides, to which Galileo appealed to establish the rotation of the earth on its axis, is now universally recognized as a grave error, and he treated with scorn Kepler's suggestion, foreshadowing Newton's establishment of the true doctrine, that a certain occult influence of the moon was in some way responsible. In regard to comets, again, he maintained no less erroneously that they were atmospheric phenomena, like meteors, though Tycho had demonstrated the falsity of such a view, which was recommended only as the solution of an anti-Copernican difficulty.

In spite of all deficiency in his arguments, Galileo, profoundly assured of the truth of his cause, set himself with his habitual vehemence to convince others,



SWINGING LAMP, CATHEDRAL OF PISA  
From which Galileo discovered the  
isochronism of the pendulum

and so contributed in no small degree to create the troubles which greatly embittered the latter part of his life. In regard to their history, there are two main points to be considered. It is in the first place constantly assumed, especially at the present day, that the opposition which Copernicanism encountered at the hands of ecclesiastical authority was prompted by hatred of science and a desire to keep the minds of men in the darkness of ignorance. To suppose that any body of men could deliberately adopt such a course is ridiculous, especially a body which, with whatever defects of method, had for so long been the only one which concerned itself with science at all. It is likewise contradicted by the history of the very controversy with which we are now concerned. According to a popular notion the point, upon which beyond all others churchmen were determined to insist, was the geocentric system of astronomy. Nevertheless it was a churchman, Nicholas Copernicus (q. v.), who first advanced the contrary doctrine that the sun and not the earth is the centre of our system, round which our planet revolves, rotating on its own axis. His great work, "*De Revolutionibus orbium coelestium*", was published at the earnest solicitation of two distinguished churchmen, Cardinal Schöenberg and Tiedemann Giese, Bishop of Culm. It was dedicated by permission to Pope Paul III in order, as Copernicus explained, that it might be thus protected from the attacks which it was sure to encounter on the part of the "mathematicians" (i. e. philosophers) for its apparent contradiction of the evidence of our senses, and even of common sense. He added that he made no account of objections which might be brought by ignorant wiseacres on Scriptural grounds. Indeed, for nearly three quarters of a century no such difficulties were raised on the Catholic side, although Luther and Melancthon condemned the work of Copernicus in unmeasured terms. Neither Paul III, nor any of

the nine popes who followed him, nor the Roman Congregations raised any alarm, and, as has been seen, Galileo himself in 1597, speaking of the risks he might run by an advocacy of Copernicanism, mentioned ridicule only and said nothing of persecution. Even when he had made his famous discoveries, no change occurred in this respect. On the contrary, coming to Rome in 1611, he was received in triumph; all the world, clerical and lay, flocked to see him, and, setting up his telescope in the Quirinal Garden belonging to Cardinal Bandini, he exhibited the sun-spots and other objects to an admiring throng.

It was not till four years later that trouble arose, the ecclesiastical authorities taking alarm at the persistence with which Galileo proclaimed the truth of the Copernican doctrine. That their opposition was grounded, as is constantly assumed, upon a fear lest men should be enlightened by the diffusion of scientific truth, it is obviously absurd to maintain. On the contrary, they were firmly convinced, with Bacon and others, that the new teaching was radically false and unscientific, while it is now truly admitted that Galileo himself had no sufficient proof of what he so vehemently advocated, and Professor Huxley after examining the case avowed his opinion that the opponents of Galileo "had rather the best of it". But what, more than all, raised alarm was anxiety for the credit of Holy Scripture, the letter of which was then universally believed to be the supreme authority in matters of science, as in all others. When therefore it spoke of the sun staying his course at the prayer of Josue, or the earth as being ever immovable, it was assumed that the doctrine of Copernicus and Galileo was anti-Scriptural, and therefore heretical. It is evident that, since the days of Copernicus himself, the Reformation controversy had done much to attach suspicion to novel interpretations of Holy Writ, which was not lessened by the endeavours of Galileo and his ally Foscarini to find positive arguments for Copernicanism in the inspired volume. Foscarini, a Carmelite friar of noble lineage, who had twice ruled Calabria as provincial, and had considerable reputation as a preacher and theologian, threw himself with more zeal than discretion into the controversy, as when he sought to find an argument for Copernicanism in the seven-branched candlestick of the Old Law. Above all, he excited alarm by publishing works on the subject in the vernacular, and thus spreading the new doctrine, which was startling even for the learned, amongst the masses who were incapable of forming any sound judgment concerning it. There was at the time an active sceptical party in Italy, which aimed at the overthrow of all religion, and, as Sir David Brewster acknowledges (*Martyrs of Science*), there is no doubt that this party lent Galileo all its support.

In these circumstances, Galileo, hearing that some had denounced his doctrine as anti-Scriptural, presented himself at Rome in December, 1615, and was courteously received. He was presently interrogated before the Inquisition, which after consultation declared the system he upheld to be scientifically false, and anti-Scriptural or heretical, and that he must renounce it. This he obediently did, promising to teach it no more. Then followed a decree of the Congregation of the Index dated 5 March, 1616, prohibiting various heretical works to which were added any advocating the Copernican system. In this decree no mention is made of Galileo, or of any of his works, neither is the name of the pope introduced, though there is no doubt that he fully approved the decision, having presided at the session of the Inquisition, wherein the matter was discussed and decided. In thus acting, it is undeniable that the ecclesiastical authorities committed a grave and deplorable error, and sanctioned an altogether false principle as to the proper use of Scripture. Galileo and Foscarini rightly urged that Holy Writ is intended to teach men to go to

heaven, not how the heavens go. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that, while there was as yet no sufficient proof of the Copernican system, no objection was made to its being taught as an hypothesis which explained all phenomena in a simpler manner than the Ptolemaic, and might for all practical purposes be adopted by astronomers. What was objected to was the assertion that Copernicanism was in fact true, "which appears to contradict Scripture". It is clear, moreover, that the authors of the judgment themselves did not consider it to be absolutely final and irreversible, for Cardinal Bellarmine, the most influential member of the Sacred College, writing to Foscarini, after urging that he and Galileo should be content to show that their system explains all celestial phenomena—an unexceptional proposition, and one sufficient for all practical purposes—but should not categorically assert what seemed to contradict the Bible, thus continued: "I say that if a real proof be found that the sun is fixed and does not revolve round the earth, but the earth round the sun, then it will be necessary, very carefully, to proceed to the explanation of the passages of Scripture which appear to be contrary, and we should rather say that we have misunderstood these than pronounce that to be false which is demonstrated."

By this decree the work of Copernicus was for the first time prohibited, as well as the "Epitome" of Kepler, but in each instance only *donec corrigatur*, the corrections prescribed being such as were necessary to exhibit the Copernican system as an hypothesis, not as an established fact. We learn further that with permission these works might be read in their entirety, by "the learned and skilful in the science" (Remus to Kepler). Galileo seems, says von Gebler, to have treated the decree of the Inquisition pretty coolly, speaking with satisfaction of the trifling changes prescribed in the work of Copernicus. He left Rome, however, with the evident intention of violating the promise extracted from him, and, while he pursued unmolested his searches in other branches of science, he lost no opportunity of manifesting his contempt for the astronomical system which he had promised to embrace. Nevertheless, when in 1624 he again visited Rome, he met with what is rightly described as "a noble and generous reception". The pope now reigning, Urban VIII, had, as Cardinal Barberini, been his friend and had opposed his condemnation in 1616. He conferred on his visitor a pension, to which as a foreigner in Rome Galileo had no claim, and which, says Brewster, must be regarded as an endowment of Science itself. But to Galileo's disappointment Urban would not annul the former judgment of the Inquisition. After his return to Florence, Galileo set himself to compose the work which revived and aggravated all former animosities, namely a dialogue in which a Ptolemaist is utterly routed and confounded by two Copernicans. This was published in 1632, and, being plainly inconsistent with his former promise, was taken by the Roman authorities as a direct challenge. He was therefore again cited before the Inquisition, and again failed to display the courage of his opinions, declaring that since his former trial in 1616 he had never held the Copernican theory. Such a declaration, naturally, was not taken very seriously, and in spite of it he was condemned as "vehemently suspected of heresy" to incarceration at the pleasure of the tribunal and to recite the Seven Penitential Psalms once a week for three years.

Under the sentence of imprisonment Galileo remained till his death in 1642. It is, however, untrue to speak of him as in any proper sense a "prisoner". As his Protestant biographer, von Gebler, tells us, "One glance at the truest historical source for the famous trial, would convince any one that Galileo spent altogether twenty-two days in the buildings of the Holy Office (i. e. the Inquisition), and even then

not in a prison cell with barred windows, but in the handsome and commodious apartment of an official of the Inquisition." For the rest, he was allowed to use as his places of confinement the houses of friends, always comfortable and usually luxurious. It is wholly untrue that he was—as is constantly stated—either tortured or blinded by his persecutors—though in 1637, five years before his death, he became totally blind—or that he was refused burial in consecrated ground. On the contrary, although the pope (Urban VIII) did not allow a monument to be erected over his tomb, he sent his special blessing to the dying man, who was interred not only in consecrated ground, but within the church of Santa Croce at Florence. Finally, the famous "E pur si muove", supposed to have been uttered by Galileo, as he rose from his knees after



TOMB OF GALILEO  
Foggini, Santa Croce, Florence

renouncing the motion of the earth, is an acknowledged fiction, of which no mention can be found till more than a century after his death, which took place 8 January, 1642, the year in which Newton was born.

Such in brief is the history of this famous conflict between ecclesiastical authority and science, to which special theological importance has been attached in connexion with the question of papal infallibility. Can it be said that either Paul V or Urban VIII so committed himself to the doctrine of geocentrism as to impose it upon the Church as an article of faith, and so to teach as pope what is now acknowledged to be untrue? That both these pontiffs were convinced anti-Copernicans cannot be doubted, nor that they believed the Copernican system to be unscriptural and desired its suppression. The question is, however, whether either of them condemned the doctrine ex cathedra. This, it is clear, they never did. As to the decree of 1616, we have seen that it was issued by the Congregation of the Index, which can raise no difficulty in regard of infallibility, this tribunal being absolutely incompetent to make a dogmatic decree. Nor is the case altered by the fact that the pope approved the Congregation's decision *in forma communi*, that is to say, to the extent needful for the purpose intended, namely to prohibit the circulation of writings

which were judged harmful. The pope and his assessors may have been wrong in such a judgment, but this does not alter the character of the pronouncement, or convert it into a decree *ex cathedra*.

As to the second trial in 1633, this was concerned not so much with the doctrine as with the person of Galileo, and his manifest breach of contract in not abstaining from the active propaganda of Copernican doctrines. The sentence, passed upon him in consequence, clearly implied a condemnation of Copernicanism, but it made no formal decree on the subject, and did not receive the pope's signature. Nor is this only an opinion of theologians; it is corroborated by writers whom none will accuse of any bias in favour of the papacy. Thus Professor Augustus De Morgan (*Budget of Paradoxes*) declares "It is clear that the absurdity was the act of the Italian Inquisition, for the private and personal pleasure of the pope—who knew that the course he took could not convict him *as pope*—and not of the body which calls itself *the Church*." And von Gebler ("Galileo Galilei"): "The Church never condemned it (the Copernican system) at all, for the Qualifiers of the Holy Office never mean the Church". It may be added that Riccioli and other contemporaries of Galileo were permitted, after 1616, to declare that no anti-Copernican definition had issued from the supreme pontiff.

More vital at the present day is the question with which we commenced: "Does not the condemnation of Galileo prove the implacable opposition of the Church to scientific progress and enlightenment?" It may be replied with Cardinal Newman that this instance serves to prove the opposite, namely that the Church has not interfered with physical science, for Galileo's case "is the one stock argument" (*Apologia*, c. v). So too Professor De Morgan acknowledges ("Motion of the Earth" in "English Cyclopædia"): "The Papal power must upon the whole have been moderately used in matters of philosophy, if we may judge by the great stress laid on this one case of Galileo. It is the standing proof that an authority which has lasted a thousand years was all the time occupied in checking the progress of thought."—So Dr. Whewell speaking of this same case says (*History of the Inductive Sciences*): "I would not be understood to assert the condemnation of new doctrines to be a general or characteristic practice of the Romish Church. Certainly the intelligent and cultivated minds of Italy, and many of the most eminent of her ecclesiastics among them, have been the foremost in promoting and welcoming the progress of science, and there were found among the Italian ecclesiastics of Galileo's time many of the earliest and most enlightened adherents of the Copernican system."

The literature concerning Galileo is abundant. In particular may be mentioned: DE MORGAN, *Motion of the Earth in English Cyclopædia*; IDEM in *Companion to the British Almanack*, 1855; IDEM, *Budget of Paradoxes* (London, 1872); WHEWELL, *History of the Inductive Sciences* (3d ed., London, 1857); BREWSTER, *Martyrs of Science* (London, 1877); VON GEBLER, *Galileo Galilei und die römische Curie* (tr., London, 1879); GRISAR, *Galilei-studien* (Ratisbon, 1882); CHOUPIN, *Valeur des Décisions Doctrinales et Disciplinaires* (Paris, 1907); DE JAGEUY, *Le procès de Galilée*, etc. (Paris, 1888); L'ÉPINOIS, *La question de Galilée* (Paris, 1878); VACANDARD, *Le procès de Galilée in Revue du clergé français*, 1 and 15 Oct., 1904; WARD in *Dublin Review*, April, July, 1871; *The History of Galileo in The Month*, Sept., Oct., 1867; GERARD, *Galileo* (Catholic Truth Society); MÜLLER, *Galileo Galilei* (Rome, 1908); IDEM, *Galileo Galilei und das kopernikanische Weltssystem in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, suppl. 101.

JOHN GERARD.

**Galitzin, ELIZABETH**, Princess, religious of the Sacred Heart; b. at St. Petersburg, 22 February, 1797; d. in Louisiana, 8 December, 1843. Her father was Prince Alexis Andreivitch, her mother Countess Protasof, the friend and "second conscience" of Madame Swetchine. When her mother abandoned the creed of the Russian "Orthodox" Church and embraced the Catholic Faith (a step to which the penalty of exile or death was still attached by Russian law),

Princess Elizabeth was roused to bitter hatred of the Catholic Church, and bound herself by oath never to change her religion. But after four years, the influence of her mother's consistency of life and the conversion of other members of the family induced her to examine the question, and finally she too made her submission. Her vocation followed soon after her conversion, and she left it to Father Rozaven to find for her "an austere order devoted to education". His choice was the Society of the Sacred Heart. Elizabeth Galitzin received the habit at Metz, in 1826, her first vows were taken in Rome at the Trinità dei Monti, 1828, and her profession took place in Paris, 1832. In 1834, she was named secretary general to the foundress, Blessed Madeleine Sophie Barat, and, in 1839, was elected assistant general and named visitor of the convents of the Sacred Heart in the United States.

Mother Galitzin carried out her duties of assistant general and visitor in a characteristic spirit. Though burning with ardour to attain the best in all religious perfection, her strict ideas of government, and the tendency to dissimulation, which autocratic natures sometimes reveal in the pursuit of their ends, prevented her from acquiring fully the spirit of the constitutions of her order. She made grave mistakes, but the Blessed foundress, always willing to make allowances for others, excused them and ever recognized that Mother Galitzin's heart was true to the society. Conscious of the harm she had done in pressing the matter of some changes in the constitutions, Mother Galitzin begged to be sent back to the United States, to restore the original organization of the society. In the midst of an outbreak of yellow fever in Louisiana she nursed the sick with heroic devotedness, until she was herself struck down and died.

GALITZIN, *Vie d'une Religieuse du Sacré Cœur* (Paris, 1869), COLLEY, *Life of Blessed Madeleine Sophie Barat* (Rohampton, 1900).

JANET STUART.

**Gall, SAINT (GALLUS)**; in the most ancient manuscript he is called GALLO, GALLONUS, GALLUNUS, and sometimes also CALLO, CHELLEH, GILIANUS, etc.). An Irishman by birth, he was one of the twelve disciples who accompanied St. Columbanus to Gaul, and established themselves with him at Luxeuil. Gall again followed his master, in 610, on his voyage on the Rhine to Bregenz; but he separated from him in 612, when Columbanus left for Italy; and he remained in Swabia, where, with several companions, he led the life of a hermit, in a desert to the west of Bregenz, near the source of the river Steinach. There, after his death, was erected an "ecclesia Sancti Galluni" governed by a "presbyter et pastor". Before the middle of the eighth century this church became a real monastery, the first abbot of which was St. Otmar. The monastery was the property of the Diocese of Constance, and it was only in 818 that it obtained from the Emperor Louis the Pious the right to be numbered among the royal monasteries, and to enjoy the privilege of immunity. At last, in 854, it was freed from all obligation whatever towards the See of Constance, and henceforth was attached only by ties of canonical dependence. Called "Abbey of St. Gall", not from the name of its founder and first abbot, but of the saint who had lived in this place and whose relics were honoured there, the monastery played an illustrious part in history for more than a thousand years.

Apart from this authentic history, there exists another version or tradition furnished by the Lives of St. Gall, the most ancient of which does not antedate the end of the eighth century. A portion of the incidents related in these Lives is perhaps true; but another part is certainly legendary, and in formal contradiction to the most ancient charters of the abbey itself. According to these biographies, Gall was ordained a priest in Ireland before his departure for the Continent,

therefore before 590. Having reached Bregenz with Columbanus, he laboured in the country as a missionary, and actively combated the pagan superstitions. Prevented by illness from following Columbanus to Italy, he was placed under interdict by the displeased Columbanus, and in consequence could not celebrate Mass until several years later, after the death of his old master. Gall delivered from the demon by which she was possessed Fridiburga, the daughter of Cunzo and the betrothed of Sigebert, King of the Franks; the latter, through gratitude, granted to the saint an estate near Arbon, which belonged to the royal treasury, that he might found a monastery there. Naturally the monastery was exempt from all dependence on the Bishop of Constance; moreover, Gall twice refused the episcopal see of that city, which was offered to him, and having been instrumental in securing the election of a secular cleric, the deacon John, the latter and his successors placed themselves in every way at the service of the abbey. Gall also declined the abbatial dignity of Luxeuil, which was offered him by the monks of the monastery after the death of St. Eustace. Shortly afterwards he died, at the age of ninety-five, at Arbon, during a visit; but his body was brought back to the monastery, and God revealed the sanctity of his servant by numerous miracles. His feast is celebrated on 16 October, the day ascribed to him in some very ancient martyrologies, while Adon, it is not known for what reason, makes it occur on 20 February. The saint is ordinarily represented with a bear; for a legend, recorded in the Lives, relates that one night, at the command of the saint, one of these animals brought wood to feed the fire which Gall and his companions had kindled in the desert.

The most ancient Life, of which only fragments have been discovered till the present date, but otherwise very important, has been remodelled and put in the better style of the ninth century by two monks of Reichenau: in 816-24 by the celebrated Wettinus, and about 833-34 by Walafrid Strabo, who also revised a book of the miracles of the saint, written somewhat earlier by Gozbert the Younger, monk of St. Gall. In 850 an anonymous monk of the same abbey wrote, in verse, a Life which he published under the name of Walafrid; and others after him further celebrated the holy patron in prose and verse.

*Vita S. Columbanus*, I. xx; *Vita S. Galli tres antiquissimæ*, ed. KRUSCH, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. rer. Merov.*, IV, 251-337; *Vita metrica*, ed. DUMMLER, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Poet. lat.*, II, 428-73—for other ancient writings see *Bibl. hag. lat.*, 3245-3258. See also RETTBERG, *Observationes ad vitam sancti Galli spectantes* (Marburg, 1842); SICKEL, *St. Gallen unter den ersten Karolingern in Mittheilungen zur vaterländische Geschichte* (St. Gall, 1866), 1-21; MEYER von KRONAU in *Mittheilungen*, etc. XIII (1872), 239-43; XVI (1877), 470-71; EGLI, *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz* (1893), 56-8; HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 4th ed., I, 338-39; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 7th ed., I, 133-34; KRUSCH, *loc. cit.*, 229-51. For earlier literature see CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibl.*, 2d ed., 1641-1642. ALBERT PONCELOT.

**Gall**, ABBEY OF SAINT, in Switzerland, Canton St. Gall, 30 miles S. E. of Constance; for many centuries one of the chief Benedictine abbeys in Europe; founded about 613, and named after Gallus, an Irishman, the disciple and companion of St. Columbanus in his exile from Luxeuil. When his master went on to Italy, Gallus remained in Switzerland, where he died about 646. A chapel was erected on the spot occupied by his cell, and a priest named Othmar was placed there by Charles Martel as custodian of the saint's relics. Under his direction a monastery was built, many privileges and benefactions being bestowed upon it by Charles Martel and his son Pepin, who with Othmar as first abbot, are reckoned its principal founders. By Pepin's persuasion Othmar substituted the Benedictine rule for that of St. Columbanus. He also founded the famous schools of St. Gall, and under him and his successors the arts, letters, and sciences were assiduously cultivated. The work of copying

manuscripts was undertaken at a very early date, and the nucleus of the famous library gathered together. The abbey gave hospitality to numerous Anglo-Saxon and Irish monks who came to copy manuscripts for their own monasteries. Two distinguished guests of the abbey were Peter and Romanus, chanters from Rome, sent by Pope Adrian I at Charlemagne's request to propagate the use of the Gregorian chant. Peter went on to Metz, where he established an important chant-school, but Romanus, having fallen sick at St. Gall, stayed there with Charlemagne's consent. To the copies of the Roman chant that he brought with him, he added the "Romanian signs", the interpretation of which has since become a matter of controversy, and the school he started at St. Gall, rivalling that of Metz, became one of the most frequented in Europe.

The chief MSS. produced by it, still extant, are the "Antiphonale Missarum" (no. 339), the "Antiphonarium Sti. Gregorii" (no. 359), and Hartker's "Antiphonarium" (nos. 390-391), the first and third of which have been reproduced in facsimile by the Solesmes fathers in their "Paléographie Musicale". The other schools of the abbey—for the younger monks and for lay scholars attracted thither by the fame of the monastic professors—were founded as early as the ninth century, for the well-known, but unrealized plan of 820 provides separate accommodation for both schools. The domestic history of the community during these centuries of consolidation was not altogether free from troubles. Even during the lifetime of Othmar, the monks had to defend themselves against the bishops of Constance, who, having already secured jurisdiction over the neighbouring Abbey of Reichenau, refused to recognise the exemption and other privileges of St. Gall. For many years the monks had to fight for their independence, but it was not until the time of Louis the Pious that their efforts were crowned with success and their rights confirmed. From that time up to the end of the tenth century was the golden age of the abbey, during which flourished many celebrated scholars—the three Notkers, Eckhard, Hartker and others. The decrees of the Council of Aachen (817) for the furtherance of discipline and the religious spirit were loyally carried into effect by Abbot Gotzbert (815-837), under whom the monks built a new and magnificent church and by whom also the library was greatly enlarged. He purchased many fresh MSS. and set his monks to multiply copies of them. His successor Grimald (841-872) carried on the work, and a catalogue drawn up in his time, still extant, shows the wide range of subjects represented. Over four hundred of the MSS. mentioned in that catalogue are still at St. Gall.

During the abbacy of Engelbert II (924-933) an incursion of the Huns threatened the abbey, and most of the valuable books and MSS. were removed to Reichenau for safety, some never being returned. In 937 a disastrous fire almost entirely destroyed the monastery, but the library fortunately escaped. The abbey and town were rebuilt and fortified, and throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries St. Gall maintained its place in the front rank of monastic establishments. With the thirteenth century, however, came a period of decline. Various causes contributed to this, one of them being the fact that the neighbouring feudal lords took to quartering themselves and their retinues upon the abbey more often than was good for monastic discipline. The abbots also were frequently called upon to settle their quarrels, and a spirit of worldliness thus crept into the cloister. About the same time the abbey and town became an independent principality, over which the abbots ruled as territorial sovereigns, taking rank as Princes of the Empire. Ulrich VI (1204-1220) was the first to hold that dignity. Records as to the library during this period are scanty. In the four-



teenth century Humanists were allowed to take away some of the rarest of the classical MSS. and in the sixteenth the abbey was raided by the Calvinists, who scattered many of the most valuable books. In 1530 Abbot Diethelm inaugurated a restoration with such success that he has been called the third founder of St. Gall. The library was one of his chief cares and his successors zealously followed his good example. Through their efforts the monastic spirit, the schools and the studies all revived and attained to something of their former greatness. In 1602, when the Swiss congregation of the Order of St. Benedict was formed, the Abbey of St. Gall took precedence as the first house of the congregation, and many of its abbots subsequently held the office of president.

A printing-press was started under Pius (1630-1674), which soon became one of the most important in Switzerland. In 1712 a great change came over the fortunes of the monastery. It was pillaged by the Swiss, who spared nothing. Most of the books and MSS. were carried off to Zurich, Berne and other places, and only a portion of them were afterwards restored to St. Gall. The abbot of the time, Leodegar by name, was obliged for security to place his monastery under the protection of the townspeople whose ancestors had been serfs of the abbey, but who had, since the Reformation, thrown off the yoke of subjection. When these disturbances were over, a final attempt was made to revive the glories of the abbey. The monastery was rebuilt for the last time under Abbots Celestine II and Bede, but the resuscitation was short-lived. In 1798 the Swiss directory suppressed the ecclesiastical principality and secularized the abbey, and in 1805 its revenues were sequestrated. The monks took refuge in other houses of the congregation, the last abbot, Pancras Forster, dying in 1829 at Muri. When the Diocese of Constance was suppressed in 1821, that portion of it in which St. Gall was situated was united to the Diocese of Coire, but in 1846 a rearrangement made St. Gall a separate see, with the abbey church as its cathedral and a portion of the monastic buildings being assigned for the bishop's residence. The church, rebuilt 1755-65 in the *rococo* style, contains some finely-carved choir-stalls and a beautiful wrought iron screen. The conventual buildings, besides the bishop's palace, now accommodate also the cantonal offices and what remains of the library—about thirty thousand volumes and MSS. The town of St. Gall has a population of over 30,000 and is one of the principal manufacturing centres in Switzerland, muslin and cotton being its chief industries.

MABILLON, *Annales O.S.B.* (Paris, 1703-39); IDEM, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* (Venice, 1733). II; STE-MARCHE, *Galla Christiana* (Paris, 1731). V; ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. Lit. O.S.B.* (Augsburg, 1754); PERIZ, *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Scriptores* (Hanover, 1826). I; YEPES, *Corónica General. O.S.B.* (Valladolid, 1609-21). II, III; WEIDMANN, *Geschichte der Bibliothek von S. Gallen* (St. Gall, 1841); SCHUBIGER, *Die Sängerschule S. Gallens* (Einsiedeln, 1858); VON ARX, *Geschichte des Cantons S. Gallen*; WARTMANN, *Urkundenbuch der Abtei S. Gallen*, A.D. 700-1350 (Zurich, 1863-82); MIGNÉ, *Dict. des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856); *Palaographie Musicale* (Solesmes, 1889). I; DAVID, *Les Grandes Abbayes d'Occident* (Bruges, 1908); HOGAN, *The Monastery and Library of St. Gall in Irish Eccl. Rec.*, XV (1894).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Galla**, SAINT, a Roman widow of the sixth century; feast, 5 October. According to St. Gregory the Great (Dial. IV, ch. xiii) she was the daughter of the younger Symmachus, a learned and virtuous patrician of Rome, whom Theodoric had unjustly condemned to death (525). Becoming a widow before the end of the first year of her married life, she, still very young, founded a convent and hospital near St. Peter's, there spent the remainder of her days in austerities and works of mercy, and ended her life with an edifying death. The letter of St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, "De statu viduarum", is supposed to have been addressed to her. Her church in Rome, near the Piazza Montanara, once

held a picture of Our Lady, which according to tradition represents a vision vouchsafed to St. Galla. It is considered miraculous and was carried in procession in times of pestilence. It is now over the high altar of Santa Maria in Campitelli.

*Messenger* (New York), XXXIX, 279; DUNBAR in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; *Acta SS.*, Oct., III, 147.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Galla**, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, embraces the territory of the Galla or Oromo tribes in Abyssinia. In its widest extent the vicariate lies between 34° and 44° long. E. of Greenwich, and 4° and 10° N. lat. The Oromo or Galla, doubtless slightly European in descent, came originally from the region of Hcalal, lying between the junction of the two Niles and the River Baro. Eventually, about the fifteenth century, they began to invade Abyssinia, where they soon became so powerful that they shared the power with the Negus of Ethiopia. The Galla are divided into two principal branches, the Borana or Western Galla, and the Barentouma or Eastern Galla, both of them subdivided into numerous tribes. There exist among the Galla other important tribes, also genuine negro tribes and tribes of Mussulman origin. The vicariate dates from 4 May, 1846. The Capuchin, Right Rev. Guglielmo Massaia, was the first vicar Apostolic. He was born at Piovà, province of Asti, Piedmont, 9 June, 1809, and had been a member of the aforesaid order twenty-one years when he was consecrated Bishop of Cassia, 24 May, 1846, and sent to the Galla tribes. It was then very difficult to gain access into the interior of Africa; only after five years of incessantly renewed attempts and at the cost of great hardships and many perils was he able to reach the region of Galla Assandabo, 20 November, 1852. Having evangelized the districts of Goudrou, Lagamara, Limmou, Nonna, and Guera, this valiant apostle entered, 4 Oct., 1859, the Kingdom of Kaffa, where conversions were abundant. With apostolic foresight he provided the converted tribes with priests, so that when persecution obliged him to flee, Christianity did not disappear.

In 1868 he was at Choa, where he laboured with success until 1879, and enjoyed the confidence of King Menelik, who made him his confidential counsellor and paid him great respect. In the interval the missions of Kaffa and Guera were administered by his coadjutor Bishop Felicissimo Coccino, who died 26 February, 1878. In 1879 Negus John of Abyssinia compelled his vassal Menelik to order Bishop Massaia to return to Europe. The venerable prelate, who had already been banished seven times, and was now more broken by labour and sufferings than by age, handed over the government of the vicariate to his coadjutor Bishop Taurin Cahagne, since 14 Feb., 1875, titular Bishop of Adramittium. Bishop Massaia was created cardinal by Leo XIII, 10 Nov., 1884; he died 6 Aug., 1889. He left valuable memoirs (see below), the publication of which was rewarded by the Italian government with the nomination to a high civil order, not accepted, however, by the venerable missionary. The mission of Harar was founded by Bishop Taurin, who from 1880 to 1899 sustained a glorious combat in this hot-bed of Islam and opened the way to the present quite prosperous mission. He has written a catechism and valuable works of Christian instruction in the Galla language. His name is held in veneration throughout these regions. The vicariate now includes the three great districts of Choa, Kaffa and Harar. There are 15 principal stations and an equal number of secondary ones. The Christians number more than 18,000. The mission possesses a seminary for priests and a preparatory seminary. It maintains 3 principal and 12 secondary schools, 3 dispensaries, 1 leper-hospital, 1 printing house, and important agricultural works. The vicar Apostolic has under his jurisdiction 125 European Capuchin missionaries from the province of Toulouse, France. There are also 8

native priests, 10 catechists, 35 seminarists, 17 Franciscan Sisters (Calais), and 12 Frères Gabriélistes (Bl. Louis-Marie Grignon de Montfort).

MASSAIA, *I miei trentacinque anni di missione nell'alta Etiopia* (illustrated, ed. Milan, 1885-95). XII; abridged ed., *In Abissinia e fra i Galli* (Florence, 1895); DE SALVIAC, *Les Galla* (Paris, 1901); *Missiones Catholicae* (Rome, 1907); GENTILE, *L'apostolo dei Galli* (Asti, 1907); *Analecra Ord. Cappuccinorum* (1889), V, 291.

ANDREAS JAROSSEAU.

**Gallagher, JOHN.** See GOULBURN, DIOCESE OF.

**Gallagher, NICHOLAS A.** See GALVESTON, DIOCESE OF.

**Gallait, LOUIS**, Flemish painter; born at Tournai, 10 May, 1810; died in Brussels, 20 Nov., 1887. He produced melodramatic and sensational pictures, very much on the lines of those of Ary Scheffer, with a leaning towards the pathetic and emotional side. Gallait was, however, a more accomplished painter than Scheffer, with whom his works have frequently been compared. His colouring was superior, and his drawing more accurate, but the two men were possessed of similar devotional fervour, and poetic emotion of a sentimental type. Gallait was a youthful prodigy, and produced his first picture when ten years old, obtaining an important local prize for it. One of his earliest performances was purchased by the municipal authorities of Tournai and presented to the Cathedral, and it was owing to the generosity of his own townspeople that he was enabled in 1835 to go to Paris and study under Hennequin. He became a member of the Institute of France, and honorary foreign Royal Academician. Several of his pictures were exhibited in London in 1862, and three at the Royal Academy in 1872, when he was residing at 51 Bedford Square. He painted in water-colours as well as in oil, and was made an honorary member of the Royal Institute.

Contemporary references in *The Athenaeum* and various art magazines of 1887 and 1892. See also *Art Journal*, April, 1886.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Galland, ANTOINE**, French Orientalist and numismatist, b. at Rollot, near Montdidier, in Picardy, 1646, d. at Paris, 1715. When he was four years old his father died leaving him in poverty, but through his diligence and industry he won protection which enabled him to pursue his studies at Noyon and later at Paris. He was already known as a scholar at the age of twenty-four, when de Nointel, the French ambassador at Constantinople, took him to the East to study the faith of the Greeks, several articles of which were the subject of a controversy between Arnault and the Protestant minister Claude. In 1675 Galland accompanied Nointel to Jerusalem, and, in 1679 he was charged by Colbert, and, after his death by Louvois, with scientific researches in the Levant, with title of king's antiquary. He profited by these journeys to become familiar with modern Greek, and to learn Turkish, Persian, and Arabic. In 1701 he was admitted to the Academy of Inscriptions and Medals, and in 1709 he was appointed to the chair of Arabic at the Collège de France. We are indebted to him for numerous letters, notes, observations and remarks on the coins and inscriptions of Greek and Latin antiquity, many of which have been inserted in Banduri's "Bibliotheca nummaria". He collaborated in Herbelot's "Bibliothèque Orientale", which he brought to a conclusion after the death of its author. He is chiefly famous for his translation of the eastern tales, "The Arabian Nights" (Paris, 1704-08). This graceful though inaccurate translation, the first which had appeared in Europe until that time, brought great fame to its author. At his death he left many manuscripts, a number of which have been published, e.g. "Indian tales and fables of Pidpai and Lokman"; the "History of the princes of the line of Tamerlane", translated from the work of the Persian historian

Abdel-rezzac; "Ottoman History", translated from the Turkish of Nam Effendi; "History of Ghengis-Khan", from the Persian history of Nurkhouid; "Numismatic Dictionary", etc.

MICHAUD, *Biographie universelle*; DE BOZE, *Histoire de l'Académie royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, depuis son établissement, avec les éloges des Académiciens morts depuis son renouvellement* (Paris, 1740); MAURY, *Les académies d'autrefois; L'ancienne académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris, 1882).

A. FOURNET.

**Gallandi, ANDREA**, Oratorian and patristic scholar, b. at Venice, 7 December, 1709; d. there 12 January, 1779, or 1780. Gallandi was descended from an ancient French family. He pursued his theological and historical studies under such excellent teachers as the two Dominicans, Daniello Concina, a renowned moralist, and Bernardo de Rossi (de Rubens), a noted historical scholar and theologian. With both of these instructors he kept up a warm friendship after he had joined the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. He established his reputation as a scholar by compiling the still valuable work of reference: "Bibliotheca veterum patrum antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Græco-Latina" (Venice, 1765-81, 14 vols.; 2nd ed., 1788). The work was dedicated to the Venetian Senate, but Gallandi did not live to see its completion. It is a collection of 380 ecclesiastical writers of the first seven centuries; its special merit is that instead of compiling important works already accessible in print, Gallandi gathered together the smaller and less known writings. Greek originals were printed in good type with Latin translations, and copious notes relative to the authors and their works were added. He also published a collection of the treatises of famous canonists (Cousant of Saint-Maur, the Ballerini, etc.) on the origin and development of canon law, which was entitled, "De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge" (Venice, 1778, 1 vol. folio; Mainz, 1790, 2 vols.). At his death Gallandi left the following work which has never been published: "Thesaurus antiquitatis ecclesiasticæ historico-apologetico-criticus complectens SS. patrum gesta et scripta doctissimorum virorum dissertationibus asserta et illustrata ac juxta seriem XII sec. digesta".

HUTER, *Nomenclator*, s. v.; *Nouvelle biographie générale* (Paris, 1858), XIX, 291.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Galle, DIOCESE OF (GALLENSIS)**, in Ceylon, created by Leo XIII 25 Aug., 1893, by detaching two civil provinces, the Southern (2146 sq. miles) and Sabaragamuwa (1901 sq. miles), from the Archdiocese of Colombo. The total population is about 900,000, of whom 10,160 are (1909) Catholics. Besides a few Europeans and burghers of mixed descent, the population includes Singalese, Moors, and Tamils. There is a still greater religious diversity: Sivites, Parsees, Mohammedans, Protestants of various denominations, mostly, however, Buddhists of the Southern type. For these reasons the conversion of the non-Catholic population is difficult; the racial and religious differences affect seriously the instruction of the faithful, sparsely scattered over a large area. Leo XIII entrusted the new diocese to the Belgian Jesuits, and appointed as first bishop the Very Rev. Joseph Van Reeth, rector of the novitiate at Tronchiennes (Belgium). The bishop-elect (b. 6 Aug., 1843) was consecrated on 19 March, 1895, in Antwerp, his native town. Accompanied by three priests and one lay brother, he took possession of his see 9 Nov., 1895, since when progress has been slow but steady. The clergy comprises 22 Jesuits and 5 secular priests (4 natives and 1 European), residing in eleven centres, each having its church, mission-house, and school. The Catholic population has been doubled. The number of confessions has risen from 6381 (1897) to 27,956 (1908), and that of Communions from 7196 to 48,000. In 1897 only

335 boys and 376 girls attended the 14 Catholic schools, of which 9 had been opened that year; there are now (1909) some 2140 boys and 1009 girls in 39 schools. In 1901 was opened St. Aloysius's College, under the Jesuit Fathers, with 300 pupils. Belgian Sisters of Charity of Jesus and Mary render praiseworthy help. They have a convent in Galle (1896) and one in Matara (1908), while a third is being built at Kegalla. To the Galle convent is attached a room for lace-making, work from which won a gold medal at the St. Louis Exhibition (U. S. A.) in 1904. A similar institution has been started at Matara.

*Missions Belges de la Compagnie de Jésus* (monthly, Brussels); *Missiones Catholicae* (Rome, Propaganda, 1907).

J. COOREMAN.

**Gallego, JUAN NICASIO**, priest and poet; b. at Zamora, Spain, 14 Dec., 1777; d. at Madrid, 9 Jan., 1853; received his training at Salamanca; entering into Holy orders, he soon went to Madrid, where he was given a post in the royal palace, being made director of the royal pages. His feelings as a patriot and his love for pseudo-classicism very naturally led him to associate himself with the coterie about the poet Quintana. Imitating the latter's metres, he surpassed him in perfection of form, but remains somewhat his inferior in respect of inspiration. It is by virtue of only seven odes and elegies that Gallego attained the high rank which he certainly occupies among Spanish poets. Of these the first was the ode, "A la defensa de Buenos Ayres" (1807), directed against the English, who, taking advantage of Spain's naval weakness, and the uneasiness in the colonies, had seized for the moment the capital of the Argentine region. With intensified liberal tendencies, Gallego presented himself for election, and was returned a deputy to the Cortes. He had consistently opposed the French invaders of the Spanish soil, with both pen and voice, yet the despotic Ferdinand VII, after his return in 1814, imprisoned him because of his liberalism. During the second constitutional period, now free again, he was appointed Archdeacon of Valencia. The Royal Spanish Academy took him into its membership, and made him its perpetual secretary. The most famous of the few compositions left by Gallego is the elegy "El Dos de Mayo", which commemorates the events of 2 May, 1808, when the heroic and devoted opposition presented to the French troops by three Spanish artillerymen, Ruiz, Daoiz and Velarte, led to the rising of the whole land against the Napoleonic usurper. The effect of Gallego's stirring strains upon his countrymen, urging them to resist unto the death, can hardly be exaggerated. Excellence of form characterizes this poem, as it does his elegy on the death of the Duchess of Frias.

His poems are in the *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, LXVII. BLANCO-GARCÍA, *Historia de la literatura española en el siglo XIX*.

J. D. M. FORD.

**Gallese.** See CIVITÀ CASTELLANA, ORTE, AND GALLESE, DIOCESE OF.

**Galletti, PIETRO LUIGI**, Benedictine, historian and archæologist; b. at Rome in 1724; d. there, 13 December, 1790. He was educated in Rome where he entered the Order of St. Benedict. While a monk in the Abbey of St. Paul Without the Walls, he made a collection of the numerous ancient inscriptions used in the pavement of the floor of the famous basilica or scattered among the cloister buildings and in the surrounding vineyards. These became soon the nucleus of a classified museum of Christian and Pagan inscriptions. Later on he became keeper of the archives and librarian of the Benedictines in Florence. Pius VI bestowed various benefices on him and made him titular Bishop of Cyrene.

As a historian Galletti displayed great erudition and diligence. Some of his writings are still authoritative,

notably his collection of inscriptions and his works on the higher papal officials of the old Lateran Palace. His literary activities were directed to widely divergent periods and spheres of historical and archæological research. On Roman antiquity he wrote: "Capena, municipio dei Romani" (Rome, 1756), and "Gabbio, antica città di Sabina, scoperta ove era Torri" (Rome, 1757). His two works "Del Vestarario della santa Romana chiesa" (Rome, 1758), and "Del Primicerio della S. Sede Apostolica e di altri Ufficiali Maggiori del Sacro Palazzo Lateranense" (Rome, 1776) deal with the early history of the Roman Curia. The latter work is especially thorough and important. Among his contributions to the history of the religious orders the following are noteworthy: "Lettera intorno la vera e sicura origine del ven. ordine di S. Girolamo" (Rome, 1755), and "Ragionamento dell'origine e de' primi tempi dell'abbazia Fiorentina" (Rome, 1773). He was the author of a biography of the bishops of Viterbo: "Lettera a Giannantonio Beretta sopra alcuni vescovi di Viterbo" (Rome, 1759), and of Cardinal Passionei: "Memorie per servire alla storia della vita del card. Domenico Passionei" (Rome, 1762). His work on the early churches of Rieti is of value for Christian archæology: "Memoria di tre antiche chiese di Riete, S. Michele Arcangelo, S. Agata alla Rocca, S. Giacomo" (Rome, 1765). Finally, it is to Galletti that is due the first great collection of medieval inscriptions, treated as a source of historical information. His "Inscriptiones Venetæ infimi ævi Romæ exstantes" (Rome, 1757) was followed in the same series by the inscriptions found in Rome concerning Bologna, Rome itself (3 vols.), the March of Ancona, and Piedmont, in all seven volumes (1757-66).

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, s. v.; *Biographie universelle*, s. v.; PAOLI, *Le notizie spettanti a Mons. P. Luigi Galletti* (Rome, 1791).

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Gallia Christiana**, a documentary catalogue or list, with brief historical notices, of all the dioceses and abbeys of France from the earliest times, also of their occupants. In 1621 Jean Chenu, an *avocat* at the Parlement of Paris, published a book entitled "Archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Gallie chronologica historia". Nearly a third of the bishops are missing, and the episcopal succession as given by Chenu was very incomplete. In 1626 Claude Robert, a priest of Langres, published with the approbation of Baronius a "Gallia Christiana", in which he even entered a large number of churches outside of Gaul, and gave a short history of the metropolitan sees, cathedrals, and abbeys. Two brothers de Sainte-Marthe, Scévole (1571-1650) and Louis (1571-1656), appointed royal historiographers of France in 1620, had assisted Chenu and Robert. At the Assembly of the Clergy in 1646 a number of prelates commissioned these brothers to compile a more definitive work. They died before the completion of their work, and it was issued in 1656 by the three sons of Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, Pierre (1618-90), himself historiographer of France, Abel (1620-71), theologian, and later general of the Oratory, and Nicolas-Charles (1623-62), prior of Clauunay. On 13 September, 1656, the Sainte-Marthe brothers were presented to the Assembly of the French Clergy, who had accepted the dedication of the work on condition that a passage suspected of Jansenism be suppressed. The work formed four volumes in folio, the first for the archdioceses, the second and third for the dioceses, and the fourth for the abbeys, all in alphabetical order. The title was "Gallia Christiana, qua series omnium archiepiscoporum, episcoporum et abbatum Franciæ vicinarumque ditionum ab origine ecclesiarum ad nostra tempora per quatuor tomos deducitur, et probatur ex antiquæ fidei manuscriptis Vaticanis, regum, principum, tabulariis omnium Galliæ cathedralium et abbatiarum". Such as it was,

the work possessed considerable value at the time, especially for the fullness of its lists and for the reproduction of a large number of valuable manuscripts. The defects and omissions, however, were obvious. The Sainte-Marthe brothers themselves announced in their preface the early appearance of a second edition corrected and enlarged. As early as 1660 the Jesuit Jean Colomb published at Lyons the "Noctes Blancalandanæ", which contained certain additions to the work of the Sammarthani, as the brothers and their successors are often called.

The edition promised by the Sainte-Marthe brothers did not appear. In 1710 the Assembly of the French Clergy offered four thousand livres to Denys de Sainte-Marthe (1650-1725), a Benedictine of Saint-Maur renowned for his polemics against the Abbé de Rancé on the subject of monastic studies, on condition that he should bring the revision of the "Gallia Christiana" to a successful conclusion, that the first volume should appear at the end of four years, and that his congregation should continue the undertaking after his death. In 1715 through his efforts the first volume appeared, devoted to the ecclesiastical provinces of Albi, Aix, Arles, Avignon, and Auch. In 1720 he produced the second volume, dealing with the provinces of Bourges and Bordeaux, and in 1725 the third, which treated of Cambrai, Cologne, and Embrun. After his death the Benedictines issued the fourth volume (1728) on Lyons, and the fifth volume (1731), on Mechlin and Mainz. Between 1731 and 1740 on account of the controversies over the Bull "Unigenitus" Dom Félix Hodin and Dom Etienne Brice, who were preparing the later volumes of the "Gallia Christiana", were expelled from the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. They returned to Paris in 1739 and issued the sixth volume, dealing with Narbonne, also (1744) the seventh and eighth volumes on Paris and its suffragan sees. Père Duplessis united his efforts with theirs and the ninth and tenth volumes, both on the province of Reims, appeared in 1751. The eleventh volume (1759) dealing with the province of Rouen was issued by Père Pierre Henri and Dom Jacques Taschereau. In 1770 the twelfth volume on the provinces of Sens and Tarentaise appeared, and in 1785 the thirteenth on the provinces of Toulouse and Trier. At the outbreak of the Revolution four volumes were lacking, Tours, Besançon, Utrecht, and Vienne. Barthélemy Haureau published (1856, 1860, and 1865) for the provinces of Tours, Besançon, and Vienne, respectively, and according to the Benedictine method, the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth volumes of the "Gallia Christiana". The province of Utrecht alone has no place in this great collection, but this defect has been remedied in part by the "Bullarium Trajectense", edited by Gisbert Brom and extending from the earliest times to 1378 (The Hague, 1891-96). The new "Gallia Christiana", of which Volumes I to V and XI and XIII were reprinted by Dom Piolin between 1870 and 1877, and Volumes VI to IX and XII by the publisher H. Welter, places after each metropolitan see its suffragan sees, and after each see the abbeys belonging to it. The documents, instead of encumbering the body of the articles, are inserted at the foot of each column under the title "Instrumenta". This colossal work does great honour to the Benedictines and to the Sainte-Marthe family. "The name of Sainte-Marthe", wrote Voltaire, "is one of those of which the country has most reason to be proud."

In 1774 the Abbé Hugues du Temps, vicar-general of Bordeaux, undertook in seven volumes an abridgment of the "Gallia", under the title "Le clergé de France", of which only four volumes appeared. About 1867 the Abbé Fisquet undertook the publication of an episcopal history of France (La France Pontificale), in which for the early period he should utilize the "Gallia", at the same time bringing the history of each diocese down to modern times. Twenty-two

volumes appeared and then the work ceased. Some years ago Canon Albanès projected a complete revision of the "Gallia Christiana", each ecclesiastical province to form a volume. Albanès, who was one of the first scholars to search the Lateran and Vatican libraries, in his efforts to determine the initial years of some episcopal reigns, found occasionally either the acts of election or the Bulls of provision. He hoped in this way to remove certain supposititious bishops who had been introduced to fill gaps in the catalogues, but died in 1897 before the first volume appeared. Through the use of his notes and the efforts of Canon Chevalier three additional volumes of this "Gallia Christiana (novissima)", treating Arles, Aix, and Marseilles, have appeared at Montbéliard since 1899.

DREUX DU RADIER, *Bibliothèque historique et critique du Poutou* (Paris, 1754); *Gallia Christiana*, Vol. IV, *Préface*; *Gallia Christiana (novissima)* (Montbéliard, 1899). *Préface* to the Aix volume; DE LONGUEMARE, *Une famille d'auteurs aux septième, dix-septième et dix-huitième siècles; les Sainte-Marthe* (Paris, 1902).

GEORGES GOYAU.

**Gallicanism.**—This term is used to designate a certain group of religious opinions for some time peculiar to the Church of France, or Gallican Church, and the theological schools of that country. These opinions, in opposition to the ideas which were called in France "Ultramontane", tended chiefly to a restraint of the pope's authority in the Church in favour of that of the bishops and the temporal ruler. It is important, however, to remark at the outset that the warmest and most accredited partisans of Gallican ideas by no means contested the pope's primacy in the Church, and never claimed for their ideas the force of articles of faith. They aimed only at making it clear that their way of regarding the authority of the pope seemed to them more in conformity with Holy Scripture and tradition. At the same time, their theory did not, as they regarded it, transgress the limits of free opinions, which it is allowable for any theological school to choose for itself provided that the Catholic Symbol be duly accepted.

**GENERAL NOTIONS.**—Nothing can better serve the purpose of presenting an exposition at once exact and complete of the Gallican ideas than a summary of the famous Declaration of the Clergy of France of 1682. Here, for the first time, those ideas are organized into a system, and receive their official and definitive formula. Stripped of the arguments which accompany it, the doctrine of the Declaration reduces to the following four articles:—

(1) St. Peter and the popes, his successors, and the Church itself have received dominion [*puissance*] from God only over things spiritual and such as concern salvation, and not over things temporal and civil. Hence kings and sovereigns are not by God's command subject to any ecclesiastical dominion in things temporal; they cannot be deposed, whether directly or indirectly, by the authority of the rulers of the Church; their subjects cannot be dispensed from that submission and obedience which they owe, or absolved from the oath of allegiance.

(2) The plenitude of authority in things spiritual, which belongs to the Holy See and the successors of St. Peter, in no wise affects the permanence and immovable strength of the decrees of the Council of Constance contained in the fourth and fifth sessions of that council, approved by the Holy See, confirmed by the practice of the whole Church and the Roman pontiff, and observed in all ages by the Gallican Church. That Church does not countenance the opinion of those who cast a slur on those decrees, or who lessen their force by saying that their authority is not well established, that they are not approved, or that they apply only to the period of the schism.

(3) The exercise of this Apostolic authority [*puis-*

sance] must also be regulated in accordance with the canons made by the Spirit of God and consecrated by the respect of the whole world. The rules, customs, and constitutions received within the kingdom and the Gallican Church must have their force and their effect, and the usages of our fathers remain inviolable, since the dignity of the Apostolic See itself demands that the laws and customs established by consent of that august see and of the Churches be constantly maintained.

(4) Although the pope have the chief part in questions of faith, and his decrees apply to all the Churches, and to each Church in particular, yet his judgment is not irreformable, at least pending the consent of the Church.

According to the Gallican theory, then, the papal primacy was limited, first, by the temporal power of princes, which, by the Divine will, was inviolable; secondly by the authority of the general council and that of the bishops, who alone could, by their assent, give to his decrees that infallible authority which, of themselves, they lacked; lastly, by the canons and customs of particular Churches, which the pope was bound to take into account when he exercised his authority.

But Gallicanism was more than pure speculation. It reacted from the domain of theory into that of facts. The bishops and magistrates of France used it, the former as warrant for increased power in the government of dioceses, the latter to extend their jurisdiction so as to cover ecclesiastical affairs. Moreover, there was an episcopal and political Gallicanism, and a parliamentary or judicial Gallicanism. The former lessened the doctrinal authority of the pope in favour of that of the bishops, to the degree marked by the Declaration of 1682; the latter, affecting the relations of the temporal and spiritual powers, tended to augment the rights of the State more and more, to the prejudice of those of the Church, on the grounds of what they called "the Liberties of the Gallican Church" (*Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*).

These Liberties, which are enumerated in a collection, or corpus, drawn up by the juriconsults Guy Coquille and Pierre Pithou, were, according to the latter, eighty-three in number. Besides the four articles cited above, which were incorporated, the following may be noted as among the more important: The Kings of France had the right to assemble councils in their dominions, and to make laws and regulations touching ecclesiastical matters. The pope's legates could not be sent into France, or exercise their power within that kingdom, except at the king's request or with his consent. Bishops, even when commanded by the pope, could not go out of the kingdom without the king's consent. The royal officers could not be excommunicated for any act performed in the discharge of their official duties. The pope could not authorize the alienation of any landed estate of the Churches, or the diminishing of any foundations. His Bulls and Letters might not be executed without the *Paréatis* of the king or his officers. He could not issue dispensations to the prejudice of the laudable customs and statutes of the cathedral Churches. It was lawful to appeal from him to a future council, or to have recourse to the "appeal as from an abuse" (*appel comme d'abus*) against acts of the ecclesiastical power.

Parliamentary Gallicanism, therefore, was of much wider scope than episcopal; indeed, it was often disavowed by the bishops of France, and about twenty of them condemned Pierre Pithou's book when a new edition of it was published, in 1638, by the brothers Dupuy.

ORIGIN AND HISTORY.—The Declaration of 1682 and the work of Pithou codified the principles of Gallicanism, but did not create them. We have to inquire, then, how there came to be formed in the bosom of the

Church of France a body of doctrines and practices which tended to isolate it, and to impress upon it a physiognomy somewhat exceptional in the Catholic body. Gallicans have held that the reason of this phenomenon is to be found in the very origin and history of Gallicanism.

For the more moderate among them, Gallican ideas and liberties were simply privileges—concessions made by the popes, who had been quite willing to divest themselves of a part of their authority in favour of the bishops or kings of France. It was thus that the latter could lawfully stretch their powers in ecclesiastical matters beyond the normal limits. This idea made its appearance as early as the reign of Philip the Fair, in some of the protests of that monarch against the policy of Boniface VIII. In the view of some partisans of the theory, the popes had always thought fit to show especial consideration for the ancient customs of the Gallican Church, which in every age had distinguished itself by its exactitude in the preservation of the Faith and the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline. Others, again, assigned a more precise date to the granting of these concessions, referring their origin to the period of the earliest Carolingians, and explaining them somewhat differently. They said that the popes had found it impossible to recall to their allegiance and to due respect for ecclesiastical discipline the Frankish lords who had possessed themselves of episcopal sees; that these lords, insensible to censures and anathemas, rude and untaught, recognized no authority but that of force; and that the popes had, therefore, granted to Carloman, Pepin, and Charles the Great a spiritual authority which they were to exercise only under papal control. It was this authority that the Kings of France, successors of these princes, had inherited. This theory comes into collision with difficulties so serious as to have caused its rejection as well by the majority of Gallicans as by their Ultramontane adversaries. The former by no means admitted that the Liberties were privileges, since a privilege can be revoked by him who has granted it; and, as they regarded the matter, these Liberties could not be touched by any pope. Moreover, they added, the Kings of France have at times received from the popes certain clearly defined privileges; these privileges have never been confounded with the Gallican Liberties. As a matter of fact, historians could have told them, the privileges accorded by popes to the King of France in the course of centuries are known from the texts, of which an authentic collection could be compiled, and there is nothing in them resembling the Liberties in question. Again, why should not these Gallican Liberties have been transmitted to the German Emperors as well, since they, too, were the heirs of Pepin and Charlemagne? Besides, the Ultramontanes pointed out, there are some privileges which the pope himself could not grant. Is it conceivable that a pope should allow any group of bishops the privilege of calling his infallibility in question, putting his doctrinal decisions upon trial, to be accepted or rejected?—or grant any kings the privilege of placing his primacy under tutelage by suppressing or curtailing his liberty of communication with the faithful in a certain territory?

Most of its partisans regarded Gallicanism rather as a revival of the most ancient traditions of Christianity, a persistence of the common law, which law, according to some (Pithou, Quesnel), was made up of the conciliar decrees of the earliest centuries or, according to others (Marca, Bossuet), of canons of the general and local councils, and the decretals, ancient and modern, which were received in France or conformable to their usage. "Of all Christian countries", says Fleury, "France has been the most careful to conserve the liberty of her Church and oppose the novelties introduced by Ultramontane canonists". The Liberties were so called, because the innovations constituted



conditions of servitude with which the popes had burdened the Church, and their legality resulted from the fact that the extension given by the popes to their own primacy was founded not upon Divine institution, but upon the false Decretals. If we are to credit these authors, what the Gallicans maintained in 1682 was not a collection of novelties, but a body of beliefs as old as the Church, the discipline of the first centuries. The Church of France had upheld and practised them at all times; the Church Universal had believed and practised them of old, until about the tenth century; St. Louis had supported, but not created, them by the Pragmatic Sanction; the Council of Constance had taught them with the pope's approbation. Gallican ideas, then, must have had no other origin than that of Christian dogma and ecclesiastical discipline. It is for history to tell us what these assertions of the Gallican theorists were worth.

To the similarity of the historical vicissitudes through which they passed, their common political allegiance, and the early appearance of a national sentiment, the Churches of France owed it that they very soon formed an individual, compact, and homogeneous body. From the end of the fourth century the popes themselves recognized this solidarity. It was to the "Gallican" bishops that Pope Damasus—as M. Babut seems to have demonstrated recently—addressed the most ancient decretal which has been preserved to our times. Two centuries later, St. Gregory the Great pointed out the Gallican Church to his envoy Augustine, the Apostle of England, as one of those whose customs he might accept as of equal stability with those of the Roman Church or of any other whatsoever. But already—if we are to believe the young historian just mentioned—a Council of Turin, at which bishops of the Gauls assisted, had given the first manifestation of Gallican sentiment. Unfortunately for M. Babut's thesis, all the significance which he attaches to this council depends upon the date, 417, ascribed to it by him, on the mere strength of a personal conjecture, in opposition to the most competent historians. Besides, it is not at all plain how a council of the Province of Milan is to be taken as representing the ideas of the Gallican Church.

In truth, that Church, during the Merovingian period, testifies the same deference to the Holy See as do all the others. Ordinary questions of discipline are in the ordinary course settled in councils, often held with the assent of the kings, but on great occasions—at the Councils of Epaone (517), of Vaison (529), of Valence (529), of Orleans (538), of Tours (567)—the bishops do not fail to declare that they are acting under the impulse of the Holy See, or defer to its admonitions; they take pride in the approbation of the pope; they cause his name to be read aloud in the churches, just as is done in Italy and in Africa; they cite his decretals as a source of ecclesiastical law; they show indignation at the mere idea that anyone should fail in consideration for them. Bishops condemned in councils—like Salonus of Embrun, Sagitarius of Gap, Contumeliosus of Riez—have no difficulty in appealing to the pope, who, after examination, either confirms or rectifies the sentence pronounced against them.

The accession of the Carolingian dynasty is marked by a splendid act of homage paid in France to the power of the papacy: before assuming the title of king, Pepin makes a point of securing the assent of Pope Zachary. Without wishing to exaggerate the significance of this act, the bearing of which the Gallicans have done every thing to minimize, one may be permitted to see in it the evidence that, even before Gregory VII, public opinion in France was not hostile to the intervention of the pope in political affairs. From that time on, the advances of the Roman primacy find no serious opponents in France before

Hincmar, the famous Archbishop of Reims, in whom some have been willing to see the very founder of Gallicanism. It is true that with him there already appears the idea that the pope must limit his activity to ecclesiastical matters, and not intrude in those pertaining to the State, which concern kings only; that his supremacy is bound to respect the prescriptions of the ancient canons and the privileges of the Churches; that his decretals must not be placed upon the same footing as the canons of the councils. But it appears that we should see here the expression of passing feelings, inspired by the particular circumstances, much rather than a deliberate opinion maturely conceived and conscious of its own meaning. The proof of this is in the fact that Hincmar himself, when his claims to the metropolitan dignity are not in question, condemns very sharply, though at the risk of self-contradiction, the opinion of those who think that the king is subject only to God, and he makes it his boast to "follow the Roman Church, whose teachings", he says, quoting the famous words of Innocent I, "are imposed upon all men". His attitude, at any rate, stands out as an isolated accident; the Council of Troyes (867) proclaims that no bishop can be deposed without reference to the Holy See, and the Council of Douzy (871), although held under the influence of Hincmar, condemns the Bishop of Laon only under reserve of the rights of the pope.

With the first Capets the secular relations between the pope and the Gallican Church appeared to be momentarily strained. At the Councils of Saint-Basle de Verzy (991) and of Chelles (c. 993), in the discourses of Arnoul, Bishop of Orleans, in the letters of Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II, sentiments of violent hostility to the Holy See are manifested, and an evident determination to elude the authority in matters of discipline which had until then been recognized as belonging to it. But the papacy at that period, given over to the tyranny of Crescentius and other local barons, was undergoing a melancholy obscurity. When it regained its independence, its old authority in France came back to it; the work of the Councils of Saint-Basle and of Chelles was undone; princes like Hugh Capet, bishops like Gerbert, held no attitude but that of submission. It has been said that during the early Capetian period the pope was more powerful in France than he had ever been. Under Gregory VII the pope's legates traversed France from north to south, they convoked and presided over numerous councils, and, in spite of sporadic and incoherent acts of resistance, they deposed bishops and excommunicated princes just as in Germany and Spain.

In the following two centuries Gallicanism is even yet unborn; the pontifical power attains its apogee in France as elsewhere; St. Bernard, then the standard-bearer of the University of Paris, and St. Thomas outline the theory of that power, and their opinion is that of the school in accepting the attitude of Gregory VII and his successors in regard to delinquent princes, St. Louis, of whom it has been sought to make a patron of the Gallican system, is still ignorant of it—for the fact is now established that the Pragmatic Sanction, long attributed to him, was a wholesale fabrication put together (about 1445) in the purlieu of the Royal Chancery of Charles VII to lend countenance to the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges.

At the opening of the fourteenth century, however, the conflict between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII brings out the first glimmerings of the Gallican ideas. That king does not confine himself to maintaining that, as sovereign, he is sole and independent master of his temporalities; he haughtily proclaims that, in virtue of the concession made by the pope, with the assent of a general council, to Charlemagne and his successors, he has the right to dispose of vacant ecclesiastical benefices. With the consent of the nobility, the Third Estate, and a great part of

the clergy, he appeals in the matter from Boniface VIII to a future general council—the implication being that the council is superior to the pope. The same ideas and others still more hostile to the Holy See reappear in the struggle of Fratricelles and Louis of Bavaria against John XXII; they are expressed by the pens of William Occam, of John of Jandun, and of Marsilius of Padua, professors in the University of Paris. Among other things, they deny the Divine origin of the papal primacy, and subject the exercise of it to the good pleasure of the temporal ruler. Following the pope, the University of Paris condemned these views; but for all that they did not entirely disappear from the memory, or from the disputations, of the schools, for the principal work of Marsilius, “*Defensor Pacis*”, was translated into French in 1375, probably by a professor of the University of Paris. The Great Schism reawakened them suddenly. The idea of a council naturally suggested itself as a means of terminating that melancholy rending asunder of Christendom. Upon that idea was soon grafted the “conciliary theory”, which sets the council above the pope, making it the sole representative of the Church, the sole organ of infallibility. Timidly sketched by two professors of the University of Paris, Conrad of Gelnhausen and Henry of Langenstein, this theory was completed and noisily interpreted to the public by Pierre d’Ailly and Gerson. At the same time the clergy of France, disgusted with Benedict XIII, took upon itself to withdraw from his obedience. It was in the assembly which voted on this measure (1398) that for the first time there was any question of bringing back the Church of France to its ancient liberties and customs—of giving its prelates once more the right of conferring and disposing of benefices. The same idea comes into the foreground in the claims put forward in 1406 by another assembly of the French clergy; to win the votes of the assembly, certain orators cited the example of what was happening in England. M. Haller has concluded from this that these so-called Ancient Liberties were of English origin, that the Gallican Church really borrowed them from its neighbour, only imagining them to be a revival of its own past. This opinion does not seem well founded. The precedents cited by M. Haller go back to the parliament held at Carlisle in 1307, at which date the tendencies of reaction against papal reservations had already manifested themselves in the assemblies convoked by Philip the Fair in 1302 and 1303. The most that we can admit is, that the same ideas received parallel development from both sides of the channel.

Together with the restoration of the “Ancient Liberties” the assembly of the clergy in 1406 intended to maintain the superiority of the council to the pope, and the fallibility of the latter. However widely they may have been accepted at the time, these were only individual opinions or opinions of a school, when the Council of Constance came to give them the sanction of its high authority. In its fourth and fifth sessions it declared that the council represented the Church, that every person, no matter of what dignity, even the pope, was bound to obey it in what concerned the extirpation of the schism and the reform of the Church; that even the pope, if he resisted obstinately, might be constrained by process of law to obey it in the above-mentioned points. This was the birth or, if we prefer to call it so, the legitimization of Gallicanism. So far we had encountered in the history of the Gallican Church recriminations of malcontented bishops, or a violent gesture of some prince discomforted in his avaricious designs; but these were only fits of resentment or ill humor, accidents with no attendant consequences; this time the provisions made against exercise of the pontifical authority took to themselves a body and found a fulcrum. Gallicanism has implanted itself in the minds of men as a national doctrine

and it only remains to apply it in practice. This is to be the work of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. In that instrument the clergy of France inserted the articles of Constance repeated at Basle, and upon that warrant assumed authority to regulate the collation of benefices and the temporal administration of the Churches on the sole basis of the common law, under the king’s patronage, and independently of the pope’s action. From Eugene IV to Leo X the popes did not cease to protest against the Pragmatic Sanction, until it was replaced by the Concordat of 1516. But, if its provisions disappeared from the laws of France, the principles it embodied for a time none the less continued to inspire the schools of theology and parliamentary jurisprudence. Those principles even appeared at the Council of Trent, where the ambassadors, theologians, and bishops of France repeatedly championed them, notably when the questions for decision were as to whether episcopal jurisdiction comes immediately from God or through the pope, whether or not the council ought to ask confirmation of its decrees from the sovereign pontiff, etc. Then again, it was in the name of the Liberties of the Gallican Church that a part of the clergy and the *Parlementaires* opposed the publication of that same council; and the crown decided to detach from it and publish what seemed good, in the form of ordinances emanating from the royal authority.

Nevertheless, towards the end of the sixteenth century, the reaction against the Protestant denial of all authority to the pope and, above all, the triumph of the League had enfeebled Gallican convictions in the minds of the clergy, if not of the parliament. But the assassination of Henry IV, which was exploited to move public opinion against Ultramontanism, and the activity of Edmond Richer, syndic of the Sorbonne, brought about, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, a strong revival of Gallicanism, which was thenceforward to continue gaining in strength from day to day. In 1663 the Sorbonne solemnly declared that it admitted no authority of the pope over the king’s temporal dominion, nor his superiority to a general council, nor infallibility apart from the Church’s consent. In 1682 matters were much worse. Louis XIV having decided to extend to all the Churches of his kingdom the *régle*, or right of receiving the revenue of vacant sees, and of conferring the sees themselves at his pleasure, Pope Innocent XI strongly opposed the king’s designs. Irritated by this resistance, the king assembled the clergy of France and, on 19 March, 1682, the thirty-six prelates and thirty-four deputies of the second order who constituted that assembly adopted the four articles recited above and transmitted them to all the other bishops and archbishops of France. Three days later the king commanded the registration of the articles in all the schools and faculties of theology; no one could even be admitted to degrees in theology without having maintained this doctrine in one of his theses, and it was forbidden to write anything against them. The Sorbonne, however, yielded to the ordinance of registration only after a spirited resistance. Pope Innocent XI testified his displeasure by the Rescript of 11 April, 1682, in which he voided and annulled all that the assembly had done in regard to the *régle*, as well as all the consequences of that action; he also refused Bulls to all members of the assembly who were proposed for vacant bishoprics. In like manner his successor Alexander VIII, by a Constitution dated 4 August, 1690, quashed as detrimental to the Holy See the proceedings both in the matter of the *régle* and in that of the declaration on the ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction, which had been prejudicial to the clerical estate and order. The bishops designate to whom Bulls had been refused received them at length, in 1693, only after addressing to Pope Innocent XII a letter in which they disavowed everything that had

been decreed in that assembly in regard to the ecclesiastical power and the pontifical authority. The king himself wrote to the pope (14 September, 1693) to announce that a royal order had been issued against the execution of the edict of 23 March, 1682. In spite of these disavowals, the Declaration of 1682 remained thenceforward the living symbol of Gallicanism, professed by the great majority of the French clergy, obligatorily defended in the faculties of theology, schools, and seminaries, guarded from the lukewarmness of French theologians and the attacks of foreigners by the inquisitorial vigilance of the French parliaments, which never failed to condemn to suppression every work that seemed hostile to the principles of the Declaration.

From France Gallicanism spread, about the middle of the eighteenth century, into the Low Countries, thanks to the works of the juriconsult Van-Espen. Under the pseudonym of Febronius, Hontheim introduced it into Germany, where it took the forms of Febronianism and Josephism. The Council of Pistoia (1786) even tried to acclimatize it in Italy. But its diffusion was sharply arrested by the Revolution, which took away its chief support by overturning the thrones of kings. Against the Revolution that drove them out and wrecked their sees, nothing was left to the bishops of France but to link themselves closely with the Holy See. After the Concordat of 1801—itself the most dazzling manifestation of the pope's supreme power—French Governments made some pretence of reviving, in the Organic Articles, the "Ancient Gallican Liberties" and the obligation of teaching the articles of 1682, but ecclesiastical Gallicanism was never again resuscitated except in the form of a vague mistrust of Rome. On the fall of Napoleon and the Bourbons, the work of Lamennais, of "L'Avenir" and other publications devoted to Roman ideas, the influence of Dom Guéranger, and the effects of religious teaching ever increasingly deprived it of its partisans. When the Vatican Council opened, in 1869, it had in France only timid defenders. When that council declared that the pope has in the Church the plenitude of jurisdiction in matters of faith, morals, discipline, and administration, that his decisions *ex cathedra* are of themselves, and without the assent of the Church, infallible and irreformable, it dealt Gallicanism a mortal blow. Three of the four articles were directly condemned. As to the remaining one, the first, the council made no specific declaration; but an important indication of the Catholic doctrine was given in the condemnation fulminated by Pius IX against the 24th proposition of the Syllabus, in which it was asserted that the Church cannot have recourse to force and is without any temporal authority, direct or indirect. Leo XIII shed more direct light upon the question in his Encyclical "Immortale Dei" (12 November, 1885), where we read: "God has apportioned the government of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the former set over things divine, the latter over things human. Each is restricted within limits which are perfectly determined and defined in conformity with its own nature and special aim. There is therefore, as it were, a circumscribed sphere in which each exercises its functions *jure proprio*". And in the Encyclical "Sapientiae Christianae" (10 January, 1890), the same pontiff adds: "The Church and the State have each its own power, and neither of the two powers is subject to the other."

Stricken to death, as a free opinion, by the Council of the Vatican, Gallicanism could survive only as a heresy; the Old Catholics have endeavoured to keep it alive under this form. Judging by the paucity of the adherents whom they have recruited—daily becoming fewer—in Germany and Switzerland, it seems very evident that the historical evolution of these ideas has reached its completion.

CRITICAL EXAMINATION.—The principal force of Gallicanism always was that which it drew from the external circumstances in which it arose and grew up: the difficulties of the Church, torn by schism; the encroachments of the civil authorities; political turmoil; the interested support of the kings of France. None the less does it seek to establish its own right to exist, and to legitimize its attitude towards the theories of the schools. There is no denying that it has had in its service a long succession of theologians and jurists who did much to assure its success. At the beginning, its first advocates were Pierre d'Ailly and Gerson, whose somewhat daring theories, reflecting the then prevalent disorder of ideas, were to triumph in the Council of Constance. In the sixteenth century Almain and Major make but a poor figure in contrast with Torquemada and Cajetan, the leading theorists of pontifical primacy. But in the seventeenth century the Gallican doctrine takes its revenge with Richer and Launoy, who throw as much passion as science into their efforts to shake the work of Bellarmine, the most solid edifice ever raised in defence of the Church's constitution and the papal supremacy. Pithou, Dupuy, and Marca edited texts or disinterred from archives the judicial monuments best calculated to support parliamentary Gallicanism. After 1682 the attack and defence of Gallicanism were concentrated almost entirely upon the four Articles. Whilst Charlas, in his anonymous treatise on the Liberties of the Catholic Church, d'Aguires, in his "Auctoritas infallibilis et summa sancti Petri", Rocaberti, in his treatise "De Romani pontificis auctoritate", Sfondrato, in his "Gallia vindicata", dealt severe blows at the doctrine of the Declaration, Alexander Natalis and Ellies Dupin searched ecclesiastical history for titles on which to support it. Bossuet carried on the defence at once on the ground of theology and of history. In his "Defensio declarationis", which was not to see the light of day until 1730, he discharged his task with equal scientific power and moderation. Again, Gallicanism was ably combatted in the works of Muzzarelli, Bianchi, and Ballerini, and upheld in those of Durand de Maillane, La Luzerne, Maret, and Dollinger. But the strife is prolonged beyond its interest; except for the bearing of some few arguments on either side, nothing that is altogether new, after all, is adduced for or against, and it may be said that with Bossuet's work Gallicanism had reached its full development, sustained its sharpest assaults, and exhibited its most efficient means of defence.

Those means are well known. For the absolute independence of the civil power, affirmed in the first Article, Gallicans drew their argument from the proposition that the theory of indirect power, accepted by Bellarmine, is easily reducible to that of direct power, which he did not accept. That theory was a novelty introduced into the Church by Gregory VII; until his time the Christian peoples and the popes had suffered injustice from princes without asserting for themselves the right to revolt or to excommunicate. As for the superiority of councils over popes, as based upon the decrees of the Council of Constance, the Gallicans essayed to defend it chiefly by appealing to the testimony of history which, according to them, shows that general councils have never been dependent on the popes, but had been considered the highest authority for the settlement of doctrinal disputes or the establishment of disciplinary regulations. The third Article was supported by the same arguments or upon the declarations of the popes. It is true that that Article made respect for the canons a matter rather of high propriety than of obligation for the Holy See. Besides, the canons alleged were among those that had been established with the consent of the pope and of the Churches, the plenitude of the pontifical jurisdiction was therefore safeguarded and Bossuet pointed out that this article had called

forth hardly any protests from the adversaries of Gallicanism. It was not so with the fourth Article, which implied a negation of papal infallibility. Resting chiefly on history, the whole Gallican argument reduced to the position that the Doctors of the Church—St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, St. Basil, St. Thomas, and the rest—had not known pontifical infallibility; that pronouncements emanating from the Holy See had been submitted to examination by councils; that popes—Liberius, Honorius, Zosimus, and others—had promulgated erroneous dogmatic decisions. Only the line of popes, the Apostolic See, was infallible; but each pope, taken individually, was liable to error.

This is not the place to discuss the force of this line of argument, or set forth the replies which it elicited; such an enquiry will more appropriately form part of the article devoted to the primacy of the Roman See. Without involving ourselves in technical developments, however, we may call attention to the weakness, of the Scriptural scaffolding upon which Gallicanism supported its fabric. Not only was it opposed by the luminous clearness of Christ's words—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church"; "I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not . . . confirm thy brethren"—but it finds nothing in Scripture which could warrant the doctrine of the supremacy of council or the distinction between the line of popes and the individuals—the *Sedes* and the *Sedens*. Supposing there were any doubt of Christ's having promised infallibility to Peter, it is perfectly certain that He did not promise it to the council, or to the See of Rome, neither of which is named in the Gospel.

The pretension implied in Gallicanism—that only the schools and the churches of France possessed the truth as to the pope's authority, that they had been better able than any others to defend themselves against the encroachments of Rome—was insulting to the sovereign pontiff and invidious to the other churches. It does not belong to one part of the Church to decide what council is œcumenical, and what is not. By what right was this honour refused in France to the Councils of Florence (1439) and the Lateran (1513), and accorded to that of Constance? Why, above all, should we attribute to the decision of this council, which was only a temporary expedient to escape from a deadlock, the force of a general principle, a dogmatic decree? And moreover, at the time when these decisions were taken, the council presented neither the character, nor the conditions, nor the authority of a general synod; it is not clear that among the majority of the members there was present any intention of formulating a dogmatic definition, nor is it proved that the approbation given by Martin V to some of the decrees extended to these. Another characteristic which is apt to diminish one's respect for Gallican ideas is their appearance of having been too much influenced, originally and evolutionally, by interested motives. Suggested by theologians who were under bonds to the emperors, accepted as an expedient to restore the unity of the Church, they had never been more loudly proclaimed than in the course of the conflicts which arose between popes and kings, and then always for the advantage of the latter. In truth they savoured too much of a courtly bias. "The Gallican Liberties", Joseph de Maistre has said, "are but a fatal compact signed by the Church of France, in virtue of which she submitted to the outrages of the Parliament on condition of being allowed to pass them on to the sovereign pontiff". The history of the assembly of 1682 is not such as to give the lie to this severe judgment. It was a Gallican—no other than Baillet—who wrote: "The bishops who served Philip the Fair were upright in heart and seemed to be actuated by a genuine, if somewhat too vehement, zeal for the rights of the Crown; whereas among those whose advice Louis XIV followed there

were some who, under pretext of the public welfare, only sought to avenge themselves, by oblique and devious methods, on those whom they regarded as the censors of their conduct and their sentiments."

Even apart from every other consideration, the practical consequences to which Gallicanism led, and the way in which the State turned it to account should suffice to wean Catholics from it forever. It was Gallicanism which allowed the Jansenists condemned by popes to elude their sentences on the plea that these had not received the assent of the whole episcopate. It was in the name of Gallicanism that the kings of France impeded the publication of the pope's instructions, and forbade the bishops to hold provincial councils or to write against Jansenism—or, at any rate, to publish charges without endorsement of the chancellor. Bossuet himself, prevented from publishing a charge against Richard Simon, was forced to complain that they wished "to put all the bishops under the yoke in the essential matter of their ministry, which is the Faith". Alleging the Liberties of the Gallican Church, the French Parliaments admitted *appels comme d'abus* against bishops who were guilty of condemning Jansenism, or of admitting into their Breviaries the Office of St. Gregory, sanctioned by Rome; and on the same general principle they caused pastoral letters to be burned by the common executioner, or condemned to imprisonment or exile priests whose only crime was that of refusing the sacraments and Christian burial to Jansenists in revolt against the most solemn pronouncements of the Holy See. Thanks to these "Liberties", the jurisdiction and the discipline of the Church were almost entirely in the hands of the civil power, and Fénelon gave a fair idea of them when he wrote in one of his letters: "In practice the king is more our head than the pope, in France—Liberties against the pope, servitude in relation to the king—The king's authority over the Church devolves upon the lay judges—The laity dominate the bishops". And Fénelon had not seen the Constituent Assembly of 1790 assume, from Gallican principles, authority to demolish completely the Constitution of the Church of France. For there is not one article of that melancholy Constitution that did not find its inspiration in the writings of Gallican jurists and theologians. We may be excused the task of here entering into any lengthy proof of this; indeed the responsibility which Gallicanism has to bear in the sight of history and of Catholic doctrine is already only too heavy.

BOSSUET, *Defensio declarationis conventus cleri gallicani in Œuvres*, ed. GUILLAUME (Paris, 1885), X; PITHOU, *Les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane* (Paris, 1594); MARCA, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii* (Frankfort, 1708); DURAND DE MAILLANE, *Les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane prouvées et commentées*, 5 vols. (Lyons, 1771); NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Venice, 1778); IX; BABUT, *La plus ancienne décrétale* (Paris, 1904); *Le concile de Turin* (Paris, 1904); DUCHESNE, *Le Concile de Turin in Revue historique* (1905), LXXXVII; MAASSEN, *Concilia ævi merovingici* (Hanover, 1893); LOT, *Études sur le règne de Hugues Capet et la fin du X<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1903); DEBERT, *Un ouvrier de la Réforme au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle in Revue des questions historiques* (July, 1908); DUPUY, *Histoire du différend entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel* (Paris, 1655); BAILLET, *Histoire des desmesles du pape Boniface VIII avec Philippe le Bel* (Paris, 1718); VALOIS, *La France et le grand schisme d'Occident*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1896-1902); IDEM, *Histoire de la Pragmatique sanction de Bourges* (Paris, 1906); KNEER, *Die Entstehung der conciliaren Theorie* (Rome, 1893); HALLER, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform* (Berlin, 1903), I; PUYOL, *Edmond Richer*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1876); GÉRIN, *Recherches sur l'assemblée du clergé de France de 1682*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1870); LAURAS, *Nouveaux éclaircissements sur l'assemblée de 1682* (Paris, 1878); MICHAUD, *Louis XIV et Innocent XI, III and IV* (Paris, 1883); FLEURY, *Institution au droit ecclésiastique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1767); and *Nouveaux Opuscules*, ed. EMERY (Paris, 1807); CHARLAS, *Tractatus de libertatibus ecclesie gallicane* (Liège, 1684); SCHWANE, *Histoire des dogmas*, tr. DEBERT, V, VI (Paris, 1903); J. DE MAISTRE, *Du pape* (Lyons, 1821); IDEM, *De l'Eglise gallicane dans son rapport avec le souverain pontife* (Paris, 1821); DUPIN, *Manuel du droit ecclésiastique*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1845); PIGNOT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique pendant le XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1853-1857); DENZINGER, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, 10th ed. (Freiburg im Br., 1908).

A. DEBERT.

**Gallican Rite, THE.**—This subject will be treated under the following six heads: I. History and Origin; II. MSS. and Other Sources; III. The Liturgical Year; IV. The Divine Office; V. The Mass; VI. The Occasional Services.

I. HISTORY AND ORIGIN.—The name *Gallican Rite* is given to the rite which prevailed in Gaul from the earliest times of which we have any information until about the middle or end of the eighth century. There is no information before the fifth century and very little then; and throughout the whole period there was, to judge by existing documents and descriptions, so much diversity that, though the general outlines of the rite were of the same pattern, the name must not be taken to imply more than a very moderate amount of homogeneity. The Rite of Spain, fairly widely used from the fifth century to the end of the eleventh, and still lingering on as an archaeological survival in chapels at Toledo and Salamanca, was so nearly allied to the Gallican Rite that the term *Hispano Gallican* is often applied to the two. But this Spanish Mozarabic Rite has, like the allied Celtic, enough of an independent history to require separate treatment, so that, though it will be necessary to allude to both by way of illustration, this article will be devoted primarily to the rite once used in what is now France. Of the origin of the Gallican Rite there are three principal theories, between two of which the controversy is not yet settled. These may be termed (1) the Ephesine, (2) the Ambrosian, and (3) the Roman theories.

(1) The first has been already mentioned under AMBROSIAN RITE and CELTIC RITE. This theory, which was first put forward by Sir W. Palmer in his "*Origines Liturgicæ*", was once very popular among Anglicans. According to it the Gallican Rite was referred to an original brought to Lyons from Ephesus by St. Pothinus and St. Irenæus, who had received it through St. Polycarp from St. John the Divine. The idea originated partly in a statement in the eighth-century tract in Cott. MS. Nero A. II in the British Museum, which refers the Gallican Divine Office (*Cursus Gallorum*) to such an origin, and partly in a statement of Colman at the Synod of Whitby (664) respecting the Johannine origin of the Celtic Easter. The Cottonian tract is of little or no historical value; Colman's notion was disproved at the time by St. Wilfrid; and the Ephesine theory has now been given up by all serious liturgiologists. Mgr Duchesne, in his "*Origines du culte chrétien*", has finally disposed of the possibility of so complicated a rite as the Gallican having so early an origin as the second century.

(2) The second theory is that which Duchesne puts forward in the place of the Ephesine. He holds that Milan, not Lyons, was the principal centre of Gallican development. He lays great stress on the incontestable importance of Milan and the Church of Milan in the late fourth century, and conjectures that a liturgy of Oriental origin, introduced perhaps by the Cappadocian Auxentius, Bishop of Milan from 355 to 374, spread from that centre to Gaul, Spain, and Britain. He points out that "the Gallican Liturgy, in the features which distinguish it from the Roman, betrays all the characteristics of the Eastern liturgies," and that "some of its formularies are to be found word for word in the Greek texts which were in use in the churches of the Syro-Byzantine Rite either in the fourth century or somewhat later", and infers from this that "the Gallican Liturgy is an Oriental liturgy, introduced into the West towards the middle of the fourth century". He does not, however, note that in certain other important peculiarities the Gallican Liturgy agrees with the Roman where the latter differs from the Oriental. Controverting the third or Roman theory of origin, he lays some stress upon the fact that Pope St. Innocent I (416) in his letter to Decentius of Gubbio spoke of usages which Mgr Duchesne recognizes as Gallican (e. g. the position of

the Diptychs and the Pax), as "foreign importations" and did not recognize in them the ancient usage of his own Church, and he thinks it hard to explain why the African Church should have accepted the Roman reforms, while St. Ambrose, himself a Roman, refused them. He assumes that the Ambrosian Rite is not really Roman, but Gallican, much Romanized at a later period, and that the Gubbio variations of which St. Innocent complained were borrowed from Milan.

(3) The third theory is perhaps rather complicated to state without danger of misrepresentation, and has not been so definitely stated as the other two by any one writer. It is held in parts by Probst, Father Lucas, the Milanese liturgiologists, and many others whose opinion is of weight. In order to state it clearly it will be necessary to point out first certain details in which all the Latin or Western rites agree with one another in differing from the Eastern, and in this we speak only of the Mass, which is of far more importance than either the Divine Office or the occasional services in determining origins. The Eastern Eucharistic offices of whatever rite are marked by the invariability of the priest's part. There are, it is true, alternative anaphoras which are used either *ad libitum*, as in the Syro-Jacobite Rite, or on certain days, as in Byzantine and East Syrian, but they are complete in themselves and do not contain passages appropriate to the day. The lections of course vary with the day in all rites, and varying antiphons, troparia, etc., are sung by the choir; but the priest's part remains fixed. In the Western rites, whether Hispano-Gallican, Ambrosian, or Roman, a very large proportion of the priest's part varies according to the day, and, as will be seen by the analysis of its Mass in this article, these variations are so numerous in the Gallican Rite that the fixed part even of the Prayer of Consecration is strangely little. Certain of the varying prayers of the Hispano-Gallican Rite have a tendency to fall into couples, a Bidding Prayer, or invitation to pray, sometimes of considerable length and often partaking of the nature of a homily, addressed to the congregation, and a collect embodying the suggestions of the Bidding Prayer, addressed to God. These Bidding Prayers have survived in the Roman Rite of to-day in the Good Friday intercessory prayers, and they occur in a form borrowed later from the Gallican, in the ordination services, but in general the invitation to prayer is reduced to its lowest terms in the word *Oremus*. Another Western peculiarity is in the form of the recital of the Institution. The principal Eastern liturgies follow St. Paul's words in I Cor., xi, 23-25, and date the Institution by the betrayal, *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ᾧ παρεδόθητο* (in the night in which He was betrayed), and of the less important anaphoras, most either use the same expression or paraphrase it. The Western liturgies date from the Passion, *Qui pridie quam pateretur*, for which, though of course the fact is found there, there is no verbal Scriptural warrant. The Mozarabic of to-day uses the Pauline words, and no Gallican Recital of the Institution remains in full; but in both the prayer that follows is called (with alternative nomenclature in the Gallican) *Post-Pridie* and the catchwords "*Qui pridie*" come at the end of the Post-Sanctus in the Gallican Masses, so that it is clear that this form existed in both. These variations from the Eastern usages are of an early date, and it is inferred from them, and from other considerations more historical than liturgical, that a liturgy with these peculiarities was the common property of Gaul, Spain, and Italy. Whether, as is most likely, it originated in Rome and spread thence to the countries under direct Roman influence, or whether it originated elsewhere and was adopted by Rome, there is no means of knowing. The adoption must have happened when liturgies were in rather a fluid state. The Gallicans may have carried to an extreme the changes begun at Rome, and may have retained



some archaic features (now often mistaken for Orientalisms) which had been later dropped by Rome. At some period in the fourth century—it has been conjectured that it was in the papacy of St. Damasus (366-84)—reforms were made at Rome, the position of the Great Intercession and of the Pax were altered, the latter, perhaps because the form of the dismissal of the catechumens was disused, and the distinction between the *missa catechumenorum* and the *missa fidelium* was no longer needed, and therefore the want was felt of a position with some meaning to it for the sign of Christian unity, and the long and diffuse prayers were made into the short and crisp collects of the Roman type. It was perhaps then that the variable Post-Sanctus and Post-Prædicatione were altered into a fixed Canon of a type similar to the Roman Canon of today, though perhaps this Canon began with the clause which now reads “Quam oblationem”, but according to the pseudo-Ambrosian tract “De Sacramentis” once read “Fac nobis hanc oblationem”. This may have been introduced by a short variable Post-Sanctus. This reform, possibly through the influence of St. Ambrose, was adopted at Milan, but not in Gaul and Spain. At a still later period changes were again made at Rome. They have been principally attributed to St. Leo (440-61), St. Gelasius (492-96), and St. Gregory (590-604), but the share that these popes had in the reforms is not definitely known, though three varying sacramentaries have been called by their respective names. These later reforms were not adopted at Milan, which retained the books of the first reform, which are now known as Ambrosian.

Hence it may be seen that, roughly speaking, the Western or Latin Liturgy went through three phases, which may be called for want of better names the Gallican, the Ambrosian, and the Roman stages. The holders of the theory no doubt recognize quite clearly that the line of demarcation between these stages is rather a vague one, and that the alterations were in many respects gradual. Of the three theories of origin the Ephesine may be dismissed as practically disproved. To both of the other two the same objection may be urged, that they are largely founded on conjecture and on the critical examination of documents of a much later date than the periods to which the conjectures relate. But at present there is little else to go upon. It may be well to mention also a theory put forward by Mr. W. C. Bishop in the “Church Quarterly” for July, 1908, to the effect that the Gallican Liturgy was not introduced into Gaul from anywhere, but was the original liturgy of that country, apparently invented and developed there. He speaks of an original independence of Rome (of course liturgically only) followed by later borrowings. This does not seem to exclude the idea that Rome and the West may have had the germ of the Western Rite in common. Again the theory is conjectural and is only very slightly stated in the article.

The later history of the Gallican Rite until the time of its abolition as a separate rite is obscure. In Spain there was a definite centre in Toledo, whose influence was felt over the whole peninsula, even after the coming of the Moors. Hence it was that the Spanish Rite was much more regulated than the Gallican, and Toledo at times, though not very successfully, tried to give liturgical laws even to Gaul, though probably only to the Visigothic part of it. In the greater part of France there was liturgical anarchy. There was no capital to give laws to the whole country, and the rite developed there variously in various places, so that among the scanty fragments of the service-books that remain there is a marked absence of verbal uniformity, though the main outlines of the services are of the same type. Several councils attempted to regulate matters a little, but only for certain provinces. Among these were the Councils of Vannes (465), Agde (506), Vaison (529), Tours (567),

Auxerre (578), and the two Councils of Mâcon (581, 623). But all along there went on a certain process of Romanizing, due to the constant applications to the Holy See for advice, and there is also another complication in the probable introduction during the seventh century, through the Columbanian missionaries, of elements of Irish origin. The changes towards the Roman Rite happened rather gradually during the course of the late seventh and eighth century, and seem synchronous with the rise of the *Maires du Palais*, and their development into kings of France. Nearly all the Gallican books of the later Merovingian period, which are all that are left, contain many Roman elements. In some cases there is reason to suppose that the Roman Canon was first introduced into an otherwise Gallican Mass, but the so-called Gelasian Sacramentary, the principal MS. of which is attributed to the Abbey of St-Denis and to the early eighth century, is an avowedly Roman book, though containing Gallican additions and adaptations. And the same may be said of what is left of the undoubtedly Frankish book known as the “Missale Francorum” of the same date. Mgr Duchesne attributes a good deal of this eighth-century Romanizing tendency to St. Boniface, though he shows that it had begun before his day. The Roman Liturgy was adopted at Metz in the time of St. Chrodegang (742-66). The Roman chant was introduced about 760, and by a decree of Pepin, quoted in Charlemagne’s “Admonitio Generalis” in 789, the Gallican chant was abolished in its favour. Pope Adrian I between 784 and 791 sent to Charlemagne at his own request a copy of what was considered to be the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, but which certainly represented the Roman use of the end of the eighth century. This book, which was far from complete, was edited and supplemented by the addition of a large amount of matter derived from the Gallican books and from the Roman book known as the Gelasian Sacramentary, which had been gradually supplanting the Gallican. It is probable that the editor was Charlemagne’s principal liturgical adviser, the Englishman Alcuin. Copies were distributed throughout Charlemagne’s empire, and this “composite liturgy”, as Mgr Duchesne says, “from its source in the Imperial chapel spread throughout all the churches of the Frankish Empire and at length, finding its way to Rome gradually supplanted there the ancient use”. More than half a century later, when Charles the Bald wished to see what the ancient Gallican Rite had been like, it was necessary to import Spanish priests to celebrate it in his presence.

It should be noted that the name *Gallican* has also been applied to two other uses: (1) a French use introduced by the Normans into Apulia and Sicily. This was only a variant of the Roman Rite. (2) The reformed Breviaries of the French dioceses in the seventeenth to mid-nineteenth centuries. These have nothing to do with the ancient Gallican Rite.

II. MSS. AND OTHER SOURCES.—There are no MSS. of the Gallican Rite earlier than the latter part of the seventh century, though the descriptions in the letters of St. Germanus of Paris (555-76) take one back another century. The MSS. are:—

(1) *The Reichenau Fragments* (Carlsruhe, 253), described (no. 8) in Delisle’s “Mémoire sur d’anciens Sacramentaires.”—These were discovered by Mone in 1850 in a palimpsest MS. from the Abbey of Reichenau in the library of Carlsruhe. The MS., which is late seventh century, had belonged to John II, Bishop of Constance (760-81). It contains eleven Masses of purely Gallican type, one of which is in honour of St. Germanus of Auxerre, but the others do not specify any festival. One Mass, except the Post-Prædicatione, which is in prose, is entirely in hexameter verse. Mone published them with a facsimile in his “Lateinische und Griechische Messen aus dem zweiten bis sechsten Jahrhundert” (Frankfort, 1850). They were

reprinted in Migne's "Patrologia Latina" (Vol. CXXXVIII), and by Neale and Forbes in "The Ancient Liturgy of the Gallican Church" (Burntisland, 1855-67).

(2) *The Peyron, Mai, and Bunsen Fragments*.—Of these disjointed palimpsest leaves, those of Mai and Peyron were found in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and those of Bunsen at St. Gall. Peyron's were printed in his "M. T. Ciceronis Orationum Fragmenta inedita" (Stuttgart, 1824), Mai's in his "Scriptorum Veterum Vaticana Collectio", and Bunsen's in his "Analecta Ante-Niceana". All these were reprinted by C. E. Hammond: Peyron's and Bunsen's in his "Ancient Liturgy of Antioch" (Oxford, 1879), and Mai's in his "Ancient Liturgies" (Oxford, 1878). The last are also in Migne's "Patrologia Latina" with Mone's Reichenau fragments. The Peyron fragment contains part of what looks like a *Lenten Contestatio* (Preface) with other prayers of Gallican type. The Bunsen fragment contains part of a Mass for the Dead (Post-Sanctus, Post-Pridie) and several pairs of Bidding Prayers and collects, the former having the title "Exhortatio" or "Exhortatio Matutina". The Mai fragments begin with part of a Bidding Prayer and contain a fragment of a *Contestatio*, with that title, and fragments of other prayers, two of which have the title "Post Nomina", and two others which seem to be prayers "Ad Pacem".

(3) *The Missale Gothicum* (Vatican, Queen Christina MSS. 317).—Described by Delisle, No. 3. A MS. of the end of the seventh century, which once belonged to the Petau Library. The name is due to a fifteenth-century note at the beginning of the book, and hence it has been attributed by Tomasi and Mabillon to Narbonne, which was in the Visigothic Kingdom. Mgr. Duchesne, judging by the inclusion of Masses for the feasts of St. Symphorian and St. Léger (d. 680), attributes it to Autun. The Masses are numbered, the MS. beginning with Christmas Eve, which is numbered "III". Probably there were once two Advent Masses, as in the "Missale Gallicanum". There are eighty-one numbered sections, of which the last is the first prayer of "Missa Romensis cottidiana", with which the MS. breaks off. The details of the Masses in this book are given in the section of the present article on the liturgical year. The Masses are all Gallican as to order, but many of the actual prayers are Roman. The "Missale Gothicum" has been printed by Tommasi (Codices Sacramentorum, Rome, 1680), Mabillon (De Liturgiâ Gallicanâ, Paris, 1685), Muratori (Liturgia Romana Vetust, Venice, 1748), Neale and Forbes (op. cit.), and in Migne's "Patrologia Latina" (Vol. LXXII).

(4) *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (Vatican, Palat. 493).—Described by Delisle, No. 5. The MS., which is of the end of the seventh, or the early part of the eighth, century is only a fragment. It begins with a Mass for the feast of St. Germanus of Auxerre (9 Oct.), after which come prayers for the Blessing of Virgins and Widows, two Advent Masses, the Christmas Eve Mass, the *Expositio* and *Traditio Symboli*, and other ceremonies preparatory to Baptism; the Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Easter Sunday ceremonies and the baptismal service, Masses for the Sundays after Easter up to the Rogation Mass, where the MS. breaks off. The Masses, as in the "Gothicum", are Gallican in order with many Roman prayers. The Good Friday prayers are, with a few verbal variations, exactly those of the Roman Missal. The MS. has been printed by Tommasi, Mabillon, Muratori, and Neale and Forbes (op. cit.), and in Vol. LXXII of Migne's "Patrologia Latina."

(5) *The Luxeuil Lectionary* (Paris, Bibl. Nat., 9427).—This MS., which is of the seventh century was discovered by Mabillon in the Abbey of Luxeuil, but from its containing among its very few saints' days the feast of St. Genevieve, Dom Morin (Revue

Bénédictine, 1893) attributes it to Paris. It contains the Prophetical Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels for the year from Christmas Eve onwards (for the details of which see the section of this article on the liturgical year). At the end are the lessons of a few special Masses, for the burial of a bishop, for the dedication of a church, when a bishop preaches, "et plebs decimas reddat", when a deacon is ordained, when a priest is blessed, "in profectioe itineris", and "lectiones cotidianæ". This Lectionary is purely Gallican with no apparent Roman influence. The MS. has not been printed in its entirety, but Mabillon in "De Liturgiâ Gallicanâ" gives the references to all the lessons and the beginnings and endings of the text.

(6) *The Letters of St. Germanus of Paris*.—These were printed by Martène (De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, Bassano, 1788) from a MS. at Autun, and are given also in Vol. LXXII of Migne's "Patrologia Latina". There appears to be no reason to doubt that they are genuine. They contain mystical interpretations of the ceremonies of the Mass and of other services. Mgr. Duchesne says of the descriptions, on which the interpretations are based, that "We may reconstruct from the letters a kind of *Ordo Gallicanus*". (See section of this article on the Mass.)

Much side light is thrown on the Gallican Rite by the Celtic books (see CELTIC RITE), especially by the Stowe and Bobbio Missals. The latter has been called Gallican and attributed to the Province of Besançon, but it is now held to be Irish in a much Romanized form, though of Continental *provenance*, being quite probably from the originally Irish monastery of Bobbio, where Mabillon found it. A comparison with the Ambrosian books (see AMBROSIAN LITURGY AND RITE) may also be of service, while most lacunæ in our knowledge of the Gallican Rite may reasonably be conjecturally filled up from the Mozarabic books, which even in their present form are those of substantially the same rite. There are also liturgical allusions in certain early writers: St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Sulpicius Severus (d. about 400), St. Casarius of Arles (d. about 542), and especially St. Gregory of Tours (d. 595), and some information may be gathered from the decrees of the Gallican councils mentioned above.

The above are all that exist as directly Gallican sources, but much information may also be gleaned from the books of the transition period, which, though substantially Roman, were much edited with Germanic tendencies and contained a large amount which was of a Gallican rather than a Roman type. The principal of these are:

(1) *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, of which three MSS. exist, one in the Vatican (Queen Christina MS. 316), one at Zurich (Rheinau 30), and one at St. Gall (MS. 348). The MSS. are of the early eighth century. The groundwork is Roman, with Gallican additions and modifications. Evidence for the Gallican rites of Ordination and some other matters is derived from this book. The Vatican MS. was published by Tommasi and Muratori, and a complete edition from all three MSS. was edited by H. A. Wilson (Oxford, 1894).

(2) *The Missale Francorum* (Vatican, Q. Christina MS. 257, Delisle No. 4).—A fragment of a Sacramentary of a similar type to the Gelasian, though not identical with it. Printed by Tommasi, Mabillon, and Muratori.

(3) *The Gregorian Sacramentary*.—Of this there are many MSS. It represents the Sacramentary sent by Pope Adrian I to Charlemagne, after it had been rearranged and supplemented by Gelasian and Gallican additions in France. One MS. of it was published by Muratori. In this, as in many others, the additions form a supplement, but in some (e. g. the Angoulême Sacramentary, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 816) the Gelasian additions are interpolated throughout.

III. THE LITURGICAL YEAR.—The Luxeuil Lectionary, the *Gothicum* and *Gallicanum* Missals, and the Gallican adaptations of the Hieronymian Martyrology are the chief authorities on this point, and to these may be added some information to be gathered from the regulations of the Councils of Agde (506), Orleans (541), Tours (567), and Mâcon (581), and from the "Historia Francorum" of St. Gregory of Tours, as to the Gallican practice in the sixth century. It is probable that there were many variations in different times and places, and that the influence of the Hieronymian Martyrology brought about many gradual assimilations to Rome. The year, as is usual, began with Advent. The Council of Mâcon, which arranges for three days' fast a week, during that season, mentions St. Martin's Day as the key-day for Advent Sunday, so that, as at present in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites, there were six Sundays of Advent (but only two Advent Masses survive in the *Gallicanum*). The *Gothicum* and the Luxeuil Lectionary both begin with Christmas Eve. Then follow Christmas Day; St. Stephen; St. John (according to Luxeuil); St. James and St. John (according to the *Gothicum*, which agrees with the Hieronymian Martyrology and with a Syriac Menology of 412, quoted by Duchesne. The Mozarabic has for 29 December "Sanctus Jacobus Frater Domini", but that is the other St. James); Holy Innocents; Circumcision; St. Genevieve (Luxeuil Lectionary only. Her day is 3 Jan.); Sunday after the Circumcision (Luxeuil); vigil of Epiphany; Epiphany; two Sundays after Epiphany (Luxeuil); "Festum Sanctæ Mariæ" (Luxeuil, called "Assumptio" in the *Gothicum*, 18 Jan.); St. Agnes (*Gothicum*); after which follow in the *Gothicum*, out of their proper places, Sts. Cecily (22 Nov.); Clement (23 Nov.); Saturninus (29 Nov.); Andrew (30 Nov.); and Eulalia (10 Dec.); the Conversion of St. Paul (*Gothicum*); St. Peter's Chair (in both. This, from its position after the Conversion of St. Paul in the *Gothicum*, ought to be St. Peter's Chair at Antioch, 22 Feb.; but it will not work out as such with the two Sundays between it and the Epiphany and three between it and Lent, as it appears in the Luxeuil Lectionary; so it must mean St. Peter's Chair at Rome, 18 Jan., which is known to have been the festival kept in Gaul); three Sundays after St. Peter's Chair (Luxeuil); *Initium Quadragesimæ*; five Lenten Masses (*Gothicum*); Palm Sunday (Luxeuil); "Symboli Traditio" (*Gothicum*); Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week, called, by the name still used in the Ambrosian Rite, *Authentica Hebdomada* (Luxeuil); Maundy Thursday; Good Friday; Easter Eve; Easter Day and the whole week; Low Sunday, called in both *Clausum Paschæ*; four more Sundays after Easter (Luxeuil); Invention of the Cross (*Gothicum*, 3 May); St. John the Evangelist (*Gothicum*, 6 May); three Rogation days; Ascension; Sunday after Ascension (Luxeuil); Pentecost; Sunday after Pentecost (Luxeuil); Sts. Ferreolus and Ferrutius (*Gothicum*, 16 June); Nativity of St. John Baptist; Sts. Peter and Paul; Decollation of St. John Baptist; Missa de Novo fructus (*sic*, Luxeuil); St. Sixtus (*Gothicum*, 6 Aug.); St. Lawrence (*Gothicum*, 10 Aug.); St. Hippolytus (*Gothicum*, 13 Aug.); Sts. Cornelius and Cyprian (*Gothicum*, 16 Sept.); Sts. John and Paul (*Gothicum*, 26 June); St. Symphorian (*Gothicum*, 22 Aug.); St. Maurice and his companions (*Gothicum*, 22 Sept.); St. Leger (*Gothicum*, 2 Oct.); St. Martin (*Gothicum*, 22 Nov.). Both books have also Commons of Martyrs and Confessors, the Luxeuil has Commons of bishops and deacons for a number of other Masses, and the *Gothicum* has six Sunday Masses. The *Gallicanum* has a Mass in honour of St. Germanus of Auxerre before the two Advent Masses. In both the *Gothicum* and *Gallicanum* a large space is given to the services of the two days before Easter, and in the latter the *Expositio* and *Traditio Symboli*

are given at great length. The moveable feasts depended, of course, on Easter. When the Roman Church altered the Easter cycle from the old computation on a basis of 84 years to the new cycle of 532 years of Victorius of Aquitaine in 457, the Gallican Church, unlike the Celts, did the same; but when, in 525, the Roman Church adopted the 19 years cycle of Dionysius Exiguus, the Gallican Church continued to use the cycle of Victorius, until the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century. Lent began with the first Sunday, not with Ash Wednesday. There is a not very intelligible passage in the canons of the Council of Tours (567) to the effect that all through August there were "festivitates et missæ sanctorum", but this is not borne out by the existing Sacramentaries or the Lectionary.

IV. THE DIVINE OFFICE.—There is curiously little information on this point, and it is not possible to re-construct the Gallican Divine Office from the scanty allusions that exist. It seems probable that there was considerable diversity in various times and places, though councils, both in France and Spain, tried to bring about some uniformity. The principal authorities are the Councils of Agde (506) and Tours (567), and allusions in the writings of St. Gregory of Tours and St. Cæsarius of Arles. These and other details have been gathered together by Mabillon in his "De Liturgiâ Gallicanâ", and his essay on the Gallican *Cursus* is not yet superseded. The general arrangement and nomenclature were very similar to those of the Celtic Rite (q. v.). There were two principal services, Matins (*ad Matutinam*, *Matutinum*) and Vespers (*ad Duodecimam*, *ad Vesperas*, *Lucernarium*); and four Lesser Hours, Prime, or *Ad Secundam*, Terce, Sext and None; and probably two night services, Complin, or *ad initium noctis*, and Nocturns. But the application of these names is sometimes obscure. It is not quite clear whether Nocturns and Lauds were not joined together as Matins; Cæsarius speaks of *Prima*, while the *Gallicanum* speaks of *Ad secundam*; Cæsarius distinguishes between *Lucernarium* and *Ad Duodecimam*, while Aurelian distinguishes between *Ad Duodecimam* and Complin; the *Gothicum* speaks of *Vespera Paschæ* and *Initium Noctis Paschæ*, and the *Gallicanum* has *Ad Duodecimam Paschæ*. The distribution of the Psalter is not known. The Council of Tours orders six psalms at Sext and twelve *ad Duodecimam*, with Alleluia (presumably as Antiphon). For Matins there is a curious arrangement which reminds one of that in the Rule of St. Columbanus (see CELTIC RITE, III). Normally in summer (apparently from Easter to July) "sex antiphonæ binis psalmis" are ordered. This evidently means twelve psalms, two under each antiphon. In August there seem to have been no psalms, because there were festivals and Masses of saints. "Toto Augusto manicationes fiant, quia festivitates sunt et missæ sanctorum". The meaning of *manicationes* and of the whole statement is obscure. In September there were fourteen psalms, two under each antiphon; in October twenty-four psalms, three to each antiphon; in November twenty-seven psalms, three to each antiphon; and from December to Easter thirty psalms, three to each antiphon. Cæsarius orders six psalms at Prime with the hymn "Fulgentis auctor ætheris", two lessons, one from the old and one from the New Testament, and a *capitellum*; six psalms at Terce, Sext, and None, with an antiphon, a hymn, a lesson, and a *capitellum*; at *Lucernarium* a "Psalmus Directaneus", whatever that may be (cf. the "Psalmus Directus" of the Ambrosian Rite), two antiphons, a hymn, and a *capitellum*; and *ad Duodecimam*, eighteen psalms, an antiphon, hymn, lesson, and *capitellum*. From this it seems as though *Lucernarium* and *Ad Duodecimam* together made up Vespers, combining the twelfth hour of the Divine Office (that is, of the recitation of the Psalter with its accompaniments) with a service for

what, without any intention of levity, one may call "lighting-up time". The Ambrosian and Mozarabic Vespers are constructed on this principle, and so is the Byzantine *Εσπεριὸς*.

Cæsarius mentions a blessing given by the bishop at the end of *Lucernarium*, "cumque expleto Lucernario benedictionem populo dedisset"; and the following is an order of the Council of Agde (canon 30): "Et quia convenit ordinem ecclesiæ ab omnibus æqualiter custodiri studendum est ut ubique fit et post antiphonas collectiones per ordinem ab episcopis vel presbyteris dicantur et hymni matutini vel vespertini diebus omnibus decantentur et in conclusione matutinarum vel vespertinarum missarum post hymnos capitella de psalmis dicantur et plebs collecta oratione ad vespem ab Episcopo cum benedictione dimittatur". The rules of Cæsarius and Aurelian both speak of two nocturns with lessons, which include on the feasts of martyrs lessons from their passions. They order also *Magnificat* to be sung at Lauds, and during the Paschal days; and on Sundays and greater festivals *Gloria in Excelsis*. There is a short passage which throws a little light upon the Lyons use of the end of the fifth century in an account of the Council of Lyons in 499, quoted by Mabillon. The council assembled by King Gundobad of Burgundy began on the feast of St. Just. The vigil was kept at his tomb. This began with a lesson from the Pentateuch ("a Moysse"), in which occurred the words "Sed ego indurabo cor ejus", etc. (Ex. vii, 3). Then psalms were sung and a lesson was read from the prophets, in which occurred the words "Vade, et dices populo huic: Audite audientes", etc. (Isaias, vi, 9), then more psalms and a lesson from the Gospels containing the words "Væ tibi, Corozain!" etc. (Matt., xi, 21; or Luke, x, 13), and a lesson from the Epistles ("ex Apostolo") which contained the words "An divitias bonitatis ejus", etc. (Rom., ii, 4). St. Agobard in the ninth century mentions that at Lyons there were no canticles except from the Psalms, no hymns written by poets, and no lessons except from Scripture. Mabillon says that though in his day Lyons agreed with Rome in many things, especially in the distribution of the Psalter, and admitted lessons from the Acts of Saints, there were still no hymns except at Complin, and he mentions a similar rule as to hymns at Vienne. But canon 23 of the Council of Tours (767) allowed the use of the Ambrosian hymns. Though the Psalter of the second recension of St. Jerome, now used in all the churches of the Roman Rite except the Vatican Basilica, is known as the "Gallican", while the older, a revision of the "Vetus Italia", used now in St. Peter's at Rome only, is known as the "Roman", it does not seem that the Gallican Psalter was used even in Gaul until a comparatively later date, though it spread thence over nearly all the West. At present the Mozarabic and Ambrosian Psalters are variants of the "Roman", with peculiarities of their own. Probably the decadence of the Gallican Divine Office was very gradual. In the eighth century tract in Cott. MS. Nero A. II. the "Cursus Gallorum" is distinguished from the "Cursus Romanorum", the "Cursus Scottorum" and the Ambrosian, all of which would seem to have been going on then. The unknown writer, though his opinion is of no value on the origin of the "Cursus", may well have known about some of these of his own knowledge; but through the seventh century there are indications of a tendency to adopt the Roman or the Monastic "cursus" instead of the Gallican, or to mix them up, a tendency which was resisted at times by provincial councils.

V. THE MASS.—The chief authorities for the Gallican Mass are the Letters of St. Germanus of Paris (555-576); and by a comparison of these with the extant Sacramentaries, not only of Gaul but of the Celtic Rite, with the Irish tracts on the Mass, with the books of the still existing Mozarabic Rite, and with the de-

scriptions of the Spanish Mass given by St. Isidore, one may arrive at a fairly clear general idea of the service, though there exists no Gallican Ordinary of the Mass and no Antiphoner. Mgr. Duchesne, in his "Origines du Culte chrétien", has given a very full account constructed on this basis, though some will differ from him in his supplying certain details from Ambrosian books, and in his claiming the Bobbio Sacramentary as Ambrosian rather than Celtic.

The Order of this Mass is as follows:—

(1) The Entrance.—Here an *Antiphona* (Introit) was sung. Nothing is said of any *Præparatio Sacerdotis*, but there is one given in the Celtic Stowe Missal (see CELTIC RITE); and the Irish tracts describe a preliminary preparation of the Chalice, as does also the Mozarabic Missal. As no Antiphoner exists, we have no specimen of a Gallican *Officium*, or Introit. Duchesne gives a Mozarabic one, which has something of the form of a Roman Responsory. The Antiphona was followed by a proclamation of silence by the deacon, and the salutation *Dominus sit semper vobiscum* by the priest. This is still the Mozarabic form of *Dominus vobiscum*.

(2) The Canticles.—These, according to St. Germanus, were: (i) The *Ajus* (ἄγιος) which may be the Greek Trisagion (Ἄγιος Θεός, κ.τ.λ.) or the Greek of the *Sanctus*, probably the latter, which is still used elsewhere in the Mozarabic, and seems to be referred to in the *Ajus*, *ajus*, *ajus* of the Life of St. Gery of Cambrai and the *Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus* of the Council of Vaison (529). In the Bobbio there is a prayer *Post Ajus*. (ii) The *Kyrie Eleison*, sung by three boys. This has disappeared from the Mozarabic. It is mentioned by the Council of Vaison (529). (iii) The Cantic of Zacharias (*Benedictus*). This is called *Prophetia* and there are collects *post Prophetiam* in the Reichenau fragments, the Gothicum, and the Bobbio. The Mozarabic and Celtic books have *Gloria in Excelsis* here, but in the former the "Benedictus" is used instead on the Sunday before the Nativity of St. John Baptist, called *Dominica pro adventu S. Johannis*. A different Cantic, *Sanctus Deus Archangelorum* was used, according to St. Germanus, in Lent.

(3) The Lessons.—These were the *Lectio Prophetica* from the Old Testament, and the *Lectio Apostolica* or Epistle. In Paschal time the Apocalypse took the place of the *Lectio Prophetica*, and a lesson from the Acts of the Apostles that of the Epistle. In Lent the Histories of the Old Testament were read instead of the Prophetic Lesson, and on Saints' Days the Acts of the Saints. This agrees with the present Mozarabic, except in the Acts of the Saints, and with the Luxeuil Lectionary, and the Bobbio. The Acts of Saints were used as Mass Lessons in the Ambrosian Rite as late as the twelfth century. According to St. Germanus the second lesson followed immediately on the first, but in the Mozarabic the *Benedicite* and a *Psallendo* (Responsory) come between them. In the Gallican the *Benedicite* and a *Responsorium* followed the Epistle. The Bobbio has a fixed collect, *Post Benedictionem*, which is that which follows *Benedictus es* (Dan., iii) on Ember Saturdays in the Roman Missal.

(4) The Gospel.—This was preceded by a procession *in tribunal analogii*, i. e. to the ambo. The word *Ἀναλόγιον* is still the Byzantine term for the desk from which the Gospel is read. A clerk again sang the "Ajus", and seven lighted candles were carried. The clerks cried out *Gloria tibi, Domine. Sanctus* was sung as they returned. Nothing is said about *Alleluia* preceding the Gospel, nor is there any in the Mozarabic. The Celtic Rite, as shown by the Stowe Missal, included an *Alleluia* at that point, as do most other rites.

(5) Here, according to St. Germanus, followed the Homily.

(6) The Prex.—The passage of St. Germanus is

"Preces vero psallere levitas pro populo ab origine libri Moysaici ducit exordium, ut audita Apostoli prædicatione levitæ pro populo deprecantur et sacerdotes prostrati ante Dominum pro peccatis populi intercedant". Duchesne makes this refer to a Bidding Litany to follow the Homily, but judging from the analogy of the Stowe Mass, which places a litany between the Epistle and Gospel, and of the Mozarabic, which on Sundays in Lent has a very similar litany between the Prophetical Lesson and the Epistle, said by the priest who "prosternat se ad pedem altaris", it might be possible to understand "audita Apostoli prædicatione" to mean "after the Epistle". The Roman Good Friday prayers, however, which are similar in import to this litany, follow the Gospel; and so does the Great Synapte of the Clementine, the Byzantine, and other Eastern rites, which have petitions of the same type, and one of which is probably the original source of this Prex. The Council of Lyons (517) also mentions "orationem plebis quæ post evangelia legeretur". No Gallican text of this litany exists, but it was probably much of the same type as that of the Stowe, which is called "Deprecatio Sancti Martini", and that which takes the place of the "Gloria in Excelsis" in Lent in the Ambrosian. The Prex is followed by a prayer called *Post Precem*.

(7) The Dismissal of the Catechumens.—This is mentioned by St. Germanus as an ancient rite of which the form was still observed. He says, in almost the same words which James of Edessa, speaking of the Syrian Rite, used a century later, that the deacon proclaims "juxta antiquum Ecclesiæ ritum". No mention is made by St. Germanus of penitents, but the Council of Lyons just mentioned gave them permission to remain until after the Prex. In the Stowe Mass, as in the Roman, there is no allusion to catechumens or penitents.

(8) The Great Entrance and Offertory.—It seems appropriate to give the Byzantine name to this ceremony, for, according to St. Germanus's description, it resembled the Great Entrance of that rite rather than anything which is now found in either the Roman or the Mozarabic of to-day, or in the Celtic Rite; and the Procession of the *Vecchioni* at Milan (see AMBROSIAN RITE) is altogether a different matter. First came the closing of the doors. This took place immediately after the Dismissal of the Catechumens in the Liturgy of St. James, and is put at the same point in the description of James of Edessa. In the Byzantine Rite of to-day it comes after the Great Entrance. In the Roman Rite there is no sign of it. St. Germanus gives it a mystical meaning about the gates of the soul, but James of Edessa gives the real origin, the guarding of the mysteries against the heathen. Then the already prepared Elements were brought in, the bread in a vessel shaped like a tower, the mixed wine and water in the chalice. St. Germanus speaks of them as *Corpus Domini* and *Sanguis Christi* (cf. the wording of the Byzantine hymn known as the *Cherubicon*). While this was done the choir sang what St. Germanus calls the *Sonum*. The Mozarabic Missal calls the Responsory which comes at this point the *Lauda*, and the name *Sonus* is given to very similar Responsories sung at Vespers and Lauds. While the Elements were being offered the choir sang the *Laudes*, which included *Alleluia*. This is the Mozarabic *Sacrificium*, the Roman *Offertorium*. St. Isidore gives the latter name to it. The tract in the Irish "Leabhar Breac" speaks of elevating the chalice "quando canitur *Imola Deo sacrificium laudis*", but the Stowe, being a priest's book, is silent about any antiphon here, though the prayers said by the priest are given. In the Stowe Missal the Offertory, which is a good deal Romanized, is preceded by the Creed. In the Ambrosian, as in the Byzantine, the Creed follows the Offertory. In the Gallican of St. Germanus there was as yet no Creed. By the time of

James of Edessa it had got into the Syrian Liturgy, but the Roman did not adopt it till much later (see CREED, LITURGICAL USE OF). The Mozarabic puts it after the Consecration. St. Germanus mentions three veils, the "*palla linostima*" [*linostema* is defined by St. Isidore (Orig., 19, 22) as a material woven of flax and wool] "*corporalis palla*" of pure linen, "*super quam oblatio ponitur*", and a veil of silk adorned with gold and gems with which the oblation was covered. Probably the "*linostima*" covered the chalice, like the modern pall.

(9) The prayer that follows is not mentioned by St. Germanus, but is given in the Gallican books. It is preceded by a Bidding Prayer. The titles of the two are *Præfatio Missæ* and *Collectio* (the usual expression being "*Collectio sequitur*"). They vary with the day, and are found in the Gothicum, Gallicanum, Bobbio, and some of the Reichenau fragments. St. Isidore mentions them as the first two of the prayers of the Mass. In the Mozarabic the Bidding Prayer is called *Missa*, and is followed by "*Agyos, agyos, agyos, Domine Deus Rex æterne tibi laudes et gratias*", sung by the choir, and an invariable invitation to prayer. The variable prayer which follows is called *Alia Oratio*. The "*Missa*" is almost always a Bidding Prayer addressed to the people, while the "*Alia Oratio*" is nearly always addressed to God, but sometimes both are Bidding Prayers and sometimes both are prayers to God.

(10) The Diptychs.—St. Germanus says "*Nomina defunctorum ideo hor illâ recitantur quâ pallium tollitur*". The Gallican books and the Bobbio have variable prayers *Post Nomina*, and the Reichenau fragments have also prayers *Ante Nomina*, which are sometimes Bidding Prayers, as are sometimes the prayers *Post Nomina* in the Gothicum. The form of the Intercession is given in the Stowe, but moved to its Roman positions in the Gelasian Canon. The Mozarabic retains the old position, and has a prayer *Post Nomina*, which St. Isidore calls the third prayer. The position of the Great Intercession at this point exactly is peculiar to the Hispano-Gallican rite, but it comes very near to the Alexandrian position, which is in the middle of the Preface, where a rather awkward break is made for it. The West Syrian and Byzantine Liturgies place the Great Intercession after the Epiklesis, the East Syrian before the Epiklesis, and the Roman and Ambrosian divide it in two, placing the Intercession for the Living before, and that for the Dead after the Consecration, with Commemorations of Saints with each.

(11) The Pax.—St. Germanus mentions that the Kiss of Peace came next, as it does now in the Mozarabic. St. Isidore associates it with the fourth prayer, which in the Gallican and Mozarabic books is called *Ad Pacem*. The Roman Rite, which has completely obliterated all distinction between the *Missa Catechumenorum* and the *Missa Fidelium*, associates this sign of unity, not with the beginning of the latter, but with the Communion, and this position is as old as the letter of St. Innocent I (416) to Decentius of Gubbio. The Ambrosian now follows the Roman, as did the Celtic Rite when the Stowe Missal was written; but the Bobbio retained the collect *Ad Pacem* in its original place, though it was probably not used with the Gelasian Canon.

(12) The Anaphora.—St. Germanus merely mentions the *Sursum Corda*, and says nothing about what follows it. The dialogue was probably in the usual form, though the curious variation in the present Mozarabic Rite makes that somewhat uncertain. Then follows the *Contestatio* or *Immolatio*, called by the Mozarabic books *Illatio*, which is in the Roman Rite the *Præfatio*. St. Isidore calls it the fifth prayer and uses the word *Illatio* for it. The Gallican books, the Bobbio, and the Mozarabic Missal give a variable one for every Mass, and the Gallican books often give



two. The general form is the same as the Roman, perhaps more diffuse in its expressions. Usually the words *Per quem* alone at the end of the proper section indicate the conclusion. The Mozarabic Illations end in varying ways, always of course leading up to the Sanctus.

(13) The Sanctus.—The Gallican wording is not found, but there is no reason to suspect any variations unless the Mozarabic “*gloria majestatis tue*” was also Gallican.

(14) The Post-Sanctus.—This takes up the idea of the Sanctus and amplifies it, leading on to the Recital of the Institution. It generally, but not always, begins with “*Vere Sanctus, vere Benedictus*”. There is a variable Post-Sanctus for every Mass. In the Gallican books this passage ends with some expression, generally simply “*per Christum Dominum nostrum*”, which serves as the antecedent to “*Qui pridie*”, etc. In the Mozarabic the usual ending is “*Ipse Dominus ac Redemptor æternus*”, which also seems to anticipate “*Qui pridie*”; but, owing to the interpolated prayer “*Adesto, adesto Jesu*”, etc., the Recital of the Institution begins a fresh sentence with no relative. All Liturgies except the Roman have some form of Post-Sanctus. Even the Ambrosian has one for Easter Eve, and the Celtic Stowe Missal seems to use one with or without the Roman Canon. The Bobbio, completely Romanized from the Preface onwards, does not include one among its variables. In one Mass in the Gothicum (Easter Eve) the Post-Sanctus (so called by Neale and Forbes) contains a quite definite Epiklesis, but the prayer which follows is called *ad fractionem panis*, so it may be really a Post-Pridie.

(15) The Recital of the Institution.—“*Qui pridie quam pro nostrâ omnium salute pateretur*” is all that exists of the Gallican form, as catchwords, so to speak. This, except that “*et*” comes there before “*omnium*”, is the Ambrosian. The Stowe and Bobbio have the Roman “*Qui pridie quam pateretur*”, etc., but the corrector of the Stowe has added the Ambrosian ending “*passionem meam prædicabitis*”, etc. The Mozarabic, though Post-Pridie is the name of the prayer which follows, has (after an invocatory prayer to our Lord) “*D. N. J. C. in quâ nocte tradebatur*”, etc., following St. Paul’s words in I Cor., xi, in which it agrees with the principal Eastern Liturgies. This is probably a late alteration.

(16) The Post-Pridie, called also *Post Mystrium* and *Post Secreta*, these two being the more usual Gallican names, while *Post-Pridie* is the universal Mozarabic name. This is a variable prayer, usually addressed to Christ or to the Father, but occasionally in the Mozarabic in the form of a Bidding Prayer. The petitions often include something of an oblation, like the *Unde et memores*, and often a more or less definite Epiklesis. Of the eleven Masses in the Reichenau fragment four contain a definite Epiklesis in this prayer, one has a Post-Pridie with no Epiklesis, one is unfinished, but has no Epiklesis as far as it goes, and in the rest this prayer is wanting. In the Gothicum there is generally no Epiklesis, but nine of the Masses there have one of some sort, in some cases vague. In the Mozarabic this prayer is usually only the oblation, though rarely there is an Epiklesis. It is followed there by a fixed prayer resembling the clause *Per quem hæc omnia* in the Roman Canon.

(17) The Fraction.—Of this St. Germanus says only that it takes place, and an antiphon is sung during it. The only rite which now retains this antiphon always is the Ambrosian, where it is called *Confractorium*. The Mozarabic has substituted for it the recitation of the Creed, “*præter in locis in quibus erit antiphona propria ad confractionem panis*”, which is chiefly during Lent, and in votive Masses. In the Stowe there is a long responsory, apparently not variable. No Gallican Confractorium remains. The fraction is

not described, but in the Celtic Rite (q. v.) there was a very complicated fraction, and in the Mozarabic the Sacred Host is divided into nine particles, seven of which are arranged in the form of a cross. The Council of Tours (567) directs that the particles shall be arranged “*non in imaginario ordine sed sub crucis titulo*”, so that it is probable that the Gallican fraction was similarly elaborate. The Stowe Gaelic tract speaks of two fractions, the first into two halves with a re-uniting and a commixture, the second into a number of particles varying with the rank of the day. The “*Leabhar Breac*” tract only mentions the first. Dom L. Gougaud (“*Les rites de la Consécration et de la Fraction dans la Liturgie Celtique*”, in “*Report of the 19th Eucharistic Congress*” (p. 359) conjectures that the first was the Host of the celebrant, the second that for the communicants.

(18) The Pater Noster.—This was preceded by a variable introduction after the plan of *Præceptis salutaribus moniti* and was followed by a variable Embolism. These are entitled in the Gallican books *Ante Orationem Dominicam* and *Post Orationem Dominicam*. In the Mozarabic the introduction *Ad orationem Dominicam* is variable, the Embolism is not.

(19) The Commixture.—Of the manner of this in the Gallican Rite there is no information, nor is there any record of the words used. But see CELTIC RITE. In the Mozarabic the particle *Regnum* (see MOZARABIC RITE) is dipped in the chalice with the words “*Vicit Leo de tribu Juda, radix David, Alleluia. Qui sedes super Cherubim, radix David, Alleluia*”, and the particle is dropped into the chalice, the priest saying “*Sancta sanctis; et conjunctio corporis D.N.J.C. sit sumentibus et potantibus nobis ad veniam et defunctis fidelibus præstetur ad requiem*.”

(20) The Benediction.—This when pronounced by a bishop was a variable formula, sometimes of considerable length. St. Germanus gives a form which was said by priests “*Pax, fides et caritas et communicatio corporis et sanguinis Domini sit semper vobiscum*.” There is a very similar form in the Stowe Missal and in the Ambrosian, but in both these it is connected with the Pax which comes at this point, as in the Roman Rite. In the Mozarabic, the deacon proclaims “*Humiliate vos benedictioni*”. This is alluded to by St. Caesarius of Arles, and is very like τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ κλινόμεν in the Byzantine Rite. Then follows a long variable Benediction of four clauses, pronounced by the priest, the people responding “*Amen*” to each clause. The Gallican Benedictions were of the same type. The practice of a Benediction before Communion continued in France long after the extinction of the Gallican Rite, and survives to this day at Lyons. It was also the practice of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Dom Cabrol (“*Benediction Episcopale*” in “*Report of the 19th Eucharistic Congress*”) considers that the Anglo-Saxon Benedictions were not survivals of Gallican (Celtic) usage, but were derived from the ancient practice of Rome itself, and that the rite was a general one of which traces are found nearly everywhere.

(21) The Communion.—St. Germanus gives no details of this, but mentions the singing of the *Trecanum*. His description of this is not very clear. “*Sic enim prima in secundâ, secundâ in tertiâ, et rursum tertiâ in secundâ rotatur in primâ*.” But he takes the threefold chant as an emblem of the Trinity. The Mozarabic on most days has a fixed anthem, Ps. xxxiii, 8 (9) (*Gustate, et videte*) 1 (2) (*Benedicam Dominum*) and 22 (23) (*Redimet Dominus*), and the Gloria with three Alleluias after each verse. This is called *Ad Accedentes*. In Lent and Easter-tide there are variants. The rather obvious *Gustate et videte* is given also in the Stowe Missal and Bangor Antiphoner, and is mentioned by St. Cyril of Jerusalem. It occurs in certain Eastern Liturgies. In the Mozarabic it is followed by the *Communio* “*Refecti Christi corpore et*

sanguine, te laudamus, Domine, Alleluia" (thrice), with a variant in Lent. This is found also in the Celtic books. Probably it was used in the Gallican also. In the Mozarabic the priest's Communion, with his private devotions, goes on during these anthems. St. Casarius of Arles and the Council of Auxerre (about 578), quoted by Duchesne, allude to the fact that men received the Host in the bare hand, but that women covered the hand with a linen cloth called *dominicalis*, which each brought with her.

(22) The Post-Communion.—This, as given in the Gallican books, is a variable *Præfatio*, or Bidding Prayer, followed by a collect. The former is entitled *Post Communionem*, the latter *Collectio*. The Mozarabic has only a collect, which is variable, but with a smaller selection than the other prayers.

(23) The Dismissal formula of the Gallican Mass is not extant. It may have been like the Stowe "Missa acta est in pace", or one form of Mozarabic "Missa acta est in nomine D.B.J.C., proficiamus cum pace."

It will be seen from the above analysis that the Gallican Mass contained a very small number of fixed elements, so that nearly the whole service was variable according to the day. The absence of an Ordinary is, therefore, of less importance than it would be in, for instance, the Roman or the Ambrosian. The full list of variables, as shown from the Reichenau fragments, the Gothicum, and St. Germanus's description, is:—

(1) The Introit. (2) *Collectio post Prophetiam*. (3) *Lectio Prophetica*. (4) *Lectio Apostolica*. (5) *Responsorium* before the Gospel. (6) Gospel. (7) *Post Precem*. (8) *Sonum*. (9) *Laudes*. (10) *Præfatio Missæ*. (11) *Collectio*. (12) *Ante Nomina*. (13) *Post Nomina*. (14) *Ad Pacem*. (15) *Contestatio or Immolatio*. (16) *Post-Sanctus*. (17) *Post-Pridie*. (18) *Confractorium*. (19) *Ante Orationem Dominicam*. (20) *Post Orationem Dominicam*. (21) *Benedictio*. (22) *Trecanum*? (23) *Communio*? (24) *Post Communionem*. (25) *Collectio or Consummatio Missæ*. Of these nos. 2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25 belong to the priest's part and are therefore found in Sacramentaries; 1, 5, 8, 9, as well as 18, 22, and 23, if these last were variable, belong to the part of the choir, and would be found in Antiphoners, if any such existed; and 3, 4, 6 are found in the Lectionary. No. 12 is only found among the Reichenau fragments, but it is found there in every Mass of which the MS. is not imperfect at that part of the service. Thus the fixed parts of the service would only be: (a.) The three Canticles. (b) The *Ajūs* and *Sanctus*, etc., at the Gospel. (c) The *Præx*. (d) The Dismissal. (e) The priest's prayers at the Offertory. (f) The Great Intercession. (g) The *Pax* formula. (h) The *Sursum Corda* dialogue. (i) The *Sanctus*. (k) The Recital of the Institution. (l) The *Pater Noster*, and possibly the *Confractorium*, *Trecanum* and *Communio*, with probably the priest's devotions at Communion. Most of these are very short, and the only really important passage wanting is the one fixed passage in the Prayer of Consecration, the Recital of the Institution.

VI. THE OCCASIONAL SERVICES.—A. *The Baptismal Service*.—The authorities for the Gallican Baptismal Service are the Gothicum and the Gallicanum, both of which are incomplete, and a few details in the second Letter of St. Germanus of Paris. The forms given in the Stowe and Bobbio are too much Romanized to illustrate the Gallican Rite very much. The form given in the Gothicum is the least complete. It consists of:—

(1) "Ad Christianum faciendum." A Bidding Prayer and collect, with the form of signing on eyes, ears and nostrils.

(2) The Blessing of the Font. A Bidding Prayer, a collect, a *Contestatio* (Preface), the infusion of chrism

in the form of a cross with a triple insufflation, and an exorcism, which here is in an unusual place.

(3) The Baptismal formula "Baptizo te in nomine, . . . in remissionem peccatorum, ut habeas vitam æternam".

(4) The Chrismation. The formula "Perungo te chrisma sanctitatis" seems to have been mixed up with a form for the bestowal of the white garment, for it goes on "tunicam immortalitatis, quam D.N.J.C. traditam a Patre primus accepit ut eam integram et inibatam preferas ante tribunal Christi et vivas in sæcula sæculorum". Probably the omission is " . . . in Nomine", etc., in the one formula; and "Accipe vestem candidam", or possibly "Accipe" alone, in the other. Mgr. Duchesne's suggestion of "a special symbolism, according to which the chrism would be considered as a garment" does not commend itself, for want of a verb to govern "tunicam". Still there is another formula for the white garment farther on.

(5) The Feet-washing. The form here is similar to that in the Gallicanum, the Bobbio, and the Stowe: "Ego te lavo pedes. Sicut D.N.J.C. fecit discipulis suis, tu facias hospitibus et peregrinis ut habeas vitam æternam." This ceremony is only found in Gaul, Spain, and Ireland. At the Council of Elvira in 305 an order was made that it should be performed by clerks and not by priests. This limitation, of which the wording is quite clear, has been unaccountably interpreted to mean that it was then forbidden altogether.

(6) The Vesting with the white garment. This has a form similar to the Roman and Celtic, but not quite the same.

(7) Two final Bidding Prayers with no collect.

The Gallicanum has a much fuller form, with the *Traditio* and *Expositio Symboli*, etc. It is:—

(1) "Ad faciendum Catechumenum." A long and curious exorcism beginning "Adgredior te, immundissime, damnate spiritus". This is only a fragment, and probably the unction and salt came here, as in the Spanish Rite.

(2) "Expositio vel Traditio Symboli." An address, the Creed, a long exposition of it, and a collect. The Creed varies verbally from the Roman form. There is a second "Expositio" later on.

(3) "Expositio Evangeliorum in aurium apertione ad electos." An address followed by a few words of each of the Gospels and an exposition of the emblems of the Evangelists. This is found in the Gelasian Sacramentary.

(4) "Præmissiones ad Scrutamen." A Bidding Prayer and a collect.

(5) "Præfatio Orationis Dominicæ." The tradition and exposition of the Lord's Prayer.

(6) "Missa in symboli traditione." This is imperfect, but agrees nearly, as far as they both go, with a Mass of the same title in the Gothicum.

(7) "Expositio Symboli." This, though on the same lines as the earlier one, differs in wording. It is very incomplete and has probably got into this place by mistake.

(8) "Opus ad Baptizando (sic)." This is preceded by various services for Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter Eve, including the Blessing of the Candle. It begins with a "Præfatio antequam exorcidiatur" and a collect. Then follow the exorcism and blessing of the font, and the infusion of the chrism, this time in the form of three crosses.

(9) The Interrogation. This includes the renunciation of Satan and a confession of faith. The latter has a peculiar form, evidently directed against Arianism:—

"Credis Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum unius esse virtutis? R. Credo."

Credis Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum ejusdem esse potestatis? R. Credo.

Credis Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum

trinæ veritatis una manente substantia Deum esse perfectum? R. Credo."

(10) The Baptismal formula: "Baptizo te credentem in Nomine, etc., ut habeas vitam æternam in sæcula sæculorum."

(11) The Chrismation. The formula is the same as the modern Roman.

(12) The Feet-washing. The words are slightly different from those in the Gothicum, Bobbio, and Stowe, but to the same effect.

(13) The "Post Baptismum". A single prayer (without Bidding Prayer) beginning "Deus ad quem scubias veteris hominis in fonte depositas". It will be seen that there is no giving of the white robe in the Gallicanum, and that the signing of the hand, found in the Celtic Rite (q.v.), is absent from both it and the Gothicum.

The Holy Week ceremonies which are mixed with the Baptismal service in the two books are not very characteristic. The couplets of invitatory and collect which occur in the Roman Good Friday service are given with verbal variations in the Gallicanum, but not in the Gothicum; in both, however, there are other prayers of a similar type and prayers for some of the Hours of Good Friday and Easter Eve. The Blessing of the Paschal Candle consists of a Bidding Prayer and collect (in the Gothicum only), the "Exultet" and its Preface nearly exactly as in the Roman, a "Collectio post benedictionem cerei", and "Collectio post hymnum cerei." There is no ceremony of the New Fire in either.

B. The Ordination services of the Gallican Rite do not occur in any of the avowedly Gallican books, but they are found in the Gelasian Sacramentary and the Missale Francorum, that is to say, a mixed form which does not agree with the more or less contemporary Roman form in the Leonine and Gregorian Sacramentaries, though it contains some Roman prayers, is found in these two books, and it may reasonably be inferred that the differences are of Gallican origin. Moreover, extracts relating to ceremonial are given with them from the *Statuta Ecclesie Antiqua*, formerly attributed to the Fourth Council of Carthage, but now known to be a Gallican decree "promulgated in the province of Arles towards the end of the fifth century" (Duchesne). The ceremonial therein contained agrees with that described in "De Officiis Ecclesiasticis" by St. Isidore of Seville. The forms for minor orders, including subdeacon, were very short, and consisted simply of the delivery of the instruments: keys to porters, books to lectors and exorcists, cruets to acolytes, chalice, paten, basin, ewer and towel to subdeacons, with appropriate words, followed by a Bidding Prayer and collect of the usual Gallican type, the whole being preceded by addresses. These forms, with considerable additions in the case of subdeacons, occur, Bidding Prayers and all, in the Roman Pontifical of to-day. In the ordination of deacons there is a form which is found in the Byzantine Rite, but has not been adopted in the Roman, the recognition by the people, after an address, with the cry of "Dignus est!". This is used for priests and bishops also (cf. 'Αγιος, in the Byzantine ordinations). The Bidding Prayer and collect which follow are both in the present Roman Pontifical, though separated by much additional matter. The ordination of priests was of the same type as that of deacons, with the addition of the anointing of the hands. The address, with a varied end, and the collect (but not the Bidding Prayer), and the anointing of the hands with its formula are in the modern Pontifical, but with very large additions. The consecration of bishops began, after an election, with a presentation and recognition, neither of which is in the modern Pontifical. Then followed a long Bidding Prayer, also not adopted in the Roman Rite, and the Consecrating Prayer *Deus omnium honorum*, part of which is embodied in the Preface in the Leonine

and Gregorian Sacramentaries, and in the present Pontifical. During this prayer two bishops held the Book of the Gospels over the candidate, and all the bishops laid their hands on his head. Then followed the anointing of the hands, but apparently not of the head as in the modern rite, with a formula which is not in the Roman books.

C. The Consecration of a Church does not occur in the recognized Gallican books, and the order of it has to be inferred from later books and from prayers in the Gelasian Sacramentary and Missale Francorum. It would seem, as Mgr. Duchesne shows in his excellent analysis of both rites (*Origines du culte chrétien*), that at a time when the Roman Rite of Consecration was exclusively funerary and contained little else but the deposition of the relics, as is shown in the *Ordines* in the St. Amand MS. (Bibl. Nat. Lat. 974), the Gallican Rite resembled more closely that of the modern Pontifical, which may be presumed to have borrowed from it. The commentary of Remigius of Auxerre (late ninth century), published by Martène, and the Sacramentary of Angoulême (Bibl. Nat. Lat. 816, about 800) which is mixed Gelasian and Gregorian, and the Sacramentary of Gellona (Bibl. Nat. Lat. 12048) are the other authorities from which Duchesne derives his details. The order of the Celtic Consecration given in the Leabhar Breac is very similar (see CELTIC RITE). The order is:

(1) The Entrance of the bishop, with "Tollite portas, principes, vestras", etc., which exhibits the outline of the present rite. (2) The Alphabets, as at present. (3) The Exorcism, Blessing and mixing of water, salt, ashes and wine. (4) The Lustration of the Altar and of the inside of the church. (5) The Consecration Prayers. These are the Prayers "Deus, qui loca nomini tuo" and "Deus sanctificationum, omnipotens dominator", which occur at the same point at present. The latter prayer in the Gallican Rite is worked into a Preface (in the Roman sense of the word). (6) The Anointing of the Altar with chrism, with the five crosses as at present. The Celtic Rite had seven. (7) The anointing of the church with chrism. Nothing is said about crosses on the walls. (8) The Consecration of the Altar, with the burning of a cross of incense thereon, and a Bidding Prayer and collect. (9) The Blessing of linen, vessels, etc. (10) The Translation of the Relics which have been kept in a separate place and a night watch kept over them. This service, which is clearly the modern elaborate consecration in germ, has also many points in common with the 'Ακολουθία εἰς Ἐγκαλῖα Ναοῦ in the Byzantine Euchologion, which is still simpler. The three are evidently three stages of the same service.

MABILLON, *De Liturgia Gallicana* (Paris, 1685); MURATORI, *Liturgia Romana vetus* (Venice, 1748); MARTÈNE, *De Antiquis Ecclesie Ritibus* (Bassano, 1758); NEALE and FORBES, *Ancient Liturgy of the Gallican Church* (Burntisland, 1855-67); H. A. WILSON, *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford, 1894); FELTOE, *Sacramentarium Leonianum* (Cambridge, 1896); DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1902; tr. London, 1904); DELISLE, *Mémoire sur d'anciens Sacramentaires* (Paris, 1886); GERBERT, *Monumenta veteris Liturgie Alemannice* (St. Blaise, 1777); PROBST, *Die abendländische Messe vom fünften bis zum achten Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1896); LUCAS, *The Early Gallican Liturgy in Dublin Review* (July, 1893; Jan., 1894); FEROTIN, *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'Église Wisigothique et Mozarabe* (Paris, 1904); E. BISHOP, *Liturgical Note in KUYERS, The Prayerbook of Althelwald* (Cambridge, 1902); IDEM, *The Earliest Roman Mass-book in Dublin Review* (Oct., 1894); IDEM, *Spanish Symptoms* (in Gallican, Irish, and Roman Service books), in *Journal of Theological Studies* (Oct., 1905); LEATY, articles in *Revue d'hist. et de litt. relig.*: *Rit Roman et Rit Gallican*, II, 93; *Origine et date du Rit Gallican*, II, 173; *Les Livres Gallicans*, II, 188 (1897); W. C. BISHOP, *Primitive Form of consecration of the Holy Eucharist*, in *Church Quarterly* (July, 1908); BÄUMER, *Geschichte des Erzbischofs* (Freiburg, 1895); BATTIFOL, *Histoire du Bréviaire romain* (Paris, 1893; tr. London, 1898); HAMMOND, *Ancient Liturgy of Antioch* (Oxford, 1879); IDEM, *Ancient Liturgies* (Oxford, 1878).

HENRY JENNER.

**Gallicanus, SAINTS.**—The following saints of this name are commemorated on 25 June:—

(1) GALLICANUS, SAINT, Roman Martyr in Egypt, 362-363, under Julian. According to his Acts (in "Acta SS.", June, VII, 31), which are not very reliable, he was a distinguished general in the war against the Persians, was consul with Symmachus, 330 (perhaps also once before with Bassus, 317). After his conversion to Christianity he retired to Ostia, founded a hospital and endowed a church built by Constantine. Under Julian he was banished to Egypt, and lived with the hermits in the desert. A small church was built in his honour in the Trastevere of Rome. His relics are at Rome in the church of Sant' Andrea della Valle. The legend of his conversion was dramatized by Roswitha.

GAMMACK in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; GREINZ in *BUCHBERGER, Kirch. Handlexikon*, s. v.; *Gallikanus*.

(2) GALLICANUS I, SAINT, seventh Bishop of Embrun, was represented at the Fourth Council of Arles in 524, assisted in person at that of Carpentras in 527; perhaps also at the Second Council of Orange in 529, and at the Third Council of Vaison in the same year.

(3) GALLICANUS II, SAINT, ninth Bishop of Embrun, assisted at the Fourth Council of Orléans, 541, and was represented by Probus at the fifth of Orléans. He is said to have consecrated the church of the Spanish martyrs Vincent, Orontius, and Victor, built at Embrun by Palladius. It is probable, however, that Palladius never existed (he is not known except from some hagiographical documents of little value), and that Gallicanus governed the diocese from 518 to 549 and perhaps until 554.

BENNETT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; *Gallia Christiana*, III, 1052; DUCESNE, *Fastes Episcopaux*, I, 291 (Paris, 1907).

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Gallienus, PUBLIUS LICINIUS EGNATIUS, Roman emperor; b. about 218; d. at Milan, 4 March, 268; appointed regent by his father Valerian when the Germans threatened the boundaries of the empire on the Rhine and the Danube. Gallienus took the western half of the empire and his father the eastern portion, in 255. Gallienus was by nature indolent and fond of pleasure. He was cruel to the vanquished, and was unable to repel the attacks of the Frankish invaders of Gaul, but bribed their chieftains to undertake the wardenship of the Rhenish borderline. When the Alemanni burst through the *limes Rhaeticus*, or Rhaetian barrier, and invaded Upper Italy, the senate armed the Roman burgesses for the first time in thirty years and raised a force of troops on its own responsibility. Gallienus defeated the enemy at Milan, but made an alliance with one of the chiefs of the Marcomanni, and gave him Upper Pannonia. He forbade the senators to enter the military service, to have anything to do with the army, and excluded them from the administration of the provinces. In consequence of this decree, the former distinction between imperial and senatorial provinces disappeared. During the wars against the Germans many distinguished Roman officers were proclaimed emperors in the various provinces. The most successful of these was Aurelian, who later became sole emperor. In consequence of the withdrawal of the troops from the eastern boundaries, the countries near the Bosphorus and the Black Sea were laid open to pillage at the hands of the Goths. Simultaneously the Persians under Sapor I swooped down on Asia Minor. Valerian led an army against them, but was betrayed and captured. His servitude lasted until his death in 260.

Gallienus thereupon became sole ruler. A bloody persecution of the Christians broke out in 257-258, instigated by imperial edicts; they were accused of failure to take up arms in defence of the empire from its invaders. Whoever refused to take part in the Roman pagan rites was first exiled, then slain. One of the first victims was St. Cyprian, Bishop of Car-

thage, who was executed 14 September, 258; at Rome Sixtus II and his deacon St. Lawrence suffered martyrdom. After the death of his father, Gallienus granted liberty of worship to the Christians. He recognized as his deputy in the East Odenathus, ruler of the commercial city of Palmyra and energetic conqueror of Sapor I, King of Persia. Afterwards he made him emperor. In the course of the wars against the enemies of the empire, the soldiers at various times proclaimed eighteen of their generals provincial emperors. These men were also called "The Thirty Tyrants". Among them were Postumus in Gaul, and Ingenuus in Pannonia, over whom Gallienus won a partial victory, with the help of Aureolus, the commander-in-chief of the imperial armies. When the troops in Italy acclaimed Aureolus "imperator", he tried to make himself master of Italy and Rome, but was defeated by Gallienus on the Adda and shut up in Milan. Gallienus was assassinated by his officers while this siege was going on.

CLINTON, *Fasti Romani* (Oxford), II; SCHILLER, *Rom. Kaiser-geschichte*; SERCK, *Untergang der Antiken Welt*, II; LINSCHMAYER, *Bekämpfung des Christenthums durch den römischen Staat* (1905), 158 sqq.; ALLARD, *Hist. des Persécutions*; HEALY, *The Valerian Persecution* (New York, s. d.).

KARL HOEBER.

Gallifet, JOSEPH DE, priest; b. near Aix, France, 2 May, 1663; d. at Lyons, 1 Sept., 1749. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of fifteen, and on taking up his studies came under the direction of Father de la Colombière, the confessor of Bl. Margaret Mary Alacoque. It is not surprising that from such a director he should acquire that love of the Sacred Heart which he cultivated with so much fervour as to merit the title of the Apostle of the devotion to the Sacred Heart. While on a mission of charity during his third year of probation at Lyons, he caught a fever which brought him to death's door. So distressed were his brethren at the fear of losing him that a certain father made a vow in his name that, if he were spared, Father de Gallifet would spend his life in the cause of the Sacred Heart. From that time he began to recover. He ratified the vow, and never slackened in his efforts to fulfil it. His superiors realizing his fitness for government advanced him to three successive rectorships—at Vesoul, at Lyons, and at Grenoble. The last-named appointment was followed by the provincialship of the Province of Lyons. In 1723, he was chosen assistant for France, an office which brought him to Rome. Here he found it in his power to work more effectively for the spread of the devotion that was dearest to his heart. Returning from Rome in 1732, he again became rector at Lyons, where he passed his declining years, a model of meekness, humility, and charity. He wrote an admirable book on the Blessed Virgin, and one on the chief virtues of the Christian religion; his greatest work, "De Cultu Sacrosancti Cordis Dei ac Domini Nostri Jesu Christi", appeared in 1726. The main purpose of this book met with much opposition at first, and its well-supported plea for the establishment of a feast of the Sacred Heart was not crowned with victory till 1765. The zealous apostle had in the meantime gone to his reward, though he lived to see the establishment of over 700 confraternities of the Sacred Heart.

DE GALLIFET, *The Adorable Heart of Jesus* (New York, 1899); SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, 111, 1124-31; DE GUILLERMY, *Mémoires de la C. de J.*, *Assistance de France*; NIX, *Cultus SS. Cordis Jesu* (Freiburg, 1891).

JOSEPH H. SMITH.

Gallipoli, DIOCESE OF (GALLIPOLITANA), in the province of Lecce (Southern Italy). The city is built on a high rock in the Gulf of Tarentum and joined to the mainland by a bridge of twelve arches. It is surrounded by a bastioned wall and dominated by a castle; has also an important trade in wine, oil and fish. Drinking-water is brought to the town from the mainland by means of an aqueduct. The harbour is a

natural one, and not particularly safe. It is thought that the place owes its origin to the inhabitants of Gallipoli in Sicily. In 450, it was laid waste by the Vandals; in the days of St. Gregory the Great (590-604) Gallipoli belonged to the Roman Church. During the Norman invasion it resisted stubbornly. Roger I gave it to his brother Bohemund, who had been made Prince of Tarentum; thenceforth the city shared the lot of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

Charles of Anjou besieged it in 1284 and destroyed it, driving the inhabitants from their homes; in 1327 Robert the Good gave them permission to return, within a short time the town again became prosperous. In 1429, the Turks disembarked there. In 1484, the Venetians, in order to force King Ferdinand to withdraw his troops from the pontifical states, blockaded the port with a fleet of 60 vessels. Despite the death of their leader, Giacomo Morello, they overcame the stubborn resistance of the citizens, and sacked the town ruthlessly. It was quickly restored; but in 1496, the Venetians, in revenge for the assistance given to Ferdinand II by the town, took possession of Gallipoli; even the French blockade in 1501 did not succeed in driving them out. In 1509 Gallipoli was given back to the Kingdom of Naples, at that time under Spanish rule. A very remarkable feat of arms occurred in 1528 when 600 Gallipolitans routed an army of 4000 French infantry and 300 cavalry. The last blockade occurred in 1809 when the English attacked the place and were repulsed.

Among its famous citizens are: the painters Giovanni Andrea Coppola, Giovanni Domenico Catalano, Giuseppe Ribera (Spagnuololetto); the sculptor Vespasiano Genuino; the poets Giovanni Coppola, Bishop of Muro, and Onofrio Orlandini; the jurists Tommaso Briganti (1762) and Filippo Briganti (1804); the physician and naturalist Giovanni Presta (1797). The earliest bishop we know of is one Benedict who lived in the days of St. Gregory the Great. The Greek Rite, which was introduced probably in the tenth century, remained in use until the year 1513. Among other bishops are: Melchisedech, present at the Second Council of Nicæa (787); Alessio Calcedonio (1493), one of Bessarion's disciples; Alfonso Herrera (1576), a generous and charitable man; Vincenzo Capece (1595), a man of remarkable holiness; Antonio Perez de la Lastra (1679), philosopher and theologian; Oronzio Filomarino (1701), a renowned theologian. The cathedral, built in 1629, has a famous façade; it is the work of Francesco Bischetini, and Scipione Lachibari. The frescoes of the cupola (martyrdom of St. Agatha) and on the walls are the work of Carlo Malinconico. The see is a suffragan of Otranto; it has 3 parishes and 20,100 souls, a convent of Carmelite nuns, and a founding hospital.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (1870), XXI, 327-31; RAVENNA, *Memorie storiche di Gallipoli* (Naples, 1838); LENORMANT, *La Grande Grèce* (Paris, —).

U. BENIGNI.

**Gallitzin** (or GOLYZIN), ADELE AMALIE, princess; b. at Berlin, 28 Aug., 1748; d. at Angermünde, near Münster, Westphalia, 27 April, 1806. She was the daughter of the Prussian General Count von Schmettau, and educated in the Catholic faith, though she soon became estranged from her religion. In 1768, she married the Russian Prince Dimitry Alexejewitsch Gallitzin, who was under Catharine II ambassador at Paris, Turin and The Hague. In each of these capitals, the princess, thanks to her beauty and her eminent qualities of mind and heart, played a brilliant rôle. At the age of twenty-four she forsook society suddenly and devoted herself to the education of her children. She applied herself assiduously to the study of mathematics, classical philology, and philosophy under the noted philosopher Franz Hemsterhuis, who kindled her enthusiasm for Socratic-Platonic idealism, and later under the name of "Dioekles" dedicated to

her the "Diotima", his famous "Lettres sur l'athéisme". The educational reform introduced by Franz v. Furstenberg, Vicar-General of Münster, induced her to take up her residence in the Westphalian capital. Here she soon became the centre of a set of intellectual men led by Furstenberg. This circle also included the gymnasial teachers, (whom she incited to the deeper study of Plato), Overberg, the reformer of popular school education, Clemens Augustus von Droste-Vischering, Count Leopold von Stolberg, the profound philosopher Hamann, who was interred in her garden. The poet Claudius of the "Wandsbecker Bote" was also a familiar visitor, and Goethe numbered the hours passed by him in this circle among his most pleasant recollections. The reading of Sacred Scripture, necessitated by the religious education of her children, and her constant intercourse with noble Catholic souls, led to her return to positive religious convictions. On 28 Aug., 1786, at the instance of Overberg, she approached the tribunal of penance for the first time in many years. Soon after she made this zealous priest her chaplain. Under his influence, she underwent a complete change which affected all her surroundings. Her religious life took on a larger growth, and produced the most admirable fruit. She became the centre of Catholic activity in Münster. In those revolutionary and godless times, she provided for the spread of religious writings, proved a support for the religious faith of many of her friends, and induced others, among them Count Stolberg, to make their peace with the Church. Her gentle charity assuaged the distress of many, and she readily and generously assisted poor and destitute priests. For extensive circles hers was a model of religious life, and her social activity was for many a providential blessing. Portions of her correspondence and diaries were published by Scheuter (Münster, 1874-76) in three parts. This admirable lady was the mother of the well-known American missionary Prince Demetrius Gallitzin.

KATERKAMP, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus dem Leben der Fürstin Gallitzin* (Münster, 1828); GALLAND, *Die Fürstin A. von Gallitzin und ihre Freunde* (Cologne, 1880).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Gallitzin**, DEMETRIUS AUGUSTINE, prince, priest, and missionary, b. at The Hague, Holland, 22 December, 1770; d. at Loretto, Pennsylvania, U. S. A., 6 May, 1840. He was a scion of one of the oldest, wealthiest, and most illustrious families of Russia. His father, Prince Demetrius Gallitzin (d. 16 March, 1803), Russian ambassador to Holland at the time of his son's birth, had been previously for fourteen years Russian ambassador to France, and was an intimate acquaintance of Diderot, Voltaire, d'Alembert, and other rationalists of the day. Though nominally an Orthodox Russian, he accepted and openly professed the principles of an infidel philosophy. On 28 August, 1768, he married in Aachen the Countess Amalie, only daughter of the then celebrated Prussian Field-Marshal von Schmettau. Her mother, Baroness von Ruffert, being a Catholic, Amalie was baptized in the Catholic Church, but her religious education was neglected, and it was not until 1786 that she became a fervent Catholic, which she remained until her death, 27 April, 1806.

Little attention was paid to the religious education of Demetrius, who was born and baptized in the Greek Orthodox Church. In youth his most constant companion was Frederick William, son of William V, then reigning Stadtholder of the Netherlands. This friendship continued even after Frederick William became King of the Netherlands and Duke of Luxemburg as William I. Almost from his infancy the young prince was subjected to rigid discipline, and his intellectual faculties, trained by the best masters of the age, reached their fullest development. When about seventeen he became a sincere Catholic, and to please his mother, whose birth (1748), marriage (1768), and



First Holy Communion (1786) occurred on 28 August, the feast of St. Augustine, assumed at confirmation that name, and thereafter wrote his name Demetrius Augustine. After finishing his education he was appointed aide-de-camp to the Austrian General von Lillien, but as there was no opportunity for him to continue a military career his parents resolved that he should spend two years in travelling through America,



ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH (1900-01)  
Loretto, Pennsylvania

the West Indies, and other foreign lands. Provided with letters of introduction to Bishop Carroll of Baltimore, and accompanied by his tutor, Father Brosius, afterwards a prominent missionary in the United States, he embarked at Rotterdam, Holland, 18 August, 1792, and landed in Baltimore, 28 October. To avoid the inconvenience and expense of travelling as a Russian prince, he assumed the name of Schmet, or Smith, and for many years was known in the United States as Augustine Smith. Soon after arriving at Baltimore, he was deeply impressed with the needs of the Church in America. He resolved to devote his fortune and life to the salvation of souls in the country of his adoption. Despite the objections of his relatives and friends in Europe, he, with the approval of Bishop Carroll, entered St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, as one of its first students, it having been founded the previous year (1791) by Sulpician priests, refugees from France. On 18 March, 1795, he was ordained priest, being the first to receive in the limits of the original thirteen of the United States all the orders from tonsure to priesthood.

In 1788 Captain Michael McGuire, an officer in the Revolutionary army, purchased about 1200 acres of land near the summit of the Alleghenies, in what is now Cambria County, Pennsylvania, and was the first white man to establish a residence within the limits of that county. He brought his family from Maryland and built his log-cabin in the valley below the site of the present town of Loretto, in the midst of a dense forest which covered all that portion of the State. His nearest neighbours were fully twenty miles distant. Soon relatives and friends followed from Maryland, established themselves in the vicinity, and formed what came to be known far and wide as McGuire's Settlement, later called Clearfield, the lands lying on the headwaters of Clearfield Creek. Some years after his arrival Father Gallitzin named it Loretto, after the city of Loretto in Italy; but it was not until 1816 that he laid out the town and caused the plan of lots to be recorded in the county archives. Captain McGuire died in 1793, bequeathing to Bishop Carroll four hundred acres of his land in trust for the benefit of the resident clergy who, he hoped, would be appointed to provide for the spiritual wants of his grow-

ing colony. He was the first to be buried in the portion of this land set aside for a cemetery, which Father Brosius consecrated on one of his early visits to the settlement.

Father Gallitzin first exercised his ministry at Baltimore and in the scattered missions of southern Pennsylvania and northern Maryland and Virginia. In 1796, while stationed at Conewago, Pennsylvania, he received a sick-call to attend a Mrs. John Burgoon, a Protestant, who lived at McGuire's Settlement, about one hundred and fifty miles distant, and who ardently desired to become a Catholic before her death. Father Gallitzin immediately started on the long journey, instructed Mrs. Burgoon, and received her into the Church. During this visit to the Alleghenies he conceived the idea of forming there a Catholic settlement. In preparation thereof, he invested his means (considerable at that time) in the purchase of land adjoining the four hundred acres donated to the Church, and at the urgent request of the little mountain colony obtained from Bishop Carroll permission to fix his permanent residence there with jurisdiction extending over a territory with a radius of over one hundred miles. In the summer of 1799 he commenced his career as pioneer priest of the Alleghenies. His first care was to erect a church and house of logs, hewn from the immense pine trees of the surrounding forest. In a letter to Bishop Carroll, dated 9 February, 1800, he writes: "Our church, which was only begun in harvest, got finished fit for service the night before Christmas. It is about 44 feet long by 25, built of white pine logs with a very good shingle roof. I kept service in it at Christmas for the first time. There is also a house built for me, 16 feet by 14, besides a little kitchen and a stable." While the church and house were being constructed, he said Mass for the few Catholics of the settlement in the log-house, erected two years previously by Luke McGuire, the elder son of the captain. That house is still standing (1909) and serves as a residence for the descendants, in direct male line, of the founder of McGuire's Settlement. To accommodate the increasing influx of Catholic colonists, Father Gallitzin in 1808 enlarged the log church to almost double its former capacity, and as the population continued to increase, he took down the log building in 1817, and on the same site erected a frame church, forty by thirty feet, which served as the parish church until 1853.



CHAPEL AND HOME OF FATHER GALLITZIN  
Loretto, Pennsylvania

Father Heyden, one of Father Gallitzin's biographers, writes (1869): "What now constitutes the dioceses of Pittsburg, Erie, and a large part of the Harrisburg new episcopal see, was then the missionary field of a single priest, Rev. Prince Gallitzin. If we except the station at Youngstown, Westmoreland County, where the Rev. Mr. Browers had settled a few years before, there was not, from Conewago in Adams County to Lake Erie—from the Susquehanna to the Potomac—a solitary priest, church, or religious estab-

ishment of any kind, when he opened his missionary career. From this statement we may conceive some idea of the incredible privations and toils which he had to encounter in visiting the various widely remote points where some few Catholics happened to reside." As early as 1800, and frequently thereafter, he wrote to Bishop Carroll, begging that one or more priests be sent to share his burdens. And so for more than twenty years he was obliged to perform, unassisted, a work which would have proved onerous for several.

He was not only the good shepherd of his multiplying flock; he was also in a particular manner their worldly benefactor. Following out his idea of establishing a Catholic colony at the place which he named Loretto, and which he made the cradle of Catholicity in Western Pennsylvania, he, by means of remittances from Germany and loans contracted on the strength of his expectations, purchased large portions of land adjoining the settlement, which he sold in small tracts to the incoming colonists at a very low rate and on easy terms. For much of this land he was never repaid. Moreover, he built, at his own expense, saw-mills, grist-mills, and tanneries, and established other industries for the material benefit of his flock. In accomplishing all this he necessarily burdened himself with a heavy personal debt; not imprudently, however, for he had received solemn assurances that he would obtain a portion of his father's large estate, as well as his share of his mother's bequest. The Russian Government, nevertheless, disinherited him for becoming a Catholic and a priest, and the German prince who had married his sister squandered both his and her inheritance. In these circumstances, he was compelled, in 1827, to appeal to the charitable public; the appeal was endorsed by Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who headed the list with a subscription of one hundred dollars; on the list stands the name of Cardinal Cappellari, afterwards Pope Gregory XVI, who subscribed two hundred dollars. Yet it was not until near the close of his life that the burden of debt was finally lifted. During the forty-one years of his pastorate in the Alleghenies, he never received a cent of salary; he maintained himself, his household, and the many orphans whom he sheltered, and abundantly supplied the wants of the needy among his flock out of the produce of his farm, which by his intelligent method of cultivation became very productive. It is estimated that he expended \$150,000 of his inheritance, a small portion of the amount that should rightly have come to him, but an immense sum for the times in which he lived, in the establishment of his Catholic colony on the Alleghenies. For some years (1804-1807) he was rewarded with ingratitude. His actions were misconstrued, his words and writings misinterpreted, his character vilified, his honour attacked, and even violent hands were laid on his person, and all this by members of his own flock. But, with the encouragement of his bishop and the aid of the civil courts, he brought his defamers to acknowledge their guilt, for which they voluntarily and publicly made full reparation before their fellow Catholics in the Loretto church.

For fourteen years after his ordination Father Gallitzin was known to the general public as Augustine Smith. This was the name which he subscribed to all his legal papers and to his entries in the parish register of baptisms and marriages. But, fearing serious difficulties in the future, at his request, on 16 Dec., 1809, the Pennsylvania legislature validated the acts and purchases made under that assumed name, and legalized the resumption of his real name. Notwithstanding his varied labours, Father Gallitzin found time to publish several valuable tracts in favour of the Catholic cause. He was the first in the United States to enter the lists of controversy in defence of the Church; he was provoked thereto by a sermon delivered on Thanksgiving Day, 1814, in Huntingdon, Pennsylvania.

VI.—24

nia, by a certain minister who went out of his way to attack what he called "popery". Repelling this attack, Father Gallitzin first published his "Defense of Catholic Principles", which ran through several editions and was the means of many conversions. This was followed by "A Letter on the Holy Scriptures" and "An Appeal to the Protestant Public".

For twenty years Father Gallitzin had laboured alone in a vast mission whose Catholic population was constantly increasing; in 1834, when Father Lemke was sent to his assistance and was assigned the northern part of Cambria County as his sphere of action, the parish of Loretto was restricted within comparatively narrow limits. In the meantime Father Gallitzin's reputation for sanctity, the fame of his talents, and the account of his labours had spread far and wide; and it was his deep humility as well as his love for his community that prevented his advancement to the honours of the Church. He accepted the office of Vicar-General for Western Pennsylvania, conferred on him by Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia, in 1827, because he felt that in that office he could promote the interests of the Church; but he strongly resisted



MONUMENT OF FATHER GALLITZIN  
Loretto, Pennsylvania

the proposals to nominate him for the position of first Bishop of Cincinnati and first Bishop of Detroit. For many years before his death he lived in the hope of seeing Loretto made an episcopal see, for Loretto was then a flourishing mission and the centre of a constantly increasing Catholic population, while Pittsburg was a small town containing but few Catholics. After forty-one years spent on the rugged heights of the Alleghenies, he died as he had lived, poor. On coming to McGuire's Settlement he found a dense wilderness; he left it dotted with fertile farms. As an evidence of his religious labours in Pennsylvania, it may be stated that within a radius of fifteen miles from the spot on which in 1799 he built his log church there are now no less than twenty-one flourishing parishes, thirty-three priests, and four religious and educational institutions. He was buried, according to his desire, midway between his residence and the church (they were about thirty feet apart); in 1847 his remains were transferred to a vault in a field nearer the town, over which a humble monument was erected out of squared blocks of rough mountain stone. In 1891 his remains were taken from the decayed coffin of cherry wood and placed in a metallic casket; in 1899, on the occasion of the centenary celebration of the foundation of the Loretto Mission, the rude monument was capped by a pedestal of granite, and this in turn by a bronze statue of the prince-priest, donated by Charles M. Schwab, who also built the large stone church, which was solemnly consecrated, 2 Oct., 1901.

LEMKE, *Leben und Wirken* (Münster, 1861); HEYDEN, *Life and Character of Rev. Prince Demetrius A. de Gallitzin* (Baltimore, 1869); BROWNSON, *Life of D. A. Gallitzin, Prince and Priest* (New York, 1872); KITTELL, *Souvenir of Loretto Centenary* (Cresson, Pa., 1899); HART in *Catholic World* (New York, 1895), LXI; MIDDLETON in *Am. Cath. Hist. Mag.* (Philadelphia, 1893), IV; FISS in *U. S. Cath. Hist. Mag.* (New York, 1890), III; HEUSER in *American Catholic Historical Magazine* (Philadelphia, 1895), VI.

FERDINAND KITTELL.

**Galloway, Diocese of (GALLOVIDIANA)**, situated in the south-west of Scotland. It comprises the Counties of Dumfries, Kirkcudbright, and Wigtown, with about four-fifths of the County of Ayr, thus embracing a territory of 3347 square miles and a general population of 373,670, of which Catholics form only a small fraction. From an historical point of view, a singular interest attaches to this diocese since it is certainly the most ancient ecclesiastical foundation in Scotland, its founder and first bishop, St. Ninian, being "the first authentic personage that meets us in the succession of Scottish missionaries" (Bellesheim). This illustrious saint, a Briton, born on the Solway shore, educated at Rome and consecrated bishop by St. Siricius, founded his episcopal see at *Whithorn* and dedicated his cathedral to St. Martin of Tours, in 397; and, having evangelized the country as far north as the Grampian mountains, died about 432. The dates here given are on the authority of the majority of Scottish writers.

The original title of the see was "Whitherne" (Quthierne), latinized "Witerna" and (more frequently) "Candida Casa", signifying the White House, so called, St. Bede tells us, from the structure and appearance of the church erected by St. Ninian "in a style unusual among the Britons". At what precise date the territorial title of "Galloway" came into use is not quite clear. It is obviously improbable that the area of the diocese was at all defined in St. Ninian's time, but from the eighth till the end of the sixteenth century it was limited to the district of Galloway, i. e., the two Counties of Kirkcudbright and Wigtown. The succession of bishops in this see was three times interrupted in the course of its history, for periods averaging three hundred years' duration each. The last Catholic bishop in the sixteenth century, Andrew Durie, died in 1558, and the see was vacant three hundred and twenty years.

It was restored, for the third time, by Leo XIII in 1878, and the Right Rev. John McLachlan, D.D., Vicar-General of the Western Vicariate of Scotland, was appointed the first bishop. From the extent of territory it would be perhaps more accurately described as a new diocese, for it was formed out of two outlying portions of the former eastern and western vicariates and has more than double the area it had at either previous restoration. The Catholic population, small in number and thinly dispersed over the whole territory, belonged chiefly to the poorer labouring class and, excepting the larger burghs, such as Ayr, Dumfries, and Kilmarnock, was very inadequately provided for in respect of ordinary religious and educational needs. But the new bishop was a man of great energy and zeal, with a wide missionary and administrative experience, and in a comparatively short time he not only thoroughly organized the diocese but also furnished it abundantly with churches, schools, presbyteries, and an efficient clergy. While engaged in this great work he received generous encouragement and support from many of the wealthier members of his flock, e. g., the third Marquess of Bute; Rev. Sir David Oswald Hunter-Blair, Baronet; Captain R. D. Barre Cunningham, and others. Bishop McLachlan died 16 Jan., 1893, and was succeeded by the Right Rev. William Turner, the present bishop; b. at Aberdeen, 12 Dec., 1844; cons. 25 July, 1893. The diocesan statistics for 1908 show a Catholic population of 17,625 souls, 21 missions, 41 churches or chapels, 30 priests in active work, 28 elementary schools, 10 religious communities (all since 1878), and various educational and charitable institutions. The diocese was a suffragan of York (England) previous to 1472; from that date until 1492 it was subject to St. Andrews; and from then until the extinction of the ancient hierarchy it was transferred to Glasgow. It is now a suffragan of the new Archbishopric of St. Andrews and Edinburgh.

BELLESHEIM, *Hist. of Cath. Church in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1800); FORBES, *Lives of St. Ninian and St. Kentigern* (Edinburgh, 1874); KEITH, *Catalogue of Scottish Bishops* (Edinburgh, 1824); WALCOTT, *Ancient Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1874); SKENE, *Celtic Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1887); MAXWELL, *Dumfries and Galloway* (Edinburgh, 1896); McKERLIE, *Lands and Owners in Galloway* (Paisley, 1906); *The Catholic Directory of Scotland for 1878 and 1908*; *The Catholic Church of Scotland, Statistics* (Glasgow, 1878).

WILLIAM TURNER.

**Galluppi, PASQUALE**, philosopher, b. at Tropea, in Calabria, 2 April, 1770; d. at Naples, 13 Dec., 1846, where from 1831 he was a professor in the university. His principal works are "Saggio filosofico sulla critica della conoscenza umana", 4 vols.; "Lettere sulle vicende della filosofia da Cartesio a Kant"; "Elementi di Filosofia"; "Lezioni di Logica e Metafisica"; "Filosofia della volontà"; "Considerazioni filosofiche sull' idealismo trascendentale". Of his "Storia della Filosofia" he completed only the first volume. His philosophy is a mixture of assent to and dissent from Descartes, the French and English sensists, Kant, and the Scottish school of Reid. Cartesianism tempered by the modifications introduced into it by Leibniz, Wolf, and Genovesi, was the system in which Galluppi's mind was trained. The problem of human knowledge was his chief preoccupation. He maintained the objective reality of our knowledge, which he based on the testimony of consciousness, making us aware not only of our internal experience, but also of the external causes to which it is due. This theory was aimed at Kant, though Galluppi agreed with him that space and time are a priori forms in the mind. Against the sensists, he denied that the mind was merely passive or receptive, and held that like a builder it arranged and ordered the materials supplied it, deducing therefrom new truths which sensation alone could never reach. He threw no light, however, on the difference between sensory and intellectual knowledge. This was the great weakness of his argument against the Scottish school, that the soul perceives not only its own affections or the qualities of bodies, but also its own substance and that of things outside itself. It was also natural that Galluppi should be foremost in attacking the theories of Rosmini concerning the idea of God as the first object of our knowledge: and it was this polemic (quiet enough in itself) which drew public attention to the Roveretan philosopher.

The morality of our actions, according to Galluppi, depends on the notion of duty which springs from the very nature of man. He never made use of the phrase "categorical imperative", but everything goes to show that on that point he did not completely escape Kant's influence: and although he asserted as the two great moral commandments "Be just" and "Be beneficent", he none the less approved of Kant's moral principle. Hence we do not find in him any hint as to the connexion between the moral law and God, beyond the statement that God must reward virtue and punish vice. Against the Scottish school, on the other hand, he denied that morality depends on the feelings. His theodicy is well within the limits of that of Leibniz, and therefore admits not only the possibility of revelation, but also the divinity of Christianity. The care and clearness of his style made his works very popular; but when the Hegelianism of the Neapolitan school became the fashion in non-Catholic circles of thought, and Scholasticism regained its hold among Catholics, Galluppi's philosophy quickly lost ground. He always kept aloof from political questions; and his works were planned and written in his own home, amidst the noise and bustle of a large and happy family.

WERNER, *Kant in Italien, 1880* (Naples, 1897).

U. BENIGNI.

**Gallwey, PETER**; b. at Killarney, 13 Nov., 1820; d. in London, 23 Sept., 1906; one of the best-known

London priests in his time. He was educated at Stonyhurst, joined the Society of Jesus at Hodder, 7 Sept., 1836, was ordained priest in 1852, and professed of four vows in 1854. As prefect of studies at Stonyhurst, 1855-57, he made important improvements in the methods of study. In 1857 he was sent to the Jesuit church in London, where—except for an interval of eight years during which he held the provincialate and other offices—he spent the remainder of his life. He was a man of deep spirituality, much venerated as a preacher, spiritual director, and giver of retreats; he was also noted for his love of the poor and his earnest advocacy of almsdeeds. So great were his energy and enterprise that he set his stamp on all he undertook. Several London convents and Catholic institutions owe largely to his zeal and encouragement both their first foundation and their successful subsequent development. His writings comprise among others: "Salvage from the Wreck", sermons preached at the funerals of some notable Catholics (1890); "Watches of the Passion" (3 vols., 1894), a series of meditations on the Passion, embodying the substance of his retreats; a number of sermons, tracts, and other small publications, mostly of a topical kind.

No life of Father Gallwey has so far been written, except a slight sketch by PERCY FITZGERALD (London, 1906).

SYDNEY F. SMITH.

**Galtelli-Nuoro**, DIOCESE OF (GALTELLINENSIS-NORENSIS), in the province of Sassari (Sardinia), on a hill of the same name, suffragan of Cagliari. In the neighbourhood there are quarries of red jasper. The ancient cathedral contains some good paintings. Nuoro, the Nora of the ancients, is a sub-prefecture of the same province, and stands about 2000 feet above sea-level. Near it are seen large quarries of granite and argentiferous lead, and a curious irregular ruin, apparently of early Roman origin. In the vicinity are twenty-four of the so-called *Nuraghi* (known locally as the Giants' Tombs), huge stone buildings in the shape of truncated cones. These belong to the neolithic age, and were a source of wonder even to the ancients. Here also are the *Virghenes* or *Domos de Janas*, a series of intercommunicating rooms excavated out of the granite rock. Galtelli was an episcopal see in 1138, when Innocent II made it a suffragan of Pisa; later, it was directly subject to the Holy See. In 1495, it was suppressed by Alexander VI, and its territory united to Cagliari. In 1787, at the request of King Victor Emmanuel III, it was re-established, but the bishop continued to live at Nuoro. Among its bishops of note was Fra Arnolfo de Bissalis (1366), renowned for his learning and eloquence. In the diocese are 25 parishes, 56,300 Catholics, 1 Franciscan monastery, 2 nunneries, 1 boys' boarding-school, and 3 girls' schools.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (1857), XIII, 95-99; SPANO, *Memorie sopra l'antica cattedrale di Galtelli* (Cagliari, 1873); MARTIN, *Storia eccl. della Sardegna* (1841), III, 325-27, 85-88.

U. BENIGNI.

**Galura**, BERNHARD, Prince-Bishop of Brixen; b. 21 August, 1764, at Herbolzheim, Breisgau; d. 17 May, 1856. After he had completed his classical studies in his native town he entered the convent of the Friars Minor at Altbreisach, but because of its suppression by Emperor Joseph II, his stay here was of short duration. In 1783 he entered the seminary of Freiburg where, after a brilliant course in the ecclesiastical sciences, he was honoured with the doctorate of theology. He was ordained priest in 1788 in the seminary of Vienna whither he had gone to follow a course of practical theology. In the same year he returned to the seminary of Freiburg, and after acting as prefect of studies for two years he took up parochial work, first at Altoberndorf and later in the cathedral of Freiburg. Recognizing in him a man of learning and sound judgment, Emperor Francis appointed him

in 1805 spiritual referee at Gunzburg, but owing to political changes he lost his position here, and ten years later was assigned to the same duty at Innsbruck. In 1819 he became Vicar-General of Vorarlberg. On 30 January, 1820, he was consecrated auxiliary bishop of Brixen, and nine years later took formal possession of the chair of St. Cassian as Bishop of Brixen.

Like his distinguished predecessors, Galura directed all his efforts towards safeguarding the unity of the Faith in his diocese. By the establishment of missions and educational institutions and by the introduction of religious orders, especially the Jesuits (who had been banished from there) and the Sisters of Mercy (in 1838), he succeeded in restoring much of what the secular power had destroyed during the administration of his predecessor. He was highly respected by the civil authorities, and his deeply religious spirit, his charity towards the poor, and his administrative abilities have made him an ornament to his church and country. Besides numerous ascetical, homiletical, and catechetical works, he wrote also: (1) "Christkatholische Religion" (5 vols., Augsburg, 1796-1800); (2) "Neue Theologie des Christenthums" (Augsburg, 1800-1805); (3) "Lehrbuch der Christlichen Wohlgezogenheit" (Augsburg, 1841).

HUTTER, *Nomencl.* (2nd ed.), III, 922; TRINKHAUSER, *Leben und Wirken des Fürstb. Galura* (Innsbruck, 1856); FELDER, *Literaturzt.* (1810), I, 118-32.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

**Galvani**, LUIGI, physician, b. at Bologna, Italy, 9 September, 1737; d. there, 4 December, 1798. It was his original intention to study theology and to enter a monastic order.

His family, however, persuaded him to abandon that idea. He took up the study of the natural sciences from the point of view of the anatomist and physiologist. After maintaining his thesis on the nature and formation of the bones, he was appointed public lecturer at the University of Bologna and at the age of twenty-five taught anatomy at the Institute of Sciences.



LUIGI GALVANI

He became especially noted as a surgeon and accoucheur. In 1790, after thirty years of wedded life, he lost his wife Lucia, the daughter of Dr. Galeazzi, one of his teachers. He kept his chair at the university until 20 April, 1798, when he resigned because he would not take the civil oath demanded by the Cisalpine Republic, it being contrary to his political and religious convictions. As a result he had to take refuge with his brother Giacomo and broke down completely through poverty and discouragement. Soon after this his friends obtained his exemption from the oath and his appointment, on account of his scientific fame, as professor emeritus. He died before the decree went into effect.

Galvani's work in comparative anatomy and physiology includes a study of the kidneys of birds and of their sense of hearing. He is famous more especially on account of his experiments concerning "the electrical forces in muscular movements", leading up to his theory of animal electricity. This began with the accidental observation, in 1780, of the twitching of the legs of a dissected frog when the bared crural nerve

was touched with the steel scalpel, while sparks were passing from an electric machine nearby. He worked diligently along these lines, but waited for eleven years before he published the results and his ingenious and simple theory. This theory of a nervous electric fluid, secreted by the brain, conducted by the nerves, and stored in the muscles, has been abandoned by scientists on account of later discoveries, but Galvani was led to it in a very logical manner and defended it by clever experiments, which soon bore fruit. Thus he discovered that when nerve and muscle touch two dissimilar metals in contact with each other, a contraction of the muscle takes place; this led ultimately to his discussions with Volta and to the discovery of the Voltaic pile. The name Galvanism is given to the manifestations of current electricity.

Galvani was by nature courageous and religious. It is reported by Alibert that he never ended his lessons "without exhorting his hearers and leading them back to the idea of that eternal Providence, which develops, conserves, and circulates life among so many divers beings". His works (*Opere di Luigi Galvani*) were collected and published by the Academy of Sciences of the Institute of Bologna (1841-42). The following are some of the titles, with the original dates of publication in the "Antichi Commentari" of the Bologna Institute: "Thesis: De Ossibus" (1762); "De Renibus atque Ureteribus Volatiliis" (1767); "De Volatiliis Aure" (1768-70); "De Viribus Electricitatis in motu musculari commentarius" (1791), reprinted at Modena, 1792, with a note and dissertation by Gio. Aldini; translated by Mayer into German (Prague, 1793), and again published as a volume of Ostwald's "Klassiker" (Leipzig, 1894); "Dell' uso e dell' attivita dell' arco conduttore nelle contrazioni de' muscoli" (1794); "Memorie sulla elettricit  animale" (1797).

*Popular Science Monthly*, July, 1892; WALSH in *Catholic World* (June, 1904); ALIBERT, *Eloges Historiques* (Paris, 1806); VENTUROLI, *Elogio* (Bologna, 1802).

WILLIAM FOX.

**Galveston, DIOCESE OF (GALVESTONIENSIS).**—It was established in 1847 and comprises that part of the State of Texas, U. S. A., between the Sabine River on the east, the Colorado River on the west, the Gulf of Mexico on the south, and the northern line of the counties of Lampasas, Coryell, McLennan, Limestone, Freestone, Anderson, Cherokee, Nacogdoches, and Shelly on the north, an area of 43,000 square miles. French Recollects with La Salle attempted in 1685 to found the first missions among the Indians in Texas, and they were followed by Spanish Franciscans from Mexico sent in 1689 to build a barrier to French occupation. These efforts met with reverses, but early in the eighteenth century the missionary zeal of the Franciscans re-established many of the old missions and extended them in numerous new directions. They remained in a flourishing state until 1812 when they were suppressed by the Spanish Government. The colonization of Texas from the United States and the declaration of its independence as a republic in 1836 checked any further efforts to reopen the missions for several years, and then the Rev. John Timon, afterwards Bishop of Buffalo (q. v.), and the Rev. John M. Odin, two Lazarists from the community in Missouri, visited the state and aroused the long-neglected religious sentiments of the people. Measures were taken for the promotion of Catholic immigration and the public officials of the new republic gave every encouragement to their work. In 1841 Father Odin was named Coadjutor Bishop of Detroit, but refused the Bulls. Texas was then made a vicariate Apostolic and Father Odin was consecrated titular Bishop of Claudiopolis, 6 March, 1842. There were then only four priests in Texas. Bishop Odin set to work vigorously to build up his charge. The Texan Congress returned several of the ancient churches to their origi-

nal uses, schools were opened, and the Ursuline nuns, the first religious community in Texas, were introduced to care for them. In 1847 the pope erected the state into a bishopric with Galveston as its episcopal see and Bishop Odin was transferred to its charge. In addition to the Ursulines he secured the services of communities of the Sisters of the Incarnate Word, the Brothers of Mary, and the Oblates, to the latter of whom he gave charge, in November, 1854, of the College of the Immaculate Conception. He visited Europe twice to secure priests and material help for his diocese. On the death of Archbishop Blanc of New Orleans, Bishop Odin was promoted, 15 Feb., 1861, to be his successor. During his incumbency of the See of Galveston he increased the number of priests to forty-two and the churches to fifty, and left the diocese with a college, four academies for girls and five schools for boys. He was born at Ambierle, France, 25 Feb., 1801, and died there, 25 May, 1870.

Claude Mary Dubuis, C.S.C., an indefatigable missionary, who had served long and unselfishly for the Church in Texas, was his successor. He was born 10 March, 1817, at Coutouvre, Loire, France, and ordained priest at Lyons, 1 June, 1844, where he was also consecrated bishop, 23 November, 1862. After years of hardships in Texas he resigned, 12 July, 1881, but kept the title of Bishop of Galveston, and retired to France. Here he lived at Vernaison in the Diocese of Lyons, receiving in 1894 promotion to the titular Archbishopric of Arca. He assisted the ordinary of Lyons in episcopal work until his death, which took place 22 May, 1895. Peter Duful, C.S.C., had been named coadjutor to Bishop Dubuis with the right of succession on 14 May, 1878. He was then Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Bengal and titular Bishop of Delous, having been consecrated at Le Mans, France, 25 November, 1860. He was born 8 Nov., 1822, at Lamure, Puy-de-D me, France, and ordained priest in the Diocese of Blois, 8 Sept., 1852. On translation to Galveston he retained his titular see; he resigned the Texas diocese on account of ill health, 18 April, 1880, and retired to the house of his Congregation of the Holy Cross at Neuilly, near Paris, France, where he died in 1889. Nicholas Aloysius Gallagher, fourth bishop, was appointed administrator of Galveston in the absence of Bishop Duful, having been consecrated at Galveston, 30 April, 1882, titular of Canopus. In 1894 he succeeded to the title of Galveston. He also acted as administrator of Columbus, Ohio, on the death of Bishop Rosecrans in 1878. Born 19 Feb., 1846, at Temperanceville, Belmont County, Ohio, he was ordained priest, 25 Dec., 1868, at Columbus, Ohio.

The religious communities of men represented in the diocese are: the Jesuits who have charge of St. Mary's University, Galveston; the Basilians (from Canada) managing St. Thomas's College, Houston, St. Mary's Seminary, La Porte, and St. Basil's College, Waco; the Fathers of the Congregation of the Holy Cross at Austin; the Paulist Fathers at Austin.

The religious communities of women are: Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word; Sisters of Charity (Emmitsburg); Sisters of St. Dominic; Sisters of the Holy Cross; Sisters of St. Mary; Sisters of Divine Providence; Ursuline Sisters; Sisters of the Holy Family. Statistics (1909): Priests 82 (53 seculars, 29 religious); churches 82 (missions with churches 35); stations 35; chapels 16; brothers 6; women religious 375; ecclesiastical students 12; colleges for boys 4, students 375; academies for girls 9; parochial schools 32; pupils in academies and parish schools 5000; hospitals 7; Catholic population 56,000.

SREA, *History of Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1894); IDEM, *Hist. Cath. Missions* (New York, 1855); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. Cath. Hierarchy of United States* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory*, 1909; *Freeman's Journal* (New York), *Morning Star* (New Orleans, June, 1870), files.


THOMAS F. MEEHAN.



**Galway and Kilmacduagh**, DIOCESE OF (GALVIENSIS ET DUACENSIS), in Ireland; an amalgamation of two distinct ancient sees; excepting the parish of Shrule (County Mayo) entirely in County Galway. Kilmacduagh, covering 137,520 acres, includes the whole Barony of Kiltartan, and part of Dunkellin and Loughrea. Galway diocese includes the barony of Galway and part of Moycullen and Clare. Its extent is less than Kilmacduagh, the united dioceses covering about 250,000 acres. Kilmacduagh coincides with the ancient territory of Hy Fiachrach Aidhne. On Ptolemy's map the district was called the country of the Gangani; later it was occupied by the Firbolg; and in the sixth century by the descendants of Fiachrach, brother of Niall of the Nine Hostages and uncle of Dathi. The time of its conversion to Christianity is uncertain. Probably it was Christian before the end of the sixth century, and it is certain that St. Colman was its first bishop. A near relative of King Guaire of Connaught, and a native of Kiltartan, he was born after the middle of the sixth century and educated at Arran, after which he lived for years a hermit's life in the Burren mountains. Drawn from his retreat by the persuasions of his friends, he founded a monastery at Kilmacduagh (610), becoming its abbot, and subsequently bishop of the whole Hy Fiachrach territory. He died in 632, and was buried at Kilmacduagh. In the five centuries following, the annalists make mention of only three bishops of Kilmacduagh. At the Synod of Kells, the diocese was made a suffragan of Tuam. Among its subsequent bishops we find men with the distinctively Irish names of O'Ruan, O'Shaughnessy, O'Murray, O'Felan, O'Brien, and O'Moloney. In the reign of Henry VIII the bishop was Christopher Bodkin, a time-server who earned the goodwill of Henry and of Elizabeth, and who through royal favour was promoted to the See of Tuam. Persecution had to be faced by his successors. One of these, Hugh De Burgo, was a prominent figure in the Confederation of Kilkenny (1642-50), and a prominent opponent of the Nuncio Rinuccini; when the war ended in the triumph of Cromwell, exile was his fate, imprisonment or death the fate of the priests, and confiscation that of the Catholic landholders. After 1653 the See of Kilmacduagh was ruled by vicars, but after 1720 the episcopal succession was regularly maintained. In 1750 Kilmacduagh was united with the smaller Diocese of Kilfenora, the latter situated entirely in County Clare, and corresponding in extent with the Barony of Corcomroe. This union has continued. At first the Bishop of Kilmacduagh was Apostolic Administrator of Kilfenora, his successor Bishop of Kilfenora and Apostolic Administrator of Kilmacduagh, and so on alternately.

Contemporary with the monastery of Kilmacduagh was that of Annaghdown, on Lough Corrib, founded in the second half of the sixth century by St. Brendan. In process of time, Annaghdown became an episcopal see extending over the territory ruled by the O'Flahertys. In this district was the town of Galway. Placed where the waters of the Corrib mingle with the sea, it was at first but a fishing village. In the ninth century it was destroyed by the Danes; subsequently it was rebuilt and protected by a strong castle; in the twelfth century again destroyed by the King of Munster; and towards the end of that century wrested from the O'Flahertys by the powerful Anglo-Norman family of De Burgo. Other Anglo-Norman families also settled there, these in process of time being called the Tribes of Galway. Loyal to England and despising the old Irish, whom they drove out, the settlers made progress, and Galway in the first half of the seventeenth century, with its guilds of merchants, its mayor, sheriff, and free burgesses, was in trade, commerce, and wealth little inferior to Dublin itself. The Diocese of Annaghdown was joined to Tuam in

1324, and Galway town became in consequence part of the latter diocese. But the Galway men, regarding the surrounding people as little better than savages, were reluctant to be associated with them, and in 1484 obtained from the Archbishop of Tuam exemption from his jurisdiction. The arrangement, sanctioned by a Bull of Innocent VIII, was to have the church of St. Nicholas, at Galway, a collegiate church, governed by a warden and eight vicars; these having jurisdiction over the whole town, as well as over a few parishes in the neighbourhood. And warden and vicars "were to be presented and solely elected by the inhabitants of the town". It was a peculiar arrangement. The warden exercised episcopal jurisdiction, appointed to parishes, visited the religious institutions, but did not, of course, confer orders. The eight vicars resembled somewhat the canons of a cathedral church. In 1485 Galway obtained a new royal charter subjecting the town to a mayor, bailiffs, and corporation. In 1551 the warden and vicars were dispossessed of their church and lands, which were given to a lay warden and vicars, all Protestants. Just a century later the Catholics were driven from the



RUINS OF ST. FACHNAN'S CATHEDRAL, KILFENORA

town by the Cromwellians. Gradually they came back, and having been tolerated during the reign of Charles II and favoured under his successor, James II, had again to face persecution during the penal times. In 1731 the town contained about 5000 inhabitants. In 1747 the Protestant governor complained of the insolence of the Catholics, and of the number of priests coming there from abroad; in 1762 out of its 14,000 inhabitants all were Catholics except 350.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were frequent disputes between the warden and the Archbishop of Tuam as to the latter's rights in Galway. There were troubles also attending the election of the warden and vicars. Driven from the corporation, the Catholics had no legally existing free burgesses, and had been compelled to meet by stealth, and constitute a mayor and corporation, so as to have the necessary electoral body. But the Galway Tribes insisted on keeping the wardenship in their own hands. When the repeal of the penal laws allowed a Catholic corporation to come into existence, in 1793, the inhabitants insisted on exercising their right to vote, and conflicts with the Tribes arose. These disputes were finally ended in 1831 by the extinction of the wardenship and the erection of Galway into an episcopal see. In 1866 the Bishop of Kilmacduagh being unable to discharge his duties, the Bishop of Galway was appointed Apostolic Administrator of Kilmacduagh and Kilfenora, "*durante beneplacito Sanctæ Sedis*". In 1883 the union of the three dioceses was made permanent by papal Bull. Since that date the bishop is "Bishop of Galway and Kilmacduagh and Apostolic Administrator of Kilfenora". Among those connected with the diocese several have acquired fame,

St. Ceallagh, who died about 550, is still venerated in Kilehris, St. Sourney in Ballindereen, St. Foila in Clarenbridge, St. Colga in Kilcolgan. In the ninth century lived Flan MacLonan, chief poet of Ireland. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries lived John Lynch, author of "Cambrensis Eversus"; O'Flaherty, author of the "Oggia"; Dr. Kirwan, Bishop of Killala; MacFibbis, the annalist; Dr. Fahy, whose history has become a standard work; Dr. O'Dea, Bishop of Clonfert, and others.

Statistics (1909): parish priests, 29; administrator, 1; curates, 29; regulars, 20; churches, 53; houses of regulars, 4; convents, 10; college, 1; monasteries, 3; Catholic population in 1901, 70,576; non-Catholic, 1931.

HARDIMAN, *History of Galway* (Dublin, 1820); FAHY, *History and Antiquities of Kilmacduagh* (Dublin, 1894); O'FLAHERTY, *Description of Iar Connaught* (Dublin, 1848); BRADY, *Episcopal Succession* (Rome, 1876); *Irish Catholic Directory for 1909*.  
E. A. D'ALTON.

**Gama**, VASCO DA, the discoverer of the sea route to the East Indies; b. at Sines, Province of Alemtejo, Portugal, about 1469; d. at Cochin, India, 24 Dec., 1524. His father, Estevão da Gama, was Alcaide Mór of Sines, and Commandador of Cercial, and held an important office at court under Alfonso V. After the return of Bartolomeu Dias, Estevão was chosen by João II to command the next expedition of discovery, but, as both died before the project could be carried into execution, the commission was given by Emanuel I to Vasco, who had already distinguished himself at the beginning of the year 1490 by defending the Portuguese colonies on the coast of Guinea against French encroachments. Bartolomeu Dias had proceeded as far as the Great Fish River (Rio do Infante), and had in addition established the fact that the coast of Africa on the other side of the Cape extended to the north-east. Pedro de Covilhão on his way from India had descended the east coast of Africa as far as the twentieth degree of south latitude, and had become cognizant of the old Arabic-Indian commercial association. The nautical problem, therefore, to be solved by Vasco da Gama was clearly outlined, and the course for the sea route to the East Indies designated. In January, 1497, the command of the expedition was solemnly conferred upon Vasco da Gama, and on 8 July, 1497, the fleet sailed from Lisbon under the leadership of Vasco, his brother Paulo, and Nicoláo Coelho, with a crew of about one hundred and fifty men. At the beginning of November, they anchored in St. Helena Bay and, on the 25th of the same month, in Mossel Bay. On 16 December, the fleet arrived at the furthest landing-point of Dias, gave its present name to the coast of Natal on Christmas Day, and reached by the end of January, 1498, the mouth of the Zambesi, which was in the territory controlled by the Arabian maritime commercial association. Menaced by the Arabs in Mozambique (2 March) and Mombasa (7 April), who feared for their commerce, and, on the contrary, received in a friendly manner at Melinda, East Africa (14 April), they reached under the guidance of a pilot on 20 May, their journey's end, the harbour of Calicut, India, which, from the fourteenth century, had been the principal market for trade in spices, precious stones, and pearls. Here also, as elsewhere, Gama skillfully surmounted the difficulties placed in his way by the Arabs, in league with the Indian rulers, and won for his country the respect needful for the founding of a new colony.

On 5 October, 1498, the fleet began its homeward voyage. Coelho arrived in Portugal on 10 July, 1499; Paulo da Gama died at Angra; Vasco reached Lisbon in September, where a brilliant reception awaited him. He was appointed to the newly created post of Admiral of the Indian Ocean, which carried with it a high salary, and the feudal rights over Sines were assured to him. In 1502 Gama was again sent out, with his uncle Vicente Sodré and his nephew Estevão, and a

new fleet of twenty ships, to safeguard the interests of the commercial enterprises established in the meantime in India by Cabral, and of the Portuguese who had settled there. On the outward voyage he visited Sofala (East Africa), exacted the payment of tribute from the Sheikh of Kilwa (E. Africa), and proceeded with unscrupulous might, and even indeed with great cruelty, against the Arabian merchant ships and the Samudrin (or Zamorin) of Calicut. He laid siege to the city, annihilated a fleet of twenty-nine warships, and concluded favourable treaties and alliances with the native princes. His commercial success was especially brilliant, the value of the merchandise which he brought with him amounting to more than a million in gold. Again high honours fell to his share, and in the year 1519 he received instead of Sines, which was transferred to the Order of Santiago, the cities of Vidigueira and Villa dos Frades, resigned by the Duke Dom Jayme of Braganza, with jurisdiction and the title of count. Once again, in 1524, he was sent to India by the Crown, under João III, to supersede the Viceroy Eduardo de Menezes, who was no longer master of the situation. He re-established order, but at the end of the year he was stricken by death at Cochin. In 1539, his remains, which up to that time had lain in the Franciscan church there, were brought to Portugal and interred at Vidigueira. To commemorate the first voyage to India, the celebrated convent of the Hieronymites in Belem was erected. A large part of the "Lusiad" of Camoens deals with the voyages and discoveries of Vasco da Gama.

The oldest and most reliable sources of the history of the voyage of discovery, whose authors were participants in it, are the *Roteiro da viagem . . . de . . . Vasco da Gama em 1497*, 2nd ed., revised, by HERCULANO AND DA PAIVA (Lisbon, 1861); also *La navigazione prima . . . scritta per un gentiluomo Fiorentino . . . in RAMUSIO, Delle Navigazioni . . .*, I, 119 sqq. Among the earliest are CASTANHEDA, DE BARROS, GOES, OSORIO, MAFFEI, and others, *Correa (Lendas da Índia)* giving positive information regarding the third voyage only.

STANLEY, *The Three Voyages of Vasco da Gama* (Hakluyt Society, No. 42, London, 1869); DE ARAGÃO, *Vasco da Gama* (3rd ed., Lisbon, 1898); SCHAEFER, *Navigation de Vasco da Gama* . . . in *Bibliothèque des voyages anciens* (Paris, 1898), II; RAVENSTEIN, *A Journal of the First Voyage of Vasco da Gama* . . . (Hakluyt Society, No. 69, London, 1898); HUMMERICH, *Vasco da Gama und die Entdeckung des Seeweges nach Ostindien* (Munich, 1898); TELLES DA GAMA, *Le Comte Amiral Vasco da Gama* (Paris, 1902).  
OTTO HARTIG.

**Gamaliel** (Γαμαλιήλ, Greek form of the Hebrew גַּמְלִיִּל, "reward of God").—The name designates in the New Testament a Pharisee and celebrated doctor of the Law. Gamaliel is represented in Acts, v, 34 sqq., as advising his fellow-members of the Sanhedrin not to put to death St. Peter and the Apostles, who, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Jewish authorities, had continued to preach to the people. His advice, however unwelcome, was acted upon, so great was his authority with his contemporaries. We learn from Acts, xxii, 3, that he was the teacher of St. Paul; but we are not told either the nature or the extent of the influence which he exercised upon the future apostle of the Gentiles. Gamaliel is rightly identified with an illustrious Jewish doctor of the Law, who bore the same name and died eighteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem. In the Talmud, this Gamaliel bears, like his grandfather Hillel, the surname of "the Elder", and is the first to whom the title "Rabban", "our master", was given. He appears therein, as in the book of the Acts, as a prominent member of the highest tribunal of the Jews. He is also treated as the originator of many legal ordinances; as the father of a son, whom he called Simeon, after his father's name, and of a daughter who married the priest Simon ben Nathanael. The Jewish accounts make him die a Pharisee, and state that: "When he died, the honour of the Torah (the law) ceased, and purity and piety became extinct." At an early date, ecclesiastical tradition has supposed that Gamaliel embraced the Christian Faith, and remained a member of the Sanhedrin

for the purpose of helping secretly his fellow-Christians (cf. *Recognitions of Clement*, I, lxxv, lxxvi). According to Photius, he was baptized by St. Peter and St. John, together with his son and with Nicodemus. His body, miraculously discovered in the fifth century, is said to be preserved at Pisa, in Italy.

*Talmud of Jerusalem*; PHOTIUS, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 171; TAYLOR, *The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (Cambridge, 1877); FOUARD, *St. Peter* (tr., New York, 1893); LE CAMUS, *L'œuvre des Apôtres*, I (Paris, 1905).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

**Gamans, JEAN**, b. 8 July, 1606, at Ahrweiler (according to other sources at Neuenahr, about two miles from Ahrweiler; there does not appear to exist any documentary evidence to show that he was born at the little town of Eupen, as stated in the "Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus"); d. at the College of Aschaffenburg near Frankfort, 25 Nov., 1684. He entered the Society of Jesus at Trier on 24 April, 1623, having studied the humanities for five years and philosophy for two years at Cologne, where he had received the degree of Master of Arts. After making his novitiate, he devoted several months to a revision of his philosophical studies, and subsequently, from 1626, spent five years teaching in the College of Würzburg, conducting his pupils through the five classes which comprised the complete course in humanities. He then studied theology for a year at Mainz (1631), after which, the houses of his province of the Upper Rhine being suppressed during the war with Sweden, he continued his theological studies for three years at Douai, where he was ordained priest on 26 March, 1633. These studies having come to an end in 1634, and being followed doubtless by the third year of probation, he discharged for several years the duties of chaplain to the land and naval troops in Belgium and Germany. We find him mentioned under this title (*Castrensis*) in the catalogue of the Flandro-Belgian province for 1641 as being attached to the professed house at Antwerp, where he made his profession of the four vows on 26 December of the same year. He lived here with the first two Bollandists, Jean Bolland and Godefroid Henschen, became inflamed with zeal for their work and was henceforth their assiduous collaborator, whithersoever his duty called him, but especially at Baden-Baden, where he resided for some time in order to direct the studies of the young princes of the House of Baden. He was undoubtedly there in 1641 and 1649. At the end of this latter year he resided in a missionary capacity at Ettlingen near Karlsruhe. Here we lose all sight of him until 1681, when he was attached to the College of Aschaffenburg near Frankfort, where he died 25 November, 1684.

For more than thirty years, it is stated in the death notice inserted in the Annual letters of the College of Aschaffenburg for that year, he was so immersed in the hagiographical researches which he had undertaken in behalf of his associates at Antwerp that he devoted to them even the hours of the night, taking only a short rest on the floor or a strip of matting. Indeed, his name occurs very often in the "Acta SS.", at the head of documents transcribed by his hand, and even of commentaries written entirely by him (cf. "Bibl. des écriv. de la C. de J.", s. v. "Gamans"). A large number of papers of this description is to be found in the vast manuscript collection of the early Bollandists preserved at the Royal Library of Brussels and in the modern Bollandist library, although the largest part of his papers, dispatched to the Bollandists after his death, were engulfed in the Main, the vessel bearing the precious freight having unfortunately sunk. Gamans had also collected a mass of material for a "Metropolis Moguntina", which he wished to compose on the model of the "Metropolis Salisburgensis" published by Hund in 1582, and also for a history of the grand ducal House of Baden. As many

as eight manuscripts of the latter work are known to exist, but no portion of it or of the "Metropolis Moguntina" has been printed.

*Lettres annuelles et Catalogues de la Province du Haut-Rhin, conservées dans les archives de la Compagnie de Jésus*; F. RANZ?, F. (LEK?), *Der Geschichtsforscher J. Gamans in Katholik*, new series, vol. XL, 300 sqq. (Mainz, 1878); *Bibl. des écrivains de la C. de J.*

CH. DE SMEDT.

**Gambling**, or **GAMING**, is the staking of money or other thing of value on the issue of a game of chance. It thus belongs to the class of aleatory contracts in which the gain or loss of the parties depends on an uncertain event. It is not gambling, in the strict sense, if a bet is laid on the issue of a game of skill like billiards or football. The issue must depend on chance, as in dice, or partly on chance, partly on skill, as in whist. Moreover, in ordinary parlance, a person who plays for small stakes to give zest to the game is not said to gamble; gambling connotes playing for high stakes. In its moral aspect, although gambling usually has a bad meaning, yet we may apply to it what was said about betting (see **BETTING**). On certain conditions, and apart from excess or scandal, it is not sinful to stake money on the issue of a game of chance any more than it is sinful to insure one's property against risk, or deal in futures on the produce market. As I may make a free gift of my own property to another if I choose, so I may agree with another to hand over to him a sum of money if the issue of a game of cards is other than I expect, while he agrees to do the same in my favour in the contrary event. Theologians commonly require four conditions so that gaming may not be illicit. What is staked must belong to the gambler and must be at his free disposal. It is wrong, therefore, for the lawyer to stake the money of his client, or for anyone to gamble with what is necessary for the maintenance of his wife and children. The gambler must act freely, without unjust compulsion. There must be no fraud in the transaction, although the usual ruses of the game may be allowed. It is unlawful, accordingly, to mark the cards, but it is permissible to conceal carefully from an opponent the number of trump cards one holds. Finally, there must be some sort of equality between the parties to make the contract equitable; it would be unfair for a combination of two expert whist players to take the money of a couple of mere novices at the game. If any of these conditions be wanting, gambling becomes more or less wrong; and, besides, there is generally an element of danger in it which is quite sufficient to account for the bad name which it has. In most people gambling arouses keen excitement, and quickly develops into a passion which is difficult to control. If indulged in to excess it leads to loss of time, and usually of money; to an idle and useless life spent in the midst of bad company and unwholesome surroundings; and to scandal which is a source of sin and ruin to others. It panders to the craving for excitement and in many countries it has become so prevalent that it rivals drunkenness in its destructive effects on the lives of the people. It is obvious that the moral aspect of the question is not essentially different if for a game of chance is substituted a horse-race, a football or cricket match, or the price of stock or produce at some future date. Although the issue in these cases seldom depends upon chance, still the moral aspect of betting upon it is the same in so far as the issue is unknown or uncertain to the parties who make the contract. Time bargains, difference transactions, options, and other speculative dealings on the exchanges, which are so common nowadays, add to the malice of gambling special evils of their own. They lead to the disturbance of the natural prices of commodities and securities, do grave injury to producers and consumers of those commodities, and are frequently attended by such unlawful methods of in-

fluencing prices as the dissemination of false reports, cornering, and the fierce contests of "bulls" and "bears", i. e. of the dealers who wish respectively to raise or lower prices.

Hitherto we have prescind from positive law in our treatment of the question of gambling. It is, however, a matter on which both the civil and the canon law have much to say. In the United States the subject lies outside the province of the Federal Government, but many of the States make gambling a penal offence when the bet is upon an election, a horse-race, or a game of chance. Betting contracts and securities given upon a bet are often made void. In England the Gaming Act, 1845, voids contracts made by way of gaming and wagering; and the Gaming Act, 1892, renders null and void any promise, express or implied, to pay any person any sum of money under, or in respect of, any contract or agreement rendered null and void by the Gaming Act, 1845, or to pay any sum of money by way of commission, fee, reward, or otherwise, in respect of any such contract or agreement, or of any services in relation thereto or in connexion therewith. From very early times gambling was forbidden by canon law. Two of the oldest (41, 42) among the so-called canons of the Apostles forbade games of chance under pain of excommunication to clergy and laity alike. The 79th canon of the Council of Elvira (306) decreed that one of the faithful who had been guilty of gambling might be, on amendment, restored to communion after the lapse of a year. A homily (the famous "De Aleatoribus") long ascribed to St. Cyprian, but by modern scholars variously attributed to Popes Victor I, Callistus I, and Melchisedes, and which undoubtedly is a very early and interesting monument of Christian antiquity, is a vigorous denunciation of gambling. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215), by a decree subsequently inserted in the "Corpus Juris", forbade clerics to play or to be present at games of chance. Some authorities, such as Aubespine, have attempted to explain the severity of the ancient canons against gambling by supposing that idolatry was often connected with it in practice. The pieces that were played with were small-sized idols, or images of the gods, which were invoked by the players for good luck. However, as Benedict XIV remarks, this can hardly be true, as in that case the penalties would have been still more severe. Profane writers of antiquity are almost as severe in their condemnation of gambling as are the councils of the Christian Church. Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus tell us that by gambling men are led into fraud, cheating, lying, perjury, theft, and other enormities; while Peter of Blois says that dice is the mother of perjury, theft, and sacrilege. The old canonists and theologians remark that although the canons generally mention only dice by name, yet under this appellation must be understood all games of chance; and even those that require skill, if they are played for money.

The Council of Trent contented itself with ordering all the ancient canons on the subject to be observed, and in general prescribed that the clergy were to abstain from unlawful games. As Benedict XIV remarks, it was left to the judgment of the bishops to decide what games should be held to be unlawful according to the different circumstances of person, place, and time. St. Charles Borromeo, in the first Synod of Milan, put the Tridentine decree into execution, and drew up a list of games which were forbidden to the clergy, and another list of those that were allowed. Among those which he forbade were not only dicing in various forms, but also games something like our croquet and football. Other particular councils declared that playing at dice and cards was unbecoming and forbidden to clerics, and in general they forbade all games which were unbecoming to the clerical state. Thus, a council held at Bordeaux in 1583 decreed that

the clergy were to abstain altogether from playing in public or in private at dice, cards, or any other forbidden and unbecoming game. The council held at Aix in 1585 forbade them to play at cards, dice, or any other game of the like kind, and even to look on at the playing of such games. Another, held at Narbonne in 1609, decreed that clerics were not to play at dice, cards, or other unlawful and unbecoming games, especially in public. There was some doubt as to whether chess was to be considered an unbecoming, and therefore an unlawful, game for clerics. In the opinion of St. Peter Damian it was certainly unlawful. On one occasion he caught the Bishop of Florence playing chess, to while away the time when on a journey. The bishop tried to defend himself by saying that chess was not dice. The saint, however, refused to admit the distinction, especially as the bishop was playing in public. Scripture, he said, does not make express mention of chess, but it is comprised under the term dice. And Baronius defends the saint's doctrine. Some sciolist, he remarks, may say that St. Peter Damian was under a delusion in classing chess under dice, since chess is not a game of chance but calls for the exercise of much skill and talent. Let that be as it may, he proceeds, priests must at any rate be guided in their conduct by the words of St. Paul, who declared that what is not expedient, what is not edifying, is not allowed.

Modern ecclesiastical law is less exacting in this matter. The provincial Councils of Westminster are content with prescribing that clerics must abstain from unlawful games. The Plenary Synod of Maynooth, held in 1900, says that since not a little time is occasionally lost, and idleness is fostered by playing cards, the priest should be on his guard against such games, especially where money is staked, lest he incur the reproach of being a gambler. He is also exhorted to deter the laity by word and example from betting at horse-races, especially when the stakes are high. The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore made a distinction between games which may not suitably be indulged in by a cleric, even when played in private, and games like cards which may be played for the sake of innocent recreation. It repeated the prohibition of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore that clerics are not to indulge in unlawful games, and only in moderation are to use those that are lawful, so as not to cause scandal. Nowadays, it is commonly held that positive ecclesiastical law only forbids games of chance, even to the clergy, when in themselves or for some extrinsic reason, such as loss of time or scandal, they are forbidden by the natural law.

FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Ludus* (Paris, 1861); BENEDICT XIV, *De Synodo diocesana* (Ferrari, 1756); HEFELLE, *Concilien Geschichte* (Freiburg, 1873), I; SLATER, *A Manual of Moral Theology* (New York, 1908), I; *Ecclesiastical Review* (New York, 1905), XXXII, 134; THOMASSIN, *Vetus Ecol. Disciplina*, III, III, cc. xlv, xlv; DESHAYES, in VACANT, *Dict. de Théol. cath.*, s. v. *Aléatoires*.

T. SLATER.

**Gams**, PIUS BONIFACIUS, ecclesiastical historian, b. at Mittelbuch, Wurtemberg, 23 January, 1816; d. at Munich, 11 May, 1892. His classical studies were made at Biberach and Rottweil (1826-1834), he studied philosophy and theology at Tübingen (1834-38), entered the seminary of Rottenburg in 1838, and was ordained priest on 11 September, 1839. He filled various posts as tutor, vicar, parish priest, and professor until 1 May, 1847, when he was appointed to the chairs of philosophy and general history by the theological faculty of Hildesheim. Finally he entered the Abbey of St. Boniface at Munich, which belonged to the Bavarian congregation of the Order of St. Benedict, and pronounced the monastic vows, 5 October, 1856, adding the name of Pius to that of Boniface. Gams filled several monastic offices, being successively master of novices, sub-prior, and prior. He is best known for his "*Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*", 3

vols. (Ratisbon, 1862-1879), and his "Series episcoporum Ecclesiæ catholicæ quotquot innotuerunt a beato Petro apostolo" etc. (Ratisbon, 1873-86, with two supplements). The "Kirchengeschichte von Spanien" is a conscientiously and methodically written work, critical, also, to a certain extent, in dealing with the earliest period of Spanish ecclesiastical history, though the author rarely abandons the aid which unreliable sources seem to furnish. The "Series episcoporum" has rendered useful service and is yet very helpful. It is a collection of the episcopal lists of all ancient and modern sees known to the author. Gaps are frequent in the lists of ancient sees, especially those of the Eastern Church. It was, of course, impossible to draw up a critical list (names and dates) for such remote times, and larger information must be sought in extensive documentary works, e.g. "Italia Sacra" and the like; as a rule, however, the author has ignored a number of scattered dissertations which would have rectified, on a multitude of points, his uncertain chronology. In 1850 Gams founded with his colleagues Alzog, F. W. Koch, Mattes, and G. J. Müller a "Theologische Monatschrift", which lasted two years (1850-1851), and in which he published a number of essays.

Works:—"Geschichte der Kirche Jesu Christi im neunzehnten Jahrhundert mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Deutschland", 3 vols. (Innsbruck, 1854-1858); "Johannes der Tauffer im Gefängnisse" (Tubingen, 1853); "Die elfte Sacularfeier des Martyrtodes des heiligen Bonifacius", etc. (Mainz, 1855); "Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien", 3 vols., in five parts (Ratisbon, 1862-79); "Spanische Briefe" in "Historisch-politische Blätter", LVI, 134 sq., 208 sq., 311 sq., 418 sq.; "Wetterleuchten auf der pyrenäischen Halbinsel," *ibid.*, LVI, 67 sq.; "Series episcoporum Ecclesiæ catholicæ quotquot innotuerunt a beato Petro apostolo" (Ratisbon, 1873); Supp. I: "Hierarchia catholica Pio IX Pontifice Romano" (Munich, 1879); Supp. II: "Series episcoporum Ecclesiæ quæ series quæ apparuit 1873 completur et continuatur ab anno circa 1870 ad 20 Febr. 1885" (Ratisbon, 1886); "Das Jahre des Martyrtodes der Apostel Petrus und Paulus" (Ratisbon, 1867).

ROTMANN, *Zu einem Jubiläum in Hist.-polit. Blätter*, CX (1892), 233-250; LAUCHERT, *Die kirchengeschichtlichen und zeitgeschichtlichen Arbeiten von P. F. B. Gams mit einer vollständigen Bibliographie in Stud. und Mittheil. aus dem Benedict. und Cisterc. Orden* (1904); GAMS in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XLIX (1904), 249-52. H. LECLERCQ.

**Gand, DIOCESE OF.** See GHEENT, DIOCESE OF.

**Gandolph** (OR GANDOLPHI), PETER, Jesuit preacher; b. in London, 26 July, 1779; d. at East Sheen, Surrey, 9 July, 1821; son of John Vincent Gandolphi of East Sheen, and grandson of Count Pietro Gandolphi, of the ancient nobility of Genoa. Father Gandolphi's brother, John Vincent, married Teresa, eldest daughter of Thomas Hornyold, of Blackmore and Hanley. His only son succeeded to the Blackmore and Hanley estates and assumed the name of Hornyold by Royal license in 1859. Hornyold was an ancient Catholic family in Worcestershire, and Blackmore Park (recently pulled down) was a fine example of an old English manor house, with numerous priests' hiding places. The present representative of the family, Alfonso Otto Gandolfi Hornyold, bears the title of Duke Gandolfi (a papal creation of 1899) as well as the old Genoese titles.

Father Gandolph was educated in the Jesuit College at Liège, and also at Stonyhurst, where he was appointed as teacher of humanities in 1801. He was ordained priest about 1804, and his first charge was at Newport, Isle of Wight. He was then transferred to the Spanish chapel at Manchester Square, London (now known as St. James's, Spanish Place), where he soon attained great fame as a preacher; and as a worker among Protestants he made many converts.

His methods, however, were somewhat infelicitous, and speedily incurred the censure of his ordinary, Bishop Poynter. It appears that he wrote too rapidly to be theologically exact, but there were certainly no heretical principles in his mind. Nevertheless, it seems strange to read of a Catholic manual entitled the "Book of Common Prayer . . . for the use of all Christians in the United Kingdom" which he brought out in 1812. On account of this, and of his "Sermons in defence of the Ancient Faith", Bishop Poynter felt it his duty to suspend him and to denounce the offending works. Gandolph went to Rome in person to defend himself, and in 1816 he obtained official approbation of the two censured works from S. P. Damiani, master of theology and Apostolic penitentiary at St. Peter's, and F. J. O'Finan, prior of the Dominican convent of St. Sixtus and St. Clement. The Congregation of Propaganda, being anxious for a peaceable settlement of this unfortunate affair, required (1 March, 1817) that Gandolph should be restored on his apologizing to Bishop Poynter for any unintentional disrespect which might have occurred in his address to the public, of which address also the bishop had complained. On 15 April Gandolph accordingly wrote an apology, but the bishop in a pastoral letter on 24 April stated that the apology was inadequate, so at last on 8 July, Gandolph made an unserved apology; but this long drawn out public humiliation was too much for him. He resigned his post in 1818 and retired to his family home at East Sheen, where he died in a year or two. His principal works were: "A Defence of the Ancient Faith" (London, 1813-14); "Liturgy, or A Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, with other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church. For the use of all Christians in the United Kingdom" (London, 1812; Birmingham, 1815); "Lessons of Morality and Piety, extracted from the Sapiential Books" (London, 1822); and a number of controversial letters and sermons.

DE BACKER, *Bibl. des Ecrivains de la C. de J.* (1869), i, 2029; *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXXXIII, pt. II, 362; LXXXIV, pt. I, 470; XCI, pt. II, 185, 200; GILLow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* s.v.; COOPER, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s.v.; OLIVER, *Collectanea S. J. Foley, Records*, S. J., VII.

C. F. WEMYSS BROWN.

**Ganganelli, LORENZO.** See CLEMENT XIV, POPE.

**Gang-Days.** See ROGATION DAYS.

**Gangra**, a titular see in the province of Paphlagonia; in the native tongue the word signifies goat, and even now large numbers of goats are seen in this region. It belonged originally to Galatia, and was then the capital of King Dejotarus, the adversary of Mithridates, and the friend of the Romans. Later the city became the metropolis of Paphlagonia. It never had more than five suffragan sees. Le Quien (I, 549-554) mentions twenty-two of its archbishops from the fourth to the twelfth century, none of whom is especially noteworthy. The metropolitan see must have been suppressed in the fourteenth century after the conquest of the country by the Turks. Captured by Tamerlane, in 1402, it was recaptured, in 1423, by Sultan Murad II; since that time it has always been Turkish. The most memorable event of its Christian history is the council held there, probably in 343, to condemn Eustathius of Armenia and his exaggerated asceticism. More than twenty canons of this council defend the legitimacy of Christian marriage against the indiscretions of Eustathius and especially of his disciples (Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, Paris, 1907, I, (2), 1029-45). It is now known as Tchiangre, and is a sandjak of the vilayet of Castamouni. It is situated at the foot of Mt. Olgassus and numbers 16,000 inhabitants, 800 of whom are Greeks and 500 Armenians, all schismatics. The ancient cathedral of St. Demetrius has been converted into a mosque.

TEXIER, *Asie-Mineure*, 617; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, IV, 550-53.

S. VAILHÉ.



**Gap, DIOCESE OF (VAPINCENSIS),** suffragan of Aix, includes the department of the Hautes-Alpes. Suppressed by the Concordat of 1801 and then united to Digne, this diocese was re-established in 1822 and comprises, besides the ancient Diocese of Gap, a large part of the ancient Diocese of Embrun. The name of this last metropolitan see, however, has been absorbed in the title of the Archbishop of Aix.

**DIOCESE OF GAP.**—Ancient traditions in liturgical books, of which at least one dates from the fourteenth century, state that the first Bishop of Gap was St. Demetrius, disciple of the Apostles and martyrs. Father Victor de Buck in the *Acta Sanctorum* (October, XI) finds nothing inadmissible in these traditions, while Canon Albanès defends them against M. Roman. Albanès names as bishops of Gap the martyr St. Tigris (fourth century), then St. Remedius (394-419), whom the Abbé Duchesne makes a Bishop of Antibes and who was involved in the struggle between Pope Zosimus and Bishop Proculus of Marseilles, finally St. Constantinus, about 439. According to Duchesne the first historically known bishop is Constantinus, pres-



PORCH AND NORTH PORTAL, CATHEDRAL OF EMBRUN

ent at the Council of Epaone in 517. The church of Gap had, among other bishops, St. Aregius (or Arey, 579-610?), who established at Gap a celebrated literary school and was held in great esteem by St. Gregory the Great; also St. Arnoude (1065-1078), a monk of Trinité de Vendôme, named bishop by Alexander II to replace the simoniac Ripert, and who became the patron of the episcopal city.

**ARCHDIOCESE OF EMBRUN.**—The Archdiocese of Embrun had as suffragans, Digne, Antibes and Grasse, Vence, Glandèves, Senez, and Nice. Tradition ascribes the evangelization of Embrun to Sts. Nazarius and Celsus, martyrs under Nero. The first bishop was St. Marcellinus (354-74). Other bishops of Embrun were St. Albinus (400-37); St. Palladius (first half of the sixth century); St. Eutherius (middle of the seventh century); St. James (eighth century); St. Alphonsus (eighth century); St. Marcellus (end of the eighth century), whom Charlemagne sent to evangelize Saxony; St. Bernard (805-25), under whose episcopate Charlemagne enriched the Diocese of Embrun; St. Benedict (beginning of the tenth century), martyred by the Saracen invaders; St. Liberalis (920-40); St. Hismide (1027-45); St. Guillaume (1120-34), founder of the celebrated Abbey of Boscodon; St. Bernard Chabert (1213-35), Henry of Segusio (1250-71), known as Ostiensis, i.e. Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, an orator and canonist of renown; the Dominican Raimond of Mévolhon (1289-94), who defended the doctrine of St. Thomas against the attacks of English theologians; Bertrand of Deaux (1323-38), who as the legate of Clement VI at Rome did much to bring about the downfall of Rienzi; Jacques Gélou (1427-32), one of

the first prelates to recognize the supernatural vocation of Joan of Arc; Giulio de' Medici (1510-11), later pope under the name of Clement VII; Cardinal François de Tournon (1517-26), employed on diplomatic missions by Francis I, and founder of the Collège de Tournon; Cardinal de Tencin (1724-40), who in September, 1727, caused the condemnation by the Council of Embrun of the Jansenist Soanen, Bishop of his suffragan See of Senez. St. Vincent Ferrer preached several missions against the Vaudois in the Diocese of Embrun. Besides the bishops named the following are honoured as saints in the present Diocese of Gap: Vincent, Orontius, and Victor, martyrs in Spain in the fourth century, the anchorite Veranus (sixth century), afterwards Bishop of Cavailon, and the anchorite St. Donatus (sixth century).

The Diocese of Gap possesses two noted places of pilgrimage, Notre-Dame d'Embrun at Embrun, where Charlemagne erected a basilica, visited by Pope Leo III and Kings Henry II and Louis XVIII. Louis XI was wont to wear in his cap a leaden image of Notre-Dame d'Embrun. The other is that of Notre-Dame du Laus, where during fifty-four years (1664-1718) the blessed Virgin appeared "an incalculable number of times" to a shepherdess, Venerable Benoîte Rencurel. Three orders of women had their origin in the diocese. The Sisters of Providence, a teaching and nursing order, established in 1823 from the Sisters of Portieux (Vosges) and after 1837 an independent congregation; the Sisters of Saint Joseph, founded in 1837 for teaching and nursing; the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Mary, founded in 1835 for teaching. The Diocese of Gap, numbering 109,510 inhabitants, had in 1906 at the cessation of the Concordat, 26 parishes, 218 missions, and 15 curacies, paid by the state. During the Middle Ages there were in the mountainous region which forms the present diocese more than seventy hospitals, *maladreries*, lazarettoes, or houses of refuge, administered by two congregations of the vicinity, the Brothers of La Madeleine and the Brothers of Holy Penitence. About half of these asylums disappeared during the religious wars of the sixteenth century. The others with the exception of half a score were suppressed by royal command about 1690, and their goods given to the large hospitals of Gap, Embrun, and Briançon. In 1900, before the Law of Associations was enforced, there were in the Diocese of Gap five maternity hospitals, a school for deaf mutes, one orphanage for boys and two for girls, seven hospitals or asylums, two institutions for the care of the sick in their homes, all under the direction of religious orders.

*Gallia Christiana* (Nova, 1715), I, 452-473, *Instrumenta*, 86-89; (Nova, 1725), III, 1051-1107; *Instrumenta*, 177-188, 205-8; ALBANÈS, *Gallia Christiana Novissima* (Montbéliard, 1899), I; DEPERY, *Histoire hagiologique du diocèse de Gap* (Gap, 1852); FISQUET, *France Pontificale* (Paris, 1868); GAILLAUD, *Histoire de Notre Dame d'Embrun* (Gap, 1862); ROMAN, *Sigillographie du diocèse de Gap* (Grenoble, 1870); *Idem*, *Tableau historique du département des Hautes-Alpes* (Paris, 1889-91); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibl.*, pp. 988, 1266.

GEORGES GOYAU.

**García, ANNE**, better known as Venerable Anne of St. Bartholomew, Discalced Carmelite nun, companion of St. Teresa; b. at Almendral, Old Castile, 1 Oct., 1550; d. at Antwerp, 7 June, 1626. She was of humble origin and spent her youth in solitude and prayer tending the flocks. When she first went to Avila to enter the Carmelite convent, she was refused, being too young; for several years after, she suffered much at the hands of her brothers. Finally, overcoming all obstacles, she entered the convent as lay sister and made her vows on 15 August, 1572. For the next ten years she filled the post of infirmarian; her spirit of prayer and humility endeared her to St. Teresa, whose almost inseparable companion and secretary she now became. St. Teresa died in her arms at Alba de Tormes in 1582. Anne afterwards returned to Avila, took part in the foundation of a convent at Ocaña (1595), and was one

of the seven nuns selected for the introduction of the order into France (October, 1604). The French superiors, desirous of sending her as prioress to Pontoise, obliged her to pass from the state of lay sister to that of choir sister. So unusual a step met with the disapproval of her companions, but as St. Teresa had foretold it many years previously Anne offered no resistance. She had also been forewarned that the same step would cause her great sufferings, and indeed her priorship at Pontoise (January to September, 1605), Paris (October, 1605, to April, 1608), Tours May, 1608, to 1611) brought her heavy trials, not the least of which were differences with her superiors. At the expiration of her last term of office she returned to Paris, but warned by a vision, she proceeded to Belgium (October, 1611), where she founded and became prioress of a convent at Antwerp (27 Oct., 1612), which she governed to the end of her life. Twice she was instrumental in delivering the town from the hands of the enemy. In 1735, Anne of St. Bartholomew was declared Venerable; her process of beatification is not yet completed. Her writings include a number of letters still preserved, an autobiography now at Antwerp, edited by M. Bouix (Paris, 1869-72), and several treatises on spiritual matters, which appeared at Paris in 1646.

ENRIQUEZ, *Historia de la Vida etc.* (Brussels, 1632, Fr. tr. at Paris, 1633); *La Vie et les instructions de la Vén. Mère Anne de S. Barthélémy, par un solitaire de Marlaigne* (Brussels, 1708; new ed., Paris, 1895).

B. ZIMMERMAN.

**Garcia, GONSALO, SAINT;** b. of a Portuguese father and a Canarese mother in Bassein, East India, about the year 1556 or 1557; d. 5 Feb., 1597. His early training was entrusted to the Jesuits, who brought him up in their college in Bassein Fort. At the age of twenty-four or twenty-five he went to Japan in the company of some Jesuit fathers who were ordered, in 1580, to leave Bassein, and join their mission in the former country. He quickly acquired a knowledge of the language; and as he was of an amiable disposition he won the hearts of the people and did great service as a catechist for eight years. He then left this kind of work and betook himself to Alacão for trading purposes. His business soon flourished and branches were opened in different places. During his frequent visits to Manila he made the acquaintance of the Franciscans, and being drawn more and more towards them he finally joined the Seraphic Order as a lay brother. He sailed from the Philippine Islands with other companions in religion under Petrus Baptista, 26 May, 1592, on an embassy from the Spanish Governor to the Emperor of Japan. After working zealously for the glory of God for more than four years, the Emperor Taiko-Sama, suspecting the missionaries were aiming at the overthrow of his throne, ordered St. Garcia and his companions to be guarded in their Convent at Miaco on 8 December, 1596. A few days afterwards, when they were singing vespers, they were apprehended and with their hands tied behind their backs were taken to prison. On 3 January, 1597, the extremities of the left ears of twenty-six confessors, St. Garcia amongst the number, were cut off; but were with great respect collected by the Christians. On 5 February of the same year, the day of the martyrdom, St. Garcia was the first to be extended on, and nailed to, the cross, which was then erected in the middle of those of his companions. Two lances piercing the body from one side to the other and passing through the heart, whilst the saint was singing the praises of God during the infliction of the torture, put an end to his sufferings and won for Garcia the martyr's crown. In 1627 these twenty-six servants of God were declared venerable by Urban VIII; their feast occurs on 5 February, the anniversary of their sufferings; and in 1629 their veneration was permitted throughout the Universal Church. The people of

Bassein practised devotion towards the saint; after the severe persecution to which Christianity was subjected in that region, from about 1739 he was gradually entirely forgotten until a well-known writer recently undertook to write the history of the place, and drew the attention of the public to St. Garcia Gonsalo. Owing to the praiseworthy endeavours of a secular priest, and the great interest evinced by the present Bishop of Damaun in the promotion of the devotion towards the saint, the feast of St. Garcia is now annually celebrated with great solemnity; and pilgrims from all parts of Bassein, Salsette, and Bombay flock to the place on that occasion.

The Bull of Canonization; *Bibliotheca Historica Filipina*; Supplement to RIBADENEIRA, *History of the Eastern Archipelago*; GÉRIN, *Lives of the Saints*; FERNANDES, *Life of Saint Gonsalo Garcia*; DE MONTE ALVERNE, *Panegyric on St. Gonsalo Garcia*; *Bombay Catholic Examiner* for 1903, 1904; *O Anglo Lusitano* for 1903, 1904.

MANOEL D'SÁ.

**García Diego, FRANCISCO.** See DIEGO Y MORENO, FRANCISCO.

**García Moreno, GABRIEL,** Ecuadorean patriot and statesman; b. at Guayaquil, 24 December, 1821; assassinated at Quito, 6 August, 1875. His father, Gabriel García Gomez, a native of Villaverde, in Old Castile, had been engaged in commerce at Callao before removing to Guayaquil, where he married Doña Mercedes Moreno, the mother of the future Ecuadorean martyr president. Gabriel García Gomez died while his son was still young, and the boy's education was left to the care of his mother, who appears to have been a woman of unusual ability for her task; she was, moreover, fortunate in securing as her son's tutor Fray José Betancourt, the famous Mercedarian, under whose tuition young García Moreno made rapid progress. A great part of his father's fortune having been lost, it was not without some considerable sacrifices that the youth was able to attend the university course at Quito. These material obstacles once overcome, he passed brilliantly through the schools, distancing all his contemporaries, and on 26 October, 1844, received his degree in the faculty of law (*Doctor en Jurisprudencia*) from the University of Quito.

In less than a year after his graduation young García Moreno had begun to take an active part in Ecuadorean politics, joining in the revolutionary movement which eventually replaced the Flores administration by that of Roca (1846). He soon distinguished himself as a political satirist by contributions to "El Zurriago", but what more truly presaged the achievements of his riper life was his good and useful work as a member of the municipal council of Quito. At the same time he was studying legal practice, and on 30 March, 1848, was admitted advocate. Immediately after this the deposed Flores, supported by the Spanish government, made an attempt to regain the presidency of Ecuador; García Moreno unhesitatingly came forward in support of the Roca administration, and when that administration fell, in 1849, he entered upon his first period of exile. After some months



GABRIEL GARCÍA MORENO

spent in Europe he returned to his native republic in the employ of a mercantile concern, and it was then that he took the first decisive step which marked him conspicuously for the enmity of the anti-Catholics, or, as they preferred to call themselves, the Liberals. At Panama he had fallen in with a party of Jesuits who had been expelled from the Republic of New Granada and wished to find an asylum in Ecuador. García Moreno constituted himself the protector of these religious, and they sailed with him for Guayaquil; but on the same vessel that carried the Jesuits and their champion, an envoy from New Granada also took passage for the express purpose of bringing diplomatic influence to bear with the dictator, Diego Noboa, to secure their exclusion from Ecuadorean territory. No sooner had the vessel entered the harbour of Guayaquil than García Moreno, slipping into a shore boat, succeeded in landing some time before the New Granadan envoy; the necessary permission was acquired from the Ecuadorean government, and the Jesuits obtained a foothold in that country. How soon the report of this exploit spread among the anti-Catholics of South America was evidenced by the fact that within a year Jacobo Sánchez, a New Granadan, had attacked García Moreno in the pamphlet "Don Félix Frias en Paris y los Jesuitas en el Ecuador", to which García Moreno's reply was an able "Defensa de los Jesuitas".

In 1853 he began to publish "La Nación", a periodical which, according to its prospectus, was intended to combat the then existing tendency of the government to exploit the masses for the material benefit of those who happened to be in power. At the same time García Moreno's programme aimed distinctly and professedly to defend the religion of the people. He was already known as a friend of the Jesuits; he now assumed the rôle of friend of the common people, to which he adhered sincerely and consistently to the day of his death. The Urbina faction, then in power, were quick to recognize the importance of "La Nación", which was suppressed before the appearance of its third number, and its proprietor was exiled, for the second time. Having been, meanwhile, elected senator by his native province of Guayaquil, he was prevented from taking his seat, on the ground that he had returned to Quito without a passport. After a sojourn at Paíta, García Moreno once more visited Europe. He was now thirty-three years of age, and his experience of political life in Ecuador had deeply convinced him of his people's need of enlightenment. It was undoubtedly with this conviction as his guide and incentive that he spent a year or more in Paris, foregoing every form of pleasure, a severe, indefatigable student not only of political science, but also of the higher mathematics, of chemistry, and of the French public-school system. On his return home, under a general amnesty in 1856, he became rector of the central University of Quito, a position of which he availed himself to commence lectures of his own in physical science. Next year he was active in the senate in opposition to the Masonic party, which had gained control of the government, while at the same time he persistently and forcibly, though unsuccessfully, struggled for the passage of a law establishing a system of public education modelled on that of France. In 1858 he once more established a paper, "La Union Nacional", which became obnoxious to the government by its fearless exposure of corruption and its opposition to the arbitrary employment of authority; and once more a political crisis ensued.

García Moreno was on principle an advocate of orderly processes of government, and that his professions in this regard were sincere his subsequent career fairly demonstrated, but at this juncture he was obliged to realize that his country was in the grip of a corrupt oligarchy, bent upon the suppression of the Church to which the whole mass of his fellow country-

men were devoted, and disposed to keep the masses in ignorance so as to sway them the more easily to its own ends. He had, years before, attacked "the revolutionary industry", a phrase probably first used by him, in the prospectus of "La Nación"; it now became necessary for him to descend to revolutionary methods. Besides, the little Republic of Ecuador was at this time menaced by its more powerful neighbour on the south, Peru. García Moreno, if he was sure of opposition at the hands of the soi-disant Liberals, was also, by this time, recognized by the masses as a leader loyal to both their common Faith and their common country, and thus he was able to organize the revolution which made him head of a provisional government established at Quito. The republic was now divided, General Franco being at the head of a rival government established at Guayaquil. In vain did García Moreno offer to share his authority with his rival for the sake of national unity. As a defensive measure against the threat of Peruvian invasion, García Moreno entered into negotiations with the French envoy with a view to securing the protection of France, a political mistake of which his enemies knew how to avail themselves to the utmost. He was now obliged to assume the character of a military leader, for which he possessed at least the qualifications of personal courage and decisive quickness of resolution. While García Moreno inflicted one defeat after another upon the partisans of Franco, the latter, as representing Ecuador, had concluded with Peru the treaty of Mapasingue. The people of Ecuador rose in indignation at the concessions made in this treaty, and Franco, even his own followers being alienated, was defeated at Babahoya (7 August, 1860) and again at Salado River, where he was driven to take refuge on a Peruvian vessel. When his adversary had been forcibly driven from the country, García Moreno showed his magnanimity in the proclamation in which he sought to heal as quickly as possible the scars of this civil war: "The republic should regard itself as one family; the old demarcations of districts must be so obliterated as to render sectional ambitions impossible." In the reorganization of the Constituent Assembly, which was summoned to meet in January, 1861, he insisted that the suffrage should not be territorial, but "direct and universal, under the necessary guarantees of intelligence and morality, and the number of representatives should correspond (proportionally) to that of the electors represented". The Convention, which met on 10 January, elected García Moreno president; he delivered his inaugural address on the 2d of April following. Then began that series of reforms among which were the restitution of the rights of the Church and a radical reconstruction of the fiscal system. In the immediate present he had to deal with the machinations of his old adversary Urbina, who, from his retirement in Peru, kept up incessant intrigues with the opposition at home, and still more with the governments of neighbouring republics. García Moreno soon came to a sensible and honourable understanding with the Peruvian government.

A violation of Ecuadorean territory by New Granada, though it led to a hostile collision in which García Moreno himself took part, had no serious consequences until the Arboledo administration gave place to that of General Mosquera, whose ambition it was to make New Granada the nucleus of a great "Colombian Confederation", in which Ecuador was to be included. Urbina was not above writing encouraging letters to the New Granadan or Colombian dictator who was scheming against the independence of Ecuador. An invitation to García Moreno to confer with Mosquera elicited a very plain intimation that, so far as the national obliteration of Ecuador was concerned, there was nothing to confer about. But in the meantime the Republic of Ecuador had ratified a concordat with Pope Pius IX (1862), and the discontent of the Regal-

ista party at home with the provisions of that instrument gave Mosquera an excellent pretext for encroaching upon his neighbour's rights. The Regalistas were, without knowing it, a kind of Erastians, who claimed the appointment to ecclesiastical benefices as an inalienable right of the civil power. The President of Ecuador was charged with "casting Colombia, manacled, at the feet of Rome"; Urbina issued "manifestos" from Peru in the sense of "South America for the South Americans"; while the proclamation of President Mosquera recited, with others which seem to have been introduced merely for the sake of appearances, his three really significant grounds of complaint against García Moreno: that the latter had ratified the concordat; that he maintained a representative of the Holy See at Quito; that he had brought Jesuits into Ecuador. It may be remarked here, in passing, that if Mosquera had added to this catalogue of offences those of insisting upon free primary education for the masses, upon strict auditing of the public accounts, and a considerable bona fide outlay upon roads and other public utilities, his proclamation might have served adequately as the indictment upon which García Moreno was condemned and eventually put to death by those whom Pius IX ironically called "the valiant sectaries".

Mosquera was determined to have war, and all the efforts of the Ecuadorean government were of no avail to prevent it. At the battle of Cuaspad all but two battalions of the forces of Ecuador fled ignominiously. It is a matter for wonder, considering the grounds upon which he had declared war, that Mosquera, in the Peace of Pínsaqui, which followed this victory, should have left the Concordat of 1862, the delegate Apostolic, and the Jesuits just as they were. In March, 1863, García Moreno tendered his resignation to the National Assembly, who insisted upon his remaining in office until the expiration of his term. Nevertheless he had to face, during the next two years, repeated seditions and filibustering raids. After sparing the lives of the leaders in one of these movements, though they had by all law and custom incurred the penalty of death, he was severely criticized for ordering the execution of another such when it had become evident that an example was necessary for the peace of the republic. In a naval battle at Jambelí (27 June, 1865) at which García Moreno was personally present, the defeat of the Urbina forces was complete, and tranquillity reigned until the presidential term expired on the 27th of the following August.

In the following year began what may be considered as a connected series of attempts which terminated, nine years later, in the assassination of García Moreno. The dispute between Spain and Peru over the Chincha Islands had led to a war in which, following García Moreno's advice, his successor Jerónimo Carrión had cast in the lot of Ecuador with that of the sister republic and its then ally, Chile. The ex-president was sent as minister plenipotentiary to Chile, with a commission to transact business with President Prado of Peru on his way. On his arrival at Lima an attempt was made to assassinate him, but it ended in the death of his assailant. His diplomatic mission resulted excellently for the friendly relations between Ecuador and its neighbours; the sojourn at Santiago also inspired García Moreno with a high admiration for Chile, and he even made up his mind to attempt a change of the Ecuadorean constitution so as to make it more like that of Chile, a project which he carried into effect in the National Convention of 1869. On his return to Ecuador he found himself a second time in the uncongenial position of leader of a revolution. To anticipate a plot which the Liberals, led by one of Urbina's relations, were known to be forming, the conservatives of Ecuador had risen, declared Carrión deposed, and made García Moreno head of the provisional government. The justice of the

grounds on which this extreme action was taken was established by the attempt of Veintemilla, at Guayaquil, only two months later, in March, 1869.

Having been duly confirmed as president *ad interim* by the National Convention of May, 1869, García Moreno resumed his work for the enlightenment, as well as the religious well-being, of his people. It was in these last years of his life that he did so much for the teaching of physical sciences in the university by introducing there the German Fathers of the Society of Jesus. The medical schools and hospitals of the capital benefited vastly by his intelligent and zealous efforts. In September, 1870, the troops of Victor Emmanuel occupied Rome; and on 18 January, 1871, García Moreno, alone of all the rulers of the world, addressed a protest to the King of Italy on the spoliation of the Holy See. The pope marked his appreciation of this outburst of loyalty by conferring on the President of Ecuador the decoration of the First Class of the Order of Pius IX, with a Brief of commendation dated 27 March, 1871. It was, on the other hand, notorious that certain lodges had formally decreed the death of García Moreno, who, in a letter to the pope, used about this time the following almost prophetic words: "What riches for me, Most Holy Father, to be hated and calumniated for my love for our Divine Redeemer! What happiness if your benediction should obtain for me from Heaven the grace of shedding my blood for Him, who being God, was willing to shed His blood for us upon the Cross!" The object of numberless plots against his life, García Moreno pursued his way with unruffled confidence in the future—his own and his country's. "The enemies of God and the Church can kill me", he once said, "but God does not die" (*Dios no muere*).

He had been re-elected president, and would soon have entered upon another term of office, when, towards the end of July, 1875, the police of Quito were apprised that a party of assassins had begun to dog García Moreno's footsteps. When, however, the chief of police warned the intended victim, the latter so discouraged all attempts to hedge him about with precautions, as to almost excuse the carelessness of his official guardians. It came out in evidence that within the fortnight preceding the finally successful attempt, the same assassins had at least twice been foiled by the president's failing to appear on occasions when he had been expected. Finally, on the evening of 6 August, the assassins found their prey unprotected, leaving the house of some very dear friends; they followed him until he had reached the Treasury, and there Faustino Rayo, the leader of the band, suddenly attacked him with a machete, inflicting six or seven wounds, while the other three assisted in the work with their revolvers.

On hearing of the death of García Moreno, Pope Pius IX ordered a solemn Mass of Requiem to be celebrated in the Church of Santa Maria in Trastevere. The same sovereign pontiff erected to his memory, in the Collegio Pio-Latino, at Rome, a monument on which García Moreno is designated:—

Religionis integerrimus custos  
Auctor studiorum optimum  
Obsequentissimus in Petri sedem  
Justitiæ cultor; scelorum vindex.

The materials for this article have been derived from a biography, now extremely rare, written by a personal friend and political associate of García Moreno, HERRERA, *Apuntes sobre la Vida de García Moreno*. See also: BERTHES, *García Moreno* (Paris); *Les Contemporains* (Paris, s. d.), I; MAXWELL-SCOTT, *Gabriel García Moreno, Regenerator of Ecuador in St. Nicholas Series* (London and New York, 1908).

E. MACPHERSON.

**Garcilasso de la Vega**, Spanish lyric poet; b. at Toledo, 6 Feb., 1503; d. at Nice, 14 Oct., 1536. A noble and a soldier, he spent much time in Italy during the campaigns of Charles V, whose entire con-

fidence he enjoyed. For a brief space (1531-2), he lost the imperial favour in consequence of his connivance at the marriage of his nephew with a royal wirl contrary to the emperor's wishes, and was imprisoned on an island in the Danube. When liberated, he entered the service of the Spanish viceroy at Naples, shared in the expedition which, in 1535, Charles directed against Tunis, and in the following year met his death while leading an attack upon a castle in Southern France at the command of his master. In the history of Spanish literature Garcilasso occupies a prominent place because of the part which he played, along with Boscan, in naturalizing the Italian verse-forms in Spanish. To him is due no little credit for the skill with which he transplanted, even excelling his older comrade Boscan, the Italian sonnet with its hendecasyllable, the canzone, the terza rima, and other forms. The bulk of his poetry as preserved is not great. In the first edition, which was printed by Boscan's widow at the end of the volume containing the first edition of her husband's compositions, it embraces, besides some early villancicos in the older and native Spanish manner, three eglogas, two elegias, an epistola in blank verse, five canciones, which are rather complicated in their structure, and thirty-seven or thirty-eight sonnets. Although he passed his life in the camp, he hardly reflects at all in his poetry the martial spirit that actuated him; the pastoral note with its gentle melancholy is most persistent in his strains. As he was well acquainted with the Italian poets of the Renaissance, he does not fail to echo here and there some of their best passages, and reminiscences of Tansillo, Sannazzaro, and Bernardo Tasso are easily found in his work. Of the ancients, Horace had much to do with the development of his graceful poetic manner.

*Works* (1544—with Boscan's poetry; Lisbon, 1626—reprinted, New York, 1903; Madrid, 1763, 1788, 1796); *Biblioteca de autores españoles*; XXXII and XI, II; tr., WIFFEN (London, 1826); partial translation in WALPOLE, *Gardland of Flowers* (London, 1806). See FERNÁNDEZ DE NAVARETTE, *Vida de G. de la V. in Documentos inéditos*, XVI; FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Literature*.

J. D. M. FORD.

**Garcilasso de la Vega** (THE INCA), historian of Peru; b. at Cuzco, Peru, 12 April, 1539; d. at Córdoba, Spain, c. 1617. The name Garcilasso is a corruption of García Laso, his real name. The historian's father was the Spanish conqueror, Sebastián Garcilasso de la Vega y Vargas, who was born at Badajoz, Spain, and died at Cuzco, 1559. The elder Garcilasso had served in Mexico under Hernán Cortez, in Guatemala under Diego de Alvarado, and in Peru under Francisco Pizarro. In 1548, he had been named Governor of Cuzco, where, unlike others of the conquerors, he had done much to better the condition of the natives. Earlier in life, he had married an Inca princess, the historian's mother. He died in 1559 while still Governor of Cuzco, being one of the very few Spanish conquerors of Peru who did not die a violent death. The Inca mother taught her son the language of the ancient inhabitants of Peru, and suggested to him the idea of writing a history of these people. For this purpose, Garcilasso travelled over the entire empire of the Incas, got as much information suitable for his purpose as he could gather from both the natives and the new colonists, and consulted the few remaining monuments of that race. Being fearful of Garcilasso's growing influence with the natives of Peru, Philip II ordered him to proceed to Spain, whither he went in 1559, shortly after the death of his father. He served there for some time under John of Austria in the latter's campaign against the Moors of Granada. About 1584, he wrote his "*Historia de la Florida*", describing the exploits of Hernando de Soto in that country, and published it at Lisbon. In 1600, he began the first part of his "*Comentarios Reales*", which is a general history of Peru. This first part, dealing with the

early history of the Incas, he finished in 1604, and published at Lisbon in 1609. In 1612, he finished the second part, dealing with the conquest of Peru by the Spaniards, and published it at Cordova in 1616. As a historian of Peru and its people, Garcilasso enjoyed singular advantages, for his mother, an Inca princess, and her relations told him everything concerning their ancestors, omitting nothing, as they considered him one of their race. On the other hand, his father, who was the Governor of Cuzco, was on intimate terms with many of the conquerors, so that from them the historian heard the accounts of their deeds. Garcilasso, therefore, was in a position to get information at first hand from both the natives and their conquerors. His work is of great historic value, as it constitutes practically the only document we possess of the ancient civilization of Peru. The first part was translated into French by Pradelle-Baudoin (Paris, 1633, and Amsterdam, 1737, 2 vols.), and again by Dalibard (Paris, 1744, 2 vols.); into German by Bottgeer (Nordhausen, 1786). The second part was translated into French by Pradelle-Baudoin (Paris, 1646, 1658, and 1707), and into English by Rigault (London, 1688).  
PRESCOTT, *Conquest of Peru* (New York, 1855); MARKHAM, *Garcilasso's Royal Commentaries* (tr., London, 1869).

VENTURA FUENTES.

**Gardar.** See AMERICA, PRE-COLUMBIAN; GREENLAND.

**Gardellini**, ALOISIO, b. at Rome, 4 Aug., 1759; d. there, 8 Oct., 1829. He is famous chiefly for his collection of the decrees of the Congregation of Rites. Until 1587, the celebration of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the administration of the sacraments had been subject to regulations made by various popes. Necessarily, in the course of time, these regulations became somewhat confused by reason of overlapping, amplification, and abolition. In the year mentioned above, Sixtus V, in the Constitution "*Immensæ æterni Dei*", called into being a body of cardinals, bishops, and clerics, whose work was to guard and guide the decorous celebration of the church offices. A collection of papal regulations and congregational decrees was published in 1730 by John Baptist Pithonius, a Venetian priest, the title of his book being "*Constitutiones pontificæ et Romanorum Congregationum decisiones ad sacros Ritus spectantes*". This work was somewhat imperfect, and it was not until 1807 that Gardellini published the first two volumes of his well-known collection of the decrees of the Congregation of Rites, to which was prefixed "*Sacrorum rituum studiosis monitum*". Gardellini was a very profound student, especially of the liturgy and kindred subjects, and in diligence, piety, and learning was unexcelled. His collection of decrees gives evidence of most painstaking labour, and comprises all the decrees from 1602. Three further volumes were published in 1816, and a sixth volume was brought out in 1819. This volume contained more recent decrees down to the date of publication, and also the Commentary on the Clementine Instruction regarding the devotion of the Forty Hours. There were a few slight errors in the complete work, and the exacting love of perfection, so characteristic of Gardellini, would not allow him to leave these errors uncorrected. Accordingly, a new and corrected edition was published in 1827, and in this edition he included certain answers given between the years 1558 and 1599. In recognition of his great services, Gardellini was appointed assessor of the Congregation of Rites. Other editions of the decrees have been issued subsequently, but the collection of Gardellini is the foundation of them all; the latest is that of Mühlbauer with the decrees in alphabetical order (1863-65; with five supplementary volumes, 1876-87). The latest edition of the "*Decreta Authentica*" of the Congregation of Rites was published in 1898.

DAVID DUNFORD.



**Gardiner, STEPHEN**, Bishop of Winchester; b. at Bury St. Edmund's between 1483 and 1490; d. at Whitehall, London, 12 Nov., 1555. His father is believed to have been John Gardiner, a clothworker, the story attributing his parentage to Lionel Woodville being a later invention. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and became doctor of civil law in 1520, and of canon law in 1521. He was also elected fellow of his college. In 1524, he became one of Sir Robert Rede's lecturers in the University, and the Duke of Norfolk chose him as tutor for his son. It was through the duke that he was introduced to the notice of Cardinal Wolsey, who immediately appreciated his talents and scholarship, and made him his own private secretary. In 1525, he was elected master of Trinity Hall, and held that office till 1549. In 1527 he accompanied Wolsey to France, where he made the acquaintance of Erasmus. He was selected



STEPHEN GARDINER

in the following year as ambassador to the pope with instructions to press the matter of the divorce. He delighted the king by his success in inducing the pope to appoint a second commission, and from this time he becomes a figure of mark at court. He was rewarded with the Archdeaconry of Norwich on 1 March, 1528-9, and immediately afterwards was sent again to Rome, but on this occasion he was unsuccessful. He became secretary to the king on 28 July, 1529, and soon gained great influence, especially after the fall of Wolsey, his former master, to whom he was now able to be of service, especially in the preservation of his foundation of Christ's College, Oxford.

His new power brought quick advancement. In 1531 he was made archdeacon of Leicester, while Oxford University conferred the doctorate of laws upon him, and late in the year he was elected Bishop of Winchester. He was consecrated on 27 Nov., and from this time began to show more independence of action, though he still remained high in the royal favour. Shortly after his consecration he spent two months in France as ambassador, but on his return he began to preach in his diocese and to administer the see with more personal interest than had been expected from a courtier-prelate. That he was now less at court was thought to be due to the fact that he had formed definite opinions against the king on the divorce question. Pope Clement certainly believed this ("Letters and Papers Henry VIII", V, 561), but notwithstanding such reports Gardiner acted as assessor in the Court which declared the marriage of Henry and Catherine null and void, and he also took an active part in the coronation of Anne Boleyn.

By 1534, in which year he resigned the post of secretary to the king, he was in a difficult position. He was antagonistic to Cromwell and Crammer, both of whom were then high in the royal counsels, and he strongly disapproved of the attack on the religious orders which was already contemplated. But his attachment to the king prevented him from taking up the firm attitude which Fisher and More had adopted, so that early in 1535 he not only accepted the royal supremacy, but he wrote his treatise "*De vera obedientia*", in which he argued that the pope had no legiti-

mate power over other churches, and that kings are entitled to supremacy in their respective churches. The book was received with delight by the Protestant party, while Catholics maintained that it had been written under compulsion and fear of death. Dr. S. R. Maitland ("*Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation*", London, 1849) shows some ground for doubting the authenticity of this work as we have it, and in particular he makes a strong case against the genuineness of the scandalous preface attributed to Bonner. However, it succeeded in regaining for him the confidence of the king, and he was again appointed ambassador to France (1535), but, owing to the machinations of Cromwell, he was recalled in 1538.

In the following year he was sent on an embassy to Germany, and on his return the celebrated Six Articles—"the whip with six strings", generally believed to have been his work—was issued by the king. Their tendency was so opposed to the policy of Cromwell, that a struggle for life between these two men became inevitable. Cromwell succeeded in obtaining the dismissal of Gardiner from the Privy Council, but his own power was at an end, and, when he was executed in 1541, he left Gardiner in possession of supreme political influence. This position he retained until the death of Henry, and, though he was actually in schism, he remained the chief support of the old religion and was looked on by the reformers as their most dangerous enemy. During this period his own nephew, Blessed German Gardiner, underwent martyrdom rather than take the oath of royal supremacy. At the funeral of Henry VIII in 1547, Gardiner took the chief place and was celebrant at the Mass, but his name had been omitted from the royal will, and he was excluded from the new Council of State. He immediately opposed both the protector and the archbishop in their attempts at religious changes, whereupon he was committed a prisoner to the Fleet, where he remained till Christmas. On his release he returned to his see, only to be recalled in May, 1548, to deliver a public sermon, so as to satisfy the Council. He preached at Paul's Cross on 29 June, maintaining the doctrine of the Real Presence, and was promptly sent to the Tower. Here he was kept for over three years in spite of his repeated protests against the illegality of his detention. At length, in December, 1551, he was brought to trial, and, on 18 April following, he was deprived of his bishopric, into which Poyntet was intruded.

From this time till the accession of Queen Mary he remained a close prisoner in the Tower. She not only restored him to liberty, but raised him to the highest honours, and on 23 Aug., 1553, he was made Lord High Chancellor, and, being restored to his diocese, he crowned the Queen on 1 Oct. He tried vainly to save both Cranmer and Northumberland; and other Protestants, such as Peter Martyr and Roger Ascham, experienced his kindness. He now made amends for his previous fall by taking a leading part in restoring England to communion with the Holy See. Another task entrusted to him was the rehabilitation of the public finances, and in this his ability and known integrity were successful. On the important subject of the queen's marriage, Gardiner boldly opposed any foreign alliance, though by doing so he courted the enmity of both the Spanish and French ambassadors besides losing to some extent the confidence of the queen herself. His policy was not followed, and, in 1554, he himself blessed the marriage of Mary and Philip in his own cathedral at Winchester. The unpopularity of the marriage in London led to riotous scenes and much religious controversy, to meet which the statute "*De hæretico comburendo*" was re-enacted in December, 1554. About the same time Gardiner obtained from the pope a Bull confirming in their possessions all who held Church property seized during the reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI, it being felt that the surrender of this property would be

a small price to pay for the restoration of the Faith in England. Though Foxe with his customary mendacity has represented Gardiner as a monster of cruelty, he had but little to do with the "Marian persecution", of which he personally disapproved, and he only took part in one trial for heresy—the Commission of Inquiry into the teaching of Hooper, Rogers, Saunders, and Taylor. By the summer of 1555, Gardiner's health was failing; he was suffering from jaundice and dropsy and was terribly changed in appearance, but he struggled on with his duties and managed to address Parliament, 21 October. The effort of making his speech was however too much for him, and, being unable to return home, he was carried to Whitehall, where he lay till the end came on 12 November. As the story of the Passion was read aloud to him, when St. Peter's denial was described, he cried out "Negavi cum Petro, exivi cum Petro, sed nondum flevi cum Petro"—the dying expression of his sorrow for his fall.

Besides "De vera obedientia", he wrote "Conquestio ad M. Bucerum de impudentia ejusdem pseudologia" (Louvain, 1544); "A Detectione of the Devil's Sophistrie wherein he robbeth the unlearned people of the true byleef in the most blessed Sacrament of the Aulter" (London, 1546); "Epistola ad M. Bucerum" (Louvain, 1546); "A declaration of suche true articles as G. Joye hath gone about to confute as false" (London, 1546); "An Explication of the true Catholique Fayth touching the blessed Sacrament" (Rouen, 1551); "Confutatio cavillationum" (1551); "Palinodia libri de vera obedientia" (Paris, 1552); "Contra convitia Martini Bucer" (Louvain, 1554); "Exetasis testimoniorum que Bucer minus genuine e S. patribus non sancte edidit de cœlibatus dono" (Louvain, 1554); "Epistolæ ad J. Checum de pronuntiatione linguæ græcæ" (Basle, 1555). Sermons, letters, and despatches are to be found in the State Papers, Collier's "Ecclesiastical History", Foxe's "Acts and Monuments", and elsewhere. Some unpublished MSS. are in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and one in Lambeth Library. There are portraits at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and at Oxford.

BREWER AND GAIRDNER, *State Papers of Henry VIII*, 20 vols and introductions (London, 1862-1907); LINGARD, *History of England*, Vol. V (London, s. d.); BREWER, *Reign of Henry VIII to the death of Wolsey* (London, 1834); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), s. v.; MULLINGER, *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), s. v.; STONE, *History of Mary I, Queen of England* (London, 1901).

EDWIN BURTON.

**Garesché, JULIUS PETER**, soldier; b. 26 April, 1821, near Havana, Cuba; killed at the battle of Stone River, Tennessee, U. S. A., 31 December, 1862. He was sent to Georgetown College, Washington, in 1833, and remained there four years. Then he was appointed to the U. S. Military Academy, at West Point, and graduated with the class of 1841, receiving his commission as a second-lieutenant in the Fourth Artillery. The five subsequent years were spent on the frontier and in garrison duty. During the Mexican War he served with distinction, and was appointed assistant adjutant-general, with the rank of captain in 1855. Wherever he was stationed, Garesché always took an active part in the affairs of the Church. In Washington he organized the first local conference of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and during his residence at the capital acted as its president. He contributed frequently on Catholic, social and political questions, to the New York "Freeman's Journal" and "Brownson's Quarterly Review", and in September, 1851, in recognition of his services to the Church, received from Pius IX the decoration of a Knight of St. Sylvester. When the Civil War broke out, he declined a commission as brigadier-general of volunteers, and was made chief of staff, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel in the regular army, to General William S. Rosecranz. In this capacity he participated in the operations of the Army of the Cumberland. At the

battle of Stone River, he was killed by a cannon-ball, while leading a column in a gallant attempt to regain a lost day.

LOUIS GARESCHÉ, *Biography of Lieut.-Col. Julius P. Garesché* (Philadelphia, 1887); SHEA, *History of Georgetown College* (New York, 1891); *Cyclopædia of Amer. Biog.* s. v.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Garet, JEAN**, Benedictine of the Congregation of Saint-Maur, b. at Havre about 1627; d. at Jumièges, 24 September, 1694. He was professed in 1647 when he was twenty years old, and lived in the Abbey of Saint-Ouen at Rouen. While there he prepared an edition of Cassiodorus which was published at Rouen in 1679. Mommsen's criticism on his edition of the "Varia", which was included in the above work, is very severe: "A work without either skill or learning, Garet took Fournier's text (Paris, 1579) as a basis, and inserted alterations of his own rather than corrections." (Mon. Germ. Hist.: Auct. antiq., XII, cxv). As a preface to his edition Garet wrote a dissertation in which he tried to prove that Cassiodorus was a Benedictine. Migne followed the Garet edition in P. L., LXIX-LXX, and it remains the most complete modern edition. Needless to say it does not contain the "Complexiones" discovered later by Maffei.

LE CERF DE LA VIEVILLE, *Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la congrégation de Saint-Maur* (The Hague, 1726), 142.

PAUL LEJAY.

**Gargara**, a titular see in the province of Asia, suffragan of Ephesus. The city appears to have been situated on Mt. Gargaron, the highest peak (1690 feet) of Mt. Ida, celebrated in Grecian mythology and the Homeric epic. It was at first inhabited by a colony from Assos, who were followed by people from Miletopolis. The grammarian Diotimes conducted a school here which was poorly attended by the uncultured inhabitants of Gargara. Three of the ancient bishops of Gargara were John, 518; Theodore, 553; and Ephrem, 878. Mt. Gargara is now known as Dikeli-Dagh, forming part of Kaz-Dagh, the ancient Ida. It has been thought that the city itself was discovered in the ruins of Akrili in the caza of Aivadjik and the sanjak of Bigha. Gargara must not be confused with the Jacobite bishopric of Gargar or Birta of Gargar, to-day Gerger, situated in the mountains west of the Euphrates and south of Malatia.

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878), I, 976-77; LEQUËN, *Oriens Christ.* (1740), I, 703-04; II, 1891-92; GAMS, *Series Episc. Eccl. Cath.*, 444.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Garin.** See ERZERUM, DIOCESE OF.

**Garin, ANDRÉ**, an Oblate missionary and parish priest, b. 7 May, 1822, at Côte-Saint-André, Isère, France; d. at Lowell, Massachusetts, 16 February, 1895. He received his education at the lesser seminary of his native town, and entered the Order of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 1 November, 1842; as he was still too young to be admitted to the priesthood he was sent to Canada, where he was ordained 25 April, 1845, by Bishop Bourget of Montreal. During a period of twelve years he devoted himself to the Indian missions of Eastern Canada, after which he occupied the post of superior successively at Plattsburg and at Buffalo.

Though his services were peculiarly valuable in his early fields of labour as he had mastered both the Montagnais and the English languages, yet an able man being needed to organize parish and mission work among the French Canadians at Lowell, Father Garin was ordered thither and in a short time his remarkable good sense, courteous manner, and kindly disposition won for him a wonderful influence over his people. During a pastorate of some twenty-five years he built costly churches and commodious school edifices; he also established several religious confraternities among

his parishioners. Grateful for all he had done for them, the members of his parish erected a statue to him two years after his death.

*Notices nécrologiques des Oblats de Marie Immaculée* (Bar-le-Duc, 1899), VII.

A. G. MORICE.

**Garland**, a wreath of flowers or evergreens formerly used in connexion with baptismal, nuptial, and funeral rites, as well as in solemn processions. The earliest certain reference to the baptismal garland, as worn by neophytes, occurs in a seventh-century description of the Alexandrine ritual, written by the patriarch Severus, who says that, after the baptism and unction (i. e. confirmation), the priest administered Holy Communion, and crowned the newly-baptized with garlands. This custom was still observed at Alexandria in the eighteenth century. A similar rite has also been inferred from a passage in the Gallican liturgy (*baptizati et in Christo coronati*), but more probably this expression is merely metaphorical. The bridal crown or wreath is said to be of pre-Christian Greek origin, adopted later by the Romans. Tertullian refers to it as a sign of paganism, but this prejudice was afterwards set aside, and it was in common use among Christians by the time of St. John Chrysostom. The bride and bridegroom were crowned to symbolize their victory over the temptations of the flesh. (For the continued use of garlands at the marriage ceremony during the early medieval period at Rome, see Duchesne, "Christian Worship", tr. London, 1903, 428-434.) The rite has been retained by the Greek Church, silver crowns taking the place of floral wreaths.

Funeral garlands were used in primitive times, in connexion with the burial of virgins, and especially of virgin martyrs, to symbolize their victory, and by analogy they came also to be used for all martyrs. Hence they are constantly found represented in painting or sculpture, on the tombs of the early Christians. In later times a crown, consisting of a wooden hoop, with two half-circles crossing each other at right angles and covered with flowers and streaming ribbons, used to be carried before the bier of an unmarried woman, and afterwards suspended over or near to the grave. This custom was continued in England all through the middle ages and Reformation period, and it survives even now in certain remote places, especially in Devon and Cornwall. The iron hook upon which such wreaths were hung, in the seventeenth century, may still be seen in the south aisle of St. Alban's Abbey. In medieval times the clergy were wont to wear floral garlands or crowns on their heads, on the occasions of solemn processions. Stow mentions one at St. Paul's, London, when the dean and chapter "apparelled in copes and vestments, with garlands of roses on their heads, issued out at the west door" (Survey of London, ed. 1750); and in the inventories and churchwardens' accounts of many an English church, items of expenditure on similar ornaments occur. The same custom prevailed also in Germany, France, and Italy. Martène (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, III, iv) mentions an illuminated missal belonging to a church at Melun, in which such floral garlands are pictured in a Corpus Christi procession, and the same is recorded at Angers, Laon, and elsewhere. According to Martène also, in certain places in France, a priest celebrating his first Mass was similarly decked, which custom still survives in certain parts of Germany and Bavaria. The term *garland* was also technically used to signify a crown of precious metal, often adorned with gems, made for the arrangement of natural or artificial flowers before the altar or sacred image at festival times.

ROCK, *Church of our Fathers* (London, 1849); WALCOTT, *Sacred Archaeology* (London, 1888); MARIOTT in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. *Baptism*; PROMPTRE, *ibid.*, s. v. *Crowns for Brides*; LEE, *Glossary of Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Terms* (London, 1877); SCANNELL (ed.), *Catholic Dictionary* (London, 1905), s. v. *Marriage*; LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Paris, 1907).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Garland, JOHN**, an English poet and grammarian, who lived in the middle of the thirteenth century. He tells us he was born in England and studied at Oxford with John of London, one of Roger Bacon's masters. He goes on to add that he was "fostered" in France and cherished that land above the land of his birth. The greater portion of his life was spent there. At one time he studied at the University of Paris, and then taught grammar and belles-lettres at Toulouse, and later at Paris. He went to Toulouse at the time of the close of the Albigensian war. Hence it was about 1229 that he composed the "Epithalamium Beatæ Virginis Mariæ", dedicated to Cardinal Romano Bonaventura, Cardinal-Deacon of Sant' Angelo, who, as legate, was trying to win back the people of Languedoc to the orthodox Faith. His "De triumphis Ecclesiæ" belongs to this period also. It is an epic poem in distichs, celebrating the victories of the crusades, the crushing of heresy, and the glories of the Faith. In 1234 he was back in Paris and wrote his "Accentuarium", a poem in 1426 hexameter verses on the laws of accent. A little later, at Paris also, he composed his "Carmen de Ecclesia", a poem on the liturgy, dedicated to Fulk, Bishop of London (1244-59). In it the poet laments the recent death of his fellow-countryman, Alexander of Hales, who died on 21 August, 1245. After the manner of the schoolmasters of his day, he wrote a glossary of this poem. For his own use as a tutor he wrote a "Distigium" or "Cornutus" in forty-two hexameter verses, grouped in pairs, to assist in remembering unusual Latin words or latinized Greek words; a "Dictionarius cum commento", or glossary; a compendium of grammar, in verse; an "Æquivoca", or list of homonyms, also in verse; a treatise on rhetoric with the odd title "Moral Examples" (*Exempla honestæ vitæ*); a "Commentarius curiatum", intended to explain to the children of nobles the meaning of such Latin words as might interest them; a "Poetria", or collection of examples in every style of versification.

In the "Exempla" he tells us he got his name from the Rue Garlande (now the Rue Galande), a main thoroughfare in the neighbourhood of the university where he taught. It was for his pupils in Paris that he penned the "Miracula Beatæ Mariæ Virginis", wherein he tells us that he worked at it in the library of Ste-Geneviève, which goes to prove that it was open to the public. It is the earliest reference to this library. Other works are attributed to John Garland, some of them erroneously, as the various poems entitled "Facetus"; "De contemptu mundi"; "Floretus"; "Cornutus novus"; a treatise on chemistry; a treatise on interest. Many of the above have never been edited. John Garland's verses are very faulty, being merely bad prose versified. The style is designedly obscure and absurdly pedantic. The sarcasms of Erasmus with reference to the pedagogical methods of medieval teachers are often supported by quotations from Garland's writings. For men of the Renaissance, he was held up as a type of the scholastic turning to literature.

On his various works and editions thereof see HAURÉAU, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits* (1879), XXVII, ii, 1-86; LE CLERC, *Histoire littéraire de la France* (1847-52), XXII, 11, 77.

PAUL LEJAY.

**Garlick, NICHOLAS, VENERABLE**, priest and martyr, b. at Dinting, Derbyshire, c. 1555; d. at Derby, 24 July, 1588. He studied at Gloucester Hall, now Worcester College, Oxford, matriculating in 1575, but did not take a degree, perhaps because of the Oath of Supremacy thereto annexed. He next became master of the high school at Tideswell in the Peak, where he exercised such a holy influence over his pupils that three of them eventually went with him to Reims and one at least, Christopher Buxton (q. v.), became a martyr. He went to Reims in June, 1581, was or-

dained, and returned to England in January, 1583. After a year of labour, probably in the Midlands, he was arrested, and in 1585 sent into exile, with the knowledge that he would find no mercy if he returned. Nevertheless he was soon back at work in the same neighbourhood. He was arrested by the infamous Topcliffe at Padley, the home of John Fitzherbert, a member of a family still surviving and still Catholic, the arrest being made through the treachery of a son of the house. Topcliffe obtained the house and lived there till he died in 1604. With Garlick was arrested another priest, Robert Ludlam, or Ludham, who had, like Garlick, been at Oxford and had engaged in teaching before his ordination in May, 1581. In Derby Gaol, a small and pestiferous prison, they found a third priest, Robert Sympon, who was of Garlick's college at Oxford. There he had taken Protestant orders, but was soon after reconciled to the Church, for which he suffered long imprisonment in York Castle. In this trial his faith had grown stronger, but having been ordained and passed through many labours, including exile, he was again in durance and in danger of his life, and this time he was wavering. Garlick and Ludlam cheered, reconciled, and comforted their fellow-captive, and all three were tried and suffered together.

KING, *Life of N. Garlick* (1904); CHALLONER, *Missionary Priests* (London, 1741), I, 203; BOASE, *Oxford Register*, II, ii, 59; FOLEY, *Records S.J.* (London, 1877-83), III, 224-29  
J. H. POLLEN.

**Garneau, François-Xavier**, a French Canadian historian, b. at Quebec, 15 June, 1809, of François-Xavier Garneau and Gertrude Amiot; d. 2 February, 1866. After a short elementary course, he studied law, having succeeded by private effort in supplying the lack of classical instruction. He held the office of city clerk from 1844 till his death. In 1845 appeared the first volume of his "Histoire du Canada", an heroic venture, considering the restoration to France after the Conquest of nearly all the civil and military archives. When, through Dr. O'Callaghan, the United States Government had secured copies of the correspondence of the French colonial governors, Garneau went to Albany to study these documents and gather materials for his future volumes, which appeared successively in 1846 and 1848, the third volume recording events as late as the Constitution of 1792. The work was favourably received by both English and French. A second edition includes the period from 1792 to the Union (1840). A third edition, 1859, had an English translation, which, however, is not reliable.

Garneau's history must be judged according to the spirit of his time. Its first pages were written shortly after the troubles of 1837 and 1838, at the dawn of the Union of the Canadas, which was the outcome and penalty of the Rebellion. The prospect was gloomy for Lower Canada, and a patriot like Garneau, howsoever impartial, could not easily repress his feelings. More reprehensible are his opinions on certain points of doctrine, and his unjust criticism of church authority and influence. These may be explained by the nature of the books he had studied without proper guidance and the antidote of a sound philosophical training. These blemishes are not found in the last edition, revised at his request by a competent ecclesiastic. In fact, Garneau was ever a practical Catholic and died a most edifying death. The title of "national historian" rightly belongs to this pioneer in the field of Canadian history, who spent twenty-five years of patient research and patriotic devotedness on a work destined to draw the attention of Europe and the United States to the glories of his country.

MORGAN, *Bibliotheca Canadensis* (Ottawa, 1867); CASGRAIN, *Œuvres complètes* (Quebec, 1873); CHAUVEAU, *Notice biographique de F.-X. Garneau* (Montreal, 1883); GAGNON, *Essai de bibliographie Canadienne* (Quebec, 1895), 198-99.

LIONEL LINDSAY.

**Garnet (GARNETT), HENRY**, English martyr, b. 1553-4; d. 1606, son of Brian Garnet, Master of Nottingham School. Henry was elected on 24 Aug., 1567, to a scholarship at Winchester School, then noted for its Catholic tendencies. He was, however, presumably a conformist until his twentieth year, when he courageously broke with all ties, retired abroad, and became a Jesuit in Rome 11 Sept., 1575. Here he enjoyed the company of Persons, Weston, Southwell, and many others, with whom in future he was to be so closely allied, and made a brilliant university course under the celebrated professors of those days—Bellarmine, Suarez, Clavius, etc. He subsequently taught for some time Hebrew and mathematics; a treatise on

physics in his hand is still preserved at Stonyhurst, and he had the honour, whilst Clavius was sick, of filling his chair. He was then summoned to England, where Father Weston was the only Jesuit out of prison, and he left Rome, 8 May, 1586, in company with Robert Southwell. Next year Weston himself was arrested, whereupon Garnet became superior and remained in office till his death.

As an indication of his prudent management it may be mentioned, that under his care the Jesuits on the English mission increased from one to forty, and that not a single letter of complaint, it is said, was sent to headquarters against him. Though he generally lived in London, the hotbed of persecution, neither he nor any of his subordinates, who often came to see him, were captured in his lodgings, though perilous adventures were numerous. He was a prolific correspondent, and his extant letters show him to have been in sympathetic touch with Catholics all over the country. He was also a generous distributor of alms, and sent to Rome relics and curiosities, amongst others the letters of Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn, now in the Vatican Library. He wrote a "Treatise of Christian Renunciation", and he translated, or caused to be translated, Canisius's "Catechism", to which he added interesting appendixes on "Pilgrimages", "Indulgences", etc. These books, now extremely rare, were perhaps secretly printed under his care in London. "A Treatise of Equivocation", believed to have been composed by Garnet, was edited by D. Jardine in 1851.

In 1595 and 1598, Garnet became involved in unpleasant clerical troubles. Some thirty-three English Catholics, almost all priests, had been shut up in Wisbech Castle. Of this number eighteen, besides two Jesuits, Father Weston and Brother Pounce, desired in the winter of 1594-5 to separate themselves from the rest and adopt a regular collegiate life. But it was impossible to do this without appearing at least to reflect unfavourably on those who did not care for the change. Furthermore, the number of the latter was considerable, and the prison was so small that any division of chambers and tables was out of the question. The minority certainly had a right to protest, but they did so in such a rough, unruly way, that they seemed to justify the separation, which was in fact



HENRY GARNET  
Sketch of a portrait now lost, Stonyhurst College

carried out with Father Garnet's approval in February, 1595. An earnest attempt to settle the differences that ensued was made in October, and, though it was not immediately successful, the division was given up in November, and a reconciliation effected so warm and so hearty that, had it not been for a subsequent quarrel on a different matter, the "Wisbech Stirs" might have been chiefly remembered as a *felix culpa*. The letters to and from Garnet over the happy settlement do him the greatest credit (Dodd-Tierney, Church History of England, III, App. pp. civ-cxvii).

The subsequent trouble, with which Garnet was also concerned, was that of the "Appellant Priests" of 1598-1602. To understand it one must remember that Elizabeth's government had rendered the presence of a bishop in England impossible. Cardinal Allen (see ALLEN, WILLIAM, Cardinal) had governed the missionary priests first from Douai, then from Rome, but after his death in 1594, a new form of government had to be essayed. As usual in missionary countries the first beginning was made with a sacerdotal hierarchy. Prefects of the Mission were appointed for the clergy in Belgium, in Spain, and in Rome, while those in England were put under an archpriest, and this arrangement lasted till the presence of a Catholic Queen, Henrietta Maria, allowed of a bishop being sent to England without seriously endangering the flock (see BISHOP, WILLIAM). But George Blackwell, the man selected for the post of archpriest, proved a failure, and had eventually to be deposed. On paper his qualifications seemed excellent; in practice his successes were few, his mistakes many. Difficulties arose with his clergy, over whose missionary faculties he exercised a somewhat brusque control. Hence anger, sharp letters on both sides, and two appeals to Rome. In the end his authority was maintained and even strengthened, but his manner of government was reprehended. Part of the censure for this should perhaps fall on Garnet, with whom Blackwell sometimes took counsel. As to this a serious misunderstanding needs correction. It has been alleged that the archpriest received "*secret orders to follow the advice of the Superior of the Jesuits in the affairs of the clergy on all points of special importance*" [The italicized words, which are erroneous or misleading, will be found in Dodd-Tierney, III, 51; Lingard (1883), VI, 640; or Taunton, "Black Monks", (London, 1901), I, 250]. One of the appellant clergy wrote in still stronger terms, which merit quotation as an example of the extremes to which controversy was sometimes carried: "All Catholics must hereafter depend upon Blackwell, and he upon Garnet, and Garnet upon Persons, and Persons on the Devil, who is the author of all rebellions, treasons, murders, disobedience and all such designments as this wicked jesuit hath hitherto contrived" ("Sparing Discoverie" 70; Watson in Law's "Jesuits and Seculars", London, 1889, p. lxxv). All that Cardinal Cajetan's "Instruction" really said was, "The archpriest will take care to learn the opinion and advice of the jesuit superiors in matters of greater importance."

Considering the difficulty of finding advisers of any sort in that time of paralysing persecution, the obvious meaning of the words is surely perfectly honourable, and becoming both to the cardinal and to the archpriest. After they had been objected to, however, they were withdrawn by a papal brief, which added that "the Jesuits themselves thought this was necessary" under the changed circumstances.

The conclusion of Garnet's life is closely connected with the Gunpowder Plot, under which heading will be found an account of his having heard from Catesby in general terms that trouble was intended, and from Father Greenway, with Catesby's consent, the full details of the plot on the distinct understanding that, if the plot were otherwise discovered, he was to be at liberty to disclose the whole truth. After the plot had

been discovered, and Garnet had been arrested, he thought it best in his peculiar circumstances to confess the whole truth about his knowledge, and for this he was tried and executed at the west end of old St. Paul's, 3 May, 1606.

Garnet is thus described in the proclamation issued for his arrest—"Henry Garnet, *alias* Walley, *alias* Darey, *alias* Farmer, of a middling stature, full faced, fat of body, of complexion fair, his forehead high on each side, with a little thin hair coming down upon the midst of the fore part of his head: the hair of his head and beard griseled. Of age betwene fifty and three score. His beard on his cheeks cut close, and his chin very thinne and somewhat short. His gait upright, and comely for a feeble man."

The execution was watched so closely that very few relics of the martyrdom were secured by Catholics, but a head of straw stained with his blood fell into the hands of a young Catholic, John Wilkinson. Some months later he showed it to a Catholic gentleman, who noticed that the blood had congealed upon one of the husks in the form of a minute face, resembling, as they thought, Garnet's own portrait. The matter was much talked of, and the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury personally conducted an examination of several witnesses, who had seen the strange phenomenon. Their evidence abundantly proves the reality of the lineaments which might be discerned in the husk. But to what extent the imaginations of the onlookers (which were undoubtedly excited) contributed to the recognition of Garnet's features in particular, can hardly be decided now, for the straw, though carefully preserved by the English Jesuits at Liège, was lost during the troubles of the French Revolution (J. Morris, "Life of Father John Gerard", London, 1881, 393-407).

As the Gunpowder Plot marked a new era of cruelty in the Protestant persecution of Catholics, so Protestant efforts to excuse their fault by blaming Garnet were at one time untiring, and even to the present day his case is discussed in an unfriendly spirit by non-Catholic writers (e. g. Jardine and Gardiner). On the other hand, the great Catholic theologians, who opposed King James in the matter of the Oath of Allegiance have spoken in Garnet's defence (especially Bellarmine "Apologia" XIII, xiii, 186, and Suarez "Defensio Fidei Catholicæ" VI, xi, §6)—a matter of good omen, considering the theological intricacies that beset his case. It is a matter of regret that we have as yet nothing like an authoritative pronouncement from Rome on the subject of Garnet's martyrdom. His name was indeed proposed with that of the other English Martyrs and Confessors in 1874, and his cause was then based upon the testimonies of Bellarmine and the older Catholic writers, which was the correct plea for the proof of *Fama Martyrii*, then to be demonstrated (see BEATIFICATION and CANONIZATION). But these ancient authors were not acquainted with Garnet's actual confessions, which were not known or published in their time. The consequence was that, as the discussion proceeded, their evidence was found to be inconclusive, and an open verdict was returned;



GARNET'S STRAW  
Print by Wierix, Stonyhurst College



thus his martyrdom was held to be neither proved nor disproved. This of course led to his case being "put off" (*dilatus*) for further inquiry, which involves in Rome a delay of many years.

GERARD, *Contributions to a life of Fr. H. Garnet* (London, 1898)—reprinted from *The Month* of same year; see also June and July, 1901). FOLEY, *Records* (London, 1878), IV, 1-192. The formal contemporary defence was by a Cretan Jesuit, EUGENIOS-JOANNIS, *Apologia pro R. P. H. Garneto* (1810), and much will be found in the Jesuit historians, BARTOLI, MORE, etc.; MORRIS, *Life of Father John Gerard* (London, 1881). See also GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II, 392; STANTON, *Mentology* (London, 1892). See also literature under GUNPOWDER PLOT.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Garnet, THOMAS, VENERABLE, protomartyr** of St. Omer and therefore of Stonyhurst College; b. at Southwark, c. 1575; executed at Tyburn, 23 June, 1608. Richard Garnet, Thomas's father, was at Balliol College, Oxford, at the time when greater severity began to be used against Catholics, in 1569, and by his constancy gave great edification to the generation of Oxford men which was to produce Campion, Persons and so many other champions of Catholicism. Thomas attended the Horsham grammar school and was afterwards a page to one of the half-brothers of the Ven. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, who were, however, conformists. At the opening of St. Omer's College in 1592, Thomas was sent there. By 1595 he was considered fit for the new English theological seminary at Valladolid, and started in January, with five others, John Copley, William Worthington, John Iverson, James Thomson, and Henry Mompesson, from Calais. They were lucky in finding, as a travelling companion, a Jesuit Father, William Baldwin, who was going to Spain in disguise under the alias Ottavio Fuscinielli, but misfortunes soon began. After severe weather in the Channel, they found themselves obliged to run for shelter to the Downs, where their vessel was searched by some of Queen Elizabeth's ships, and they were discovered hiding in the hold. They were immediately made prisoners and treated very roughly. They were sent round the Nore up to London, and were examined by Charles, second Lord Howard of Effingham, the lord admiral. After this Father Baldwin was sent to Bridewell prison, where he helped the confessor James Atkinson (q. v.) to obtain his crown. Meantime his young companions had been handed over to Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, having found that they encouraged one another, sent them one by one to different Protestant bishops or doctors. Only the youngest, Mompesson, conformed; the rest eventually escaped and returned to their colleges beyond seas after many adventures. We are not told specifically what befell young Garnet, but it seems likely that he was the youth confined to the house of Dr. Richard Edes (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XVI, 364). He fell ill and was sent home under bond to return to custody at Oxford by a certain day. But his jailer not appearing in time, the boy escaped, and to avoid trouble had then to keep away even from his own father. At last he reached St. Omer again, and thence went to Valladolid, 7 March, 1596, having started on that journey no less than ten times.

After ordination in 1599, "returning to England I wandered", he says, "from place to place, to reduce souls which went astray and were in error as to the knowledge of the true Catholic Church". During the excitement caused by the Gunpowder Plot in 1605 he was arrested near Warwick, going under the name Thomas Rokewood, which he had no doubt assumed from Ambrose Rokewood of Coldham Hall, whose chaplain he then was, and who had unfortunately been implicated in the plot. Father Garnet was now imprisoned first in the Gatehouse, then in the Tower, where he was very severely handled in order to make him give evidence against Henry Garnet, his uncle, superior of the English Jesuits, who had lately admitted him into the Society. Though no connexion with the

conspiracy could be proved, he was kept in the Tower for seven months, at the end of which time he was suddenly put on board ship with forty-six other priests, and a royal proclamation, dated 10 July, 1606, was read to them, threatening death if they returned. They were then carried across the Channel and set ashore in Flanders.

Father Garnet now went to his old school at St. Omer, thence to Brussels to see the superior of the Jesuits, Father Baldwin, his companion in the adventures of 1595, who sent him to the English Jesuit novitiate, St. John's, Louvain, in which he was the first novice received. In September, 1607, he was sent back to England, but was arrested six weeks later by an apostate priest called Rouse. This was the time of King James's controversy with Bellarmine about the Oath of Allegiance. Garnet was offered his life if he would take it, but steadfastly refused, and was executed at Tyburn, protesting that he was "the happiest man this day alive". His relics, which were preserved at St. Omer, were lost during the French Revolution.

POLLEN, *Protomartyr of Stonyhurst College in Stonyhurst Magazine* (1889), 334-82; BLACKFAN, *Annales Coll. S. Albani, Vallesolei*, ed. POLLEN (1899), 57, 84; CAMM in *The Month* (Aug., 1898), 164-77; YEPEZ, *Persecución de Inglaterra* (Madrid, 1599), 820-30; FOLEY, *Records S.J.*, II, 475-505.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Garnier, CHARLES, a Jesuit Missionary**, b. at Paris, 1606, of Jean G. and Anne de Garault; d. 7 December, 1649. He studied classics, philosophy, and theology at the Jesuit college of Clermont, joining the order in 1624. He begged to be sent to the Canadian mission, and sailed in 1636 on the same fleet as Governor Montmagny. He was sent forthwith to the Huron country, where he was to spend the fourteen years of his heroic apostolate without once returning to Quebec. In six months he mastered the difficult language, and began a career of unceasing charity which was to be crowned by martyrdom. His zeal for the conversion of infidels brooked no hindrance nor delay. Neither distance nor weather, nor danger of death could prevent him from hastening to the stake to baptize and exhort captives of war. Filth, vermin, fetid and loathsome disease could not deter him from tending and redeeming dying sinners. His frail frame miraculously resisted the intense strain. His angelic patience amidst endless trials won him the title of "lamb" of the mission, whereof Brébeuf was styled the "lion". Several times—first in 1637, then in 1639 with Jogues, and later with Pijart—he strove to convert the Tobacco nation. His constancy finally overcame their obstinacy. They asked for the black robes (1646), and Garnier went to dwell with them until death. After the martyrdom of Fathers Daniel (1648), Brébeuf, and Lalemant (March 1649), he calmly awaited his turn. After decimating the Hurons, the Iroquois attacked the Tobacco nation. During the massacre of St. John's village, Garnier went about exhorting his neophytes to be faithful. Mortally wounded he dragged himself towards a dying Indian to absolve him, and received the final blow in the very act of charity (1649) on the eve of the Immaculate Conception, a dogma he had vowed to defend. His letters to his brother, a Carmelite, reveal his sanctity. Rague-neau testifies to his heroic spirit of sacrifice. Parkman compares his life to that of St. Peter Claver among the blacks and styles it a voluntary martyrdom.

ROCHEMONTAIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France* (Paris, 1896); SHEA, *The Catholic Church in colonial days* (New York, 1886); BRESSANI, *Les Jésuites martyrs du Canada* (Montréal, 1877); MARTIN, *Vie manuscrite et Lettres du Père Garnier*.

LIONEL LINDSAY.

**Garnier, JEAN**, church historian, patristic scholar, and moral theologian; b. at Paris, 11 Nov., 1612; d. at Bologna, 26 Nov., 1681. He entered the Society of

Jesus at the age of sixteen, and, after a distinguished course of study, taught at first the humanities, then philosophy, at Clermont-Ferrand (1643-1653), and theology at Bourges (1653-1681). In 1681, he was sent to Rome on business of his order, fell ill on the way, and died at Bologna. Garnier was considered one of the most learned Jesuits of his day, was well versed in Christian antiquity, and much consulted in difficult cases of conscience. In 1648, he published for the first time the "Libellus fidei", sent to the Holy See during the Pelagian controversy by Julian, Bishop of Eclanum in Apulia. Garnier added notes and an historical commentary. The Libellus also found a place in Garnier's later work on Mercator.

In 1655, he wrote "Regulæ fidei catholicæ de gratia Dei per Jesum Christum", and published the work at Bourges. In 1673, he edited at Paris all the works of Marius Mercator (d. at Constantinople after 451). The edition contains two parts. The first gives the writings of Mercator against the Pelagians, and to these Garnier adds seven dissertations: (1) "De primis auctoribus et præcipuis defensoribus hæresis quæ a Pelagio nomen accepit"; (2) "De synodis habitis in causa Pelagianorum"; (3) "De constitutionibus imperatorum in eadem causa 418-430"; (4) "De subscriptione in causa Pelagianorum"; (5) "De libellis fidei scriptis ab auctoribus et præcipuis defensoribus hæresis Pelagianæ"; (6) "De his quæ scripta sunt a defensoribus fidei catholicæ adversus hæresim Pelagianorum ante obitum S. Augustini"; (7) "De ortu et incrementis hæresis Pelagianæ seu potius Cœlestianæ". Cardinal Noris (op. 3, 1176) considered these dissertations of great value, and says that, if he had seen them in time, he would have put aside his own writings on the subject. In the second part, Garnier gives a good historical sketch of Nestorianism from 428 to 433, then of the writings of Mercator on this heresy, and adds two treatises on the heresy and writings of Nestorius, and on the synods held in the matter between 429 and 433. Much praise is bestowed on Garnier by later learned writers for the great amount of historical knowledge displayed in his dissertations, but he is also severely blamed for his arbitrary arrangement of the writings of Mercator and for his criticism of the original (Tillemont, "Mémoires ecclésiastiques", XV, 142; Cotelier, "Monum. eccl. græc.", III, 602).

Garnier edited in 1675 at Paris the "Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutyrianorum" (composed before 566 by Liberatus, an archdeacon of Carthage), correcting many mistakes and adding notes and a dissertation on the Fifth General Council. In 1678 he wrote "Systema bibliothecæ collegii Parisiensis S. J.", a work considered very valuable for those arranging the books in a library. In 1680, he edited the "Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum" from an ancient manuscript, and added three essays: (1) "De indiculo scribendæ epistolæ"; (2) "De ordinatione summi pontificis"; (3) "De usu pallii" (see LIBER DIURNUS). In the second essay he treats the case of Pope Honorius, whom he considers free of guilt. In 1642, Sirmond had published in four volumes the works of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus (d. 455); Garnier added an "Auctarium", which, however, was not published until 1684. It consists of five essays: (1) "De ejus vita"; (2) "De libris Theodoretii"; (3) "De fide Theodoretii"; (4) "De quinta synodo generali"; (5) "De Theodoretii et orientalium causâ". In these he is rather severe on Theodoret and condemns him undeservedly. Another posthumous work of Garnier's, "Tractatus de officiis confessarii erga singula penitentium genera", was published at Paris in 1689.

HURTER, *Nomenclator*; BAUMGARTNER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Garnier, JULIEN**, Jesuit missionary, b. at Connerai, France, 6 January, 1643; d. in Quebec, 1730. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1660, and, in October,

1662, sailed for Canada. He was the first Jesuit to be ordained there, and after his ordination in 1668, he prepared himself for missionary work among the Indians. He went first to the Oneida, but within a few months changed the field of his labours to the Onondaga mission. Garaconthié, the Onondaga chief, received him with every evidence of friendship, and, at his request, rebuilt the chapel of St. Mary. So successful was his ministry among the Onondagas, that, on the arrival of other missionaries in 1671, Garnier set out with Father Frémin for the Seneca country, where he found a bare handful of Christian Indians at the Gandachioragou mission. He immediately began to preach and baptize, and persevered in his work even after his chapel was destroyed by a fire which wiped out the entire village.

When trouble arose in 1683 between the French and the Senecas, Garnier went with de Lamberville to Governor de la Barre to urge compromise and moderation. He was unable, however, to dissuade the latter from his policy of repression, and de la Barre set out upon the ill-starred expedition which was to prevent priests from venturing among the northern tribes for over thirteen years. Every missionary was recalled at the outbreak of hostilities and Garnier was sent in turn to the settlements of Lorette and Caughnawaga. His adventurous spirit, naturally, chafed under the inactivity of these more tranquil labours, and when access to the Indians was made possible by the Treaty of Montreal, in 1701, Father Garnier hastened back to his mission among the Senecas, where he remained till 1709, when Schuyler's expedition once more made it necessary for him to return to Canada. His departure marked the end of missionary work among the Senecas, and he passed his remaining years among the various settlements along the St. Lawrence, retiring from active life in 1728.

Both his extraordinary missionary zeal and the length of time over which his labours extended have marked Father Garnier as the Apostle of the Senecas. His intimacy with this tribe was much more close than that of any other of the early Jesuits, and the notes and letters he has left still remain one of the principal and most accurate sources of information on this division of the Iroquois.

CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (New York, 1908); *Jesuit Relations; Handbook of American Ethnology* (Washington, 1907).

STANLEY J. QUINN.

**Garofalo.** See TISIO.

**Garrigan, PHILIP JOSEPH.** See SIOUX CITY, DIOCESE OF.

**Garrucci, RAFFAELE**, historian of Christian art, b. at Naples, 23 January, 1812; d. at Rome, 5 May, 1885. He belonged to a wealthy family, entered the Society of Jesus at the age of fifteen, and was professed on 19 March, 1833. He devoted himself to the study of the Christian Fathers, also to profane and Christian antiquities; both he and the celebrated De Rossi became the principal disciples of Father Marchi. On his many journeys through Italy, France, Germany, and Spain, he collected much valuable material for his archaeological publications. In 1854 he wrote for Father Cahier's "Mélanges d'Archéologie" a study on Phrygian syncretism. Soon after he edited the notes of Jean L'Heureux on the Roman catacombs (in manuscript since 1605); later an essay on the gilded glasses of the catacombs (1858), and another on the Jewish cemetery at the Villa Randanini. In 1872 he began the publication of a monumental history of early Christian antiquities, entitled "Storia dell' arte cristiana". It was destined to include all works of sculpture, painting, and the minor and industrial arts, during the first eight centuries of the Christian Era. It is, in fact, a general history of early Christian art, and contains five hundred finely engraved plates and ex-

planatory text. Five of the six volumes contain, respectively, the catacomb-frescoes—and paintings from other quarters—gilded glasses, mosaics, sarcophagi, and non-sepulchral sculptures. The first volume is devoted to the theoretical part of the work, i. e. to a history of Christian art properly so called.

In this vast collection Garrucci re-edited to some extent materials taken from earlier works. For hitherto unedited materials he used photographs or reproductions of some other kind. His engravings are not always very accurate, and in point of finish are inferior to those obtained by more modern processes. His reproductions of catacomb-frescoes, in particular, have lost much of their value since the publication of the accurate work of Mgr. Wilpert (*Pittura delle catacombe romane*, Rome, 1903). On the whole, however, it must be said that the "Storia dell' arte cristiana" is yet far from being superseded by any similar work. Father Garrucci had more erudition than critical judgment; in this respect his fellow-student De Rossi was far superior to him. Hence the text of Garrucci's publications is now of doubtful authority. The list of his publications covers 118 numbers in *Sommervogel*, "Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus" (Brussels, 1902), III. Among them are the aforementioned "Storia dell' arte cristiana nei primi otto secoli della chiesa" (6 vols., Prato, 1872-81); "Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento" (2 vols., Rome, 1864-65); "Le monete dell' Italia antica, Raccolta generale" (Rome, 1885).

PROCACTINI DI MONTESCAGLIOSO, *Commemorazione del P. Raffaele Garrucci* (Naples, 1885); BAUMGARTNER, *Pater Garrucci's Geschichte der christlichen Kunst des Altertums in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, X (1876), pp. 158-180; Garrucci, *on Christian Art in The Month*, XXVIII (1876), pp. 47-60, a short account of the preceding article.

R. MAERE.

**Garvey, EUGENE A.** See ALTOONA, DIOCESE OF.

**Garzon, DIOCESE OF (GARZONENSIS)**, suffragan of Popayán in the Republic of Colombia. It comprises the provinces of Neiva and Sur, and lies east of Popayán. It is about 140 miles in length, and its breadth varies from 40 to 100 miles. It extends from 1½° to 4° north latitude, and lies between the 75° and 77° west longitude. The episcopal see is at Neiva, a town of 11,000 inhabitants, situated 150 miles S. W. of Bogotá, at a height of 1500 feet above sea-level, on the river Magdalena, which is navigable to this point. The diocese originally formed part of that of Tolima, which lay in the midst of the Cordilleras. As the territory was so extensive, the population very numerous, and the difficulties of visitation too great, the bishop petitioned the Holy See to divide the diocese. This was done by a decree of Leo XIII, 20 June, 1900. The northern half was erected into a new diocese—Ibagué, suffragan of Bogotá—and the southern half formed the Diocese of Garzon. Mgr. Estéban Rojas, born at Hato in the Diocese of Popayán, 15 January, 1859, had been raised to the See of Tolima, 18 March, 1895. He was transferred to Neiva as first Bishop of Garzon. The cathedral is dedicated to the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady. The population, of which a large part is of mixed origin, is almost entirely Catholic. Till recent years the public authorities neglected education and threw the whole burden on the clergy, but of late government schools are being established. (See COLOMBIA, REPUBLIC OF.)

PETRE, *The Republic of Colombia* (London, 1906); SCRUGGS, *The Colombian and Venezuelan Republics* (Boston, 1902); STUBB, *Die Vulkanberge von Colombia* (Dresden, 1906); HUMBOLDT, *Vues des Cordilleres, et monuments des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique* (Paris, 1816).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Gascoigne, SIR THOMAS.** See POPISH PLOT.

**Gaspare del Bufalo, BLESSED**, founder of the Missionaries of the most Precious Blood (C.P.P.S.); b. at Rome on the feast of the Epiphany, 1786; d. 28 December, 1837. His parents were Antonio del

Bufalo, chief cook of the princely family of Altieri, and his wife Annunziata Quartieroni. Because of his delicate health, his pious mother had him confirmed at the tender age of one and a half years (1787). As he was suffering from an incurable malady of the eyes, which threatened to leave him blind, prayers were offered to St. Francis Xavier for his recovery. In 1787, he was miraculously cured, wherefore he cherished in later life a special devotion to the great Apostle of India, and selected him as the special patron of the congregation which he founded. From his earliest years he had a great horror of even venial sins, and showed deep piety, a spirit of mortification, remarkable control over his evil inclinations (especially his innate irascibility and strong self-will), and also heroic love for the poor and the miserable. Having entered the Collegium Romanum at the age of twelve, he received in 1800 first tonsure, and one year later the four minor orders. As catechetical instructor at St. Mark's, his zeal won for him the name "The Little Apostle of Rome", and when but nineteen years old, he was appointed president of the newly instituted catechetical school of Santa Maria del Pianto.

After his ordination (31 July, 1808), he obtained a canonry at St. Mark's, and soon instituted with Gaetano Bonani a nocturnal oratory. He assisted Francesco Albertini in founding the Archconfraternity of the Most Precious Blood, and worked with great zeal in the poorer districts of Rome, preaching frequently in the market-places. In 1810 he was summoned before General Miollis to swear allegiance to Napoleon. But neither threats nor promises could induce him to do so, because Pius VII had forbidden it. The words with which he announced his final decision have become famous: "Non posso, non debbo, non voglio" (I cannot; I ought not; I will not). In consequence he suffered banishment, and later on imprisonment in the foul dungeons of Imola and Rocca (1810-1814). After Napoleon's fall he returned to Rome, intending to enter the re-established Jesuit Order. But obeying his spiritual adviser, Albertini, he founded a congregation of secular priests to give missions and spread devotion to the Most Precious Blood. Through Cardinal Cristaldi he obtained the pope's sanction and, as a mother-house, the former convent of San Felice in Giano. Of this he took solemn possession, 11 August, 1815. The Bull of beatification says, "Through Umbria, Emilia, Picenum, Tuscany, Campania, Samnium, in short all the provinces of Middle Italy, he wandered, giving missions". The very titles accorded to him by his contemporaries speak volumes: "Il Santo", "Apostle of Rome", "Il martello dei Carbonari" (Hammer of Italian Freemasonry).

How arduous some of his missions were may be gleaned from the fact that he frequently preached five times daily, sometimes even oftener. At Sanseverino fifty priests were not sufficient to hear confessions after his sermons. Though idolized by the people, he was not without enemies. His activity in converting the "briganti", who came in crowds and laid their guns at his feet after he had preached to them in their mountain hiding-places, excited the ire of the officials who profited from brigandage through bribes and in other ways. These enemies almost induced Leo XII to suspend del Bufalo. But after a personal conference, the pope dismissed him, remarking to his courtiers, "Del Bufalo is an angel". His enemies next tried to remove him from his post by procuring his promotion as "internuncio to Brazil". In vain, however, for his humility triumphed. A last attempt under Pius VIII (1830) met with temporary success. Del Bufalo was deprived of faculties for a short time, and his congregation threatened with extinction. But his wonderful humility again manifested itself, and, though himself misjudged and his life-work menaced by the very authority that should have supported him, he showed no signs of resentment,

forgave his enemies, and excused his unmerited condemnation. The storm soon passed, Gaspere was restored to honour, and resumed his work with renewed zeal. In 1836 his strength began to fail. Although fatally ill, he hastened to Rome, where the cholera was raging, to administer to the spiritual wants of the plague-stricken. It proved too much for him, and he succumbed in the midst of his labours on 28 Dec., 1837. He was beatified by Pius X on 29 Aug., 1904.

KONRADI AND JUSSEL, *Leben des sel. Kaspere del Bufalo*; SARDI, *Notizie intorno alla vita del beato Gaspare del Bufalo*.

ULRICH F. MUELLER.

**Gaspé**, PHILIPPE-AUBERT DE, a French Canadian writer, b. at Quebec, 30 Oct., 1786, of a family ennobled by Louis XIV in 1693; d. 29 Jan., 1871. His grandfather fought under Montcalm at Carillon (Ticonderoga). He studied at Quebec Seminary, and after a brief practice of the law, was appointed sheriff. Forced by misfortune to retire to his ancestral home at Saint-Jean-Port-Joli, on the St. Lawrence, he there spent thirty years in study. At the ripe age of seventy-five, he produced a work, "Les Anciens Canadiens" (Quebec, 1861), which is a household word throughout Canada. This historical novel, almost entirely based on fact, illustrates Canadian national tradition, character, and manners. The author has interwoven the events of his own chequered life with the tragic tale of the struggles and fall of New France, and of the change of regime, the eyewitnesses of which he had personally known. In 1866, Gaspé published his "Mémoires", which continue and amplify the precious historical notes contained in his other works. Less brilliant and attractive than his novel, the "Mémoires" are an excellent specimen of anecdotal history. The author's standing and experience, the latter embracing directly or indirectly the space of a century dating from the Conquest, constitute him an authentic chronicler of an obscure yet eventful period of history.

MORGAN, *Bibl. Can.* (Ottawa, 1867); CASGRAIN, *Œuvres complètes* (Quebec, 1873).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

**Gassendi** (GASSENDY, GASSEND), PIERRE, French philosopher and scientist; b. at Champtercier, a country place near Digne in Provence, 22 January, 1592 (tombstone says IX cal. Feb., i. e. 24 Jan.); d. at Paris, 24 October, 1655. He studied Latin and rhetoric at Digne, and philosophy at Aix, whence his father, Antoine, called him back to take charge of domestic affairs. However, he was appointed to succeed his former teacher of rhetoric at Digne at the age of 16, and his teacher of philosophy at Aix at the age of 19. His friends and patrons at Aix, Prior Gautier and Councillor Peirese, recognized his character and talents from his first publication and helped him to enter the ecclesiastical state. He became doctor of theology at Aix and attained proficiency in Greek and Hebrew literature. To allow him leisure for his studies, he was appointed a canon (c. 1623) and provost (c. 1625) at the cathedral of Digne. Until 1645, his studies were interrupted only by a journey to the Netherlands in 1628—his only trip outside of France. In 1645, on the recommendation of Cardinal Richelieu, he was appointed by the king to a professorship of mathematics at the Collège Royal of France, which he reluctantly accepted, being granted the rare privilege of returning to his native soil whenever his health required it. On 23 November, he delivered his inaugural address in presence of the cardinal. His lectures before a numerous and learned audience were astronomical rather than mathematical, and resulted, two years later, in the publication of his "Institutio Astronomica". Meanwhile an inflammation of the lungs had obliged him to return to Provence. In 1653, he went back to Paris and was re-

ceived in a friendly manner at the Château de Montmort, where a year later he fell seriously ill with intermittent fever. He was bled nine times, and, although he declared himself too weak for another bleeding, he submitted to the decision of the best doctors in Paris. He underwent the same operation five times more, after which his speech became mere whispering, and he expired quietly at the age of 63.

Gassendi, "the Bacon of France", is specially noteworthy for his opposition to the Aristotelean philosophy, and for his revival of the Epicurean system. He wished the aprioristic methods then prevailing in the schools replaced by experimental proofs. His cosmology, psychology, and ethics are epicurean, except that he maintains the doctrine of the Creator and of Providence, and the spirituality and immortality of the soul. He thus attempts to build up a Christian philosophy upon Epicurus—an inconsistency, which is attacked by non-Christian, as well as Christian, philosophers. His views on the constitution of matter and his merits in regard to modern kinetic atomism are explained by Lasswitz. That Gassendi was neither "the father of materialism" nor a sceptic in the proper sense is shown by Kiefl (see Baldwin, op. cit. below). He corresponded with Hobbes, Mersenne, Christina of Sweden, and engaged in controversy with Fludd, Herbert, and Descartes.



PIERRE GASSENDI

That as an amateur astronomer, Gassendi was a persevering, attentive, and intelligent observer, is evident from his notebook carefully kept from 1618 until 1652 and filling over 400 pages. With a Galilean telescope he observed the transit of Mercury in 1631, predicted by Kepler, by projecting the sun's image on a screen of paper. His instrument was not strong enough, however, to disclose the occultations and transits of Jupiter's satellites, or the true shape of Saturn's ring. The results of his astronomical work are analysed in Delambre's "Histoire de l'Astronomie Moderne" (Paris, 1821, II). Other works of minor importance refer to biographies, physics, and anatomy. Gassendi was in correspondence with Cassini, Galilei, Hevel, Kepler, Kircher, Scheiner, Vallis, and other scientists. As to the Copernican system, he maintained that it rested on probabilities, but was not demonstrated, although he ably refuted all objections against it. To those whose conscience forbade them to accept Copernicanism, he said that the Tychonian system recommended itself as the most probable of all (Op. V, De Rebus Cœlestibus, V).

In character, Gassendi was retiring and unpretentious. With friends, he would give way to a humorous and ironical vein; in controversy, he observed the Socratic method. On Sundays and feast days he never omitted celebrating Mass; and when in Paris, he went to the church of his friend, Père Mersenne. In his last illness he asked for the Viaticum three times, and for extreme unction, and his aspirations were words from the Psalms. Gassendi was esteemed by all, and loved by the poor, for whom he provided in lifetime and in his last will. He founded two anniversary Masses for himself, one to be said in the

cathedral of Digne, and one in the chapel of his friend, Monmort, at St-Nicolas-des-Champs, Paris, where he was buried. The accompanying picture represents his marble bust in that mausoleum. The assertion that he was a Minorite is without foundation.

Gassendi's "Opera Omnia" were edited in 6 vols., Lyons, 1658, and Florence, 1727.

BALDWIN, *Dict. of Philos. and Psychol.* (New York, London, 1905), III, 335; *Archiv f. Gesch. d. Philos.* II (1889), 459; X (1907), 238; *Biographie Univ.* s. v.; LASSWITZ, *Geschichte d. Atomistik* (Hamburg, Leipzig, 1890), II, 126; NOAK, *Histor.-Biogr. Handwörterb.* (Leipzig, 1879); RITTER, *Geschichte d. Philos.*, X, 543; STÖCKL, *Geschichte d. Philos. d. Mittelalters* (Mainz, 1866), III, 316; *Idem in Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; UEBERWEG, *Grundriss d. Gesch. d. Philos.* (Berlin, 1901), 101.

J. G. HAGEN.

**Gasser von Valhorn, JOSEPH**, an Austrian sculptor, b. 22 Nov., 1816, at Pragrat, Tyrol; d. 28 Oct., 1900. He was first instructed by his father, a wood-carver, and later studied at the Academy, Vienna. In 1846 he went to Rome, where a government stipend enabled him to remain several years. On his return he settled in Vienna (1852), and executed five heroic figures for the portal of the cathedral at Speyer: Our Lady, the Archangel St. Michael, St. John the Baptist, St. Stephen, and St. Bernard of Clairvaux, completed in 1856. Also in Speyer he carved seven reliefs for the Kaiserhalle. The marble statue of Rudolph IV on the Elizabeth bridge over the Danube Canal, Vienna, is by him. Other works are the statues of Maximilian I, Frederick the Warlike, and Leopold of Hapsburg for the Museum of the Arsenal; the marble statues of the Seven Liberal Arts in the staircase of the Opera House; twenty-four figures for the Cathedral of St. Stephen; the relief of Duke Rudolph the Founder for the New Townhall; the "Prometheus" and the "Geneviève" for the Court Theatre; a number of statues for the Altlerchenfelder Church; busts of Herodotus and Aristarchus for the university; and portraits of Maximilian of Mexico and of his wife the Empress Charlotte. He also made a bust of the Emperor Francis Joseph for the Hôtel de Ville, Paris, and sculptures for the new cathedral, Linz. Most important among his works are the subjects for the Votive Church, Vienna, modelled around the year 1873: the Coronation of Mary, the group of the Trinity, a figure of Christ the Redeemer, statues for the high and side altars, nine angels, and the tympan reliefs for the three main portals. Gasser was professor at the Academy from 1865 to 1873, and was inscribed among the nobility in 1879. In spite of his long life, and much good work, he had but small influence on the development of modern sculpture in Austria.

*Austrian New Art in Summer Number of Studio* (New York, 1900); BAEDERER, *Guidebook for Austria* (Leipzig, 1900); BROCKHAUS in *Konversations-Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1908).

M. L. HANDLEY.

**Gassner, JOHANN JOSEPH**, a celebrated exorcist; b. 22 Aug., 1727, at Braz, Vorarlberg, Austria; d. 4 April, 1779, at Pondorf, on the Danube (Diocese of Ratisbon); studied at Prague and Innsbruck; ordained priest, 1750, and after serving various missions, became parish priest and dean of Pondorf May, 1776. A few years after his appointment to Klosterle in the Diocese of Chur, Switzerland (1758), his health began to fail, so that he was scarcely able to fulfil the duties of his ministry; he consulted various physicians in vain; suddenly he conceived the idea that his infirmities might be due to the influence of the evil spirit and might be cured by spiritual means. His experiment was successful. He applied this method also to others, and soon thousands came to him to be healed. The fame of these cures spread far and wide; he was invited to the Diocese of Constance, to Ellwangen, Ratisbon, and other places; everywhere he had the same success.

He was convinced that the evil spirit could harm the body as well as the soul; and hence that some in-

firmities were not the result of natural agencies, but were caused by the Devil. Only cases of the latter kind were taken up; he applied the exorcisms of the Church, and commanded the evil one to depart from the afflicted, in the name of the Lord Jesus. To find out whether the disease was caused naturally or not, he applied the "probative exorcism", i. e. he commanded the spirit to indicate by some sign his presence in the body. And only then he made use of the "expulsive exorcism". His proceedings were not secret; anyone of good standing, Catholic or Protestant, was admitted. People of all classes, nobles, ecclesiastics, physicians, and others often gathered around him to see the marvels they had heard of. Official records were made; competent witnesses testified to the extraordinary happenings. The character of the work made many enemies for him, but also many staunch friends and supporters. One of his bitterest opponents was the rationalistic professor Johannes Semler of Halle. Also the physician Mesmer pretended that the cures were performed by the animal magnetism of his invention, but he was afraid of confronting Gassner. Among his friends were the Calvinistic minister, Lavater of Zurich, and especially Count Fugger, the Prince-Bishop of Ratisbon.

Official investigations were made by the ecclesiastical authorities; and all were favourable to Gassner, except that they recommended more privacy and decorum. The University of Ingolstadt appointed a commission, and so did the Imperial Government; they ended with the approval of Gassner's procedure. In fact, he never departed from the Church's teaching or instructions concerning exorcism, and always disclaimed the name of wonder-worker. He was an exemplary priest, full of faith and zeal, and altogether unselfish in his works of mercy.

ZIMMERMANN, *Johann Joseph Gassner, der berühmte Exorzist* (Kempten, 1878); *MAST in Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

**Gaston, WILLIAM**, jurist; b. at Newbern, North Carolina, U. S. A., 19 Sept., 1778; d. at Raleigh, North Carolina, 23 January, 1844. His father, Dr. Alexander Gaston, a Presbyterian native of Ireland, formerly a surgeon in the British Navy, was killed at Newbern by British soldiers during the Revolution, and his education devolved on his mother Margaret Sharpe, a Catholic Englishwoman. She sent him to Georgetown College in 1791, his name being the first inscribed on the roll of the students of that institution. After staying there four years he entered Princeton College, New Jersey, where he graduated with first honours in 1796. He then studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1798. In August, 1800, Gaston was elected to the Senate of his native state, although its constitution at the time contained a clause excluding Catholics from office. Elected to Congress in 1813 and 1815, his career in Washington was active and brilliant, as one of the influential leaders of the Federal party. Resuming the practice of law, he was elevated in 1833 to the bench of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, an office which he held for the remainder of his life. In the convention of 1835 he was mainly instrumental in securing the repeal of the article of the North Carolina State Constitution that practically disfranchised Catholics. He was one of the most intimate friends of Bishop England, and his splendid gifts of intellect were always devoted to the promotion of the Faith and the welfare of his fellow-Catholics.

SHEA, *History of Georgetown University* (Washington, 1891); FINOTTI, *Bibliographia Catholica Americana* (New York, 1872); *The Metropolitan* (Baltimore, 1866), IV, 585 sqq.; MURRAY, *Catholic Pioneers of America* (New York, 1882).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Gatianus, SAINT**, founder and first Bishop of Tours; b. probably at Rome; d. at Tours, 20 December, 301. He came to Gaul during the consulate of Decius and



Gratus (250 or 251), devoted half a century to the evangelization of the third Lyonnaise province amid innumerable difficulties, which the pagans raised against him. But he overcame all obstacles, and at his death the Church of Tours was securely established. The "traditional school", relying on legends that have hitherto not been traced back beyond the twelfth century, have claimed that St. Gatianus was one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, and was sent into Gaul during the first century by St. Peter himself. This assertion, which has been refuted by learned and devout writers, is untenable in the face of the testimony of Gregory of Tours. To this bishop, who lived in the sixth century, we are indebted for the only details we possess concerning his holy predecessor.

C. CHEVALIER, *Origines de l'Eglise de Tours* and SEHAN DE SAINT-CLAVIEN, *Saint Gatien, premier évêque de Tours* in *Mém. de la Soc. archéol. de Touraine* (Tours, 1871), XVI; D'ESPINAT, *La controverse sur l'époque de la mission de Saint Gatien dans les Gaules* in *Mém. de la Soc. d'agric., sciences et arts d'Angers* (Angers, 1873), 376-444.

LÉON CLUGNET.

**Gau**, FRANZ CHRISTIAN, architect and archæologist, b. at Cologne, 15 June, 1790; d. at Paris, January, 1854. In 1809 he entered the Académie des Beaux-Arts, Paris, and in 1815 visited Italy and Sicily. In 1817 he went to Nubia, and while there he made drawings and measurements of all the more important monuments of that country, his ambition being to produce a work which should supplement the great work of the French expedition in Egypt. The result of his labours appeared in a folio volume (Stuttgart and Paris, 1822), entitled "Antiquités de la Nubie, ou monuments inédits des bords du Nil, situés entre la première et la seconde cataracte, dessinés et mesurés en 1819". It consists of sixty-eight plates, of plans, sections, and views, and has been received as an authority. His next publication was the completion of Mazois's work on the ruins of Pompeii. In 1825 Gau was naturalized as a French citizen, and later became architect to the city of Paris. He directed the restoration of the churches of Saint-Julien-le-Pauvre, and Saint-Séverin, and built the great prison of La Roquette, etc. With his name, also, is associated the revival of Gothic architecture in Paris—he having designed and commenced, in 1846, the erection of the church of Sainte-Clotilde, the first modern church erected in the capital in that style. Illness compelled him to relinquish the care of supervising the work, and he died before its completion.

*Imperial Dict. Univ. Biog.*, s. v.; MICHAUD, *Biog. Univ.*, s. v. THOMAS H. POOLE.

**Gaubil**, ANTOINE, a French Jesuit and missionary to China, b. at Gaillac (Aveyron), 14 July, 1689; d. at Peking, 24 July, 1759. He entered the Society of Jesus 13 Sept., 1704, was sent to China, where he arrived 28 June, 1722, and thenceforth resided continuously at Peking until his death. His Chinese name was Sung Kiun-yung. He had taken Parennin's place as head of the school in which Manchus were taught Latin, to act as interpreters in Russian affairs. Gaubil, the best astronomer and historian among the French Jesuits in China during the eighteenth century, carried on an extensive correspondence with the savants of his day, among them Fréret and Delisle. His works are numerous and are even yet highly prized. Among them is "Traité de l'Astronomie Chinoise" in the "Observations mathématiques", published by Père Souciet (Paris, 1729-1732). From Chinese sources Gaubil translated the history of Jenghiz Khan (*Histoire de Gentchiscan*, Paris, 1739) and part of the annals of the T'ang Dynasty (in "Mémoires concernant les Chinois", vols. XV and XVI); he also wrote a treaty on Chinese chronology (*Traité de la Chronologie Chinoise*, Paris, 1814) and executed a good translation of the second of the Chinese classics, the "Book of

History" (*Shoo-king*), edited by De Guignes (Paris, 1770).

Gaubil left a great number of manuscripts now kept in the Observatory and the Naval Depot (Paris), and in the British Museum (London). From three manuscript volumes kept formerly at the Ecole Sainte-Geneviève (Paris) the present writer published: "Situation de Holin en Tartarie" (T'oung Pao, March, 1893), and "Situation du Japon et de la Corée" (T'oung Pao, May, 1898). Abel Rémusat, in "Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques" (II, p. 289), wrote of Gaubil: "More productive than Parennin and Gerbillon, less systematical than Prémare and Fouquet, more conscientious than Amiot, less light-headed and enthusiastic than Cibot, he treated thoroughly, scientifically, and critically, every question he handled." His style is rather fatiguing, as Gaubil, in studying the Chinese and Manchu languages, had forgotten much of his native tongue.

HENRI CORDIER.

**Gaudentius**, SAINT, Bishop of Brescia from about 387 until about 410; he was the successor of the writer on heresies, St. Philastrius. At the time of that saint's death Gaudentius was making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The people of Brescia bound themselves by an oath that they would accept no other bishop than Gaudentius; and St. Ambrose and other neighbouring prelates, in consequence, obliged him to return, though against his will. The Eastern bishops also threatened to refuse him Communion if he did not obey. We possess the discourse which he made before St. Ambrose and other bishops on the occasion of his consecration, in which he excuses, on the plea of obedience, his youth and his presumption in speaking. He had brought back with him from the East many precious relics of St. John Baptist and of the Apostles, and especially of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, relics of whom he had received at Cæsarea in Cappadocia from some nieces of St. Basil. These and other relics from Milan and elsewhere he deposited in a basilica which he named *Concilium Sanctorum*. His sermon on its dedication is extant. From a letter of St. Chrysostom (Ep. clxxxiv) to Gaudentius it may be gathered that the two saints had met at Antioch. When St. Chrysostom had been condemned to exile and had appealed to Pope Innocent and the West in 405, Gaudentius warmly took his part. An embassy to the Eastern Emperor Arcadius from his brother Honorius and from the pope, bearing letters from both and from Italian bishops, consisted of Gaudentius and two other bishops. The envoys were seized at Athens and sent to Constantinople, being three days on a ship without food. They were not admitted into the city, but were shut up in a fortress called Athyra, on the coast of Thrace. Their credentials were seized by force, so that the thumb of one of the bishops was broken, and they were offered a large sum of money if they would communicate with Atticus, who had supplanted St. Chrysostom. They were consoled by God, and St. Paul appeared to a deacon amongst them. They were eventually put on board an unseaworthy vessel, and it was said that the captain had orders to wreck them. However, they arrived safe at Lampsacus, where they took ship for Italy, and arrived in twenty days at Otranto. Their own account of their four months' adventures has been preserved to us by Palladius (Dialogus, 4). St. Chrysostom wrote them several grateful letters.

We possess twenty-one genuine tractates by Gaudentius. The first ten are a series of Easter sermons, written down after delivery at the request of Benivolus, the chief of the Brescian nobility, who had been prevented by ill health from hearing them delivered. In the preface Gaudentius takes occasion to disown all unauthorized copies of his sermons published by shorthand writers. These pirated editions seem to have been known to Rufinus, who, in the dedication to

St. Gaudentius of his translation of the pseudo-Clementine "Recognitions", praises the intellectual gifts of the Bishop of Brescia, saying that even his extempore speaking is worthy of publication and of preservation by posterity. The style of Gaudentius is simple, and his matter is good. His body lies at Brescia in the Church of St. John Baptist, on the site of the Concilium Sanctorum. His figure is frequently seen in the altar-pieces of the great Brescian painters, Moretto, Savoldo, and Romanino. The best edition of his works is by Galeardi (Padua, 1720, and in P. L., XX).

The editions are enumerated by SCHOENEMANN, I, who is quoted by MIGNE; BOSSE in *Acta SS.*, 25 Oct.; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, X; CEILLIER, *Hist. des auteurs eccl.* (Paris, 1858-69), X, xii, sq.; NIRSCHL, *Lehrb. der Patol.*, II.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

**Gaudentius of Brescia** (GAUDENTIUS BRIXIENSIS or BONTEMPS), theologian of the Order of Friars Minor Capuchins; b. at Brescia in 1612; d. at Orzano, 25 March, 1672; descended from the noble Brescian family of Bontempo; having entered the Capuchin Order, was assigned to the duties of lector of theology. In this capacity he visited the several convents of his own province of Brescia, as well as other houses of study of the different Capuchin provinces of Italy. He was taken suddenly ill at Orzano, and died there while engaged in preaching a course of Lenten sermons. His remains were later removed to the Capuchin church at Verola, where they now rest. His fame as a theologian rests mainly on his "Palladium Theologicum seu tuta theologia scholastica ad intimam mentem d. Bonaventuræ Seraph. Doc. cujus eximie doctrinæ raptæ restituantur, sententiæ impugnatae propugnantur", a work in which elegance of style, depth of thought, and soundness of doctrine are admirably combined, and which ranks the author among the foremost exponents of the Franciscan school. Gaudentius's pupil and countryman, Gianfrancesco Durantio, undertook the publication of the work after the death of the author; and under the patronage of Louis XIV of France, who subjected the manuscript to the examination of a special commission of doctors of the Sorbonne, it was published at Lyons, in seven folio volumes, in 1676.

DA FORLÌ, *Annali dell' Ordine dei Frati Minori Cappuccini* (Milan, 1882-83), III, 188-89; BERNARD OF BOLOGNA, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ord. Min. S. Franc. Cap.* (Venice, 1797), 109; BONARI, *I conventi ed i Cappuccini Bresciani* (Milan, 1891), xxviii, 667; HURTER, *Nomenclator*; EBERL in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Kapuzinerorden*, VII, 131; SCHREIBEN, *Dogmatik* (Freiburg im Br., 1873), I, 451.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

**Gaudete Sunday**, the third Sunday of Advent, so called from the first word of the Introit at Mass (*Gaudete*, i. e. Rejoice). The season of Advent originated as a fast of forty days in preparation for Christmas, commencing on the day after the feast of St. Martin (12 November), whence it was often called "St. Martin's Lent"—a name by which it was known as early as the fifth century. The introduction of the Advent fast cannot be placed much earlier, because there is no evidence of Christmas being kept on 25 December before the end of the fourth century (Duchesne, "Origines du culte chrétien", Paris, 1889), and the preparation for the feast could not have been of earlier date than the feast itself. In the ninth century, the duration of Advent was reduced to four weeks, the first allusion to the shortened season being in a letter of St. Nicholas I (858-867) to the Bulgarians, and by the twelfth century the fast had been replaced by simple abstinence. St. Gregory the Great was the first to draw up an Office for the Advent season, and the Gregorian Sacramentary is the earliest to provide Masses for the Sundays of Advent. In both Office and Mass provision is made for five Sundays, but by the tenth century four was the usual number, though some churches of France observed five as late as the thirteenth century. Notwithstanding all these modifica-

tions, however, Advent still preserved most of the characteristics of a penitential season, which made it a kind of counterpart to Lent, the middle (or third) Sunday corresponding with Lætare or Mid-Lent Sunday. On it, as on Lætare Sunday, the organ and flowers, forbidden during the rest of the season, were permitted to be used; rose-coloured vestments were allowed instead of purple (or black, as formerly); the deacon and subdeacon reassumed the dalmatic and tunicle at the chief Mass, and cardinals wore rose-colour instead of purple. All these distinguishing marks have continued in use, and are the present discipline of the Latin Church. *Gaudete Sunday*, therefore, makes a break, like Lætare Sunday, about midway through a season which is otherwise of a penitential character, and signifies the nearness of the Lord's coming. Of the "stations" kept in Rome on the four Sundays of Advent, that at the Vatican basilica is assigned to *Gaudete*, as being the most important and imposing of the four. In both Office and Mass throughout Advent, continual reference is made to our Lord's second coming, and this is emphasized on the third Sunday by the additional signs of gladness permitted on that day. *Gaudete Sunday* is further marked by a new Invitatory, the Church no longer inviting the faithful to adore merely "The Lord who is to come", but calling upon them to worship and hail with joy "The Lord who is now nigh and close at hand". The Nocturn lessons from the Prophecy of Isaiah describe the Lord's coming and the blessings that will result from it, and the antiphons at Vespers re-echo the same prophetic promises. The joy of expectation is emphasized by the constant Alleluia, which occur in both Office and Mass throughout the entire season. In the Mass, the Introit "*Gaudete in Domino semper*" strikes the same note, and gives its name to the day. The Epistle again incites us to rejoicing, and bids us prepare to meet the coming Saviour with prayers and supplication and thanksgiving, whilst the Gospel, in the words of St. John Baptist, warns us that the Lamb of God is even now in our midst, though we appear to know Him not. The spirit of the Office and Liturgy all through Advent is one of expectation and preparation for the Christmas feast as well as for the second coming of Christ, and the penitential exercises suitable to that spirit are thus on *Gaudete Sunday* suspended, as it were, for a while in order to symbolize that joy and gladness in the promised Redemption which should never be absent from the hearts of the faithful.

GUÉRANGER, *L'Année Liturgique*, tr. SHEPHERD (Dublin, 1867); BATIFFOL, *Hist. du Bréviaire Romain* (Paris, 1893); MARTENE, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus* (Rouen, 1700); DURAND, *Rationale Divini Officii* (Venice, 1568); LEROUX, *Hist. et Symbolisme de la Liturgie* (Paris, 1889).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Gaudier**, ANTOINE LE, writer on ascetic theology; b. at Château-Thierry, France, 7 January, 1572; d. at Paris, 14 April, 1622. About the age of twenty he entered the Society of Jesus at Tournay. Later on he was rector at Liège, professor of Holy Scripture at Pont-à-Mousson, and of moral theology at La Flèche. In these two last-named posts he was also charged with the spiritual direction of his brethren, and showed such an aptitude for this branch of the ministry that he was named master of novices and tertians. His appointment to these offices shows that Gaudier, since he died at the age of fifty, must have evinced an early intellectual maturity and an exceptional talent for the guidance of souls. In the discharge of his various functions, he found an opportunity of developing before a domestic audience the principal matter of asceticism, which he elaborated little by little into a complete treatise. The eagerness shown to possess his spiritual writings led him at last to publish them. There then appeared successively in Latin: "*De sanctissimo Christi Jesu amore opusculum*" (Pont-à-Mousson, 1619), translated into English by G. Tickell,

S.J. ("The Love of Our Lord Jesus Christ", Derby, 1864); "De verâ Christi Jesu imitatione"; "De Dei præsentia"; "Praxis meditandi a B.P. Ignatio traditæ explicatio" (Paris, 1620). There are French translations of these four works. After the death of Father Gaudier all his spiritual works, both printed and unedited, were collected in one folio volume under the title "De naturâ et statibus perfectionis" (Paris, 1643), a better edition in three octavo volumes being later supplied by Father J. Martinow, S.J. (Paris, 1856-8). While this great treatise is of special interest to Jesuits, since it is primarily intended for their institute, it is regarded by enlightened judges as one of the most beautiful and solid monuments of Catholic asceticism. The whole of the speculative part is of general interest, and the practical part, with the exception of rare passages, is equally so. It contains a thirty days' retreat according to the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, which has been separately edited several times since 1643. The great value of the work is heightened by the fact that Gaudier had personal intercourse with the immediate disciples of the saint.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jesus*, III, col. 1265.

PAUL DEBUCHY.

**Gaudiosus**, Bishop of Tarazona (Turiasso), Spain, d. about 540. Our information concerning the life of this holy bishop is scant, and rests on comparatively late sources. On the occasion of the translation of his remains in 1573, a sketch of his life was discovered in the grave, written on parchment; apart from the Breviary lessons of the Church of Tarazona, this document contains the only written details we possess concerning the life of Gaudiosus. His father, Guntha, was a military official (*spatharius*) at the court of the Visigothic King Theudoric (510-25). The education of the boy was entrusted to St. Victorinus, abbot of a monastery near Burgos (Oca), who trained him for the service of the church. Later (c. 530) he was appointed Bishop of Tarazona. Nothing more is known of his activities. Even the year of his death has not been exactly determined. After his death he was venerated as a saint. According to the MS. life found in his grave he died on 29 October, but the Church of Tarazona celebrates his feast on 3 November. He was first entombed in the church of St. Martin (dedicated later to St. Victorinus), attached to the monastery where he had spent his youthful years. In 1573 his remains were disinterred and translated to the cathedral of Tarazona.

Acta SS., I, Nov., 664-65; DE LA FUENTE, *La Santa Iglesia de Tarazona en sus Estados Antiguos y Modernos* (Madrid, 1865).

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Gaughran**, LAURENCE. See MEATH, DIOCESE OF.

**Gaul, CHRISTIAN.**—The Church of Gaul first appeared in history in connexion with the persecution at Lyons under Marcus Aurelius (177). The pagan inhabitants rose up against the Christians, and forty-eight martyrs suffered death under various tortures. Among them there were children, like the slave Blandina and Ponticus, a youth of fifteen. Every rank of life had members among the first martyrs of the Church of Gaul: the aristocracy were represented by Vettius Epagathus; the professional class by Attalus of Pergamus, a physician; a neophyte, Maturus, died beside Pothinus, Bishop of Lyons, and Sanctus, deacon of Vienne. The Christians of Lyons and Vienne in a letter to their brethren of Smyrna give an account of this persecution, and the letter, preserved by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V, i-iv), is one of the gems of Christian literature. In this document the Church of Lyons seems to be the only church organized at the time in Gaul. That of Vienne appears to have been dependent on it and, to judge from similar cases, was probably administered by a deacon. How or where Christianity first gained a

foothold in Gaul is purely a matter of conjecture. Most likely the first missionaries came by sea, touched at Marseilles, and progressed up the Rhone till they established the religion at Lyons, the metropolis and centre of communication for the whole country. The firm establishment of Christianity in Gaul was undoubtedly due to missionaries from Asia. Pothinus was a disciple of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, as was also his successor, Irenæus. In the time of Irenæus Lyons was still the centre of the Church in Gaul. Eusebius speaks of letters written by the Churches of Gaul of which Irenæus is bishop (Hist. Eccl., V, xxiii). These letters were written on the occasion of the second event which brought the Church of Gaul into prominence. Easter was not celebrated on the same day in all Christian communities; towards the end of the second century Pope Victor wished to universalize the Roman usage and excommunicated the Churches of Asia. Irenæus intervened to restore peace. About the same time, in a mystical inscription found at Autun, a certain Pectorius celebrated in Greek verse the Ichthus or fish, symbol of the Eucharist. A third event in which the bishops of Gaul appear is the Novatian controversy. Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, and other colleagues in Gaul are mentioned in 254 by St. Cyprian (Ep. lxviii) as opposed to Novatian, whereas Marcianus of Arles was favourable to him.

No other positive information concerning the Church of Gaul is available until the fourth century. Two groups of narratives, however, aim to fill in the gaps. On the one hand a series of local legends trace back the foundation of the principal sees to the Apostles. Early in the sixth century we find St. Casarius, Bishop of Arles, crediting these stories; regardless of the anachronism, he makes the first Bishop of Vaison, Daphnus, whose signature appears at the Council of Arles (314), a disciple of the Apostles (Lejay, *Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles*, p. 5). One hundred years earlier one of his predecessors, Patrocles, based various claims of his Church on the fact that St. Trophimus, founder of the Church of Arles, was a disciple of the Apostles. Such claims were no doubt flattering to local vanity; during the Middle Ages and in more recent times many legends grew up in support of them. The evangelization of Gaul has often been attributed to missionaries sent from Rome by St. Clement—a theory, which has inspired a whole series of fallacious narratives and forgeries, with which history is encumbered. More faith can be placed in a statement of Gregory of Tours in his "Historia Francorum" (I, xxviii), on which was based the second group of narratives concerning the evangelization of Gaul. According to him, in the year 250 Rome sent seven bishops, who founded as many churches in Gaul: Gatianus the Church of Tours, Trophimus that of Arles, Paul that of Narbonne, Saturninus that of Toulouse, Denis that of Paris, Stremonius (Austremonius) that of Auvergne (Clermont), and Martialus that of Limoges. Gregory's statement has been accepted with more or less reservation by serious historians. Nevertheless even though Gregory, a late successor of Gatianus, may have had access to information on the beginnings of his church, it must not be forgotten that an interval of three hundred years separates him from the events he chronicles; moreover, this statement of his involves some serious chronological difficulties, of which he was himself aware, e. g. in the case of the bishops of Paris. The most we can say for him is that he echoes a contemporary tradition, which represents the general point of view of the sixth century rather than the actual facts. It is impossible to say how much legend is mingled with the reality.

By the middle of the third century, as St. Cyprian bears witness, there were several churches organized in Gaul. They suffered little from the great persecution. Constantius Chlorus, the father of Constantine, was not hostile to Christianity, and soon after the cessation

of persecution the bishops of the Latin world assembled at Arles (314). Their signatures, which are still extant, prove that the following sees were then in existence: Vienne, Marseilles, Arles, Orange, Vaison, Apt, Nîmes, Lyons, Autun, Cologne, Trier, Reims, Rouen, Bordeaux, Gabali, and Eauze. We must also admit the existence of the Sees of Toulouse, Narbonne, Clermont, Bourges, and Paris. This date marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the Church of Gaul. The towns had been early won over to the new Faith; the work of evangelization was now extended and continued during the fourth and fifth centuries. The cultured classes, however, long remained faithful to the old traditions. Ausonius was a Christian, but gives so little evidence of it that the fact has been questioned. Teacher and humanist, he lived in the memories of the past. His pupil Paulinus entered the religious life, at which, however, the world of letters was deeply scandalized; so much so, indeed, that Paulinus had to write to Ausonius to justify himself. At the same period there were pagan rhetoricians who celebrated in the schools, as at Autun, the virtues and deeds of the Christian emperors. By the close of the fifth century, however, the majority of scholars in Gaul were Christians. Generation by generation the change came about. Salvianus, the fiery apologist (died c. 492), was the son of pagan parents. Hilary of Poitiers, Sulpicius Severus (the Christian Sallust), Paulinus of Nola, and Sidonius Apollinaris strove to reconcile the Church and the world of letters. Sidonius himself is not altogether free from suggestions of paganism handed down by tradition. In Gaul as elsewhere the question arose as to whether the Gospel could really adapt itself to literary culture. With the inroads of the barbarians the discussion came to an end.

It is none the less true that throughout the Empire the progress of Christianity had been made chiefly in the cities. The country-places were yet strongholds of idolatry, which in Gaul was upheld by a twofold tradition. The old Gallic religion, and Græco-Roman paganism, still had ardent supporters. More than that, among the Gallo-Roman population the use of spells and charms for the cure of sickness, or on the occasion of a death, was much in vogue; the people worshipped springs and trees, believed in fairies, on certain days clothed themselves in skins of animals, and resorted to magic and the practice of divination. Some of these customs were survivals of very ancient traditions; they had come down through the Celtic and the Roman period, and had no doubt at times received the imprint of the Gallic and Græco-Roman beliefs. Their real origin must, of course, be sought further back in the same obscurity in which the beginnings of folk-lore are shrouded. This mass of popular beliefs, fancies, and superstitions still lives. It was the principal obstacle encountered by the missionaries in the rural places. St. Martin, a native of Pannonia, Bishop of Tours, and founder of monasteries, undertook especially in Central Gaul a crusade against this rural idolatry. On one occasion, when he was felling a sacred tree in the neighbourhood of Autun, a peasant attacked him, and he had an almost miraculous escape. Besides St. Martin other popular preachers traversed the rural districts, e. g. Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, another converted soldier, also Martin's disciples, especially St. Martin of Brives. But their scattered and intermittent efforts made no lasting effect on the minds of the peasants. About 395 a Gallic rhetorician depicts a scene in which peasants discuss the mortality among their flocks. One of them boasts the virtue of the sign of the cross, "the sign of that God Who alone is worshipped in the large cities" (Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, no. 893, v. 105). This expression, however, is too strong, for at that very period a single church sufficed for the Christian population of Trier. Nevertheless the rural parts continued the more refractory.

At the beginning of the fifth century, there took place in the neighbourhood of Autun the procession of Cybele's chariot to bless the harvest. In the sixth century, in the city of Arles, one of the regions where Christianity had gained its earliest and strongest foothold, Bishop Caesarius was still struggling against popular superstitions, and some of his sermons are yet among our important sources of information on folk-lore.

The Christianization of the lower classes of the people was greatly aided by the newly established monasteries. In Gaul as elsewhere the first Christian ascetics lived in the world and kept their personal freedom. The practice of religious life in common was introduced by St. Martin (died c. 397) and Cassian (died c. 435). Martin established near Tours the "grand monastère", i. e. Marmoutier, where in the beginning the monks lived in separate grottoes or wooden huts. A little later Cassian founded two monasteries at Marseilles (415). He had previously visited the monks of the East, and especially Egypt, and had brought back their methods, which he adapted to the circumstances of Gallo-Roman life. Through two of his works, "*De institutis cenobiorum*" and the "*Collationes XXIV*", he became the doctor of Gallic asceticism. About the same time Honoratus founded a famous monastery on the little isle of Lérins (Lerinum) near Marseilles, destined to become a centre of Christian life and ecclesiastical influence. Episcopal sees of Gaul were often objects of competition and greed, and were rapidly becoming the property of certain aristocratic families, all of whose representatives in the episcopate were not as wise and upright as Germanus of Auxerre or Sidonius Apollinaris. Lérins took up the work of reforming the episcopate, and placed many of its own sons at the head of dioceses: Honoratus, Hilary, and Caesarius at Arles; Eucherius at Lyons, and his sons Salonius and Veranius at Geneva and Vence respectively; Lupus at Troyes; Maximus and Faustus at Riez. Lérins too became a school of mysticism and theology and spread its religious ideas far and wide by useful works on dogma, polemics, and hagiography. Other monasteries were founded in Gaul, e. g. Grigny near Vienne, Ile Barbe at Lyons, Réomé (later known as Moutier-Saint-Jean), Morvan, Saint-Claude in the Jura, Chinon, Loches, etc. It is possible, however, that some of these foundations belong to the succeeding period. The monks had not yet begun to live according to any fixed and codified rule. For such written constitutions we must await the time of Caesarius of Arles.

Monasticism was not established without opposition. Rutilius Namatianus, a pagan, denounced the monks of Lérins as a brood of night-owls; even the effort to make chastity the central virtue of Christianity met with much resistance, and the adversaries of Priscillian in particular were imbued with this hostility to a certain degree. It was also one of the objections raised by Vigilantius of Calagurris, the Spanish priest whom St. Jerome denounced so vigorously. Vigilantius had spent much time in Gaul and seems to have died there. The law of ecclesiastical celibacy was less stringent, less generally enforced than in Italy, especially Rome. The series of Gallic councils before the Merovingian epoch bear witness at once to the undecided state of discipline at the time, and also to the continual striving after some fixed disciplinary code.

The Church of Gaul passed through three dogmatic crises. Its bishops seem to have been greatly preoccupied with Arianism; as a rule they clung to the teaching of Nicæa, in spite of a few temporary or partial defections. Athanasius, who had been exiled to Trier (336-38), exerted a powerful influence on the episcopate of Gaul; one of the great champions of orthodoxy in the West was Hilary of Poitiers, who also suffered exile for his constancy. Priscillianism had a greater hold on the masses of the faithful.



It was above all a method, an ideal of Christian life, which appealed to all, even to women. It was condemned (380) at the Synod of Saragossa where the Bishops of Bordeaux and Agen were present; none the less it spread rapidly in Central Gaul, Eauze in particular being a stronghold. When in 385 the usurper Maximus put Priscillian and his friends to death, St. Martin was in doubt how to act, but repudiated with horror communion with the bishops who had condemned the unfortunates. Priscillianism, indeed, was more or less bound up with the cause of asceticism in general. Finally the bishops and monks of Gaul were long divided over Pelagianism. Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, had obliged Leporius, a disciple of Pelagius, to leave Gaul, but it was not long until Marseilles and Lérins, led by Cassian, Vincent, and Faustus, became hotbeds of a teaching opposed to St. Augustine's and known as Semipelagianism. Prosper of Aquitaine wrote against it, and was obliged to take refuge at Rome. It was not until the beginning of the sixth century that the teaching of Augustine triumphed, when a monk of Lérins, Cæsarius of Arles, an almost servile disciple of Augustine, caused it to be adopted by the Council of Orange (529).

In the final struggle Rome interfered. We do not know much concerning the earlier relations between the bishops of Gaul and the pope. The position of Irenæus in the Easter Controversy shows a considerable degree of independence; yet Irenæus proclaimed the primacy of the See of Rome. About the middle of the third century the pope was appealed to for the purpose of settling difficulties in the Church of Gaul and to remove an erring bishop (Cyprian, Epist. lxviii). At the Council of Arles (314) the bishops of Gaul were present with those of Brittany, Spain, Africa, even Italy; Pope Sylvester sent delegates to represent him. It was in a way a Council of the West. During all that century, however, the episcopate of Gaul had no head, and the bishops grouped themselves according to the ties of friendship or locality. Metropolitans did not exist as yet, and when advice was needed Milan was consulted. "The traditional authority", says Duchesne, "in all matters of discipline remained always the ancient Church of Rome; in practice, however, the Council of Milan decided in case of conflict." The popes then took the situation in hand, and in 417 Pope Zosimus made Patrocles, Bishop of Arles, his vicar or delegate in Gaul, and provided that all disputes should be referred to him. Moreover, no Gallic ecclesiastic could have access to the pope without testimonial letters from the Bishop of Arles. This primacy of Arles waxed and waned under the succeeding popes. It enjoyed a final period of brilliancy, under Cæsarius, but after his time it conferred on the occupant merely an honorary title. In consequence, however, of the extensive authority of Arles in the fifth and sixth centuries, canonical discipline was more rapidly developed there, and the "Libri canonum" that were soon in vogue in Southern Gaul were modelled on those of the Church of Arles. Towards the end of this period Cæsarius assisted at a series of councils, thus obtaining a certain recognition as legislator for the Merovingian Church.

The barbarians, however, were on the march. The great invasion of 407 made the Goths masters of all the country to the south of the Loire, with the exception of Bourges and Clermont, which did not fall into their hands until 475; Arles succumbed in 480. Then the Visigoth kingdom was organized, Arian in religion, and at first hostile to Catholicism. Gradually the necessities of life imposed a policy of moderation. The Council of Agde, really a national council of Visigothic Gaul (506), and in which Cæsarius was dominant, is an evidence of the new temper on both sides. The Acts of this council follow very closely the principles laid down in the "Breviarium Alarici"—a summary of the Theodocian Code drawn up by Alaric II, the

Visigothic king, for his Gallo-Roman subjects—and met with the approval of the Catholic bishops of his kingdom. Between 410 and 413 the Burgundians had settled near Mainz; in 475 they had come farther south along the Rhone, and about this time became Arians. The Franks, soon to be masters of all Gaul, left the neighbourhood of Tournai, defeated Syagrius in 486, and established their power as far as the Loire. In 507 they destroyed the Visigoth Kingdom, and in 534 that of the Burgundians; in 536 by the conquest of Arles they succeeded to the remnants of the great state created by the genius of King Theodoric; with them began a new era (see FRANKS).

The transition from one regime to another was made possible by the bishops of Gaul. The bishops had frequently played a beneficent rôle as intermediaries with the Roman authorities. Before the barbarian invasions they were the true champions of the people. Indeed it was long believed that they had been invested with special powers and the official title of *defensores civitatum* (defenders of the States). While this title was never officially borne by them, the popular error was only formal and superficial. Bishops like Sidonius Apollinaris, Avitus, Germanus of Auxerre, Cæsarius of Arles, were truly the defenders of their fatherland. While the old civic institutions were tottering to their fall, they upheld the social fabric. Through their efforts the barbarians became amalgamated with the native population, introducing into it the germs of a new and vigorous life. Lastly the bishops were the guardians of the classical traditions of Latin literature and Roman culture, and long before the appearance of monasticism had been the mainstay of learning. Throughout the sixth and seventh centuries manuscripts of the Bible and the Fathers were copied to meet the needs of public worship, ecclesiastical teaching, and Catholic life. The only contemporary buildings that exhibit traces of classical or Byzantine styles are religious edifices. For all this, and for much more, the bishops of Gaul deserve the title of "Makers of France".

After the writings of EUSEBIUS of CÆSAREA, SULPICIUS SEVERUS, PAULINUS of NOLA, SALVIANUS, GREGORY of TOURS, etc., our principal source of information is the epigraphic material published by LE BLANT, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule antérieures au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1856-65), with a supplement (1897); IDEM, *Les sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule* (Paris, 1896). SIRMOND and LALANDE, *Concilia antiqua Gallie* (4 vols., fol., 1629-68); also the catalogues or lists of bishops preserved in many dioceses and edited by DELISLE in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXIX.

General works devoted to the history and study of Christianity have chapters on the Church in Gaul. Special reference works: DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, I (1894; 2nd ed., 1907), II (1900); HOUTIN, *La controverse de l'apostolicité des églises de France au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1901); ANALECTA BOLLANDIANA, XIX, 354; MORIN, *Saint Lazare et saint Marimin in Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de France*, LIX (Paris, 1898); AUBÉ in *Revue historique*, VII (1878), 152-64; HAVET, *Les origines de saint Denis in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* (Paris, 1890), p. 25; DUFOURCQ, *La christianisation des foules dans l'Empire romain in Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, IV (Paris, 1899), 239; AMPÈRE, *Histoire littéraire de la France avant le XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, I and II (Paris, 1839); ROGER, *L'enseignement des lettres classiques en Gaule d'Ausone à Alcuin* (Paris, 1905); IMBART de LA TOUR, *Les paroisses rurales du IV<sup>e</sup> au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1900); BABUT, *Priscillien et le priscillianisme* (Paris, 1909); DUFOURCQ, *Le mouvement légendaire lérinien in Etude sur les "Gesta Martyrum" romains*, II (Paris, 1907); DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1889), 32, 84; IDEM, *La première collection romaine des décrétales in Atti del secondo congresso di archeologia cristiana* (Rome, 1902), 159; ARNOLD, *Cæsarius von Arelate und die gallische Kirche seiner Zeit* (Leipzig, 1894); MALNORY, *Cæsare, évêque d'Arles* (Paris, 1894); CHÉNON, *Le "Defensor Civitatis" in Nouvelle revue historique du droit français* (1889), 551; CHATELAIN, *Uncialis scriptura* (Paris, 1902); ENLART, *Manuel d'archéologie française*, I (Paris, 1902). For a more extensive literature see MONOD, *Bibliographie de l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1888); MOLINIER, *Les sources de l'histoire de France*, Pt. I: *Epoque primitive, Mérovingiens et Carolingiens* (Paris, 1902).

PAUL LEJAY.

Gaulli, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, called BACICCIO, an Italian painter; b. at Genoa, 1639; d. at Rome, 1709. He first studied in Genoa under Borzone, who instructed



him in design and colouring. Early in life he went to Rome and became a pupil of Bernini and Mario Nuzzi da Fiori, whose assistance and recommendation laid the foundation of his fortune and reputation. A considerable part of his life was given over to portrait painting. He is said to have executed paintings of seven pontiffs—from Alexandria VII to Clement XI—and of all the cardinals of his time. His paintings of children show much grace and vivacity. His greatest merit, however, lies in his historical compositions, which show good arrangement, agreeable colouring, and a spirited touch. Sometimes his work was incorrect and heavy, and his draperies too stiff. He understood the art of foreshortening his figures in a marked degree, as shown by his work in the angles of the dome of St. Agnèse, in the Palazzo Navona. His chief work is the painting of the "Assumption of St. Francis Xavier", in the vault of the church of the Gesù, Rome. This picture is celebrated for the boldness and truth of the foreshortening, and the brilliancy of the colouring. Another celebrated work is the "Virgin and Child, surrounded by angels, with St. Anne kneeling in front"; it is in the church of St. Francesco a Ripa; and in the church of Sant' Andrea there is an altarpiece by Gaulli of the "Death of St. Francis Xavier". Gaulli's facility of composition, rapidity of hand, and clear bright style rendered his mural paintings very attractive to his contemporaries; but these works are now considered as belonging to an essentially superficial style of art. He is one of the painters called by his countrymen *Macchinisti*. His faults are less obtrusive in his easel pictures, and his manner more varied.

PILKINGTON, *Dict. of Painters* (London, MDCCCLII); MACKENZIE, *Imperial Dict. Univ. Biog.* (London, Glasgow, Edinburgh); BRYAN, *Dict. Painters and Engravers* (New York, London, 1903).

THOMAS H. POOLE.

**Gaultier**, ALOISIU'S-EDOUARD-CAMILLE, priest and schoolmaster; b. at Asti, Piedmont, about 1745, of French parents; d. at Paris, 18 Sept., 1818; began his studies in France, and completed them in Rome, where he was ordained; upon his return to France (1780) he devoted himself to the work of education and in 1786 opened a school in Paris, wherein he applied his principle of instructing children while amusing them. The French Revolution obliged him to seek refuge in England, and, finding in London a number of his former pupils of the French nobility, he opened a course for the education of French refugees. His principles were greatly admired and his methods commended by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. He came back to France in 1801, and continued to teach and publish his educational works. Later another journey to London was undertaken for the purpose of studying the monitorial system of teaching, practised by Bell and Lancaster, a system which he wanted to introduce into the French schools. During the Hundred Days, Carnot appointed him a member of the commission for the reorganization of public instruction, and later Gaultier was one of the founders of the "Société pour l'enseignement élémentaire".

To give a complete list of Gaultier's works is impossible here. They include text-books for every branch of primary instruction, reading, writing, arithmetic, geometry, geography, history, logical and grammatical analysis, composition, politeness, etc., and they apply his method of instructive plays, that is, a system of questions and answers in which, according to the correctness or incorrectness of the answers, a scheme of loss and gain in credits constantly stimulates the interest of the pupils. While, from the point of view of modern pedagogy, this method has many obvious defects, especially that of being too mechanical and of insisting too much on mere memory, it was nevertheless an advance on methods previously used, and it acknowledged, though carrying it to excess, the great importance of the principle of interest in education.

It must be supplemented by the application of the psychological principles of adaptation, reflection, and assimilation.

*Nouvelle biographie générale* (Paris, 1858), XIX, 676, Buisson, *Dictionnaire de pédagogie* (Paris, 1887), I, 1, 1146.

C. A. DUBRAY.

**Gaume**, JEAN-JOSEPH, French theologian and author, b. at Fuans (Franche-Comté) in 1802; d. in 1879. While attached to the Diocese of Nevers, he was successively professor of theology, director of the *petit séminaire*, canon, and vicar-general of the diocese, and had already published several works, when he left for Rome in 1841. Gregory XVI made him a knight of the Reformed Order of St. Sylvester. A doctor of theology of the University of Prague, a member of several societies of scholars, honorary vicar-general of several dioceses, he received from Pius IX in 1854 the title of protonotary apostolic.

Abbé Gaume is the author of numerous books treating of theology, history, education. Those of the first category are still esteemed, those of the second have fallen into oblivion, and those of the third gave rise to the famous question of the classics. These last writings are all inspired by one and the same thought; vividly struck by the religious and moral deterioration of his age, the author seeks its remote cause, and believes he finds it in the Renaissance, which was for society a resurrection of the paganism of antiquity, prepared the way for the Revolution, and was, in fine, the primal source of all the evil. Such is the dominating idea of the works "La Révolution" (8 vols., 1856) and "Histoire de la société domestique" (2 vols., 1854). It is again met with in "Les Trois Rome" (1857). But to cure the ills of society it was necessary to devise a new method of moulding childhood and youth; this was to consist in catechetical instruction and the exclusion of pagan authors from classical studies. In support of this method he composed his "Catéchisme de Persévérance, ou Exposé de la Religion depuis l'origine du monde jusqu'à nos jours" (8 vols., 1854); "La Religion et l'Eternité" (1859); "Traité de l'Esprit Saint" (1864). To this series of works belong his "Manuel du Confesseur" (1854) and "l'Horloge de la Passion" (1857), which he translated from St. Alphonsus Liguori.

The reform, or rather the revolution—the word is his—which he deemed necessary in classic instruction he had indicated as early as 1835 in his book "Le Catholicisme dans l'éducation", without arousing much comment. He returned to the subject in 1851 in a work entitled "Le Ver rongeur des sociétés modernes ou le Paganisme dans l'éducation". The renown of the author, still more the patronage of two influential prelates—Mgr. Gousset, Archbishop of Reims, and Mgr. Parisis, Bishop of Arras—and above all the articles of Louis Veuillot in "L'Univers", which supported Abbé Gaume from the first, gained for his views a hearing which they had previously failed to secure, and provoked a lively controversy among Catholics. After having shown that the intellectual formation of youth during the first centuries of the Church and throughout the Middle Ages was accomplished through the study of Christian authors (ch. i-vi), Gaume proceeds to prove that the Renaissance of the sixteenth century perverted education throughout Europe by the substitution of pagan writers for Christian authors. In support of his thesis, he brings forward the testimony of men (viii-ix) and of facts (x-xxv), indicating the influence of classical paganism on literature, speech, the arts, philosophy, religion, the family, and society. Despite a proportion of truth, the exaggeration of his thesis was evident. It was the condemnation of the method held in honour in the Church for three centuries; Benedictines, Jesuits, Oratorians, the secular clergy themselves had, without opposition from the Holy See, made the pagan

authors the basis of the curriculum in their colleges. Gaume did not go so far as to exclude the pagan texts; he allowed them some place in the three highest classes (the course comprised eight), but banished them from the first five years.

Consulted by the professors of his *petit séminaire* as to the course to pursue, the Bishop of Orléans, Mgr. Dupanloup, addressed them a letter on classical teaching, in which he boldly declared himself in favour of the existing regulations and methods, thus preserving for the ancient authors the rank they had hitherto held, but at the same time assigned an important place to Holy Scripture, the Fathers, and modern authors. Sharply attacked by Veillot in "L'Univers", the bishop retorted by issuing a pastoral on the classics and especially on the interference of lay journalism in episcopal administration, and concluded by enjoining on the professors of his *petits séminaires* to receive no longer "L'Univers". Then the question became even more burning; newspaper articles, brochures, pamphlets, even books succeeded one another on this question which created a general commotion among educationists. Gaume published in support of his thesis the "Lettre sur le paganisme dans l'éducation". For a time it seemed as though the diocese were on the point of division. At this juncture Mgr. Dupanloup drew up a declaration which was signed by forty-six prelates. It contained four articles, two of which dealt with journalism in its relations with episcopal authority, and two with the use of the classics. It was therein stated: (1) that the employment of the ancient classics in secondary schools, when properly chosen, carefully expurgated, and explained from a Christian point of view, was neither evil nor dangerous; (2) that, however, the use of these ancient classics should not be exclusive, but that it was useful to join to it in becoming measure, as is generally done in all houses directed by the clergy, the study and explanation of Christian authors. Abbé Gaume and his partisans lost no time in reducing their claims to the three following points: (1) the more comprehensive expurgation of pagan writers; (2) the more extensive introduction of Christian authors; (3) the Christian teaching of pagan authors. Nevertheless it required instructions from Rome to put an end to this controversy. The Abbé Gaume published further: "Bibliothèque des classiques chrétiens, latins et grecs" (30 vols., 1852-55); "Poètes et Prosauteurs profanes complètement expurgés" (1857).

LAGRANGE, *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup*, II, vi, vii; E. VEUILLOT, *Vie de Louis Veillot*, II, xviii; L. VEUILLOT, *Mélanges*, Series I, vol. VI; Series II, vol. I; *Le Correspondant* (1852), various articles.

A. FOURNET.

**Gautama.** See BUDDHISM.

**Gauthier, CHARLES HUGH.** See KINGSTON, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

**Gavantus** (GAVANTO), BARTOLOMEO, liturgist, a member of the Barnabite Order; b. at Monza, 1569; d. at Milan, 14 August, 1638. Gavantus devoted himself early to liturgical studies, and with such success that his fame soon spread to Rome, where he was recognized as having a most accurate knowledge of the sacred rites. His chief work is entitled "Thesaurus sacramentorum seu commentaria in rubricis Missalis et Breviarii Romani" (Milan, 1628; revised ed. by Merati, Rome, 1736-38). In this work the author traces the historical origin of the sacred rites themselves, treats of their mystical significance, gives rules as to the observance and obligation of the rubrics, and adds decrees and brief explanations bearing on the subject-matter of the work. The book was examined and approved by Cardinals Millino, Muto, and Cajetan, and was dedicated to Pope Urban VIII. Gavantus was general of his order, and, in recognition of his great services, was named perpetual consultor to the Congregation of Rites by Pope Urban VIII 1623-1644.

DAVID DUNFORD.

**Gayarré, CHARLES ETIENNE ARTHUR**, American historian and writer of fiction, grandson of Etienne de Boré, the first successful sugar-planter of Louisiana; b. in New Orleans, January, 1805; d. 11 February, 1895. Père Antoine (Antonio de Sedella), famed in Louisiana history, baptized him in St. Louis cathedral, where also, ninety years later, the funeral rites were performed over his remains. Having received his early education in his native city, he went to Philadelphia in 1826 to study law, was admitted to the Pennsylvania Bar in 1828, and to that of Louisiana in 1829. Entering the political arena, he was elected to the State legislature in the same year, and subsequently, in 1835, was sent to the Senate of the United States. However, ill-health prevented him from ever performing his duties as senator, and the dictate of his physician kept him in France for eight years. The natural bent of his mind, the historical environment of his youth (Louisiana having just emerged from her colonial existence into American statehood), and personal acquaintance with many of the men who were chief actors on the historical stage, all combined to determine the character of his life-work, which later secured for him the title, "Historian of Louisiana". Having obtained material from public and private archives in France, he published (1846-47) the result of his researches in "Histoire de la Louisiane"—a work which, based as it is on original documents, cannot but be of great value to the student of history. This "Histoire de la Louisiane" is the foundation and substance of the later and more comprehensive "History of Louisiana", which is the great work of his life (4th ed., 4 vols, New Orleans, 1903).

In the "History of Louisiana", the author includes an earlier work, "Poetry and Romance of the History of Louisiana", in which, he explicitly states, he intends to weave "the legendary, the romantic, the traditional, and historical elements" into one narrative, and which contains such flights of imagination as to leave it devoid of critical value. The other parts of the work are more strictly historical in scope and value; yet the vivid style coupled with much personal observation precludes the analytical, dispassionate method, which the modern writer is wont to apply to the treatment of historical subjects. However, inasmuch as Gayarré's book represents an intelligent and systematic compilation of documentary evidence, it is a remarkable achievement for his time, and is even yet an indispensable source of information concerning the history of Louisiana. Other works of his are: "Fernando de Lemos" (1872); "Aubert Dubayet, or the Two Sister Republics" (1882), a historical romance; both works are of local interest. He also contributed a number of historical articles to various magazines.

KING, *Charles Gayarré, Preface to History of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1903); *Publications of Louisiana Historical Society* (New Orleans, 1906), vol. III, pt. IV; *Collections in the Howard Memorial Library*, New Orleans.

ANTHONY F. ISENBERG.

**Gaza** (Heb. 'Azzâh, the strong), a titular see of Palæstina Prima, in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Gaza is one of the oldest cities in the world. Its first inhabitants were the Hevites (Deut. ii, 23). The Rephaïm and the Enacim, expelled later by Josue, inhabited the surrounding mountains (Josue xi, 22). The Hevites were driven forth by the Philistines who came from Caphtor (D. V., Cappadocia; Deut., ii, 23; Amos, ix, 7; Jer., xlvii, 4). Little else is known as to the origin of this warlike people, who occupied the whole Mediterranean coast between Phœnicia and Egypt, and whom the Hebrews could never wholly subdue. It is agreed, however, that they came from the southern coast of Asia Minor and the islands of the Ægean. Jeremias (xlvii, 4) speaks of the island of Caphtor, the isle of Cappadocia in D. V. According to Stephen of Byzantium ("De Urbibus", s. vv. Gaza,

Minoa) the city of Gaza was a colony from Crete (cf. *Soph.*, ii, 5). This statement is in accordance with the Biblical narrative which tells of reprisals made by the "Cereithi" (Cretans), a Philistine tribe. Philistines were established in the vicinity of Gaza as early as the time of Abraham; their leader, Abimelech, who bore the title of king, resided at Gerara (*Gen.*, xxi, 33; xxvi, 1). Some critics, however, hold that the title of "King of the Philistines" was given to Abimelech, not because he was himself a Philistine, but because he dwelt in the country afterwards inhabited by that people. In any case the Philistines certainly possessed Gaza when Moses and the Hebrews arrived in the Holy Land. Though it was assigned to the tribe of Juda, the city could never be conquered by Josue on account of its high wall (*Gen.*, xv, 18; *Jos.* xv, 47; *Amos*, i, 7). The tribe of Juda possessed the city by right but not in fact.

Gaza appears to have been the metropolis of the five satrapies which formed the territory of the Philistines; and like the four other cities, Ascalon, Accaron, Azotus, and Geth, it had a king whose power extended to all the cities and villages of the region. Samson, to escape from the hands of the Philistines, bore the gates of the city away on his shoulders during the night to the neighbouring mountain (*Judges* xvi, 3); it was at Gaza that, blind and a prisoner of the Philistines, he pulled down the temple of Dagon on himself and his enemies (*Judges* xvi, 21-30). Dagon was not the special deity of Gaza. He is to be met with also at Ascalon, Azotus, and the other Philistine cities to which the term "Beth-dagon" is applied. To a certain extent the Philistines had transformed into a national deity this god of Assyrian origin, a monster having in part the shape of a fish, in part also the form of a man. The Israelites, who had captured Gaza shortly before the time of Samson (*Judges* i, 18), were still in possession of it in the time of Solomon (*III Kings*, iv, 24). It is probable, however, that at this later date the city merely paid tribute, retaining its autonomy.

The people of Gaza continued to manifest their hatred for the Jews, and carried on a brisk commerce in Jewish slaves (*Amos*, i, 6), which drew upon them the terrible maledictions of the prophets of Israel (*Amos*, i, 6-7; *Zach.*, ix, 5; *Jer.*, xxv, 20; *xlvi*, 5). The evils foretold began when the rulers of Egypt and those of Assyria or Chaldea engaged in their long and eventful struggle for the domination of Asia and world-supremacy. Being on the great highway of the conquering armies, Gaza was destined to special suffering. About 734 B. C., Thelathphalasar III numbered among his vassals Hanon, the King of Gaza, who had joined Rasin and Phacee, Kings of Syria and Israel, in revolt against the Assyrian monarch. On the approach of the Assyrian army Hanon fled to Egypt and the city was taken and sacked. But the victors had scarcely departed when Hanon returned to Gaza; and in 720 we find him on the battlefield of Raphia, among the allies of Pharaoh Shabaka, where he was defeated and taken prisoner. Shortly after this the Philistines of Gaza were defeated by Ezechias, King of Juda (*IV Kings*, xviii, 8), and were forced to revolt with him against the Assyrians; the latter, however, returned and again compelled the Philistines to submit. Assarhaddon and Assurbanipal numbered among their tributaries Tsibel, King of Gaza. When the Assyrian empire had been destroyed Egypt sought to enrich itself from the spoils, and Pharaoh Necho II captured Gaza (*Jer.*, xlvii, 1; *Herodotus* II, clix) on his way towards Carchemish, where he was defeated by the Babylonians, who, under the leadership of Nabuchodonosor (Nebuchadnezzar), took the offensive and recaptured Gaza. The city was especially ill-treated, and had afterwards to pay tribute to King Nabonides for the building of the great temple of Sin at Haran. Later the Babylonians gave way to

the Persians. Cambyses, on the occasion of his expedition to Egypt in 525, besieged Gaza, which alone dared to resist his march (*Polybius*, XVI, 40). It submitted, nevertheless, and under the Persian dominion, according to *Herodotus* (III, xv), who compares it to Sardis, one of the most beautiful cities of Asia, it enjoyed great prosperity. The people of Gaza, who seem to have been very courageous and very loyal to their masters, whoever they might be, refused to open the gates to the army of Alexander the Great (332). He was forced to begin a regular siege, which lasted two months and cost him many men. After storming the city, Alexander laid waste to Gaza, put the men to the sword, and sold the women and children into slavery. He afterwards allowed the place to be re-colonized; but the new-comers were of a different stock from the old inhabitants. The Philistine stronghold made way for an Hellenic city (*Diodorus Siculus*, XVII, xlviii, 7; *Arrian*, II, xxxvi; *Quintus Curtius*, IV, xxxiii). Henceforth there is little peace for Gaza. For several centuries it was the battlefield for Egyptian, Syrian, and Jewish armies. It was taken three times by Ptolemy I, King of Egypt (320, 312, and 302 B. C.), and twice by Antigonos (315 and 306). Finally it fell to the Lagidae, who retained it for almost a century. In 219 Antiochus of Syria took possession of it, and organized there the invasion of Egypt; but he was defeated at Raphia in 217, and compelled to abandon his conquest to the Egyptians. In 198 he again took Gaza, routed the Egyptians in the following year, and this time was able to retain his conquest. Jonathan Machabeus appeared with his army before Gaza, which refused to open its gates, so the suburbs were burnt, and the inhabitants compelled to give hostages, 145-143 B. C. (*I Mach.*, xi, 60-62).

Alexander Jannæus besieged the city for a whole year (98) and finally captured it through treachery, sacked it and slew a large number of the inhabitants (*Josephus*, "Ant. Jud.", XIII, xiii, 3; "Bel. Jud.", I, iv, 2). It was rebuilt later by Pompey and by Gabinius (*Josephus*, "Ant. Jud.", XIV, iv, 4; *Appian*, "Syr.", 51). Anthony ceded to Cleopatra the whole of the Mediterranean coast between Egypt and Phœnicia, and Augustus gave Gaza to Herod the Great (30 B. C.). At Herod's death it became subject to the governor of Syria. In A. D. 66 the revolted Jews sacked the city, which was of course soon recaptured by the Romans (*Josephus*, "Bel. Jud.", II, xviii, 1). The era of Gaza, found on its coins and on numerous pagan and Christian inscriptions, dates from a journey of Pompey through Palestine, 28 October, 61 B. C. Gaza is mentioned only once in the New Testament (*Acts*, viii, 26), in connexion with the route followed by the eunuch of Queen Candace. The Hellenistic city had transformed its Oriental deities into Graeco-Roman gods, and was long hostile to Christianity, which as late as the first quarter of the fourth century had scarcely secured a foothold there. It is true that Philemon, to whom St. Paul addressed an epistle, is spoken of as its first bishop; but this is merely an unreliable tradition. St. Sylvanus, its first bishop, martyred (310) at the mines of Phœno, is called "bishop of the churches about Gaza" (*Eusebius*, "Hist. Eccl.", VIII, xiii; "De Mart. Palæst.", xii, iv); Asclepas, his successor, is also called "bishop of the churches about Gaza". He assisted at the Council of Nicæa in 325, and was one of the Catholic bishops most feared by the Arians. He is always found among those who suffered the most severely in the Arian conflict, with men like St. Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and others of that type.

Constantine the Great forcibly introduced Christianity into Gaza, but such was the hostility of the pagan population that Bishop Asclepas deemed it prudent to build the church outside the city. Near the church, but likewise without the walls, arose later

the oratory of the martyr St. Timothy; in the same place were relics of the martyrs St. Major and St. Thea. Christianity, however, spread rapidly in Majuma, the port of Gaza, between two and three miles from the city and owing dependence to it. The citizens of the port obtained from Constantine the privilege of municipal independence for their city, under the name of Constantia, with the right to have its own bishops. When, later, Julian the Apostate withdrew its civic rights from Majuma, it still retained its bishops, the most famous of whom were Peter the Iberian, a Monophysite ascetic, and St. Cosmas, foster brother and friend of St. John Damascene. In the neighbouring cities, e. g. Anthedon, Bethelia, and Menois, Christianity was also introduced with difficulty. Under Julian the Apostate three brothers, Eusebius, Nestabos, and Zeno, were put to death at Gaza by the populace. St. Hilarion, born in the neighbouring Thabatha, a small village, was compelled to flee to Sicily to escape persecution by the pagans (Sozom., "Hist. Eccl.", V, ix; Greg. Naz., "Invect. I in Jul.", 66-67). The first church built in Gaza itself was the work of St. Irenon (d. 393) whose feast is 16 December. He was succeeded by Æneas, and later by St. Porphyry (395-420), the true restorer of Christianity in Gaza. This holy bishop first sent Marcus, his deacon and historian, to Constantinople to obtain an order to close the pagan temples. The Christians then scarcely numbered 200 in Gaza; though the rest of the empire was gradually abandoning its idols, Gaza was stubborn in its opposition to Christianity. The decree was granted by the emperor, and the temples closed, with the exception of the Marneion, the temple sacred to Zeus Marnas, which had replaced that of Dagon. There was no great change, however, in the sentiments of the people; so St. Porphyry decided to strike a decisive blow. He went himself to Constantinople during the winter of 401-402 and obtained from Arcadius a decree for the destruction of the pagan temples, which Cynegius, a special imperial envoy, executed in May, 402. Eight temples, those of Aphrodite, Hecate, the Sun, Apollo, Core, Fortune, the Herceion, and even the Marneion, were either pulled down or burnt. Simultaneously soldiers visited every house, seizing and burning the idols and books of magic. On the ruins of the Marneion was erected, at the expense of the empress, a large church called the Eudoxiana in her honour, and dedicated 14 April, 407. Paganism had thus ceased to exist officially.

Gaza, now a Christian city, became rich and prosperous; and during the fifth and sixth centuries was the seat of a famous school of Christian rhetoricians. Monasticism also flourished there; and the Church recognizes as saints many religious of Gaza, e. g. Dorotheus, Dositheus, Barsanuphius, and John the Prophet; the Monophysite monks were also, for a time, actively engaged in its environs. At the Arab invasion, about 637, the city fell before General Amr. The Eudoxiana was converted into a mosque, and the Roman garrison, consisting of sixty soldiers under the command of Callineus, having refused to apostatize, was slain at Eleutheropolis and Jerusalem ("Analecta Bollandiana", XXIII, 289-307; "Echos d' Orient", VIII, 1905, 40-43). The Arabs venerate the city as the burial-place of Hachem, the grandfather of Mahomet. When the Crusaders came, Gaza was almost in ruins; owing, however, to its situation on the way from Egypt to Syria, it soon regained prosperity. Baldwin III built a fortress there (1149) and confided it to the Templars. Saladin pillaged the city in 1170, but the fortress did not fall until 1187. Richard the Lion-hearted held it for a brief time. In 1244 the combined forces of Christians and Saracens were defeated by the Kharezmians. The Turks finally took Gaza in 1516; and in 1799 Bonaparte held it for a few days. It is now known as Ghazzeah, and is a kaimak-

amat in the sandjak of Jerusalem. It numbers over 40,000 inhabitants, nearly all Mussulmans. There are only 1000 Greek schismatics, 150 Jews, 50 Protestants, and 150 Catholics. The latter have a Catholic pastor under the Patriarch of Jerusalem. The Greek Church contains the tomb of St. Porphyry. Mosques are very numerous, among the most remarkable being Djami-el-Kebir, the ancient cathedral of the crusaders, dedicated to St. John the Baptist; also Nebi-Hachem, in which is the tomb of the grandfather of Mahomet. The city is unclean, and its streets narrow and crooked. But seen from a distance, amid its surrounding vegetation, it appears magnificent. The entire district is well irrigated and cultivated; the soil is extremely rich, and the trade of the city rather prosperous.

MARCUS DIACONUS, *Vita Porphyri episcopi Gazensis* (Leipzig, 1893); SIBER, *De Gaza Palaestina oppido episcopi episcopis* (Leipzig, 1715); LE QUÉREX, *Origena Christianus*, III, 603-622; STARR, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste* (Jena, 1852); SEITZ, *Die Schule von Gaza* (Heidelberg, 1892); RORSSOS, *Trois Gazens* (Greek; Constantinople, 1893); SCHREIER, *Der Kalender und die Aera von Gaza* (Berlin, 1896); GATT in VIC., *Diet. de la Bible*, s. v. S. VAILLÉ.

**Gazzaniga**, PIETRO MARIA, theologian, b. at Bergamo, Italy, 3 March, 1722; d. at Vicenza, 11 Dec., 1799. At a very early age he entered the Order of St. Dominic, and after a brilliant course in the various branches of ecclesiastical sciences, especially philosophy and theology, he was, despite his youth, appointed to teach philosophy and church history, first in the various houses of his order and later at the University of Bologna. His genius, however, his untiring labours, and above all, his faculty for communicating knowledge did not long remain concealed within the walls of Bologna. Owing to the changes introduced into the theological faculty of the University of Vienna in 1760, the chair of dogmatic theology, which had been assigned exclusively to members of the Dominican Order, was vacant. It was but natural then that the empress, Maria Theresa, should appeal to his superiors to have him transferred to her cherished seat of learning. His fame accompanied him. Students from all quarters flocked to him. At his feet sat the empress herself; Cardinal Migazzi, the renowned Garampi, and even Pius VI, during his sojourn in Vienna, never failed to attend his lectures. After twenty years of active work he returned to Italy, where he continued to lecture in various places until his death.

In theology Gazzaniga is ranked as one of the foremost defenders and exponents of the Thomistic school during the latter part of the seventeenth, and the beginning of the eighteenth, century. By strict adherence to the traditional teaching of his school, he set himself against the spirit of his age, which sought to modernize and to conduct all theological schools of Austria on plans designed to render them more independent of ecclesiastical and royal authority. He succeeded in winning over to his cause Simon Rock, till then the faithful associate of Van Swieten, the inveterate promoter of the Jansenistic spirit in Austria, and with his assistance finally restored Thomism in the schools of that country. His fidelity to St. Thomas likewise rendered him very bitter against Molinism; so much so, in fact, that he succeeded in persuading the party of Father Gomar, as against that of Arminius, to subscribe to the Thomistic doctrine of predestination and reprobation (*ad sanam Thomistarum de prædestinatione et reprobatione doctrinam descendunt, Prælect.*, vol. II, diss. 6, n. 242). His principal work, the "*Prælectiones theologice habitæ in vindobonensi universitate, nunc vero alio methodo dispositæ, emendatæ et auctæ*", has gone through many editions (9 vols., Bologna, 1788-1793; Bassani, 1831).

WERNER, *Geschichte der Kath. Theologie*, 198; HURTER, *Nomenclator*. JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

**Gebal**. See GIBLIANS.

**Gebhard**, ARCHBISHOP OF COLOGNE. See TRUCHSESS VON WALDBURG.

**Gebhard (III) of Constance**, bishop of that city, and strenuous defender of papal rights against imperial encroachments during the Investitures conflict; b. about 1040; d. 12 November, 1110. He was a son of Duke Bertold I and a brother of Bertold II, of Zähringen. For some time he was provost at Xanten, then entered the Benedictine monastery at Hirschau and on 22 December, 1084, was consecrated Bishop of Constance by the cardinal-legate, Otto of Ostia, the future Urban II. The see of Constance was then occupied by the imperial anti-Bishop Otto I, who, though excommunicated and deposed by Gregory VII in 1080, retained his see by force of arms. At an imperial synod held at Mainz, in April, 1085, Gebhard and fourteen other German bishops who remained faithful to Gregory VII were deposed, and Otto I was declared the lawful Bishop of Constance. Luckily, Otto I died in the beginning of 1086, and Gebhard was able to take possession of his see. One of his first acts as bishop was the reform of the Benedictine monastery of Petershausen near Constance, which he recruited with monks from Hirschau. In 1089 he consecrated the new cathedral of Constance, to replace the old one which had fallen into ruins in 1052.

On 18 April, 1089, Pope Urban II appointed him and Bishop Altmann of Passau, Apostolic vicars for Germany. Arnold, a monk of St. Gall, whom Henry IV appointed anti-Bishop of Constance on 28 March, 1092, tried in vain to eject Gebhard from the See of Constance. The latter had powerful friends in his brother Bertold II, Duke Welf IV, the monks of Hirschau and Petershausen, and the citizens of Constance. In 1094 Gebhard held a synod of reform at Constance, and in 1095 he attended the Synod of Piacenza. Soon, however, the influence of Henry IV began to increase in Germany. In 1103 Gebhard was driven from his see, and the imperial anti-bishop, Arnold, usurped the bishopric. With the assistance of Henry V, Gebhard regained his see in 1105, freed the king from the ban by order of Paschal II, and accompanied him on his journey to Saxony. Gebhard attended the Synod of Nordhausen on 27 May, 1105, the diet at Mainz on Christmas, 1105, was sent as imperial legate to Rome in the spring of 1106, and was present at the Council of Guastalla in October of the same year. In the fresh dispute that arose between Paschal II and Henry V, Gebhard seemed to side with the emperor, but, after being severely reprimanded by the pope, withdrew from public life and devoted his whole attention to the welfare of his diocese.

HENKING, *Gebhard III. Bischof von Konstanz* (Stuttgart, 1880); ZELL, *Gebhard von Zähringen in Freiburger Diocesan-Archiv* (Freiburg im Br., 1865), I, 305-404; MEYER VON KNONAU in *Schriften des Vereins für die Geschichte des Bodensees* (Lindau, 1896), XXV, 18 sqq.; IDEM in *Allg. Deutsche Biogr.*; NEUGART, *Episcopatus Constantiensis* (St. Blasien, 1803), I, 467-502.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Gebhart, EMILE**, a French professor and writer, b. 19 July, 1839, at Nancy; d. 22 April, 1908, in Paris. He was the grand-nephew of General Drouot, one of the most distinguished soldiers of the First Empire. Having finished his studies in the Lycée of Nancy, he was admitted to the Ecole Française of Athens, where he imbibed the Hellenic spirit and gathered a rich harvest of facts and anecdotes for his future works. When he returned to France he was sent to the Lycée of Nice and soon after appointed professor of foreign literatures in the University of Nancy. He was so successful that a chair of Southern European literatures was instituted specially for him at the Sorbonne, in 1880. For the twenty-six years during which he retained that position, he was the most popular professor in the Sorbonne, his course of lectures being attended by enthusiastic audiences both of students and of men and women of the world. In 1895 he was elected to the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, and in 1905 to the French Academy. He was

fond of travelling, and every summer, for twenty-five years, he spent three months in Italy, visiting Rome, Milan, Florence, Venice, seeking rare and antique books in libraries, staying in monasteries and talking with the monks, and gathering information concerning popular legends from the common people on the streets and in the cottages of the poor. All the materials so collected were afterwards used in his books. His favourite subjects were Greek antiquity and the Italian Renaissance. He treated them in a masterly manner, showing a thorough but unpretentious knowledge. His style is clear, slightly sarcastic at times, but extremely agreeable. His principal works are: "Praxitèle" (1864), "La Renaissance et la Réforme" (1877), "Les Origines de la Renaissance en Italie" (1879), "L'Italie mystique" (1890), "Le son des Cloches, contes et légendes" (1898), "Moines et Papes" (1896), "Autour d'une tiare" (1894), "Cloches de Noël et de Pâques" (1900), "Conteurs florentins au moyen-âge" (1901), "Jules II" (1904), "Florence" (1906). The last days of his life were dimmed by sadness. As he had always been fond of mysticism, which he had so well described in his lives of St. Francis of Assisi and St. Catherine of Siena, and as he disliked the rationalistic doctrines of the time, the attacks of the Radicals on his religious and patriotic ideals wounded him deeply.

HERVIEU, *Réponse au discours de réception à l'Académie Française* (Paris, 1905); *Annales politiques et littéraires*, 1904 and 1908; *Le Correspondant*, 1905, Vol. CCXVIII; *Les Questions Actuelles* (30 May, 1908).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

**Gedeon** [GIDEON (Heb. גִּדְעֹן, "hewer")], also called JEROBAAL (Judges, vi, 32; vii, 1; etc.), and JERUBSHEETH (II Kings, xi, 21, in the Hebrew text), was one of the Greater Judges of Israel. He belonged to the tribe of Manasses, and to the family of Abiezer (Judges, vi, 34). Gedeon's father was Joas, and lived in Ephra (Judges, vi, 11). The following is in substance the account of Gedeon's judgeship as related in Judges, vi-viii: Israel, having forsaken Yahweh's worship, had been for seven years exceedingly humbled by the incursions of the Midianites and of other Eastern tribes. At length, they turned to God who sent them a deliverer in the person of Gedeon. In a first theophany, granted him by day while he was threshing wheat, Gedeon received the difficult mission of freeing his people; whereupon he built an altar to the Lord (Judges, vi, 24). In a second theophany during the following night, he was directed to destroy the village-altar to Baal, and to erect one to Yahweh. This he did with the result that the people clamoured for his death to avenge his insult to their false god. Joas, however, saved his son's life by the witty taunt, which secured for the latter the name of Jerobaal: "Let Baal revenge himself!" (vi, 25-32). Thus divinely commissioned, Gedeon naturally took the lead against Midian, and Amalec, and other Eastern tribes who had crossed the Jordan, and encamped in the valley of Jezrael. Comforted by the famous signs of the fleece (vi, 36-40), and accompanied by warriors from Manasses, Aser, Zabulon, and Nephthali, he took up his position not far from the enemy. But it was God's intention to show that it was His power which delivered Israel, and hence He reduced Gedeon's army from 32,000 to 300 (vii, 1-8). According to a divine direction, the Hebrew commander paid a night visit to the enemy's camp and overheard the telling of a dream which prompted him to act at once, certain of victory (vii, 9-15). He then supplied his men with trumpets and with torches enclosed in jars, which, after his example, they broke, crying out: "The sword of Yahweh and Gedeon." Panic-stricken at the sudden attack, Israel's enemies turned their arms against one another, and broke up in flight towards the fords of the Jordan (vii, 16-23). But, summoned by Gedeon, the Ephraimites cut off the Midianites at the fords, and



captured and slew two of their princes, Oreb and Zeb, whose heads they sent to the Hebrew leader, rebuking him at the same time for not having called earlier upon their assistance. Gedeon appeased them by an Eastern proverb, and pursued the enemy beyond the Jordan river (vii, 24; viii, 3). Passing by Soccoth and Phaniel, he met with their refusal of provisions for his fainting soldiers, and threatened both places with vengeance on his return (viii, 4-9). At length, he overtook and defeated the enemies of Israel, captured their kings, Zebee and Salmana, returned in triumph, punishing the men of Soccoth and Phaniel on his way, and finally put to death Zebee and Salmana (viii, 10-21). Grateful for this glorious deliverance, Gedeon's countrymen offered him the dignity of an hereditary king, which he declined with these noble words: "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you, but Yahweh shall rule over you" (viii, 22-23). He nevertheless asked and obtained from his soldiers the golden rings and other ornaments which they had taken from the enemy; and out of this spoil he made what seems to have soon become an object of idolatrous worship in Israel. Gedeon's peaceful judgeship lasted forty years. He had seventy sons, and "died in a good old age, and was buried in the sepulchre of his father in Ephra" (viii, 24-32). His victory is alluded to in Isaias, x, 26, and in Ps., lxxxii, 12 (Heb. lxxxiii, 11), where the four kings mentioned in Judges, vii, viii, are distinctly named—a fact which shows that, at the time when this psalm was composed, the narrative of Gedeon's exploits was commonly known in its present form. The various literary features exhibited by the text of Judges, vi-viii, have been minutely examined and differently appreciated by recent scholars. Several commentators look upon these features—such for instance as the two names, Gedeon and Jerobaal; the two theophanies bearing on Gedeon's call; the apparently twofold narrative of Gedeon's pursuit of the routed enemies, etc.—as proving conclusively the composite origin of the sacred record of Gedeon's judgeship. Others, on the contrary, see their way to reconcile all such features of the text with the literary unity of Judges, vi-viii. However this may be, one thing remains perfectly sure, to wit, that whatever may be the documents which have been utilized in framing the narrative of Gedeon's exploits, they agree substantially in their description of the words and deeds of this Greater Judge of Israel.

Catholic commentaries on the book of Judges by CLAIR (Paris, 1880); VON HUMMELAUER (Paris, 1888); LAGRANGE (Paris, 1903); Non-Catholic, by MOORE (New York, 1895); BUDGE (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1897); NOWACK (Göttingen, 1900).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

**Gédoyn, NICOLAS**, a French translator and literary critic; b. at Orléans, 17 June, 1667; d. 10 August, 1744, at Port-Pertuis, near Beaugency. After studying in the College of the Jesuits, he entered their novitiate in 1684, becoming later professor of rhetoric at Blois. Ill-health, afterwards, obliged him to resign this position, and leave the Society of Jesus, for which, however, he always retained his affection. A canonicate at the Sainte-Chapelle (Paris) and two abbey positions gave him the means of devoting himself to educational works. In 1711, he was elected to membership in the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and in 1718 his free translation and adaptation of Quintilian, containing many allusions to contemporaries, was the occasion of his election to the French Academy. He also translated Pausanias (1731), and wrote "Réflexions sur le goût", published by d'Olivet in "Recueil d'opuscules littéraires" (Amsterdam, 1767). Several other memoirs and essays were collected by d'Olivet, and published under the title of "Œuvres diverses de M. l'abbé Gédoyn". They contain a life of Epaminondas, an apology for translations, essays on the education of children, Roman urbanity, the ancients and the moderns, etc. In education,

Gédoyn is an advocate of progress, and deploras the routine and the tradition which make parents and educators conform blindly to received methods and usages without realizing that circumstances change and that methods of education should be adapted and modified in consequence. Three things are necessary to a complete education: knowledge, virtue and good manners; the constant endeavour of the master should be to develop these in his pupils. Since money spent by parents for the education of their children is an invested capital of the greatest importance, great care should be taken in the selection of tutors.

*Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (Paris, 1858), XIX, 802; d'Olivet, *Vie de Gédoyn* (1752); MAIRE in *Buisson's Dictionnaire de pédagogie* (Paris, 1887), I, i, 1149.

C. A. DUBRAY.

**Gegenbauer, JOSEF ANTON VON**, an accomplished German historical and portrait painter, b. 6 March, 1800, at Wangen, Wurtemberg; d. 31 January, 1876, at Rome. He studied first at the Royal Academy in Munich under Robert von Langer, remaining in that city from 1815 to 1823. Among his productions there were two idyllic works which were much admired, a "Saint Sebastian" and a "Madonna and Child", altar-piece for his native town. In 1823 the painter went to Rome, where he remained until 1826, studying especially the works of Raphael. He became notably successful as a fresco painter, and, on his return to Wurtemberg, the king made him court painter and commissioned him to decorate the Royal Villa of Rosenstein. In 1829 Gegenbauer went again to Rome and worked on frescoes. During his later residence at Stuttgart he was employed from 1836 to 1854 in decorating the Royal Palace with sixteen scenes in fresco from the history of Wurtemberg. These include incidents in the life of Count Eberhard II of Wurtemberg. In the same building are many of his oil paintings, among them being "Two Shepherds", "Adam and Eve after their Expulsion from Eden", and "Moses Striking the Rock". In the Stuttgart Gallery is also his "Hercules and Omphale". His other paintings in oil, ranging in date from 1829 to 1860 include many on mythological subjects: "Sleeping Venus and Two Satyrs", "Leda and the Swan", "Apollo and the Muses", "Bacchus and Ariadne", "Venus and Cupid", "Ceres and Jason", "Æolus Æola", "Pluto and Proserpine", "Neptune and Thetis", several Genii and Amorettes, and some portraits. Among Gegenbauer's frescoes, in addition to those already mentioned, are "Jupiter giving Immortality to Psyche", "The Marriage of Cupid and Psyche", four scenes from the life of Psyche, "The Four Seasons", an "Aurora"—all at the Villa Rosenstein. In addition to these works, we may mention, as well as various Madonnas, "The Ascension of the Virgin", "The Crucifixion", the "Hercules and Omphale", the last in the Thorwaldsen Museum at Copenhagen.

CHAMPLIN and PERKINS, *Cyclopedia of Painters and Paintings* (New York, 1886); BRYAN, *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*. AUGUSTUS VAN CLEEF.

**Gehenna.** See HELL.

**Geiler von Kaysersberg, JOHANN**, a celebrated German pulpit orator, b. at Schaffhausen, Switzerland, 16 March, 1445; d. at Strasburg, 10 March, 1510. Until a scientific presentation of the history of the development of the Catholic sermon appears, an appreciation of even the most distinguished pulpit orator, although based on careful investigation, can only be a preliminary labour, for the picture, however elaborate, will lack the proper background. This is true in the case of the celebrated medieval preacher to the common people, Berthold of Ratisbon, and it applies no less to the great pulpit orator of the early sixteenth century, Geiler von Kaysersberg. More fortunate is the treatment of the subject in its relations to purely literary history, for the importance of Geiler in literature can

be exactly determined. According to this history he was closely connected with those humanists of Strasburg of whom the leader was the well-known Jacob of Wimpheling (1450-1528), called "the educator of Germany". Like Wimpheling, Geiler was a secular priest; both fought the ecclesiastical abuses of the age, but not in the spirit of Luther and his adherents. They looked, instead, for salvation and preservation only in the restoration of Christian morals in Church and State through the faithful maintenance of the doctrines of the Church. The scene of Wimpheling's fruitful labours was the school, that of Geiler's the pulpit.

The surname "von Kayzersberg", given to Geiler by his contemporaries, was taken from the name of the place where his grandfather, who brought him up, lived. The father was killed by a hunting-accident when Geiler was three years old; and the excellent



JOHANN GEILER VON KAYSERSBERG  
Reproduced from Reusner, "Icones"  
(Strasburg, 1587)

grandfather, who lived in Kayzersberg, took charge of the education of the child, sending him to the school at Ammersweiher, near Kayzersberg in Alsace, where his mother lived. When the talented boy was fifteen years old he went to the University of Freiburg in the Breisgau, which had just been opened; two years later he received the baccalaureate, and after two more years was made master of arts.

He now gave lectures on various writings of Aristotle in the next semester, and in the following half-year filled the office of dean of the philosophical faculty for a brief period. In May, 1471, he went to the University of Basle, also founded but a short time before, in order to study theology, and obtained the doctorate in 1475. At Basle he became acquainted with Sebastian Brant, with whom he formed a lasting friendship. While at Basle, Geiler preached his first sermons in the cathedral and greatly enjoyed his pulpit labours; the confessional, however, caused him many difficulties of conscience. Basle, nevertheless, was not to be the place where his powers were to find their permanent employment. At the entreaty of the students of Freiburg, the magistracy and citizens of that city obtained his appointment to the Freiburg University, of which he was elected rector the next year. But lecturing to students was not congenial to him; his inclination was always for preaching, and in this latter office his talents found a life-work suited to them. For a time he preached in the cathedral of Würzburg, in which city he thought of making his permanent home, but a fortunate accident changed his plans. Peter Schott, senator of Strasburg, an important and influential citizen who had charge of the property of the cathedral, urged strongly upon Geiler, now a well-known preacher, that his first duty was to the people of Alsace; accordingly Geiler resolved, notwithstanding the entreaties of the citizens of Würzburg, to settle in Strasburg, and pursuant to this decision he remained there the rest of his life.

Before this date the mendicant orders had supplied the pulpit of the cathedral of Strasburg. On account, however, of the frequent change of preachers and,

above all, owing to some friction between the mendicants and the parish priests, the cathedral chapter, together with the bishop and the city authorities, desired to have a secular priest appointed to fill the office permanently. Consequently a special position as preacher was made for Geiler, and he filled this appointment with apostolic courage and intense zeal for souls for over thirty years. He not only preached, as required, every Sunday and feast day in the cathedral, and even daily during fasts, but also, on special occasions, in the monasteries of the city and often outside of the city. His daily life, passed in this simple round of duties, was only broken by occasional short journeys for which he apparently used his monthly holiday. Thus he frequently visited Frederick of Zollern, Bishop of Augsburg, who was very friendly to him; once he was called to Fussen on the River Lech by his special patron the Emperor Maximilian, who desired his advice. He seems to have taken his short intervals of rest, when possible, for making pious pilgrimages, generally in the vicinity of his home, sometimes to distant spots. At Einsiedeln in Switzerland he met the Blessed Nikolaus of Flüe, who was even then well known; another time he journeyed to Sainte-Baume, near Marseilles, in order to pray in the grotto of St. Mary Magdalen. At home he lived very plainly, even austere. It was only natural that a life of such incessant labour, one in which the powers were constantly exerted to the utmost and none of the comforts of ease were enjoyed, should soon wear out the bodily frame. A kidney trouble developed, to relieve which he was obliged to visit annually the hot springs of Baden; dropsy finally appeared, and he passed away on Lætare Sunday of the year above mentioned. The next day, in the presence of an immense multitude of people, he was buried at the foot of the pulpit which had been especially built for him, and of which he had been for so many years the greatest ornament.

The numerous volumes of Geiler's sermons and writings which have been published do not give a complete picture of the characteristic qualities of the preacher. God's grace had made Geiler an orator, and the aim Geiler sought, without regard to other considerations, was to produce the most powerful effect on his hearers. He prepared himself with great care for the pulpit, writing out his sermons beforehand, as his contemporary Beatus Rhenanus reports; these preparatory compositions, however, were drawn up, not in German, but in Latin. Only a very small part of the sermons that have been issued under his name are directly his. At a very early date his addresses were taken down by others and published. The best critic of Geiler's works, the well-known writer on literary history, Prof. E. Martin of Strasburg, has made the attempt, in the "Allgemeine deutsche Biographie", to give a summary of Geiler's genuine writings; according to him the authenticated writings number thirty-five. Notwithstanding this rich material, a proper appreciation of the extraordinary preacher is very difficult, because it is not certain that any of the extant works give exactly what Geiler said. One thing, however, is evident from them, that the Strasburg preacher was a widely read man not only in theology, but also in the secular literature of the day. This is shown by the sermons having Sebastian Brant's "Ship of Fools", which appeared in 1494, for their theme; these sermons attained the greatest popularity. Geiler displayed, also, exceptional facility in using public events to attract and hold the attention of his hearers. In originality of speech Geiler is in form, as in time, between Berthold of Ratisbon and Abraham a Sancta Clara, and perhaps the shortest and best characterization of the greatest preacher of the early Reformation period is indicated by this intermediate position; Berthold's homeliness of address showed only occasional lapses from the proprieties of

speech, Geiler yielded oftener to the coarseness of his age, Abraham exceeded his contemporaries in unfortunate errors as to form and content.

According to the testimony of contemporaries, the effect of Geiler's forcible and unusual sermons was at times very marked; but the decay of morals was by now too great for them to have a permanent effect. Geiler himself complained bitterly that neither clergy nor laity were willing to join in a common reform. A man of austere morality, he never failed to show an apostolic courage towards both high and low, and exhibited an extraordinary daring in fighting vice and degeneracy of morals. Hence his works are an important source for the history of the civilization of these degenerate times. There are no distinct statements regarding what he effected by his personal influence among his intimate friends, especially by his influence on the pious family of the senator, Schott, upon Wimpeling and Brant, who were, like Geiler, reformers in the best sense of the word, as well as, by his counsels, upon the Emperor Maximilian. Another striking merit of Geiler's oratory was that his thoughts were expressed in the language of ordinary life, which he used with unequalled skill. In this way posterity possesses, in Geiler's writings, an enduring source for the knowledge of the speech, customs, and beliefs of the common people at the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is no longer necessary to take up a question warmly discussed, even in modern times, as to how a work of Geiler's came to be on the Index (cf. Reusch, "Der Index", I, 370), as in the last issue of the Index Geiler's name does not appear.

Chief sources: BEATUS RHENANUS, *Vita Geileri* (Strasbourg, 1513); DACHEUX, *Die ältesten Schriften Geilers von Kaisersberg* (Freiburg, 1882); DE LORENZI, *Ausgabe der Schriften Geilers* (Trier, 1881-83). See also von AMMON, *Geiler von Kaisersberg, Leben, Lehren und Predigen* (Erlangen, 1826); DACHEUX, *Un réformateur catholique à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1876), condensed in German tr. by LINDEMANN in *Sammlung historischer Bildnisse* (Freiburg, 1876); KERKER, *Geilers kirchliche Haltung in Histor.-pol. Blätter* (1861-62); MARTIN in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*; KAWERAU, in *Realencycl. für prot. Theol.*; JANNSEN, ed. PASTOR, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, I; FLEGER, *Zur Geschichte des Predigtwesens in Strassburg vor Geiler* (Strasbourg, 1907). N. SCHEID.

**Geissel, JOHANNES VON**, Cardinal, Archbishop of Cologne, b. 5 February, 1796, at Gimmeldingen, in the Palatinate; d. 8 September, 1864, at Cologne. After completing his classical studies at Neustadt-on-the-Hardt, and at Edesheim, he was received into the then imperial Lyceum of Mainz in 1813, and studied theology in the diocesan seminary of the same city, under Prof. Liebermann, from 1815 to 18. He was ordained priest, 22 August, 1818. For a short time he became assistant in the parish of Hambach. On 1 February, 1819, he was appointed professor at the Gymnasium of Speyer; on 24 June, 1822, canon of the cathedral chapter of Speyer; and on 25 May, 1836, dean of that body. Nominated Bishop of Speyer by the King of Bavaria, he was preconized by Gregory XVI, 20 May, 1837, and consecrated in Augsburg cathedral the following 13 August.

The new bishop displayed such zeal and efficiency that after four years he was called to a larger sphere of activity. After the accession to the throne of Prussia of Frederick William IV, the "conflict of Cologne" was to be settled amicably by an agreement between Church and State, to the effect that Archbishop Clemens August von Droste-Vischering would relinquish the personal direction of the archdiocese, which should pass over to a coadjutor with the right of succession. On 24 September, 1841, Gregory XVI appointed Geissel coadjutor to the Archbishop of Cologne; and on 4 March, 1842, he entered upon the administration of the archdiocese. When Clemens August died (19 October, 1845), Geissel succeeded him, and was enthroned as archbishop, 11 January, 1846. Finally, Pius IX created him cardinal, 30 September, 1850.

Geissel was a man of many gifts and great energy,

one of the foremost German bishops of the nineteenth century. His services in behalf of the Catholic Church in Prussia and throughout Germany are of permanent value. Discretion and a sense of justice on the part of the government of Frederick William IV made it possible for the cardinal to regulate and ameliorate the conditions of the archdiocese in harmony with the policy of the State. He ended the heretical dissensions created by the Hermesian School by suspending the refractory Hermesian professors Braun and Achterfeldt of Bonn; and he reorganized the theological faculty of that university by calling in as professors Dieringer and Martin, men of unsuspected orthodoxy. He was also solicitous for the education of the clergy, and established two seminaries for boys at Neuss and Munstereifel. To instill new zeal into the spiritual life of his people he encouraged popular missions, introduced religious orders and congregations into the archdiocese, instituted the Perpetual Adoration, and stimulated devotion to the Blessed Virgin by celebrating with unusual splendour the declaration of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Of still greater importance for the Church in Germany was his convocation of the German episcopate to a meeting at Würzburg, 1848. The result of this meeting of the hierarchy was a number of momentous deliberations for the future prosperity of the Church. In 1860 he held a provincial council at Cologne. Another matter which the cardinal had at heart during his life, was the completion of Cologne cathedral, the preparations for which had commenced in 1842. Geissel lived long enough to see the edifice completed and dedicated in October, 1863.

In the years preceding his elevation to the episcopal dignity, Geissel also displayed notable literary activity. During the first two decades of its existence (1821-37) he contributed numerous anonymous essays of either serious or humorously-satirical character on questions and occurrences of the day to the "Katholik", and became one of the foremost contributors to that periodical. His unusual poetical talent is shown by a number of poems, mostly of a religious character, and published partly in that periodical, partly issued singly, as the occasion offered. After his death there appeared a special edition of his "Festgedicht auf die Grundsteinlegung zum Fortbau des Kölner Doms" (Cologne, 1865). However, his most marked effort as a writer is his historical work, "Der Kaiser—Dom zu Speyer. Eine topographisch-historische Monographie" (3 vols., Mainz, 1828); 2nd ed. in one volume, as vol. IV of his "Schriften und Reden" (Cologne, 1876).

Other historical writings of less significance are: "Der Kirchensprengel des alten Bisthums Speyer" (Speyer, 1832); "Die Schlacht am Hasenbühl und das Königskreuz zu Gölheim" (Speyer, 1835). Of other separate writings are to be mentioned "Sammlung aller Gesetze und Verordnungen über das Kirchen- und Schulwesen im bayerischen Rheinreise vom Jahre 1796-1830" (Speyer, 1830); "Die religiöse Erziehung der Kinder aus gemischten Ehen. Eine geschichtlichen-rechtliche Erörterung" (Speyer, 1837); first published in the "Katholik", vols. LXIII, LXIV (1837). His pastoral letters, memoirs and addresses, composed by him during his episcopacy, show a great mind and heart. They have been collected with other dispersed and minor writings of earlier days, and various poems, in "Schriften und Reden von Johannes Cardinal von Geissel, Erzbischof von Köln, herausgegeben von Karl Theodor Dumont" (Vols. I-III, Cologne, 1869-70); later on vol. IV was added, "Der Kaiserdom zu Speyer", 2nd ed. (1876).

REMLING, *Cardinal von Geissel, Bischof zu Speyer und Erzbischof zu Köln, im Leben und Wirken* (Speyer, 1873); BAUDRI, *Der Erzbischof von Köln, Johannes Cardinal von Geissel und seine Zeit* (Cologne, 1881); PRÜLL, *Cardinal von Geissel, Aus seinem handschriftlichen Nachlass geschildert* (2 vols. Freiburg im Br., 1895-96); DUMONT, *Diplomatische Correspondenz über die Berufung des Bischofs Johannes von Geissel von Speyer zum Coadjutor des Erzbischofs Clemens August Freiherrn von Droste zu Vischering*

von Köln (Freiburg im Br., 1880), *Conventus episcoporum Herpholensis*, 1848; in *Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum recentiorum*, Calaneo Lacensis, V (Freiburg im Br., 1879), col. 959-1114; *Acta et Decreta Concilii Provinciae Colonienensis anno 1859 celebrati*, Cologne, 1862; also in *Acta et Decreta s. Conc. rec. Coll. Lacensis*, V, col. 231-332.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

**Gelasius I, SAINT, POPE;** d. at Rome, 19 Nov., 496. Gelasius, as he himself states in his letter to the Emperor Anastasius (Ep. xii, n. 1), was *Romanus natus*. The assertion of the "Liber Pontificalis" that he was *notione Afer* is consequently taken by many to mean that he was of African origin, though Roman born. Others, however, interpreting *notione Afer* as "African by birth", explain *Romanus natus* as "born a Roman citizen". Before his election as pope, 1 March, 492, Gelasius had been much employed by his predecessor, Felix II (or III), especially in drawing up ecclesiastical documents, which has led some scholars to confuse the writings of the two pontiffs.

On his election to the papacy, Gelasius at once showed his strength of character and his lofty conception of his position by his firmness in dealing with the adherents of Acacius (see ACACIUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE). Despite all the efforts of the otherwise orthodox patriarch, Euphemius of Constantinople (q. v.), and the threats and wiles by which the Emperor Anastasius tried to obtain recognition from the Apostolic See, Gelasius, though hard-pressed by difficulties at home, would make no peace that compromised in the slightest degree the rights and honour of the Chair of Peter. The constancy with which he combated the pretensions, lay and ecclesiastical, of the New Rome; the resoluteness with which he refused to allow the civil or temporal pre-eminence of a city to determine its ecclesiastical rank; the unflinching courage with which he defended the rights of the "second" and the "third" sees, Alexandria and Antioch, are some of the most striking features of his pontificate. It has been well said that nowhere at this period can be found stronger arguments for the primacy of Peter's See than in the works and writings of Gelasius. He is never tired of repeating that Rome owes its ecclesiastical principedom not to an œcumenical synod nor to any temporal importance it may have possessed, but to the Divine institution of Christ Himself, Who conferred the primacy over the whole Church upon Peter and his successors. (Cf. especially his letters to Eastern bishops and the decretal on the canonical and apocryphal books.) In his dealing with the emperor he is at one with the great medieval pontiffs. "There are two powers by which chiefly this world is ruled: the sacred authority of the priesthood and the authority of kings. And of these the authority of the priests is so much the weightier, as they must render before the tribunal of God an account even for the kings of men." Gelasius's pontificate was too short to effect the complete submission and reconciliation of the ambitious Church of Byzantium. Not until Hormisdas (514-23) did the contest end in the return of the East to its old allegiance. Troubles abroad were not the only occasions to draw out the energy and strength of Gelasius. The Lupercalia, a superstitious and somewhat licentious vestige of paganism at Rome, was finally abolished by the pope after a long contest. Gelasius's letter to Andromachus, the senator, covers the main lines of the controversy.

A staunch upholder of the old traditions, Gelasius nevertheless knew when to make exceptions or modifications, such as his decree obliging the reception of the Holy Eucharist under both kinds. This was done as the only effective way of detecting the Manichæans, who, though present in Rome in large numbers, sought to divert attention from their hidden propaganda by feigning Catholicism. As they held wine to be impure and essentially sinful, they would refuse the chalice and thus be recognized. Later, with the change of conditions, the old normal method of receiving

Holy Communion under the form of bread alone returned into vogue. To Gelasius we owe the ordinations on the ember days (Ep. xv), as well as the enforcement of the fourfold division of all ecclesiastical revenues, whether income from estates or voluntary donations of the faithful, one portion for the poor, another for the support of the churches and the splendour of Divine service, a third for the bishop, and the fourth for the minor clergy. Though some writers ascribe the origin of this division of church funds to Gelasius, still the pontiff speaks of it (Ep. xiv, n. 27) as *dulium rationabiliter decretum*, having been for some time in force. Indeed, Pope Simplicius (475, Ep. i, n. 2) imposed the obligation of restitution to the poor and the Church upon a certain bishop who had failed in this duty; consequently it must have been already regarded as at least a custom of the Church. Not content with one enunciation of this charitable obligation, Gelasius frequently inculcates it in his writings to bishops. For a long time the fixing of the Canon of the Scriptures was attributed to Gelasius, but it seems now more probably the work of Damasus (367-85). As Gelasius, however, in a Roman synod (494), published his celebrated catalogue of the authentic writings of the Fathers, together with a list of apocryphal and interpolated works, as well as the proscribed books of the heretics (Ep. xlii), it was but natural to prefix to this catalogue the Canon of the Scriptures as determined by the earlier pontiff, and thus in the course of time the Canon itself came to be ascribed to Gelasius. In his zeal for the beauty and majesty of Divine service, Gelasius composed many hymns, prefaces, and collects, and arranged a standard Mass-book, though the Missal that has commonly gone by his name, the "Sacramentarium Gelasianum", belongs properly to the next century. How much of it is the work of Gelasius is still a moot question. Though pope but for four years and a half, he exerted a deep influence on the development of church polity, of the liturgy and ecclesiastical discipline. A large number of his decrees have been incorporated into the Canon Law.

In his private life Gelasius was above all conspicuous for his spirit of prayer, penance, and study. He took great delight in the company of monks, and was a true father to the poor, dying empty-handed as a result of his lavish charity. Dionysius Exiguus in a letter to his friend, the priest Julian (P. L., LXVII, 231), gives a glowing account of Gelasius as he appeared to his contemporaries.

As a writer Gelasius takes high rank for his period. His style is vigorous and elegant, though occasionally obscure. Comparatively little of his literary work has come down to us, though he is said to have been the most prolific writer of all the pontiffs of the first five centuries. There are extant forty-two letters and fragments of forty-nine others, besides six treatises, of which three are concerned with the Acacian schism, one with the heresy of the Pelagians, another with the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, while the sixth is directed against the senator Andromachus and the advocates of the Lupercalia. The best edition is that of Thiel.

The feast of St. Gelasius is kept on 21 Nov., the anniversary of his interment, though many writers give this as the day of his death.

P. L., LIX, 9-191; CXXVIII, 439; CXXIX, 1210; THIEL, *Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum Genuinae* (Braunsberg, 1868), I, 285-613, 21-82; JAFFÉ, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (Berlin), I, 53-60; DUCHESNE, *Le Liber Pontificalis* (Paris, 1886), I, 254-257; GRISAR, *Geschichte Roms und der Papst im Mittelalter*, I, 452-457, passim; THOMNES, *De Gelasio I Papa* (Wiesbaden, 1873); ROUX, *Le Pape Gélase* (Bordeaux-Paris, 1880). For the Sacramentary of Gelasius see PROBST, *Die ältesten römischen Sacramentarien und Ordines* (Münster, 1892); BISHOP, *The Earliest Roman Mass-book in Dublin Review* (October, 1894); WILSON, *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford, 1894); WILSON, *A Classified Index to the Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries* (Cambridge, 1890); also P. L., LXXIV, 1049.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.



**Gelasius II**, POPE, b. at Gaeta, year unknown; elected 24 Jan., 1118; d. at Cluny, 29 Jan., 1119. No sooner had Paschal II ended his stormy pontificate, than the cardinals, knowing that the emperor, Henry V, had concerted measures with a faction of the Roman nobility to force the selection of a pliant imperial candidate, met secretly in a Benedictine monastery on the Palatine. Having dispatched a messenger to Monte Cassino, to summon the aged chancellor, Cardinal John of Gaeta, they turned a deaf ear to his entreaties and unanimously declared him pope.

John was of a noble family, probably the Gaetani. Early in life he entered the monastery of Monte Cassino, where he made such progress in learning and became so proficient in Latin, that, under successive pontiffs, he held the office of chancellor of the Holy See. He was the trusted adviser of Paschal II; shared his captivity and shielded him against the zealots who charged the pope with heresy for having, under dire compulsion, signed the "Privilegium", which constituted the emperor lord and master of papal and episcopal elections (see PASCHAL II and INVESTITURES). When the news spread that the cardinals had elected a pope without consulting the emperor, the imperialist party broke down the doors of the monastery; and their leader, Cenizo Frangipani, seized the new pontiff by the throat, cast him to the ground, stamped on him with spurred feet, dragged him by the hair to his neighbouring castle, and threw him, loaded with chains, into a dungeon. Indignant at this brutal deed, the Romans rose in their might; and, surrounding the robber's den, demanded the instant liberation of the pontiff. Frangipani, intimidated, released the pope, threw himself at his feet, and begged and obtained absolution. A procession was formed, and amidst shouts of joy Gelasius II (so he termed himself) was conducted to the Lateran and enthroned.

The triumph was of short duration; for, 2 March, the formidable figure of Henry V was seen in St. Peter's. As soon as he had heard of the proceedings at Rome, he left his army in Lombardy and hastened to the capital. Gelasius immediately determined upon flight. On a stormy night, the pope and his court proceeded in two galleys down the Tiber, pelted by the imperialists with stones and arrows. After several mishaps Gelasius at length reached Gaeta, where he was received by the Normans with open arms. Being only a deacon, he received successively priestly ordination and episcopal consecration. Meanwhile, the emperor, ignoring the action of the cardinals, placed on the throne of St. Peter a senile creature of the royal power, Maurice Burdinus, Archbishop of Braga in Portugal, who had the audacity to take the venerated name of Gregory (see GREGORY VIII, ANTIPOPE). Gelasius pronounced a solemn excommunication against both of them; and as soon as the emperor, frustrated of his prey, left Rome, he returned secretly; but soon took the resolution of taking refuge in France. He went by way of Pisa, where he consecrated its splendid marble cathedral, and Genoa. He was received by the French with the utmost reverence. The powerful minister of Louis VI, the Abbot Suger, conducted him to the monastery of Cluny. Gelasius was perfecting plans for the convocation of a great council at Reims, when he succumbed to pleurisy, leaving the consummation of the fifty years' war for freedom to his successor, Callistus II (q. v.).

Baronius and Reumont agree in pronouncing that no historical personage ever compressed so many misfortunes into the short space of a year and five days. There seems to be no reason why the Benedictine Order should not take up his case for canonization. Benedict XIV tells us ("De Beat. et Canon.", I, xli, n. 30) that in his time the question was mooted; but for one reason or another, it was overlooked. The life of Gelasius was written by his intimate friend, Pandul-

phus of Pisa, an eye-witness to what he narrates; it is in Muratori, "Rer. ital. Scr.", III, 1 sqq.

*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, II, 311-12, 376; WATTERICH, *Pontificum Romanorum Vita* (1862), II, 91-114; BARONICUS, *Ann. Eccl.* ad ann. 1118, 1119; GAETANI, *Vita del pontefice Gelasio II* (Rome, 1802, 1811); histories of medieval Rome by GREGOROVICUS; VON REUMONT.

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

**Gelasius of Cyzicus**, ecclesiastical writer. He was the son of a priest of Cyzicus, and wrote in Bithynia, about 475, to prove against the Eutychians, that the Nicene Fathers did not teach Monophysitism. These details he gives us in his preface (Labbe, II, 117). Beyond that nothing is known about his personality. His "Syntagma" or collection of Acts of the Nicene Council, has hitherto been looked upon as the work of a sorry compiler; recent investigations, however, point to its being of some importance. It is divided into three books (Labbe, II, 117-296): bk. I treats of the Life of Constantine down to 323; bk. II of History of the Council in thirty-six chapters; of bk. III only fragments have been published. The whole of book III was discovered by Cardinal Mai in the Ambrosian Library, and its contents are fully described by Oehler. The serious study of the sources of Gelasius may be said to have begun with Turner's identification of the long passages taken from Rufinus (X, 1-5) in bk. II. A complete analysis of the sources [the Hist. Eccl. of Eusebius, Rufinus (in the Greek version of Gelasius of Caesarea d. 395), Socrates, Theodoret, "John", and Dalmatius], will be found in Löschcke, whose efforts it would appear, have restored to Gelasius a place among serious Church historians, of which he has been wrongly deprived, and have also lent weight to the hitherto generally rejected idea that there was an official record of the Acts of the Council of Nicea; and further that it was from this record that Dalmatius derived the opening discourse of Constantine, the confession of Hosius, the dialogue with Phædo, and the nine dogmatic constitutions, which Hefele had pronounced "most certainly spurious". The "John" to whom Gelasius refers as a forerunner of Theodoret, is still unidentified; from him were derived the published portions of bk. III, the letters of Constantine to Arius, to the Church of Nicomedia, and to Theodotus, all of which Löschcke contends are authentic. He also proves that a comparison of Constantine's letter to the Synod of Tyre (335), as given by Gelasius and Athanasius (Apolog., n. 86), shows Gelasius to give the original, Athanasius an abbreviated version.

Text of GELASIUS in LABBE-COLETTI, *Conc.*, II, 117-296; OEHLER in *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftliche Theol.* (1861), IV, 439-442; TURNER, *On Gelasius of Cyzicus in Journal of Theological Studies* (1899), I, 126-7; LÖSCHCKE, *Das Syntagma des Gelasius Cyzicenus* (Bonn, 1906); LEJAY in *Revue d'Hist. et de Litt. Relig.* (1906), XI, 279; HEFELE, *Histoire des Conciles*, new Fr. tr., LECLERCQ (Paris, 1907), I, 391 sqq.

EDWARD MYERS.

**Gellée**, CLAUDE. See LORRAIN, CLAUDE.

**Gemara**. See TALMUD.

**Gemblours** (GEMBOUX, GEMBLACUM), a suppressed Benedictine monastery about nine miles north-west of Namur on the river Orneau in Belgium, founded c. 945 by St. Guibert (Wibert) and dedicated to St. Peter the Apostle and the holy martyr Exuperius. St. Guibert was assisted in the erection of the monastery and the selection of its monks by Erluin, who had resigned a canonry to become a monk. Some of Guibert's relatives impugned the legality of the monastic foundation on the plea that the monastery was built on fiscal land which had been given in fief to Guibert's ancestors and could not be alienated without imperial authority. Emperor Otto I summoned Guibert and Erluin to his court, but was so favourably impressed with the manner in which they defended their pious undertaking that on 20 September, 946, he



issued an imperial diploma approving the foundation of Gemblours and granting it various privileges. Guibert appointed his friend Erluin first Abbot of Gemblours, while he himself became a monk at the monastery of Gorze near Metz. Twice he returned to the Gemblours; once in 954, when the Hungarians threatened to pillage the monastery, on which occasion he not only preserved it from injury, but also converted some Hungarians to the true Faith; and a second time in 957, when his brother-in-law Heribrand of Mawolt had seized the revenues of the monastery. He persuaded Heribrand to leave the possessions of the monastery unmolested in the future. On 23 May, 962, St. Guibert died at Gorze and his remains were brought to Gemblours. When monastic discipline was well established at Gemblours, Erluin attempted, at the suggestion of Count Regnier of Hainaut, to reform the monastery of Lobbes in 955. But on the night of 20 October, 958, three of the monks of Lobbes, who hated reform, assaulted Erluin in his cell, dragged him outside of the monastery, and inflicted on him serious bodily injuries. Erluin died at Gemblours on 10 August, 986, after Pope Benedict VII had granted his monastery exemption and papal protection.

During the short reign of his successor Heriward (987-990), the monks voluntarily relinquished their right of exemption in favour of Bishop Noiger of Liège, who was friendly disposed towards the monastery. Heriward was succeeded by Erluin II (990-1012), under whose weak administration monastic discipline greatly relaxed. His successor Olbert (1012-1048), a pious and learned abbot, restored discipline, built a new abbey church in 1022, organized a rich library, and by encouraging sacred and profane learning gave the first impulse to the subsequent flourishing condition of Gemblours. During the period of its greatest intellectual activity Gemblours was ruled over by Mysach (1048-1071); Thietmar (1071-1092); Liehard (1092-1115), and Anselm (1115-1136). Under Thietmar flourished the famous chronicler Sigebert (1030-1112), who in a neat Latin style wrote a chronicle of the world from 381-1111, a history of the Abbots of Gemblours, and other historical works of great value. His chronicle was continued by Abbot Anselm till 1136, and his history of the Abbots of Gemblours by the monk Gottschalk, a disciple of Sigebert. The learned Prior Guerin, who was a famous teacher at the school of Gemblours, was a contemporary of Sigebert. In 1157 and again in 1185 the monastery was destroyed by fire, and, though rebuilt, it began from this period to decline in importance. In 1505, under Abbot Arnold II of Solbregg (1501-1511), it became affiliated with the Bursfeld Union (see BURSFEELD, ABBEY OF). It was pillaged by the Calvinists in 1598, and was partly destroyed by fire in 1678 and again in 1712. It was just beginning to recover from these heavy misfortunes when in 1793 the Government suppressed it. The buildings are now used for a state agricultural college.

TOUSSAINT, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Gembloux* (Namur, 1884); BERLIÈRE, *Monasticon Belge* (Bruges, 1890), I, 15-26; IDEM in *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous, 1887), IV, 303-315; *Gallia Christiana*, II, 554-569; SIGEBERT-GOTTSCHALK, *Gesta Abbatum Gemblacensium* (till 1136), in P. L., CLX, 591-658; MABILLON, *Vita S. Guiberti in Acta SS. O.S.B.*, sec. V, 299-314; IDEM, *Vita Olberti in Acta SS. O.S.B.*, sec. VI, 596-606.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Gemistos of Plethon.** See PLETHON.

**Genealogy (IN THE BIBLE).**—The word *genealogy* occurs only twice in the New Testament: I Tim., i, 4, and Tit., iii, 9. In these passages commentators explain the word as referring to the Gentile theogonies, or to the Essene generation of angels, or to the emanation of spirits and æons as conceived by the Gnostics, or to the genealogies of Jesus Christ, or finally to the genealogies of the Old Testament construed into a source of an occult doctrine. Some even appeal to Philo in order to refer St. Paul's expression to the

various stories and fables told about Moses and the Patriarchs. In the Old Testament the term *γενεαλογία* occurs only in a few manuscripts of the Septuagint, in I Par., iv, 33; v, 7, 17; ix, 22; I Esd., viii, 1, where the commonly received text reads *καταλογισμός* or *καταλογισμός*. In the present article, therefore, we shall not dwell upon the term *genealogy*, but consider the parts, usually genealogical lists, introduced by the phrase "these are the generations" or "this is the book of the generation"; we shall investigate the meaning of the introductory phrase, enumerate the principal genealogical lists, indicate their sources, draw attention to their importance, and point out their deficiencies. Special genealogical lists, for instance those of Christ, found in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, must be studied separately.

**I. INTRODUCTORY PHRASE.**—The introductory formula, "these are the generations" or "this is the book of the generation", is the heading to the ten parts of the Book of Genesis. It occurs also in Num., iii, 1; Ruth, iv, 18; I Par., i, 29. Similar expressions are found frequently, especially in the Books of Paralipomenon. What is their meaning? They do not denote any genealogy or genealogical table in our sense of these words. There can be no question of posterity in Gen., ii, 4: "these are the generations of the heaven and the earth" as *toledoth*, the Hebrew equivalent of "generations", seems to imply. In Gen., vi, 9, the introductory formula is followed by the history of the Flood; hence it cannot point forward to a genealogical table. If we keep in mind, on the other hand, that primitive history was only genealogy adorned with various anecdotes and stories of incidents, we begin to realize that the genealogical portions of the Book of Genesis are abbreviated and rudimentary biographies. The proper meaning of our introductory formula is, therefore, simply, "this is the history".

**II. GENEALOGICAL LISTS.**—The peculiar character of primitive history accounts for the numerous genealogical lists found in the books of the Old Testament. We shall enumerate only the principal ones: Gen., v, 1-31, gives the Patriarchs from Adam to Noe; Gen., x, 1-32, the ethnography of the sons of Noe; Gen., xi, 10-26, the Patriarchs from Sem to Abraham; Gen., xi, 27-32, the posterity of Thare; Gen., xxii, 20-24, the posterity of Nachor; Gen., xxv, 1-4, the descendants of Abraham by Cetura; Gen., xxv, 12-18, the posterity of Ismael; Gen., xxv, 23-29, the sons of Jacob; Gen., xxxvi, 1-43, the posterity of Esau and the princes of Edom; Gen., xli, 8-27, the family of Jacob going into Egypt; Num., iii, 14-39, the list of the Levites; Num., xxvi, 1-51, the heads of the tribes; Ruth, iv, 18-22, the genealogy of David; I Esd., vii, 1-5, the genealogy of Esdras; II Esd., xi-xii, the genealogy of a number of persons. I Par., i-iix, is replete with genealogical lists which either repeat, or abbreviate, or again develop the foregoing genealogies, adding at times other documents of an unknown origin. For instance, there is a brief genealogy of Benjamin in I Par., vii, 6-12, a longer one in I Par., viii, 1-40; similarly a brief genealogy of Juda in I Par., iv, 1-23, a more complete one in I Par., ii, 3; iii, 24. The inspired historian makes no effort to harmonize these striking differences, but seems to be only careful to reproduce his sources.

In order to appreciate the foregoing lists properly, four of their peculiarities must be kept in mind: (1) In the primitive languages each word had a certain meaning. Foreign names had to be translated or replaced by other names. As the Semitic language developed out of the primitive, the proper names too underwent a similar change, so as to assume a Semitic, and at times even a Hebrew, colouring. This does not destroy the historical character of the men known under these changed appellations; the martyr St. Adauctus does not become a mere fiction simply because his real name is unknown. Lenormant has left

us a comparison between the antediluvian Patriarchs of the Bible and the antediluvian heroes of Chaldean tradition (Origines de l'histoire, I, Paris, 1880, pp. 214-90), and Vigouroux has given us a study on the mythological origin of the antediluvian Patriarchs (Livres saints et critique ration., 1891, IV, liv. I, c. vii, pp. 191-217). All this goes to show that the names actually found in the Biblical genealogies denote the same subject, but do not present the same form as the original names. (2) The names found in the Biblical genealogies do not always denote persons, but may signify a family, a tribe or nation, or even the country in which the bearers of the respective names dwelt. For instance, Jos., vii, 1, speaks of "Achan the son of Charmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zare of the tribe of Juda", while the context (cf. 16 sqq.) shows that Zabdi stands for the "house of Zabdi" and Zare for the "family of Zare". Again, throughout Gen., x, the genealogy serves an ethnographic purpose, so that its names represent nations or countries. The name of the country can be identified with that of its inhabitants, because the country stands for its people by way of a metaphor which has almost ceased to be so on account of its frequent use. The same proper name denotes an individual, a family, a house, a tribe, or a nation, on account of the idea of solidarity of the whole community in the merits and demerits of the individual member. This width of meaning of the genealogical names does not detract from their historicity, since the obscurity of one's grandfather or great-grandfather does not prevent one from being a real offspring of his tribe or nation. (3) When the names in the Biblical genealogies denote particular persons, their connexion may be only a legal one. A woman whose husband died without issue was bound by law to be married to her husband's brother, and the first-born son of such a so-called levirate marriage was reckoned and registered as the son of the deceased brother (Deut., xxv, 5 sqq.). The question proposed to Christ by the Sadducees (Matt., xxii, 24; Mark, xii, 19; Luke, xx, 28) shows that this law was observed down to the time of Christ. Such a substitution of legal for physical parentage in the Biblical genealogies does not remove the offspring from his proper family or tribe. (4) Finally, the strangers incorporated into a tribe or a family are reckoned among the descendants of the respective eponym. This custom explains the words of Jacob spoken on his death-bed (Gen., xlviii, 5-6); he ordains that the sons of Joseph, excepting Ephraim and Manasses, "shall be called by the name of their brethren in their possessions".

III. SOURCES OF THE GENEALOGIES.—Generally speaking, the later genealogies were derived from written sources, either inspired or profane. For instance, the genealogy of Benjamin in I Par., vii, 6-12, is based on the data given in the Books of Genesis and Numbers; a more extensive genealogy of the same patriarch found in I Par., viii, 1-40, is based, no doubt, on written sources too, which are, however, unknown to us. As to the earlier genealogies, their veracity cannot be directly proved independently of inspiration. Written documents were used much earlier than the archaeologists of the first half of the eighteenth century believed. Moreover, very little writing was required to preserve the earliest genealogical lists, which are both rare and brief. We may grant freely that the art of writing was not known from Adam to the Flood, and for centuries after Noe. But keeping in mind the following facts, we find no difficulty in admitting oral tradition and memory as sufficient sources for these periods. (1) It has been found that the power of memory is much greater among peoples who have not learnt the art of writing. (2) Each of the genealogical lists belonging to the two periods in question contains only ten generations, so that only twenty names required to be transmitted by tradition. (3)

Before the introduction of writing, two devices were employed to aid the memory; either history was versified, or the facts were reduced to certain standard numbers. This second form was in use among the Scriptural nations. There were ten antediluvian Patriarchs, ten postdiluvian; seventy descendants of Jacob are named on the occasion of Israel's going into Egypt, though some of them were dead at that time, others had not yet been born; the ethnographical list of Genesis enumerates seventy nations, though it gives some names of little importance and omits others of great importance; I Par., ii, 3-55, gives seventy descendants of Juda; I Par., viii, 1-28, seventy descendants of Benjamin. This device guarded also against arbitrary insertion or omission of any name, though it did not fully exclude the substitution of one name for another. A possible exception against such an arrangement will be considered in the last section.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF THE GENEALOGIES.—The Hebrews shared the predilection for genealogies which prevailed among all the Semitic races. Among the Arabs, for instance, no biography is complete without a long list of the hero's ancestors. They register even the lineage of their horses, esteeming their nobility according to their extraction (Cf. "Revue des deux mondes", 15 May, 1855, pp. 1775-77; Caussin de Perceval, "Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme", Paris, 1844-48). Among the Hebrews such genealogical lists were of still higher importance for the following reasons: (1) According to the Mosaic enactments, the Palestinian soil was given over to definite tribes and families. In order to recover, in the year of the jubilee, these family possessions, the claimant had to prove his legal descent. (2) The nearest kinship conferred among the Hebrews the rights of the so-called *Goel*. Lev., xxv, 25, and Ruth, iv, 1-6, show some of the advantages implied in this right. The term *Goel* is rendered in the Latin Vulgate *propinquus* or *proximus*; in the English version it is translated by "kinsman". (3) Again, the priests and Levites had to prove their legal descent in order to fulfil the honourable and remunerative functions of their respective offices. On returning from the Babylonian Captivity several were excluded from the priestly class because they could not prove their Levitical pedigree (I Esd., ii, 62; II Esd., vii, 64). Josephus (Vit., I) appeals to the priestly registers and is proud of the royal descent of his mother; he shows that even the priests residing in Egypt had their sons registered authentically in Jerusalem, so as to safeguard their priestly prerogatives (C. Apion., I, vii). (4) Finally, the prophecy that the Messiah was to be born of the tribe of Juda and the house of David rendered the genealogy of this family most important. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, xix, 20) relates on the authority of Hegesippus that Domitian (A. D. 81-96) put to death all the descendants of David, excepting the relatives of Christ on account of their lowly condition.

V. DEFICIENCIES OF THE GENEALOGIES.—It cannot be denied that some of the genealogical links are omitted in the Biblical lists; even St. Matthew had to employ this device in order to arrange the ancestors of Christ in three series of fourteen each. At first sight such omissions may seem to be at variance with Biblical inerrancy, because the single members of the genealogical lists are connected by the noun *son* or the verb *beget*. But neither of these links creates a real difficulty: (1) The wide meaning of the noun *son* in the genealogies is shown in Matt., i, 1: "Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham". This phrase prepares the reader for the view that the noun *son* may connect a person with any one of his ancestors, however remote. (2) As to the verb *beget*, some writers maintain that the Hiphil form of its Hebrew equivalent refers to the immediate offspring, while its Qal form may denote a more remote generation. But this contention does not rest on any solid foundation. It is

true that the Hiphil form occurs in Gen., v and xi; it is also true that the successive links of the genealogies in these two chapters appear to exclude any intermediate generation. But this is only apparent. Unless it be certain from other sources that the Hebrew word in question signifies the begetting of an immediate offspring, Gen., v. 15, for instance, may just as well mean that Malaleel at the age of sixty-five begot the grandfather of Jared as that he begot Jared immediately. The same holds true of the other Patriarchs mentioned in the above two chapters. Nor can it be urged that such an interpretation would destroy the chronology of the Patriarchs; for the inspired writer did not intend to transmit a chronology.

PRATIN *Dict. de la Bible*; KNABENBAUER in HAGEN, *Lexicon Biblicum*, Paris, 1905; FANNIER, *Genealogie biblique cum monumentis Egyptiorum et Chaldeorum collata* (Lille, 1886); BRICKER, *La Chronologie des premiers âges de l'humanité in La Controverse*, 15 March, 15 May, 1886, pp. 375-93, 5-27; VON HUMMELAUER, *Comment. in Gen.* (Freiburg, 1895), 572; IDEM, *Das vormossaische Priesterthum in Israel* (Freiburg, 1899).

A. J. MAAS.

**Genealogy of Christ.**—It is granted on all sides that the Biblical genealogy of Christ implies a number of exegetical difficulties; but rationalists have no solid reason for refusing to admit any of the attempted solutions, nor can we agree with those recent writers who have given up all hope of harmonizing the genealogies of Christ found in the First and Third Gospels. The true state of the question will become plain by studying the Biblical genealogies of Christ first separately, then in juxtaposition, and finally in their relation to certain exceptions to their harmony.

(1) *St. Matthew's Genealogy of Christ.*—The genealogy of Christ according to the First Evangelist descends from Abraham through three series of fourteen members each; the first fourteen belong to the patriarchal order, the second to the royal, and the third to that of private citizens. Matt., i. 17, shows that this arrangement was intended; for the writer expressly states: "So all the generations, from Abraham to David, are fourteen generations. And from David to the transmigration of Babylon, are fourteen generations; and from the transmigration of Babylon to Christ are fourteen generations."

First Series	Second Series	Third Series
1. Abraham	1. Solomon	1. Jechonias
2. Isaac	2. Roboam	2. Salathiel
3. Jacob	3. Abia	3. Zorobabel
4. Judas	4. Asa	4. Abiud
5. Phares	5. Josaphat	5. Eliacim
6. Esron	6. Joram	6. Azor
7. Aram	7. Ozias	7. Sadoc
8. Aminadab	8. Joatham	8. Achim
9. Naasson	9. Achaz	9. Eliud
10. Salmon	10. Ezechias	10. Eleazer
11. Booz	11. Manasses	11. Mathan
12. Obed	12. Amon	12. Jacob
13. Jesse	13. Josias	13. Joseph
14. David	14. Jechonias	14. Jesus

The list of the First Evangelist omits certain members in Christ's genealogy: (1) The writer gives only three names for the time of the Egyptian exile (Esron, Aram, and Aminadab), though the period lasted 215 or 430 years; this agrees with Gen., xv, 16, where God promises to lead Israel back in the fourth generation. But according to Gen., xv, 13, the stranger shall afflict Israel for four hundred years. (2) The three names Booz, Obed, and Jesse cover a period of 366 years. Omitting a number of other less probable explanations, the difficulty is solved most easily by the admission of a lacuna between Obed and Jesse. (3) According to I Par., iii, 11-12, Ochozias, Joas, and Amasias intervene between Joram and Azarias (the Ozias of St. Matthew); these three names cannot have been unknown to the Evangelist, nor can it

be supposed that they were omitted by transcribers, for this conjecture would destroy the Evangelist's computation of fourteen kings. (4) According to I Par., iii, 15, Joakim intervenes between Josias and Jechonias. We may waive the question whether St. Matthew speaks of only one Jechonias or of two persons bearing that name; nor need we state here all the doubts and difficulties connected with either answer. (5) St. Matthew places only nine links between Zorobabel and St. Joseph for a period covering some 530 years, so that each generation must have lasted more than 50 years. The genealogy as given in St. Luke enumerates eighteen generations for the same period, a number which harmonizes better with the ordinary course of events. As to the omission of members in genealogical lists see GENEALOGY.

(2) *St. Luke's Genealogy of Christ.*—The genealogy in Luke, iii, 23-38, ascends from Joseph to Adam or rather to God; this is the first striking difference between the genealogies as presented in the First and Third Gospel. Another difference is found in their collocation: St. Matthew places his list at the beginning of his Gospel; St. Luke, at the beginning of the public life of Christ. The artificial character of St. Luke's genealogy may be seen in the following table:—

First Series	Second Series	Third Series	Fourth Series
1. Jesus	22. Salathiel	43. David	57. Thare
2. Joseph	22. Neri	44. Jesse	58. Nachor
3. Heli	24. Melchi	45. Obed	59. Sarug
4. Mathat	25. Addi	46. Booz	60. Ragau
5. Levi	26. Cosan	47. Salmon	61. Phaleg
6. Melchi	27. Helmadan	48. Naasson	62. Heber
7. Janne	28. Her	49. Aminadab	63. Sale
8. Joseph	29. Jesus	50. Aram	64. Cainan
9. Mathathias	30. Eliezer	51. Esron	65. Arphaxad
10. Amos	31. Jorim	52. Phares	66. Sem
11. Nahum	32. Mathat	53. Judas	67. Noe
12. Hesli	33. Levi	54. Jacob	68. Lamech
13. Nagge	34. Simeon	55. Issac	69. Mathusale
14. Mahath	35. Judas	56. Abraham	70. Henoch
15. Mathathias	36. Joseph		71. Jared
16. Semei	37. Jona		72. Malaleel
17. Joseph	38. Eliakim		73. Cainan
18. Juda	39. Melea		74. Henos
19. Joanna	40. Menna		75. Seth
20. Reza	41. Mathatha		76. Adam
21. Zorobabel	42. Nathan		77. God

The artificial structure of this list may be inferred from the following peculiarities: it contains eleven septenaries of names; three septenaries bring us from Jesus to the Captivity; three, from the captivity to the time of David; two, from David to Abraham; three again from the time of Abraham to the creation of man. St. Luke does not explicitly draw attention to the artificial construction of his list, but this silence does not prove that its recurring number of names was not intended, at least in the Evangelist's source. In St. Luke's genealogy, too, the names Jesse, Obed, Booz, cover a period of 366 years; Aminadab, Aram, Esron fill a gap of 430 (or 215) years, so that here several names must have been omitted. In the fourth series, which gives the names of the antediluvian and postdiluvian patriarchs, Cainan has been inserted according to the Septuagint reading; the Hebrew text does not contain this name.

(3) *Harmony between St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Genealogy of Christ.*—The fourth series of St. Luke's list covers the period between Abraham and the creation of man; St. Matthew does not touch upon this time, so that there can be no question of any harmony. The third series of St. Luke agrees name for name with the first of St. Matthew; only the order of names is inverted. In this section the genealogies are rather identical than merely harmonious. In the first and second series, St. Luke gives David's descendants through his son Nathan, while St. Matthew enumerates in his second and third series David's descendants


through Solomon. It is true that the First Gospel gives only twenty-eight names for this period, against the forty-two names of the Third Gospel; but it cannot be expected that two different lines of descendants should exhibit the same number of links for the period of a thousand years. Abstracting from the inspired character of the sources, one is disposed to regard the number given by the Third Evangelist as more in harmony with the length of time than the number of the First Gospel; but we have pointed out that St. Matthew consciously omitted a number of names in his genealogical list, in order to reduce them to the required multiple of seven.

(4) *Exceptions to the Preceding Explanation.*—Three main difficulties are advanced against the foregoing harmony of the genealogies: First, how can they converge in St. Joseph, if they give different lineages from David downward? Secondly, how can we account for their convergence in Salathiel and Zorobabel? Thirdly, what do we know about the genealogy of the Blessed Virgin?

(1) The convergence of the two distinct genealogical lines in the person of St. Joseph, has been explained in two ways: (a) St. Matthew's genealogy is that of St. Joseph; St. Luke's, that of the Blessed Virgin. This contention implies that St. Luke's genealogy only seemingly includes the name of Joseph. It is based on the received Greek text, *ὁν (ὡς ἐνομήζετο υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ) τοῦ Ἡλίου*, "being the son (as it was supposed, of Joseph, but really) of Heli". This parenthesis really eliminates the name of Joseph from St. Luke's genealogy, and makes Christ, by means of the Blessed Virgin, directly a son of Heli. This view is supported by a tradition which names the father of the Blessed Virgin "Joachim", a variant form of Eliacim or its abbreviation Eli, a variant of Heli, which latter is the form found in the Third Evangelist's genealogy. But these two considerations, viz. the received text and the traditional name of the father of Mary, which favour the view that St. Luke gives the genealogy of the Blessed Virgin, are offset by two similar considerations, which make St. Luke's list terminate with the name of Joseph. First, the Greek text preferred by the textual critics reads, *ὁν υἱὸς, ὡς ἐνομήζετο, Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἡλίου*, "being the son, as it was supposed, of Joseph, son of Heli", so that the above parenthesis is rendered less probable. Secondly, according to Patrizi, the view that St. Luke gives the genealogy of Mary began to be advocated only towards the end of the fifteenth century by Annius of Viterbo, and acquired adherents in the sixteenth. St. Hilary mentions the opinion as adopted by many, but he himself rejects it (Mai, "Nov. Bibl. Patr.", t. I, 477). It may be safely said that patristic tradition does not regard St. Luke's list as representing the genealogy of the Blessed Virgin.

(b) Both St. Matthew and St. Luke give the genealogy of St. Joseph, the one through the lineage of Solomon, the other through that of Nathan. But how can the lines converge in St. Joseph? St. Augustine suggested that Joseph, the son of Jacob and the descendant of David through Solomon, might have been adopted by Heli, thus becoming the adoptive descendant of David through Nathan. But Augustine was the first to abandon this theory after learning the explanation offered by Julius Africanus. According to the latter, Estha married Mathan, a descendant of David through Solomon, and became the mother of Jacob; after Mathan's death she took for her second husband Mathat, a descendant of David through Nathan, and by him became the mother of Heli. Jacob and Heli were, therefore, uterine brothers. Heli married, but died without offspring; his widow, therefore, became the levirate wife of Jacob, and gave birth to Joseph, who was the carnal son of Jacob, but the legal son of Heli, thus combining in his person two lineages of David's de-

scendants. The explanation will appear clearer in the following diagram:



(2) The second difficulty urged against the harmony between the two genealogies is based on the occurrence of the two names Zorobabel and Salathiel in both lists; here again the two distinct lineages of David's descendants appear to converge. And again, two answers are possible: (a) It is more commonly admitted that the two names in St. Matthew's list are identical with the two in St. Luke's series; for they must have lived about the same time, and the names are so rare, that it would be strange to find them occurring at the same time, in the same order, in two different genealogical series. But two levirate marriages will explain the difficulty. Melchi, David's descendant through Nathan, may have begotten Neri by a widow of the father of Jechonias; this made Neri and Jechonias uterine brothers. Jechonias may then have contracted a levirate marriage with the widow of the childless Neri, and begotten Salathiel, who was therefore the levirational son of Neri. Salathiel's son Zorobabel begat Abiud; but he also may have been obliged to contract a levirate marriage with the widow of a childless legal relative belonging to David's descendants through Nathan, thus begetting Reza, who legally continued Nathan's lineage. (b) A more simple solution of the difficulty is obtained, if we do not admit that the Salathiel and Zorobabel occurring in St. Matthew's genealogy are identical with those in St. Luke's. The above proofs for their identity are not cogent. If Salathiel and Zorobabel distinguished themselves at all among the descendants of Solomon, it is not astonishing that about the same time two members of Nathan's descendants should be called after them. The reader will observe that we suggest only possible answers to the difficulty; as long as such possibilities can be pointed out, our opponents have no right to deny that the genealogies which are found in the First and Third Gospel can be harmonized.

(3) How can Jesus Christ be called "son of David", if the Blessed Virgin is not a daughter of David? (a) If by virtue of Joseph's marriage with Mary, Jesus could be called the son of Joseph, he can for the same reason be called "son of David" (Aug., *De cons. evang.*, II, i, 2). (b) Tradition tells us that Mary too was a descendant of David. According to Num., xxxvi, 6-12, an only daughter had to marry within her own family so as to secure the right of inheritance. After St. Justin (*Adv. Tryph. C.*) and St. Ignatius (*Eph. XVIII*), the Fathers generally agree in maintaining Mary's Davidic descent, whether they knew this from an oral tradition or inferred it from Scripture, e. g. Rom., i, 3; II Tim., ii, 8. St. John Damascene (*De fid. orth.*, IV, 14) states that Mary's great-grandfather, Panther, was a brother of Mathat; her grandfather, Barpanther, was Heli's cousin; and her father, Joachim, was a cousin of Joseph, Heli's levirate son. Here Mathat has been substituted for Melchi, since the text used by St. John Damascene, Julius Africanus, St. Irenæus, St. Ambrose, and St. Gregory of Nazianus omitted the two generations separating Heli from Melchi. At any rate, tradition presents the Blessed Virgin as descending from David through Nathan.

KNABENBAUER in HAGEN, *Lexicon Biblicum* (Paris, 1907), II, 389 sq.; PRAT in *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Paris, 1903), III, 166 sqq. The question is also treated in the recent *Lives of Christ* by FOUARD, DIDON, GRIMM, etc. The reader will find the subject treated also in the commentaries on the Gospel of St. Matthew or St. Luke, e. g. KNABENBAUER, SCHANZ, FILION,

MACÉVILLY, etc. DANKO, *Historia revelationis divinae Novi Testamenti* (Vienna, 1867), 180-192, gives all the principal publications on the question up to 1865.

A. J. MAAS.

**Génebrard**, GILBERT, a learned Benedictine exegete and Orientalist, b. 12 December, 1535, at Riom, in the department of Puy-de-Dôme; d. 16 Feb., 1597, at Semur, department of Côte-d'Or. In his early youth he entered the Cluniac monastery of Mausac near Riom, later continued his studies at the monastery of Saint-Allyre in Clermont, and completed them at the Collège de Navarre in Paris, where he obtained the doctorate in theology in 1562. A year later he was appointed professor of Hebrew and exegesis at the Collège Royal and at the same time held the office of prior at Saint-Denis de La Chartre in Paris. He was one of the most learned professors at the university, and through his numerous and erudite exegetical works became famous throughout Europe. Among his scholars at the Collège Royal was St. Francis de Sales, who in his later life considered it an honour to have had Génebrard as professor (*Traité de l'Amour de Dieu*, XI, 11). About 1578 he went to Rome, where he was honourably received by Sixtus V and stood in close relation to Allen, Baronius, Bosio, and other ecclesiastical celebrities. Upon his return, in 1588, he became one of the chief supporters of the Holy League in France. On 10 May, 1591, he was appointed Archbishop of Aix by Gregory XIII, but accepted this dignity only after the express command of the pope. He was consecrated by Archbishop Beaton of Glasgow on 10 April, 1592. As archbishop he remained a zealous leaguer, even after Henry IV became reconciled with the Church in July, 1593. The new king, however, became daily more popular and gained over to his side most of the Catholics. Génebrard saw that further opposition would be useless and, on 15 Nov., 1593, sent his submission to the king ("Revue des questions historiques", Paris, 1866, I, 616, note). This, however, did not prevent the Provençal Parliament from banishing him on 26 Sept., 1596. For a short time he stayed at Avignon, but, being allowed by the king to return, he retired to the priory of Semur, which he held *in commendam*. Génebrard translated many rabbinic writings into Latin; wrote one of the best commentaries on the Psalms: "Psalmi Davidis vulgatæ editione, calendario hebræo, syro, græco, latino, hymnis, argumentis, et commentariis, etc. instructi" (Paris, 1577); is the author of "De Sanctæ Trinitate" (Paris, 1569); "Joel Propheta cum chaldæa paraphrasi et commentariis", etc. (Paris, 1563); "Chronographiæ libri IV" (Paris, 1580), and numerous other works. He also edited the works of Origen (Paris, 1574).

DESVOYE, *Étude historique sur Gilbert Génebrard in Revue de Marseille et de Provence* (August, 1885), 327-353, and separately; *Critique on the preceding in Studien und Mittheilungen O. S. B. und O. Cist.* (Raigern, 1886), VII, 484 sq.; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1907), III, 269-274; *Gallia Christiana*, I, 334; ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. lit. O. S. B.*, III, 361-366; HEUBERGER in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.

MICHAEL OTT.

**General Chapter** (Lat. *capitulum*, a chapter).—The daily assembling of a community for purposes of discipline and administration of monastic affairs has always included the reading of a chapter of the rule, and thus the assembly itself came to be called the chapter and the place of meeting the chapter-house. The qualifying word *conventual*, *provincial*, or *general*, explains the nature of the meeting, and a general chapter, therefore, is one composed of representatives of a whole order or congregation or other group of monasteries. Historically, general chapters, or the germ from which they developed, can be traced back to St. Benedict of Aniane in the beginning of the ninth century. Although his scheme of confederation did not outlive its originator, the idea was revived a century later at Cluny. The example of Cluny produced

imitators, and abbeys like Fleury, Dijon, Marmoutier, St-Denis, Cluse, Fulda, and Hirsau (or Hirschau), became centres of groups of monasteries in which a more or less embryonic system of general chapters was introduced. Later on, Cîteaux, Camaldoli, Monte Vergine, Savigny, and other reforms, elaborated the idea, which resulted eventually in the congregational system inaugurated by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, and since that date it has been the almost invariable custom of every order or congregation. The constitution, times of meeting, and powers of a general chapter, however, vary so much in the different religious orders that it is impossible to generalize on these points. At Cîteaux, for instance, the chapter met at the mother-house every year, and was, in theory, attended by all the abbots of the order. In other orders the meeting of chapters was held every three or four years, and this has remained the more general usage till the present day. In those that are divided into provinces, the provincial superiors, and sometimes some other officials as well, presided over by the general, if there be one, form the chapter; in others, the superiors of all the houses. Amongst Benedictines, each congregation has its own separate chapter, which is composed usually of the abbot and an elected delegate from each monastery, with the president of the congregation at their head. A general chapter usually elects the general or president of the order or congregation, sometimes appoints the various superiors and other officials, settles matters of business and discipline, hears appeals from its subjects, and in some cases also has the right to draw up or sanction changes in its constitutions. Subject of course to the Holy See, it represents the highest authority in its own particular order or federation. For more detailed descriptions as to the composition and powers of general chapters, the separate articles on the various religious orders must be consulted.

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Generation** (Lat. Vulgate, *generatio*).—This word, of very varied meaning, corresponds to the two Hebrew terms: *dôr*, *tôledôth*. As a rendering of the latter, the Vulgate plural form, *generationes*, is treated in the article GENEALOGY. As a rendering of the former, the word *generation* is used in the following principal senses. (1) It designates a definite period of time, with a special reference to the average length of man's life. It is in this sense, for example, that, during the long-lived patriarchal age, a "generation" is rated as a period of 100 years (Gen., xv, 16, compared with Gen., xv, 13, and Ex., xii, 40), and that, at a later date, it is represented as a period of only 30 to 40 years. (2) The word *generation* is used to mean an indefinite period of time: of time *past*, as in Deut., xxxii, 7, where we read: "Remember the days of old, think upon every generation", and in Isaiah, lviii, 12, etc.; of time *future*, as in Ps. xlv (Heb. xlv), 18, etc. (3) In a concrete sense, *generation* designates the men who lived in the same period of time, who were contemporaries, as for instance in Gen., vi, 9: "Noe was a just and perfect man in his generations"; see also: Num., xxxii, 13; Deut., i, 35; Matt., xxiv, 34; etc. (4) Independently of the idea of time, *generation* is employed to mean a race or class of men as characterized by the same recurring condition or quality. In this sense, the Bible speaks of a "just generation", literally "generation of the just" [Ps. xiii (Heb., xiv), 6; etc.], a "perverse generation", equivalent to: "generation of the wicked" [Deut., xxxii, 5; Mark, ix, 18 (Gr., verse 19); etc.]. (5) Lastly, in Is., xxxviii, 12, the word *generation* is used to designate a dwelling-place or habitation, probably from the circular form of the nomad tent. Whence it can be readily seen that, in its various principal acceptations, the word *generation* (usually in the Septuagint and in the Greek New Testament: γενεά) preserves something of the



primitive meaning of "circuit", "period", conveyed by the Hebrew term *דָּוָר*, *dôr*.

GESENIUS, *Thesaurus* (Leipzig, 1829); FÜRST, *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1867); BROWN, DRIVER AND BRIGGS, *Hebrew and English Lexicon* (New York, 1906).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

**Generationism.** See **TRADUCIANISM**.

**Genesareth** (*Γεννησαρὲς*).—This is the name given to the Lake of Tiberias in Luke, v, 1; called *Γεννησαρ* in I Mach., xi, 67. (See **TIBERIAS**, **LAKE OF**.)

**Genesis**, the name of the first book of the Pentateuch (q.v.).

**Genesisius**, (1) a comedian at Rome, martyred under Diocletian in 286 or 303. Feast, 25 August. He is invoked against epilepsy, and is honoured as patron of theatrical performers and of musicians. The legend (*Acta SS.*, Aug., V, 119) relates: Genesisius, the leader of a theatrical troupe in Rome, performing one day before the Emperor Diocletian, and wishing to expose Christian rites to the ridicule of his audience, pretended to receive the Sacrament of Baptism. When the water had been poured upon him he proclaimed himself a Christian. Diocletian at first enjoyed the realistic play, but, finding Genesisius to be in earnest, ordered him to be tortured and then beheaded. He was buried on the Via Tiburtina. His relics are said to be partly in San Giovanni della Pigna, partly in S. Susanna di Termini and in the chapel of St. Lawrence. The legend was dramatized in the fifteenth century; embodied in later years in the oratorio "Polus Atella" of Löwe (d. 1869), and still more recently in a work by Weingartner (Berlin, 1892). The historic value of the Acts, dating from the seventh century, is very doubtful, though defended by Tillemont (*Mémoires*, IV, s. v. Genesisius). The very existence of Genesisius is called into question, and he is held to be a Roman counterpart of St. Gelasius (or Gelasinus) of Hierapolis (d. 297). He was venerated, however, at Rome in the fourth century; a church was built in his honour very early, and was repaired and beautified by Gregory III in 741.

LECLERCQ, *Les Martyrs*, II, 428; *Anal. Bolland.*, XVIII, 186.

(2) **GENESIUS OF ARLES**, a notary martyred under Maximianus in 303 or 308. Feast, 25 Aug. He is honoured as patron of notaries, and invoked against chilblains and scurf. The Acts (*Acta SS.*, Aug., V, 123, and Ruinart, 559), attributed to St. Paulinus of Nola, state: Genesisius, native of Arles, at first a soldier, became known for his proficiency in writing, and was made secretary to the magistrate of Arles. While performing the duties of his office the decree of persecution against the Christians was read in his presence. Outraged in his ideas of justice, the young catechumen cast his tablets at the feet of the magistrate and fled. He was captured and executed, and thus received baptism in his own blood. His veneration must be very old, as his name is found in the ancient martyrology ascribed to St. Jerome. A church and altar dedicated to him at Arles were known in the fourth century.

(3) **GENESIUS**, twenty-first Bishop of Clermont, d. 662. Feast, 3 June. The legend, which is of a rather late date (*Acta SS.*, June, I, 315), says that he was descended from a senatorial family of Auvergne. Having received a liberal education he renounced his worldly prospects for the service of the Church, became archdeacon of Clermont under Bishop Proculus, and succeeded him in the episcopacy in 656. He laboured earnestly for the maintenance of Christian morality, and founded a hospital at Clermont and also the Abbey of Manlieu. After five years, fearing for his own soul, he left Clermont secretly and went to Rome in the garb of a pilgrim. The bereaved flock sent a deputation to the Holy See. Genesisius was found and induced to return. He then built a con-

vent at Chantoin. He was buried in the church which he had built at Clermont in honour of St. Symphorian, and which later took his own name. In the life of St. Prix (Præjectus), Genesisius is mentioned as one of the protectors of his childhood.

DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux* (Paris, 1907), II, 37; *Gallia Chr.*, II, 245.

(4) **GENESIUS**, Count of Clermont, d. 725. Feast, 5 June. According to the lessons of the Breviary of the Chapter of Camaleria (*Acta SS.*, June, I, 497), he was of noble birth; his father's name is given as Audastrius, and his mother's as Tranquilla. Even in his youth he is said to have wrought miracles—to have given sight to the blind and cured the lame. He built and richly endowed several churches and religious houses. He was a friend of St. Bonitus, Bishop of Clermont, and of St. Meneleus, Abbot of Menat. He was buried at Combronde by St. Savinian, successor of Meneleus.

(5) **GENESIUS** (or **GENESTUS**), thirty-seventh Archbishop of Lyons, d. 679. Feast, 1 November. He was a native of France, not of Arabia or Armenia as is sometimes stated, and became a religious and abbot (not of Fontenelle, but) attached to the court and camp of Clovis II, where he acted as chief almoner to the queen, St. Bathildis. He succeeded St. Chamond (Annemundus) in the See of Lyons, and was consecrated in 657 or 658. His name is found for the first time as bishop in a signature of 6 Sept., 664, attached to a charter drawn up by Bertefred, Bishop of Amiens, for the Abbey of Corbie. On 26 June, 667, he subscribed another charter framed by Drauscus, Bishop of Soissons, for a convent of the Blessed Virgin founded by Ebroin, mayor of the palace, and his wife Leutrade. In the conflict between Ebroin and St. Leger (Leodegarius), Bishop of Autun, Genesisius (675–76) took the part of the bishop and was in consequence attacked by an armed band sent by Ebroin to expel him from Lyons; but Genesisius collected a force and successfully defended his city. In September, 677, he assisted at an assembly held at Maslay. He was succeeded at Lyons by Landebertus. His body remained in the church of St. Nicetius till the beginning of the fourteenth century, when it was transferred to Chelles.

*Gallia Christ.*, IV, 47; DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, II, 170; and for each of the saints, SMITH AND WACE, *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* (London, 1880), II, 627–28.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Geneva.** See **LAUSANNE** and **GENEVA**, **DIOCESE OF**.

**Genevieve**, **SAINT**, patroness of Paris, b. at Nanterre, c. 419 or 422; d. at Paris, 512. Her feast is kept on 3 January. She was the daughter of Severus and Gerontia; popular tradition represents her parents as poor peasants, though it seems more likely that they were wealthy and respectable townspeople. In 429 St. Germain of Auxerre and St. Lupus of Troyes were sent across from Gaul to Britain to combat Pelagianism. On their way they stopped at Nanterre, a small village about eight miles from Paris. The inhabitants flocked out to welcome them, and St. Germain preached to the assembled multitude. It chanced that the pious demeanour and thoughtfulness of a young girl among his hearers attracted his attention. After the sermon he caused the child to be brought to him, spoke to her with interest, and encouraged her to persevere in the path of virtue. Learning that she was anxious to devote herself to the service of God, he interviewed her parents, and foretold them that their child would lead a life of sanctity and by her example and instruction bring many virgins to consecrate themselves to God. Before parting next morning he saw her again, and on her renewing her consecration he blessed her and gave her a medal engraved with a cross, telling her to keep it in remembrance of her dedication to Christ. He exhorted her likewise to be content with the medal, and wear it

instead of her pearls and golden ornaments. There seem to have been no convents near her village; and Genevieve, like so many others who wished to practise religious virtue, remained at home, leading an innocent, prayerful life. It is uncertain when she formally received the religious veil. Some writers assert that it was on the occasion of St. Gregory's return from his mission to Britain; others say she received it about her sixteenth year, along with two companions, from the hands of the Bishop of Paris. On the death of her parents she went to Paris, and lived with her god-mother. She devoted herself to works of charity and practised severe corporal austerities, abstaining completely from flesh meat and breaking her fast only twice in the week. These mortifications she continued for over thirty years, till her ecclesiastical superiors thought it their duty to make her diminish her austerities.

Many of her neighbours, filled with jealousy and envy, accused Genevieve of being an impostor and a hypocrite. Like Blessed Joan of Arc, in later times, she had frequent communion with the other world, but her visions and prophecies were treated as frauds and deceptions. Her enemies conspired to drown her; but, through the intervention of Germain of Auxerre, their animosity was finally overcome. The bishop of the city appointed her to look after the welfare of the virgins dedicated to God, and by her instruction and example she led them to a high degree of sanctity. In 451 Attila and his Huns were sweeping over Gaul; and the inhabitants of Paris prepared to flee. Genevieve encouraged them to hope and trust in God; she urged them to do works of penance, and added that if they did so the town would be spared. Her exhortations prevailed; the citizens recovered their calm, and Attila's hordes turned off towards Orléans, leaving Paris untouched. Some years later Merowig (Mérovée) took Paris; during the siege Genevieve distinguished herself by her charity and self-sacrifice. Through her influence Merowig and his successors, Childeric and Clovis, displayed unwonted clemency towards the citizens. It was she, too, who first formed the plan of erecting a church in Paris in honour of Saints Peter and Paul. It was begun by Clovis at Mont-lès-Paris, shortly before his death in 511. Genevieve died the following year, and when the church was completed her body was interred within it. This fact, and the numerous miracles wrought at her tomb, caused the name of Sainte-Geneviève to be given to it. Kings, princes, and people enriched it with their gifts. In 847 it was plundered by the Normans and was partially rebuilt, but was completed only in 1177. This church having fallen into decay once more, Louis XV began the construction of a new church in 1764. The Revolution broke out before it was dedicated, and it was taken over in 1791, under the name of the Panthéon, by the Constituent Assembly, to be a burial place for distinguished Frenchmen. It was restored

to Catholic purposes in 1821 and 1852, having been secularized as a national mausoleum in 1831 and, finally, in 1885. St. Genevieve's relics were preserved in her church, with great devotion, for centuries, and Paris received striking proof of the efficacy of her intercession. She saved the city from complete inundation in 834. In 1129 a violent plague, known as the *mal des ardents*, carried off over 14,000 victims, but it ceased suddenly during a procession in her honour. Innocent II, who had come to Paris to implore the king's help against the Antipope Anacletus in 1130, examined personally into the miracle and was so convinced of its authenticity that he ordered a feast

to be kept annually in honour of the event on 26 November. A small church, called Sainte-Geneviève des Ardents, commemorated the miracle till 1747, when it was pulled down to make room for the Foundling Hospital. The saint's relics were carried in procession yearly to the cathedral, and Mme de Sévigné gives a description of the pageant in one of her letters.

The revolutionaries of 1793 destroyed most of the relics preserved in St. Genevieve's church, and the rest were cast to the winds by the mob in 1871. Fortunately, however, a large relic had been kept at Verneuil, Oise, in the eighteenth century, and is still extant. The church built by Clovis was entrusted to the Benedictines. In the ninth century they were replaced by secular canons. In 1148, under Eugene III and Louis VII, canons from St. Victor's Abbey at Senlis were introduced. About 1619 Louis XIII named Cardinal François de La Rochefoucauld Abbot of St. Genevieve's. The canons had been lax and the cardinal selected Charles Faure to reform them. This holy man was born in 1594, and entered the canons regular at Senlis. He was remarkable for his piety, and, when ordained, succeeded after a hard struggle in reforming



ST. GENEVIEVE AT PRAYER  
Puviss de Chavannes, the Panthéon, Paris

the abbey. Many of the houses of the canons regular adopted his reform. He and a dozen companions took charge of Sainte-Geneviève-du-Mont, at Paris, in 1634. This became the mother-house of a new congregation, the Canons Regular of St. Genevieve, which spread widely over France. Another institute called after the saint was the Daughters of St. Genevieve, founded at Paris, in 1636, by Francesca de Blosset, with the object of nursing the sick and teaching young girls. A somewhat similar institute, popularly known as the Miramiones, had been founded under the invocation of the Holy Trinity, in 1611, by Marie Bonneau de Rubella Beauharnais de Miramion. These two institutes were united in 1665, and the associates called the Canonesses of St. Genevieve. The members took no vows, but merely promised obedience to the rules as long as they remained in the institute. Suppressed during the Revolution, it was revived in 1806 by Jeanne-Claude Jacoulet under the name of the Sisters of the Holy Family. They now have charge of over 150 schools and orphanages.

*Vie de Sainte Geneviève*, ed. CHARPENTIER (Paris, 1697); *Acta SS.*, Jan. I, 137-8, 725; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1712), XVI, 621 and 802, *Gallia Christiana*, VII, 700; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, I, 17-20; BENNETT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; DELALAIN, *Légendes historiques de Sainte Geneviève* (Paris, 1872); TRIANON in *Revue du Monde catholique* (Paris, 1872), XXXIV, 476-82; PARK in *Dublin University Magazine* (Dublin, 1876), LXXXVII, 102; GUÉRIN, *Vie des Saints* (Paris, 1880), I, 92-101; VIDIEU, *Sainte Geneviève et son influence sur les destinées de la France* (Paris, 1896); FLEURY, *Hist. ecclési.*, LXIX, 22, LXXIV, 39.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Genevieve**, DAUGHTERS OF SAINT. See HOLY FAMILY, RELIGIOUS CONGREGATIONS OF.

**Genezareth**, LAND OF.—By this name is designated in Mark, vi, 53, a district of Palestine bordering on the Sea of Galilee, and which in the parallel passage of Matthew (xiv, 34) is called "the country of Genesar". The two forms of the name are obviously cognate, but their origin and signification are disputed points among Biblical scholars, nor is there unanimity of opinion as to whether the name was given first to the land and afterwards to the lake or vice versa. The traditional signification: "Garden of the Princes" (as if derived from גִּנְסָרִים, *Gan-sarim*) goes back to St. Jerome and the Talmud. Several modern scholars, however, prefer the derivation of the name from the Hebrew word כִּנְרֶת, *kinnereth*; or from the plural form *kinneroth*, cognate with *kinnor*, signifying a harp or zither. This name, according to them, would have been originally given to the lake on account of the supposed harp-like shape of its contour; but it seems more probable that the name was first used to designate the district, and was derived from the ancient fortified city within the borders of Nephtali, mentioned in the Book of Josue as *Ceneroth* in xi, 2, and as *Cenereth* in xix, 35. According to the Gospel narrative (cf. Matt., xiv, 13-36; Mark, vi, 31-56; Luke, ix, 10-17), which is confirmed by the description found in Josephus (Bel. Jud., III, x), the land of Genezareth lay to the west, and partly to the north, of the lake of the same name, and bordered thereon. These sources do not determine the exact boundaries of the district, but it is probable from other incidental indications that it comprised the entire west coast of the lake, extending westward as far as the boundary separating Nephtali and Zabulon from Aser, and northward probably as far as the plain of Huleh and the mountains of Safed. Physically the district resembles somewhat a section of a vast amphitheatre, sloping, gently on the northern side and more abruptly on the west, toward the low basin of the lake, and terminating in the plain now called Ghueir.

From the historical and religious standpoint the land of Genezareth is one of the most interesting localities in all Palestine, chiefly because of its connection with the public ministry of Our Lord. Within its boundaries were located Capharnaum, Corozain, Arbel, Magdala, and Tiberias, as well as the more ancient Cenereth. Of these once famous towns nothing remains at present except a few ruins, and the two wretched little villages occupying the site of Tiberias and of Magdala. According to the descriptions found in the Talmud, this region was a marvel of richness and fertility, a veritable paradise; and the same is affirmed by Josephus (loc. cit.), who describes it as "wonderful in fertility as well as in beauty". He adds: "Its soil is so fruitful that all sorts of trees can grow upon it . . . for the air is so well tempered that it agrees with all sorts. Thus the palm-tree, which requires a warm atmosphere, flourishes equally well with the walnut, which thrives best in a cold climate. . . . One may say that this place accomplishes a marvel of nature, forcing those plants which are naturally enemies of one another to agree together." It was noted for its delicious fruits of all varieties, and the climate was such that they flourished in nearly all the seasons of the year. Centuries of neglect have completely

obliterated all this richness and luxuriance; and at present, except a few scattered palms and wild fig-trees, the slopes of the land of Genezareth are barren and lifeless as are most of the other regions of Palestine.

HEIDETIN VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Genésareth*; MERRILL in HAST, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Gennesaret*; JOSEPHUS, *Bel. Jud.*, III, x; VICTOR GUÉRIN, *Description de la Palestine*, I, pp. 208-9, 214-15, 224-5.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

**Genga**, GIROLAMO, painter, born at Urbino in 1476; died at the same place, 1551. This talented craftsman was apprenticed in his fifteenth year to Luca Signorelli, whom he assisted in many of his works, especially at Orvieto. He then attached himself to Perugino, in whose school he was for three years, becoming the intimate friend of Raphael. After a residence in Florence and Siena, he returned to Urbino to carry out some work for the duke, Guidobaldo II. Later on he resided at Rome, where he painted an altar-piece for the church of St. Catherine of Siena, but, in 1512, returned to Urbino at the request of the then duke, Francesco Maria, with whom eventually he went into banishment at Cesena, and for whom he painted his chief altar-piece, "God the Father, the Virgin, and Four Fathers of the Church", now in the Brera at Milan. He was not only a painter and sculptor, but a modeller in wax, clay, and terra-cotta, and some of the drinking-cups he executed in wax were used as models for finished works in silver. He designed vestments and musical instruments, and was an expert musician himself. Vasari speaks of him as "an admirable inventor" and again as "a man of the most upright character, insomuch that a bad action committed by him was never heard of". In the Pitti Palace at Florence there is a "Holy Family" which was painted by Genga.

VASARI, *Le Vite dei Pittori*, ed. MILANESI (Florence, 1878-1885); CIOGNARA, *Storia della Scultura* (Prato, 1823); KUGLER, *Handbook of Painting* (London, 1848); BRYAN's *Dict. of Painters and Engravers*, ed. WILLIAMSON (London, 1903).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Génicot**, EDWARD, moral theologian, b. at Antwerp, Belgium, 18 June, 1856; d. at Louvain, 21 February, 1900. After making a brilliant course of studies at the Jesuit college in his native city, he entered the Society of Jesus, 27 September, 1872. He was successively professor of humanities and of rhetoric at Ghent and Antwerp, and after being ordained priest and sustaining a public defence in all theology, taught first canon law and then moral theology at the Jesuit college in Louvain from 1889 until his comparatively early and unexpected death. Father Génicot was a professor well liked by all his classes because of the solidity and clearness of his teaching. In 1896 he published his "Theologiæ Moralis Institutiones", of which the sixth edition, in harmony with recent decrees of the Holy See, appeared in 1909 (Brussels). Father Génicot drew his inspiration chiefly from the large work of Ballerini-Palmieri. His own work is characterized by a great clearness of exposition, firm and straightforward judgment, avoidance of subtilities, and rejection of defective arguments; also by marked intellectual honesty that dares to follow principles to their utmost conclusions and set down the conduct confessors may legitimately follow in the confessional. Confessors have no reason to fear the broadness of his conclusions, if they do not actually pass beyond the limits prescribed by the author. Another work, "Casus Conscientiæ", was published after the author's death. The third edition (1906) appeared with additions and corrections in 1909 (Louvain). These *Casus*, gathered in large part from actual experience, are remarkable for their presentation of real life and are something more than a mere repetition of theory.

J. SALSMANS.

**Gennadius I**, SAINT, Patriarch of Constantinople (458–471), has left scarcely any writings. Facundus (Defensio, II, iv) states that he wrote against St. Cyril of Alexandria, probably in 431–2, and quotes a passage to show that his work was more violent even than the letter of Ibas. If St. Cyril's letter of 434 (Ep. lvi) is to the same Gennadius, they were friends in that year. Gennadius succeeded Anatolius as Bishop of Constantinople in 458. On 17 June, 460, St. Leo wrote to him (Ep. clxx) warning him against Timothy Elurus, the Monophysite who had made himself Patriarch of Alexandria. Not later, it seems, than 459 St. Gennadius celebrated a great council of eighty-one bishops, many of whom were from the East and even from Egypt, including those who had been dispossessed of their sees by Elurus. The letter of this council against simony is still preserved (Mansi, VII, 912). About the same time St. Daniel the Stylite began to live on a column near Constantinople, apparently without the patriarch's leave, and certainly without the permission of Gelasius, the owner of the property where the pillar stood, who strongly objected to this strange invasion of his land. The Emperor Leo protected the ascetic, and some time later sent St. Gennadius to ordain him priest, which he is said to have done standing at the foot of the column, since St. Daniel objected to being ordained, and refused to let the bishop mount the ladder. At the end of the rite, however, the patriarch ascended to give Holy Communion to the stylite and to receive it from him. Whether he then imposed his hands on him is not said. Possibly he considered it sufficient to extend them from below towards the saint. According to Theodorus Lector, Gennadius would allow no one to become a cleric unless he had learned the Psalter by heart. He made St. Marcan *oconomus* of the Church of Constantinople.

St. Gennadius is said by Joannes Moschus to have been very mild and of great purity. We are told by Gennadius of Marseilles that he was *lingua nitidus et ingenio acer*, and so rich in knowledge of the ancients that he composed a commentary on the whole Book of Daniel. The continuation of St. Jerome's Chronicle by Marcellinus Comes tells us (according to some manuscripts) that Gennadius commented on all St. Paul's Epistles. Some fragments are collected in Migne, P. G., LXXXV, chiefly from the two catenæ of Cramer on Romans; a few passages are found in the catena of Eusebius, and a few in the Vienna MS. gr. 166 (46). Some fragments in the catenæ of Nicephorus show that Gennadius also commented on Genesis. He is seen to have been a learned writer, who followed the Antiochene school of literal exegesis. He is celebrated in the Greek Menæa on 25 Aug. and 17 Nov.; and on the former day in the Roman Martyrology.

*Acta SS.*, 25 Aug.; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, XVI; TURNER in *East., Dict. of the Bible*, extra volume, 517.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

**Gennadius II**, Patriarch of Constantinople (1454–1456).—His original name was George Scholarius (Γεώργιος Σχολάριος). He was born about 1400, was first a teacher of philosophy and then judge in the civil courts under the Emperor John VIII (1425–1448). In this capacity he accompanied his master to the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439) and was at that time in favour of the union. He made four speeches at the council, all exceedingly conciliatory, and wrote a refutation of the first eighteen of Marcus Eugenius's syllogistic chapters against the Latins. But when he came back to Constantinople, like most of his countrymen, he changed his mind. Marcus Eugenius converted him completely to anti-Latin Orthodoxy, and from this time till his death he was known (with Marcus) as the most uncompromising enemy of the union. He then wrote many works to defend his new convictions, which differ

so much from the earlier conciliatory ones that Allatius thought there must be two people of the same name ("Diatriba de Georgiis" in Fabricius-Harles, "Bibliotheca Græca", X, 760–786); to whom Gibbon: "Renaudot has restored the identity of his person, and the duplicity of his character." ("Decline and Fall", lxviii, note 41. For Renaudot's work see bibliography below). Scholarius entered the monastery "of the Almighty" (τοῦ Παντοκράτορος) under Constantine XI (1448–1453) and took, according to the invariable custom, a new name—Gennadius. Before the fall of the city he was already well known as a bitter opponent of the union. He and Marcus Eugenius were the leaders of the anti-Latin party. In 1447, Marcus on his death-bed praised Gennadius's irreconcilable attitude towards the Latins and the union (P. G., CLX, 529). It was to Gennadius that the angry people went after seeing the Uniat services in the great church of Santa Sophia. It is said that he hid himself, but left a notice on the door of his cell: "O unhappy Romans, why have you forsaken the truth? Why do you not trust in God, instead of in the Italians? In losing your faith you will lose your city", and so on (quoted by Gibbon, *ibid.*, ed. Bury, VII, 176).

As soon as the massacre of 29 May, 1453, was over, when Mohammed the conqueror thought of reorganizing the now subject Christians, he was naturally anxious to put an end to any sort of alliance between them and the Western princes. So he sent for this Gennadius because he was one of the chief enemies of the union, and told him to be patriarch. The see had been vacant three years, since the resignation of Athanasius II (1450). On 1 June, 1453, the new patriarch's procession passed through the streets that were still reeking with blood; Mohammed received Gennadius graciously and himself invested him with the signs of his office—the crosier (δικανίκιον) and mantle. This degrading ceremony has continued ever since, except that now (since the Turks hanged Parthenius III in 1657) the sultan thinks it beneath his dignity, so that it is performed by the grand vizier (Pitzipios, "L'Eglise Orientale", Rome, 1855, III, 83). Mohammed also arranged with Gennadius the condition of Orthodox Christians (the so-called "Roman nation") in the Turkish Empire, made the patriarch their acknowledged civil head before the Porte and gave him a diploma (called *berat*) exactly defining his rights and duties. This *berat* is still given to every patriarch before his consecration (or enthronement). Gennadius, who was not in Holy orders, was then ordained to each grade. Although he so disliked Latins, he seems to have kept good relations with the sultan. One of the symbolic books of the Orthodox Church is the Confession (Ὁμολογία) made by him to Mohammed, by which he is said to have secured a certain measure of tolerance for his people (see below). As the Santa Sophia had been made into a mosque, he used as his patriarchal church, first that of the Apostles (where the emperors were buried), then that of the All-Blessed (τῆς πανμακαρίστου=the Blessed Virgin). But after two years, in 1456 (Gedeon in his *Πατριαρχικὸν Πινάκας*, Constantinople, 1890; others say it was in 1459), he resigned. It is difficult to give the full reason for this step. It is commonly attributed to his disappointment at the sultan's treatment of Christians. On the other hand, Mohammed seems to have kept the fairly tolerant conditions he had allowed to them; various writers hint darkly at other motives (see Michalcescu, *op. cit. infra*, 13). Gennadius then, like so many of his successors, ended his days as an ex-patriarch and a monk. He lived in the monastery of St. John Baptist at Seres in Macedonia (north-east of Saloniki), and wrote books till his death in 1468 (Papageorgiu in the "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", III, 315). Gennadius Scholarius fills an important place in Byzantine history. He was the

last of the old school of polemical writers and one of the greatest. Unlike most of his fellows he had an intimate acquaintance with Latin controversial literature, especially with St. Thomas Aquinas and the Schoolmen. He was as skilful an opponent of Catholic theology as Marcus Eugenicius, and a more learned one. His writings show him to be a student not only of Western philosophy but of controversy with Jews and Mohammedans, of the great Hesychast question (he attacked Barlaam and defended the monks; naturally, the Barlaamites were *λατινόφρονες*), in short, of all the questions that were important in his time. He has another kind of importance as the first Patriarch of Constantinople under the Turk. From this point of view he stands at the head of a new period in the history of his Church; the principles that still regulate the condition of Orthodox Christians in the Turkish Empire are the result of Mohammed II's arrangement with him.

**WORKS.**—Gennadius was a prolific writer during all the periods of his life. He is said to have left from 100 to 120 works (Michalcescu, *op. cit. infra*, 13). Of these a great number are still unedited. P. G., CLX, 320–773, contains the chief collection of what has been published. To this must be added the works in Simonides, *Ὁρθ. Ἐλλην. θεολογικαὶ γράφαί* (London, 1859), 42–72; Jahn, *"Anecdota graeca theologica"* (Leipzig, 1893), 1–68, and others mentioned below.

**First Period** (while he was in favour of the union, 1438–c. 1445).—The chief works of this time are the "speeches" made at the Council of Florence (printed in Hardouin, IX, and P. G., CLX, 386 sqq.), also a number of letters addressed to various friends, bishops, and statesmen, mostly unedited. An "Apology for five chapters of the Council of Florence", edited first (in Latin) at Rome in 1577, and again in 1628, is doubtful (in P. G., CLIX, it is attributed to Joseph of Methone). A "History of the Council of Florence" under his name (in manuscript) is really identical with that of Syropoulos (ed. Creighton, The Hague, 1660).

**Second Period** (as opponent of the union, to his resignation of the patriarchal see, c. 1445–1456 or 1459). A great number of polemical works against Latins were written in this time. Two books about the "Procession of the Holy Ghost" (one in Simonides, *loc. cit.*, the other in P. G., CLX, 665); another one "against the insertion of the Filioque in the Creed" (*ibid.*, 713); two books and a letter about "Purgatory"; various sermons and speeches; a "Panegyric of Marcus Eugenicius" (in 1447), etc. Some translations of works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and polemical treatises against his theology by Gennadius are still unedited, as is also his work against the Barlaamites. There are also various philosophical treatises of which the chief is a "Defence of Aristotle" (*ἀντιλήψεις ὑπὲρ Ἀριστοτέλους*) against the Platonist, Gemistus Pletho (P. G., CLX, 743 sqq.).

His most important work is easily his "Confession" (*Ἐκθεσις τῆς πίστεως τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν*, generally known as *Ὁμολογία τοῦ Γενναδίου*) addressed to Mohammed II. It contains twenty articles, of which however only the first twelve are authentic. It was written in Greek; Achmed, Kadi of Berrhoea, translated it into Turkish. This is the first (in date) of the Orthodox Symbolic books. It was published first (in Greek and Latin) by Brassicanus (Vienna, 1530), again by Chytræus (Frankfort, 1582). Crusius printed it in Greek, Latin, and Turkish (in Greek and Latin letters) in his "Turco-Græcia" (Basle, 1584, reprinted in P. G., CLX, 333, sqq.). Kimmel has reprinted it (Greek and Latin) in his "Monumenta fidei Eccl. Orient." (Jena, 1850), I, 1–10; and Michalcescu in Greek only [Die Bekenntnisse und die wichtigsten Glaubenszeugnisse der griech.-orient. Kirche (Leipzig, 1904), 17–21]. There exists an arrangement of this Confession in the form of a dialogue in which Mohammed asks questions ("What is God?"—"Why is he called *θεός*?"—"And

how many Gods are there?" and so on) and Gennadius gives suitable answers. This is called variously Gennadius's "Dialogue" (*διάλογος*), or "Confessio prior", or "De Via salutis humanae" (*Περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας ἀνθρώπων*). Kimmel prints it first, in Latin only (*op. cit.*, 1–10), and thinks it was the source of the Confession (*ibid.*, iii). It is more probably a later compilation made from the Confession by some one else (Otto, *op. cit. infra*). It should be noticed that Gennadius's (quasi-Platonic) philosophy is in evidence in his Confession (God cannot be interpreted, *θεός* from *θεῖον*, etc.; cf. Kimmel, *op. cit.*, viii–xvi). Either for the same reason or to spare Moslem susceptibility he avoids the word *Πρόσωπα* in explaining the Trinity, speaking of the three Persons as *ἰδιώματα* "which we call Hypostases" (*Conf.*, 3).

During the *third period*, from his resignation to his death (1459–1468), he continued writing theological and polemical works. An Encyclical letter to all Christians "In defence of his resignation" is unedited, as are also a "Dialogue with two Turks about the divinity of Christ", and a work about the "Adoration of God". Jahn (*Anecdota graeca*) has published a "Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew", and a collection of "Prophecies about Christ" gathered from the Old Testament. A treatise, "About our God, one in three, against Atheists and Polytheists" (P. G., CLX, 567 sqq.), is chiefly directed against the theory that the world may have been formed by chance. Five books, "About the Foreknowledge and Providence of God", and a "Treatise on the manhood of Christ", are also in P. G., CLX. Lastly, there are many homilies by Gennadius, most of which exist only in manuscript at Athos ("Codd. Athous", Paris, 1289–1298). A critical edition of Gennadius's collected works is badly needed.

For the question of the supposed two persons, both named George Scholarius, see ALLATIUS, *De Georgio eorumque scriptis in De Eccl. occid. atque orient. perp. consensione* (Cologne, 1648), III, 5, 6. His theory has been taken up again by KIMMEL, *op. cit.*, ii–vii, but was confuted long ago by RENAUDOT, *Dissertation de Gennadii vita et scriptis* (Paris, 1709) in P. G., CLX, 248 sqq. OUDIN, *Comment. de Script. Eccl.* (Leipzig, 1722), II, 2481; FABRICIUS-HARLES, *Bibl. Graeca* (Hamburg, 1790), XI, 349; and everyone since maintain the identity of Gennadius. ΤΡΥΦΩΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΔΗΣ, *Περὶ δόξης τῶν Συλλόγων* (Athens, 1896); SATHOS, *Georgios Scholarios* (1895); DRÄSEKE in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, IV (1895), 3 sqq.; GEDEON, *Πατριαρχοὶ Πάπες* (Constantinople, s. d.), 471 sqq.; CRUSIUS, *Turcogræcia*, I, 2; OTTO, *Des Patr. Gennadius Confessio kritisch untersucht* (Vienna, 1864); KRUMBACHER, *Byzantinische Literatur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897), 119–121.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**Gennadius of Marseilles** (GENNADIUS SCHOLASTICUS), a priest whose chief title to fame is his continuation of St. Jerome's catalogue "De Viris illustribus". Nothing is known of his life, save what he tells us himself in the last (xcvii) of the biographies in question: "I, Gennadius, presbyter of Massilia, wrote eight books against all heresies, five books against Nestorius, ten books against Eutyches, three books against Pelagius, a treatise on the thousand years of the Apocalypse of John, this work, and a letter about my faith sent to blessed Gelasius, bishop of the city of Rome" (ed. Bernoulli, 95). This fixes his period more or less; Gelasius reigned from 492–496, so Gennadius must have lived at the end of the fifth century.

Internal evidence shows that he was a Semipelagian, as indeed the name of his city would make one suspect. Of all the works to which he refers, only the "De Viris illustribus"—"this work"—is certainly extant. He tells us further that he translated and restored to their authentic form Evagrius Ponticus's works (xi, 65), and those of Timothy Ælurus (lxxii, 86). These translations are also lost. He twice mentions a "catalogue of heretics" that he means to write (xxv, 74, and liii, 79). Presumably this is the work "against all heresies" referred to above. There is a pseudo-Augustinian treatise, "De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus"



(P. L., LVIII, 979-1054), that is now universally attributed to Gennadius. The only question is with which of the works he speaks of having written the last-mentioned should be identified. It has often been thought to be the letter to Gelasius. Caspari (op. cit. infra), Bardenhewer, Czapla, and others have pointed out that the treatise has nothing of the nature of a letter or of a personal profession of faith. Only once, in chap. xxiii, does the author write in the first person (*hudo, vitupero*, etc.). They think therefore that it is more probably a fragment of Gennadius's eight books "against all heresies", apparently the last part, in which, having confuted the heretics, he builds up a positive system.

There are many indications that the author was a Semipelagian in Gennadius's chapters "De Viris illustribus". Semipelagians are warmly praised (Fastidiosus, lvi, p. 80; Cassian, lxi, 81; Faustus, lxxxv, 89); full Pelagians (Pelagius himself, xlii, 77; Julian of Eclanum, xlv, 77) are heretics; Catholics are treated shabbily (Augustine, xxxviii, 75; Prosper of Aquitania, lxxxiv, 89); even popes are called heretics (Julius I, in i, 61). The same tendency is confirmed by the treatise "De eccles. dogmatibus", which is full of Semipelagianism, either open or implied (original sin carefully evaded, great insistence on free will and denial of predestination, grace as an *adjutorium* in the mildest form, etc.; cf. Wiggers, op. cit. infra, 353 sq.). Perhaps the most reprehensible effect of Gennadius's opinions on this point is his sneering remark about St. Augustine's prolific genius: "He wrote so much that it cannot all be found. For who shall boast of possessing all his works, or who shall read with as much care as he used in writing?" And at the end he tempers his faint praise by saying that Augustine "caused doubts about the question of unborn children to the simple" and that he "remained a Catholic" (xxxviii, 75). To say of Augustine merely that he remained a Catholic, shows prejudice, if anything can.

We have said that Gennadius's chief, if not his only, title to fame is his continuation of St. Jerome's "De Viris illustribus". In that work Jerome had for the first time drawn up a series of one hundred and thirty-five short biographies of famous Christians, with lists of their chief works. It was the first patrology and dictionary of Christian biography. So useful a book of reference naturally became popular, and while no one thought of controlling or correcting it, many people wrote continuations after the same method. We hear of such a continuation by one Paterius, a disciple of Jerome, and of a Greek translation by Sophronius. But it was Gennadius's continuation that won most favour, that was accepted everywhere as a second part of the same work, and was always written (eventually printed) together with St. Jerome's work. Gennadius's part contains about one hundred lives (variously numbered: by Bernoulli, i to xcvi, with some marked as xciiib, etc., originally cxxxvi-cxxxii), modelled strictly on those of Jerome. In xc, 92, he says (in one version) that Theodore of Coesytia (Theodulus) "died three years ago, in the reign of Zeno". From this Czapla deduces that Gennadius wrote between 491 and 494. The series is arranged more or less in chronological order, but there are frequent exceptions. The text is in a bad state. Other people have modified it and added to it without noting the fact—as is usual among medieval writers. Richardson (op. cit. infra) and Czapla consider, apparently with reason, that chapters xxx (John of Jerusalem), lxxxvii (Victorinus), xciii (Cerealis of Africa), and all the end portion (xcv-ci), are not authentic. There is doubt about parts of the others. Gennadius was on the whole an honourable and scrupulous writer. In one place (lxxxv, 90) he says: "There are other works by him (Faustus) which I will not name because I have not yet read them." He

uses the name "Scholasticus" as an honourable epithet repeatedly (lxiii, 82, lxvii, 84, lxxxix, 87, lxxxiv, 89). It is generally, and very justly, given to him by others.

*De Viris illustribus*, ed. ANDREAS (Jerome and Gennadius together, as nearly always; Rome, 1468). This is the editio princeps: the work had a long history in manuscript before (cf. Bernoulli, op. cit., xvi-lvi), and has been reprinted constantly since. FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica* (Hamburg, 1714), II, 1-43; this is the edition reproduced in P. L., LVIII, 1059-1120; the most practical modern ed. is BERNOULLI, *Hieronymus und Gennadius De Viris illustribus* (Freiburg im Br., 1895, vol. II of KRUGER, *Sammlung ausgewählter Kirchen und dogmengeschichtlichen Quellschriften*), with apparatus and notes. All references above are to this edition. The work *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* was published by ELMENHORST (Hamburg, 1614), reprinted in P. L., LVIII, 979-1054; CZAPLA, *Gennadius als Luterarhistoriker* (Münster, 1898). RICHARDSON edited GENNADIUS in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XIV (1895); JUNGSMANN, *Questiones Gennadanas* (Leipzig, 1881); CASPARI, *Kirchenhistorische Anekdota* (Christiana, 1883); DIEKAMP, *Wann hat Gennadius seinen Schriftstellerkatalog verfasst? in Römische Quartalschrift* (1898), 411-420; BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 608; WIGGERS, *Versuch einer genau. Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus* (Hamburg, 1883), 350-356.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**Gennings**, EDMUND AND JOHN, the first, a martyr for the Catholic Faith, and the second, the restorer of the English province of Franciscan friars, were brothers and converts to the Church. Edmund Gennings was born at Lichfield in 1567; died in London, 10 Dec., 1591. John was b. about 1570; d. at Douai, 12 Nov., 1660.

Edmund, even in his boyhood, exhibited an unusual gravity of manners and a mystical turn of mind; when about sixteen years of age, he was converted to the Catholic Faith, and immediately afterwards entered the English College at Reims. He was ordained priest in 1590, being then only twenty-three years of age, and at once returned to England under the assumed name of Ironmonger. But his missionary career was of short duration, for he was seized whilst saying Mass in London on 7 Nov., 1591, and executed at Gray's Inn Fields on 10 Dec. His martyrdom was the occasion of several remarkable incidents, chief of which was the conversion of his younger brother John. On his return to England, Edmund Gennings had at once gone to Lichfield to seek out his kindred in the hope of bringing them to the true faith, but he found that all his relatives were dead except this one brother, who had, however, left his native city and gone to London. Thither Edmund proceeded and for a whole month searched the city, visiting every place where he thought his brother might be found. Eventually, when he was about to give up the search, he achieved his purpose, but the younger brother, far from being won over to Edmund's faith, only besought him to go away, lest he himself should become suspect; and when after awhile Edmund was seized and condemned John "rejoiced rather than bewailed the untimely and bloody end of his nearest kinsman, hoping thereby to be rid of all persuasions which he suspected he should receive from him touching the Catholic Religion". So wrote John Gennings in his life of his brother, published in 1614 at St-Omer.

Undoubtedly at this time John Gennings was bent on pleasure, but one must make allowances for the spirit of remorse with which he looked back on those days in after years, and not accept his own estimate of his youth too readily. However, about ten days after his brother's execution, a change came over him. He began one night to think of his brother's death and contempt of the world, and to compare his own life with that of the martyr. He was struck with remorse and wept bitterly; and next prayed for light. Instantly he felt an exceeding great reverence for the saints and, above all, our Blessed Lady, and it seemed to him that he saw his brother in glory. He thereupon made a vow to forsake friends and country and seek a true knowledge of his brother's faith. Being received

into the Church, he entered Douai College, was ordained priest in 1607, and the following year was sent upon the English mission. Here he conceived a desire for the restoration of the English province of Franciscans, and sought out Father William Staney, the commissary of the English friars, and from him received the habit, either in 1610 or 1614 (the date is uncertain). After this, he went for a time to a convent of the order at Ypres, in Flanders, where he was joined by several English companions, amongst whom was Christopher Davenport, known in religion as Franciscus à Sancta Clara, afterwards a famous controversialist. Thus was the foundation of a new English province laid, and Father William Staney, recognizing the zeal of John Gennings, now gave into his hands the seal of the old province of the English Observants.

Gennings next proceeded to procure a house for the English friars at Gravelines, but in 1618 he obtained leave from the minister general to establish a settlement at Douai. As a matter of fact, most of the friars who had joined Gennings were *alumni* of Douai College, and in transferring their residence to that town he hoped to obtain a continuous supply of recruits. The work of restoring the English province was definitely confided to him by the general chapter of 1618, and he was nominated "Vicar of England". To assist him in the work of restoration, the commissary general of the Belgian nation was empowered to gather together all the English and Scotch friars from any province in the order. A decree of the same general chapter placed the English Poor Clares of Gravelines under the jurisdiction of the English friars. In 1625, the number of English friars having greatly increased, Gennings sent Father Franciscus à Sancta Clara to Rome to plead that the English province be canonically established. The request was granted with the simple restriction that the superior of the province should not assume the title of provincial, but that of custos; but, in 1629, this restriction was taken away and Friar John Gennings was appointed minister provincial. The first chapter of the new province was held at Brussels in Advent of the same year, in the convent of the English sisters of the third order, which Gennings had himself founded in 1619. This community of tertiary sisters has continued to the present time, and is now established at Taunton, in England, with a branch house at Woodchester. Father John Gennings was re-elected provincial in 1634, and again in 1643.

MASON, *Certamen Seraphicum Provinciae Angliae* (Douai, 1649); QUARACCHI, 1885; CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*; A.F., *Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica* (London, 1726); THADDEUS, *The Franciscans in England* (London, 1898).

FATHER CUTHBERT.

**Genoa**, ARCHDIOCESE OF (JANUENSIS), in Liguria, Northern Italy. The city is situated on the gulf of the same name, extends along the lowest ridges of the Ligurian Apennines, which sweep around the gulf, between the mouths of the Polcevera and the Bisagno, and is protected from the inroads of these waters by the Punta della Lanterna and the Punta del Carignano. The bay forms a natural harbour secured against storms by the promontory of Portofino, which acts as a breakwater. Two piers (the smaller one begun in 1133) were necessary to break the force of the tide during storms. Its favourable position has made Genoa the largest trade centre on the Mediterranean. It is also a naval fortress with a chain of defences about ten miles in length.


In 205 B. C., Mago the Carthaginian landed there with a large army, and sacked the town for its sympathy with Rome, the rest of Liguria supporting the Carthaginians. From the end of the Second Punic War, Genoa belonged to Rome. After the Lombard invasion, it remained subject to Byzantium, like nearly all the maritime towns of Italy. In A. D. 641 King

Rotari, in his expedition along the coast of Liguria, sacked Genoa, and carried off immense booty. It was later incorporated in the Lombard kingdom, probably under Charlemagne, becoming part of the March of Obertenga. In 935, it was surprised and sacked by the Saracens, but the Genoese fleet followed up the enemy and defeated them near the island of Asinara. In 1008, the Saracens came for the third time. Meanwhile the trade and enterprise of Genoa had steadily increased, and now rivalled that of Pisa, in those early times its friendly neighbour. In 1016, they drove the Arab chief Mogalied from Sardinia. In 1052, the town organized itself into a commune, and was governed by consuls and a podestà (mayor); in 1258, however, the control was divided between the podestà and a "captain of the people", a condition which lasted till 1310. From 1339 to 1797, except when the rule was in the hands of foreigners, the city was governed by doges chosen from the principal families, at first for life, but after 1528 for periods of two years.

In 1087, the Genoese and Pisans captured Almadia and Subeila in Africa. In the First Crusade their fleet transported the crusading armies to the Holy Land, secured many ports in Syria and Palestine for the Christians, and, in return for their services, they were granted important commercial privileges among the Christian principalities of the East. Together with the Pisans they aided Innocent II to put down the schism of Anacletus, and, as a reward, the pope divided between the two municipalities the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, retaining, however, his own overlordship. In 1147, they took Almeria and Tortosa, in Spain, from the Moors. The threatening attitude of Genoa forced Frederick Barbarossa to recognize all its liberties and possessions; hence, until the reign of Frederick II, it remained friendly to the imperial cause, and even assisted in the attack on Sicily. In 1240, however, the Genoese refused to do homage to Frederick II, and, in 1241, they lent their fleet to transport the northern prelates to the council convened by Gregory IX, but were pursued and defeated between the islands of Il Giglio and Monte Cristo by the Pisans, the allies of the emperor. In 1244, Innocent IV took refuge in Genoa. The commercial favour shown by the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204-60) towards the Venetians enabled the latter to defeat the Genoese at St-Jean d'Acre and on the high seas, in 1257 and 1258 respectively. In 1261, the Genoese took their revenge by assisting Michael Palæologus to reconquer Constantinople, and obtained from him Smyrna and Pera, and the monopoly of trade in the Black Sea. They developed markets rapidly on the shores of this sea, the principal one being Caffa, and carried on a brisk trade, exporting mainly wine, oil, woollens, and silks, and importing skins, furs, corn, Persian stuffs, etc. For the government of these colonies, a general consulate of the empire of Gazaria was established.

A bitter war now began between the rival cities of Genoa and Pisa. From 1262 to 1267, five naval battles (Settepozzi, Durazzo, Trapani, Tyre, and St-Jean d'Acre) were fought, in which Genoa was generally the loser. St. Louis IX of France sought to establish peace on a firm footing (Cremona, 1270); but a revolt in Corsica, stirred up by the Pisans, soon led to another war (1282-1284), which ended in the utter defeat of the Pisans near the island of Meloria. Soon the old rivalry with Venice was renewed, and the scene of the conflict shifted to the East. At Laiazzo, on the coast of Armenia, the Genoese were victorious (1294); the Venetians retaliated by destroying the Genoese quarter of Galato (1296), but in 1298 Lamba Doria (founder of the Doria family, famous in the annals of Genoa) totally destroyed the Venetian fleet at Curzola. Both rivals being now weakened, Henry VII (1311) easily obtained from the Genoese the right to govern them for twenty years, and a promise of help against

Naples. A little later, Robert of Anjou (1318-1335) was called in by the Guelphs in opposition to the Visconti of Milan, favoured by the Ghibellines. When the Venetians, together with the Greeks and Catalanians, wished, in 1342, to occupy the island of Scio as an outpost against the Turks, the Genoese, profiting by a quarrel among the allies, forestalled them. This, amongst other causes, led to a fresh outbreak of war in 1350. In the Bosphorus (1352), a fierce but indecisive battle was fought; while at Alghero in Sardinia (1353) the Genoese were defeated by the Venetians and their allies. Genoa then chose Giovanni Visconti, Archbishop of Milan, as its ruler or "Signore". In 1354,



FAÇADE, CATHEDRAL OF GENOA (XIII CENTURY)

Paganino Doria routed the Venetian forces in the Adriatic and at Porto Longone in the Morea (Greece). Driven out of the Black Sea, the Venetians took Beirut by way of compensation, and Genoa seized Cyprus (1373). When the Greek Emperor, John V, gave the Venetians the island of Tenedos, the Genoese, fearing lest the former should thereby have access to the Black Sea, espoused the cause of Andronicus; in this way broke out the conflict known as the War of Chioggia. The Genoese, defeated at Anzio (1378), were victorious at Pola (1379) and blockaded Venice, but were obliged to surrender when the blockade was broken by Vettor Pisani. The great rivals were now exhausted.

During the fifteenth century, Genoa constantly called on outsiders to rule her, but as constantly rebelled against their rule (1396-1409, France; 1409-1413, Teodoro II Paleologo di Monferrato; 1422-1435, Filippo Maria Visconti; 1458-1461, France; 1464-1478, 1487-1499, the Sforza of Milan; 1499-1512, 1515-1522, France). Meanwhile her colonies in the East were slipping away (Pera, 1453; Caffa, 1475). In 1431, at Portofino, the fleet in the service of Visconti was defeated by the Venetian and Florentine allies. Genoa was involved in the conflict between Francis I and Charles V, and in 1522 was sacked by the Spaniards. In 1527, the Spanish were expelled by the celebrated Andrea Doria with French aid, and in the

year following Andrea succeeded in ridding himself of his French allies. The "Signoria" was offered him, but he prudently refused the title, though in reality he exercised its powers. This brought about the Fieschi Plot (1546), which proved abortive owing to the death of its leader. Noteworthy events in the subsequent history of Genoa are the attempts of Corsica to shake off Genoese authority (1553; 1737, King Theodore), its annexation by France in 1768, and the two conspiracies for the annexation of Genoa by Savoy (Vachero, 1628; Della Torre, 1672). In 1684, Louis XIV, without any just cause, had the town bombarded. A hundred years later (1797) the French set up there a democratic republic. In 1800, Masséna sustained a famous siege and blockade on the part of the Austrians and English. In 1805, the duchy was annexed to France, but in 1814 was provisionally, and in 1815 definitely, annexed to the Kingdom of Sardinia.

Genoa owes to the magnificence of its architecture its title of "La Superba" (the Proud). Among its best-known churches are: San Lorenzo, rebuilt in the twelfth century, the lower part of the façade dating from 1100, the remainder from 1523. The spandrels over the door are decorated with bas-reliefs of various periods. The cupola dates from 1567. There are paintings by Barrocci, Ferrari, Cambiaso, and sculptures by Montorsoli, Sansovino, Guglielmo della Porta and others. Near by is the little church of St. John the Baptist, formerly the baptistery of the city. The church of Saints Andrew and Ambrose (600) has paintings by Guido Reni and Rubens. Santissima Annunziata has beautiful Composite columns, and a famous Last Supper by Procaccino. In the church of St. Catherine of Genoa (with the saint's room adjoining) may be seen her body preserved in a silver urn. The church of Saints Cosmas and Damian antedates the year 1000; that of St. Donatus, consecrated in 1189, is built of old Roman materials. St. Philip Neri dates from 1694; the Gesù Maria from 1487. The latter has paintings by Paggi, Cambiaso, and Salimbeni. St. George's has two bronze doors, a part of the booty of Almeria (1148). The altar of St. John's was erected after the victory at Pola. On the façade of St. Mark's (1173) is a marble lion captured from the Venetians at Pola. Other churches are: Santa Maria in Castello (columns of oriental granite); Santa Maria del Carmine (rich tabernacle); San Siro (the cathedral till 985); San Stefano, which existed in 493, and has a painting by Giulio Romano. San Matteo, containing the war-trophies of the Dorias, was founded in 1125 by Martino Doria, and restored by Andrea Doria from plans by Fra Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli; on the façade is the sarcophagus of Lamba Doria, the victor at Curzola; under the high altar is the tomb of Andrea Doria by Montorsoli, and several inscriptions recall the triumphs of this noble family of seamen and rulers. Santa Maria in Carignano (sixteenth century), one of the handsomest churches in the world, is in the form of a Greek cross; its cupola is the work of Galeazzo Alessi (q. v.) of Perugia. The Campo Santo, or public cemetery, is also greatly admired for its beautiful statuary. Among Genoa's public edifices are the Albergo dei Poveri, or home for the poor (1655), with a church attached; the Loggia dei Banchi, or exchange, built by Galeazzo Alessi. The Palazzo Ducale (1291) is crowned with a row of stucco statues of the various princes and kings defeated by the Genoese; its spacious halls were adorned by famous artists. The Palazzo S. Giorgio (1260), restored in 1368, has many statues of the doges of the fifteenth century. Worthy of notice also are the university, founded in 1471 by Bartolomeo Bianco, the Palazzo Reale, and the Municipio or Town Hall. Genoa has many famous private palaces, e. g. the Adorno, with paintings by Rubens, Guido Reni, Titian, and Giulio Romano; the Doria, with a representation of St. George and the Dragon over the doorway. Besides the university, there is a

merchant-marine school, a Catholic high school, an academy of fine arts and other institutions of a similar nature.

The line of bishops is usually dated from St. Solomon or Salonus, said to have been martyred in 269. Other bishops are mentioned in the third and fourth centuries, the first known with any certainty being Diogenes, a member of the Council of Aquileia in 381. Blessed Jacobus a Voragine, author of the *Legenda Aurea* (Golden Legend) and Bishop of Genoa (1292-1298), tells us that till the tenth century he found no mention of a Bishop of Genoa, thus proving that in his time nothing was known of the legendary martyred bishops. The St. Syrus I assigned to the beginning of the fourth century may therefore be a double of St. Syrus II (1139-1163). When the Lombards captured Milan (568), its bishop, Laurentius, and many of his clergy took refuge in Genoa; five other Milanese bishops took up their residence there. It was this same Laurentius who dedicated the church of St.

Gentile da Fabriano, Italian painter; b. probably about 1378 in the District of the Marches; d. probably 1427. The history of this artist has for a long time been involved in mystery, and even Vasari's statements concerning him have to be accepted with caution. Of his early life we still know nothing, but thanks to the investigations of Milanese, Amico Ricci, and later on of Venturi and Corrado Ricci, we have a few definite facts concerning him. The earliest mention of him is concerned with the decoration of the large council hall in the doges' palace at Venice, which, it seems clear, must have been carried out between 1411 and 1414, probably in the former year, as the theory set up by Wickhoff, placing the work at a much later date, has now been proved to be untenable. In 1408, however, Gentile is known to have painted a large altar-piece in Venice for Francesco Amadi, and this date implies that he must have been resident in the city for some years previously, because it was not possible for an artist, who had not been



MARY MAGDALEN, ST. NICHOLAS, JOHN THE BAPTIST, AND ST. GEORGE  
Gentile da Fabriano, San Nicolò, Florence

Ambrose built for the Milanese refugees. About 617, Bishop Appellinus became involved in the schism of Agrestius. In 634, Bishop Asterius ordained St. Byrsinus, who was to be one of the apostles of Northumbria.

Councils were held at Genoa in 773 (?), 1216, and 1292. Innocent IV and Adrian V were natives of the city. It was originally a suffragan of Milan, but, in 1133, Innocent II made it a metropolitan see. Its first archbishop was the St. Syrus mentioned above. Its suffragan sees are Albenga, Bobbio, Brugnate and Luni-Saranza, Chiavari, Savona and Noli, Tortona, Ventimiglia. It has 200 parishes and 470,000 souls (161,000 in the city); there are 33 religious houses for men in the city, and 19 throughout the diocese; also 62 convents for women in the city, and 82 throughout the diocese. The archdiocese supports 2 Catholic daily newspapers, 3 weekly papers, and 13 other periodicals.

CAPPARELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1857), XIII, 269-419; SEMERLA, *Storia della metropoli di Genova* (1843); CANALE, *Storia civile, commerciale e letteraria dei Genovesi fino al 1797* (Genoa, 1844-1845); HERMANN, *Gesch. Genuas* (Dresden, 1832); *Giornale storico e letterario della Liguria* (1900-).

U. BENIGNI.

born in Venice, to be accepted as a member of its school or guild, unless resident in the city for some considerable time before he made his application. Between April, 1414, and September, 1419, we know that he was painting in Brescia, decorating a chapel for Pandolfo Malatesta, and it was on the occasion of the visit which Pope Martin V made to Malatesta, when he was received at Chiari, that the pope invited Gentile to pay him a visit in Rome. We have evidence of the date on which he set out, because on the 18 September, 1419, he applied for a safe-conduct. There were serious difficulties, however, connected with the early days of the pontificate of Martin V, and Gentile only got as far as Florence, and could not proceed to Rome.

Of Gentile's residence in Florence we have evidence from the two applications he made, dated 23 March, and 6 April, 1420, that he might be relieved from the payment of tribute, inasmuch as he was only temporarily sojourning in Florence, and was on his way to his native city; but he could not have remained very long in Fabriano, because on 21 November, 1422, he figures in the deeds of matriculation connected with the doctors and painters of Florence,

and in the following year he signs and dates his picture executed to the order of Palla Strozzi for the church of Santa Trinità in that city. The evidence that he continued in Florence in 1423 is found in some deeds relating to a curious quarrel which took place between one of Gentile's pupils and a certain Bernardo, who threw some stones into the courtyard of the house where Gentile was, breaking some small pieces of sculpture which happened to be of great value to the artist.

Gentile's work in Siena has usually been assigned to the year 1426, but closer investigation shows that it was carried out in 1425, and a lease of a house in Siena taken for a month by the artist in that year is still in existence, and proves the date of the residence of Gentile in Siena, and the time that he took to paint the picture. It is dated 22 July, and at the end of August of the same year Gentile was in Orvieto, painting in the Duomo, as the archives of the cathedral prove. That work completed, he was at length able to leave for Rome, and in 1427 was at work in the church of San Giovanni in Laterano, and the records of his engagement and stipend have been printed. By 22 November, 1428, he was dead, because on that day, according to the evidence of the commune of Fabriano, his niece Maddalena took possession of the property of her uncle, who was declared to have died in Rome intestate. Further evidence of this date is given by a deed dated October, 1427, in which the master is spoken of as deceased, and these documents prove the inaccuracy of the statements of Vasari both as regards the date of Gentile's decease and the place where Vasari says he died, Città di Castello. Amico Ricci and Milanese were inaccurate in stating that Gentile died after 1450, as they were misled by a phrase "autore requisito" which occurs in a document representing the visit of Roger van der Weyden to Rome, when he visited San Giovanni in Laterano, and saw the paintings of Gentile. He expressed the greatest admiration for the work, and according to Ricci and Milanese called the author of the paintings before him. Inasmuch as the visit took place in 1450, these two authors placed Gentile's decease after that date, but the phrase refers to the author having died, and this is proved by the two documents just cited.

These few facts practically embrace all that we definitely know respecting this artist. He is said to have learned his art under Allegretto Nuzzi. His family name is by some writers given as Maso or Massi, and his burial is said to have taken place in Santa Francesca Romana in the Campo Vaccino, but all these statements are for the present matters of conjecture. He was probably born at Fabriano in the March of Ancona, according to the evidence of his name, but Nuzzi is believed to have died when Gentile was fifteen years old, and therefore he could have derived very little instruction from Nuzzi. Two of his pictures are dated, the "Adoration of the Kings" in the Academy at Florence, 1423; and the group of saints in San Nicolò in the same city, 1425. His best work in Rome and Venice has perished, but he is well represented in the Brera Gallery in Milan, the galleries of Perugia, Paris, and Berlin; and important pictures in the Heugel collection in Paris and the Stroganoff collection in St. Petersburg are now accepted as being from his hand. Of his work in Rome there is a representation of the miracle of St. Nicholas to be seen in the Vatican Gallery, and part of his work in Orvieto still remains. A picture in the royal collection at Buckingham Palace is attributed to him, with considerable evidence in its favour; and his paintings are also to be seen at Settignano, in the municipal gallery at Pisa, and in the Jarves collection at Newhaven in the United States, but his most important work is the large picture in the Academy in Florence, a painting of remarkable excellence and extraordinary beauty. In his birthplace there is one picture representing St.

Francis, which is probably a genuine work. His paintings are distinguished by great magnificence of colour and marked by his peculiar method of high relief in *gesso* work, and by the remarkable use he made of small portions of the most brilliant colour, applied in conjunction with masses of gold. He may be accepted as one of the greatest masters of his period, and as a man exceedingly skilful in composition, and full of grand ideas as regards colouring and effect, for in the combination of rich colour with gold he has seldom if ever been equalled amongst decorative painters.

ARDUINO COLASANTI, *Gentile da Fabriano* (Bergamo, 1909); AMICO RICCI, *Memorie Storiche delle Arti e degli Artisti della Marca di Ancona* (Macerata, 1834); GIULIO CANTALAMESSA, *Vecchi affreschi a S. Vittoria in Matenano in Nuova Rivista Musea*, III, 1; A. AND A. LONGHI, *L'anno della morte di Gentile da Fabriano* (Fano, 1887); VASARI, *Vite de' più eccellenti pittori* (Florence, 1550); also edited by MILANESI (Florence, 1878-85); BRYAN's *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*, ed. WILLIAMSON, III (London and New York, 1904), s. v. *Massi*.  
GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Gentiles** (Heb. *Gôyim*; Gr. *ἔθνη*, *ἔθνηκοί*, "Ἕλληνες; Vulg. *Gentes*, *Gentiles*, *Græci*), a word of Latin origin and usually employed in the plural. In the English versions of both Testaments it collectively designates the nations distinct from the Jewish people. The basis of this distinction is that, as descendants of Abraham, the Jews considered themselves, and were in fact, before the coming of Christ, the chosen people of God. As the non-Jewish nations did not worship the true God and generally indulged in immoral practices, the term *Gôyim* "Gentiles" has oftentimes in the Sacred Writings, in the Talmud, etc., a disparaging meaning. Since the spread of Christianity, the word *Gentiles* designates, in theological parlance, those who are neither Jews nor Christians. In the United States, the Mormons use it of persons not belonging to their sect. See PROSELYTES.

(Catholic authors are marked with an asterisk.) SCHURER, *History of the Jewish People*, second division, vol. I (New York, 1891); SELBIE in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; LÉSTRE\* in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Gentils*; HIRSCH in *Jewish Encycl.*, s. v. (New York, 1903); BROWN, BRIGGS, and DRIVER, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, s. v. "J" (New York, 1906); DOLLINGER\*, *The Gentile and the Jew* (tr. London, 1906).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

**Gentili**, ALOYSIUS, b. 14 July, 1801, at Rome; d. 26 September, 1848, at Dublin. He was proficient in poetry, displayed considerable musical aptitude, had a taste for mechanical and electrical science, and was devoted to the cultivation of modern languages, applying himself more particularly to the study of English. His early life was that of a brilliant young man of the world, full of ambition of a nobler kind, a pet of society, and an evident favourite of fortune. He sought admission into the Society of Jesus, and would have been accepted, but his health seemed broken, and the Society did not venture to receive him. He became more and more impressed with the conviction that God called him to the priesthood and to labour for the conversion of England. He made the acquaintance of Father Rosmini, who, at his earnest entreaty, accepted him as a postulant of the newly-founded Institute of Charity. He remained in Rome, attending theological lectures, whilst residing at the Irish College, in order, at the same time, to improve his English, and after his ordination to the priesthood, in 1830, proceeded to Domo d'Ossola to make his novitiate.

Whilst Gentili was living at the Irish College, a young English gentleman, who had been converted whilst a student at Cambridge, arrived in Rome. This was Mr. Ambrose Philipps de Lisle (q. v.). This zealous convert applied to the rector of the Irish College, to obtain for him a priest to preach the Catholic Faith in the neighbourhood of his ancestral home. The rector suggested the Abate Gentili as in every way



suiting to the purpose. This led to a great friendship between the young priest and Mr. de Lisle, the submission of the whole project to Rosmini, and eventually to the coming of Gentili and other fathers to England in 1835. It was not merely the invitation of Mr. Phillips de Lisle that brought the Rosminians to England. In the meantime, one of the vicars Apostolic, Bishop Baines, who then ruled over the Western District, having his residence at Bath, had sought to obtain the services of the fathers for his college of Prior Park. Though Rosmini gave his consent as early as 1831, the period of preparation for the English Mission was a long one; for the little band did not sail from Civit  Vecchia till 22 May, 1835. They set forth with a more personal blessing and mission from the Holy See than even St. Augustine and his companions received from St. Gregory the Great; for Pope Gregory XVI actually came on board the vessel and blessed the three "Italian missionaries" just before they sailed, probably a unique event in missionary history. Gentili and his companions arrived in London on 15 June, and no time was lost in getting to work. A few days later Gentili preached his first sermon in England, at Trelawney House, in Cornwall, whither they had been invited by Sir Henry Trelawney, Bart., a zealous convert. He took for his text, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church", and his discourse made a remarkable impression upon the many Protestants who came to hear it. Soon after, the missionaries were settled at Prior Park, where early in the following year (1836) Gentili gave a retreat to the whole college; and this was one of the first, if not the first public retreat according to the method of St. Ignatius ever given in a secular college in England. For this reason it excited among some no little criticism and opposition as a "novelty".

For two years Gentili was made president of Prior Park; but Bishop Baines' plan of combining secular and regular professors on his staff was an ill-advised one, and eventually led to the only possible result, viz. the entire withdrawal of the fathers from Prior Park College. This step left them free to devote their energies and their increasing numbers to the real work for which they came—preaching the Faith to the English people. In 1840 was opened the missionary settlement at Grace-Dieu, the seat of Mr. Phillips de Lisle, from which as a centre they evangelized much of the surrounding country, the total population of which region was reckoned at 6000, of whom only twenty-seven were Catholics. Notwithstanding the unpromising surroundings, the bitter hostility of the neighbouring ministers and Gentili's being publicly burnt in effigy, his ceaseless labours were rewarded in a space of some two years, by the reception of sixty-one adult converts, the baptism of sixty-six children under seven years of age and of twenty other children conditionally, and the conversion of an Anglican clergyman, Rev. Francis Wackerbarth. These consoling fruits were secured by incessant toil, daily instructions, visits, and religious services of every kind, sometimes in inns or hired rooms, sometimes in a poor cottage, or even in the open air. In the meantime the numbers of the Fathers had much grown. Among the Italians are now to be mentioned Fathers Pagani, Rinolfi, and Signini; whilst some Englishmen and Irishmen had joined their ranks, notably the afterwards celebrated Fathers Furlong and Hutton. In 1842 Gentili visited Oxford, where it is probable, but not certain, that he met Newman. At any rate the visit had important consequences. For Gentili did meet one of Newman's chief and best-beloved followers, William Lockhart, a young Scotch graduate. The result was that during August of the following year, "Mr. Lockhart, feeling it impossible to resist his conviction that the Anglican Church had fallen into fatal schism in separating from the Holy See, came to visit Father Gentili at Loughborough. After making a few days retreat under him

in the chapel house at Loughborough, he was received into the Catholic Church, and a little later, entered as a postulant of the Order". This conversion was the very first-fruit of the Oxford Movement, preceding the reception of Newman himself by no less than two years.

The first public mission was given at Loughborough by Fathers Gentili and Furlong, and had an extraordinary success. Sixty-three converts were instructed and received at it. From this time forward, the work of the fathers takes a new and far wider development. Great public missions all over the country alternate with innumerable spiritual retreats to colleges and communities for the next five years. It was a stirring-up of the minds and hearts of the Catholics of England, and a gathering into the net of converts from Protestantism, on a scale which astonishes us as we read of it at this distance of time. Some idea may be given of the labours and zeal of the fathers from what has been recorded of various great public missions. They usually gave four or five discourses daily, at fixed intervals, taking the sermons alternately, treating both dogmatic and moral Gospel doctrines, especially the great truths, the mystery of the Redemption, the Divine precepts, the Life of Christ. And the whole of the time intervening between the discourses was devoted to the arduous work of the confessional. So great usually was the concourse of penitents, that the fathers were kept occupied for eight or ten hours a day. Sometimes they even remained in church all night long, hearing confessions, and had absolutely no time either to say Mass, or recite the Divine Office, much less take any sleep, or any nourishment, except in a hasty manner. Such wearisome labours were not interrupted, but only varied, for weeks and even months together. They had to prepare children for their First Communion, instruct converts, restore peace in families, see to the restitution of ill-gotten goods. They also introduced processions, evening Benedictions, and other solemn functions at the close of missions.

The years 1844 to 1848 were fully occupied with an incredible number of popular missions and retreats all over England. At Newcastle 250 adult Protestants were received into the Church; at Manchester missions in three of the principal churches produced no less than 378 converts. It was in 1848 that Gentili gave his great mission in Dublin, where, in spite of the political excitement of that year, the confessionals were so crowded, that the Fathers often sat there without a break from the last instruction at night till the Mass on the following morning. But a sad and altogether unexpected blow brought to a sudden end the labours of this great mission. Father Gentili, the pioneer missionary, was suddenly seized with a fatal fever, and died after only a few days' illness. His mortal remains still repose in Glasnevin Cemetery.

PAGANI, *Life of the Rev. Aloysius Gentili, LL.D.* (London, 1851); G. B. PAGANI, *La Vita di Luigi Gentili* (Rome, 1904); IDEM, *The Life of Antonio Rosmini-Serbat* (tr. and abridged, London, 1907); PURCELL AND DE LISLE, *Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle* (2 vols., London, 1900); CASARTELLI, *A Forgotten Chapter of the Second Spring* (London, 1895).

L. C. CASARTELLI.

Gentili, CHARLES JOSEPH. See AGRA, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

**Genuflexion.**—To genuflect [Lat. *genu flectere*, *genuculare* (post-classic), to bend the knee; Gr. *γόνυ κλίνειν* or *κάμπτειν*] expresses (1) an attitude (2) a gesture: involving, like prostration, a profession of dependence or helplessness, and therefore very naturally adopted for praying and for worship in general. "The knee is made flexible by which the offence of the Lord is mitigated, wrath appeased, grace called forth" (St. Ambrose, *Hexaem.*, VI, ix). "By such posture of the body we show forth our humbleness of heart" (Alcuin, *De Parasceve*). "The bending of the knee is an expres-

sion of penitence and sorrow for sins committed" (Rabanus Maurus, *De Instit. Cler.*, II, xli).

I. AN ATTITUDE OR POSTURE AT PRAYER.—To kneel while praying is now usual among Christians. Under the Old Law the practice was otherwise. In the Jewish Church it was the rule to pray standing, except in time of mourning (Scudamore, *Notit. Eucharist.*, 182). Of Anna, the mother of Samuel, we read that she said to Heli: "I am that woman who stood before thee here praying to the Lord" (I Kings, i, 26; see also II Esd., ix, 3-5). Of both the Pharisee and the publican it is stated in the parable that they stood to pray, the attitude being emphasized in the case of the former (Luke, xviii, 11, 13). Christ assumes that standing would be the ordinary posture in prayer of those whom He addressed: "And when you shall stand to pray", etc. (Mark, xi, 25). "And when ye pray, you shall not be as the hypocrites, that love to stand and pray in the synagogues", etc. (Matt., vi, 5). But when the occasion was one of special solemnity, or the petition very urgent, or the prayer made with exceptional fervour, the Jewish suppliant knelt. Besides the many pictorial representations of kneeling prisoners, and the like, left us by ancient art, Gen., xli, 43 and Esth., iii, 2 may be quoted to show how universally in the East kneeling was accepted as the proper attitude of suppliants and dependents. Thus Solomon dedicating his temple "kneeling down in the presence of all the multitude of Israel, and lifting up his hands towards Heaven", etc. (II Par., vi, 13; cf. III Kings, viii, 54). Esdras too: "I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands to the Lord my God" (I Esd., ix, 5); and Daniel: "opening the windows in his upper chamber towards Jerusalem, he knelt down three times a day, and adored, and gave thanks before his God, as he had been accustomed to do before" (Dan., vi, 10), illustrate this practice. Of Christ's great prayer for His disciples and for His Church we are only told that "lifting up his eyes to heaven, he said", etc. (John, xvii, 1); but of His Agony in the Garden of Gethsemani: "kneeling down, he prayed" (Luke, xxii, 41). The lepers, beseeching the Saviour to have mercy on them, kneel (Mark, i, 40; cf. x, 17).

Coming to the first Christians, of St. Stephen we read: "And falling on his knees, he cried with a loud voice, saying", etc. (Acts, vii, 59); of the Prince of the Apostles: "Peter kneeling down prayed" (Acts, ix, 40); of St. Paul: "kneeling down, he prayed with them all" (Acts, xx, 36; cf. xxi, 5). It would seem that the kneeling posture for prayer speedily became habitual among the faithful. Of St. James, the brother of the Lord, tradition relates that from his continual kneeling his knees had become callous as those of a camel (Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, II, xxiii; *Brev. Rom.*, 1 May). For St. Paul the expressions "to pray" and "to bow the knee" to God are complementary (cf. Phil., ii, 10; Eph., iii, 14, etc.). Tertullian (*Ad Scap.*, iv) treats kneeling and praying as practically synonymous. And when forgiveness of offences has to be besought, Origen (*De Orat.*, 31) goes so far as to maintain that a kneeling posture is necessary.

It is remarkable that the "orantes" (praying figures) of early Christian art are in the catacomb frescoes invariably depicted as standing with arms extended. Some remarks of Leclercq (*Manuel d'Archéologie chrétienne*, I, 153 sqq.) suggest that a probable explanation may be found in the view that these "orantes" are merely conventional representations of prayer and of suppliants in the abstract. They are symbols, not pictures of the actual. Now, conventional representations are inspired as a rule in respect of detail, not so much by manners and customs prevalent at the date of their execution, as by an ideal conserved by tradition and at the place and time accepted as fitting. Ancient art has left us examples of pagan as well as of Christian "orantes". The attitude (standing with arms extended or upraised) is substantially

the same in all. This, then, is the attitude symbolical, among the ancients, of prayer. In reality, however, suppliants have, as a matter of course, very generally knelt. Hence such classical phrases as: "Genu ponere alicui" (Curtius); "Inflexo genu adorare" (Seneca); "Nixi genibus" (Livy); "Genibus minor" (Horace). On the other hand, examples are not wanting of Christians who pray standing. The "Stans in medio carceris, expansis manibus orabat", which the Church has adopted as her memory of the holy martyr, St. Agatha, is an illustration. And as late as the end of the sixth century, St. Gregory the Great describes St. Benedict as uttering his dying prayer "stans, erectis in celum manibus" (*Dial.*, II, c. xxxvii). Nor is it unlikely that since standing has always been a posture recognized, and even enjoined, in public and liturgical prayer, it may have survived well into the Middle Ages as one suitable, at least in some circumstances, for even private devotion. Yet, from the fourth century onwards, to kneel has certainly been the rule for private prayer. Eusebius (*Vita Constant.*, IV, xxii) declares kneeling to have been the customary posture of the Emperor Constantine when at his devotions in his oratory. At the end of the century, St. Augustine tells us: "They who pray do with the members of their body that which befits suppliants; they fix their knees, stretch forth their hands, or even prostrate themselves on the ground" (*De curâ pro mortuis*, v). Even for the ante-Nicene period, the conclusion arrived at by Warren is probably substantially correct:—"The recognized attitude for prayer, liturgically speaking, was standing, but kneeling was early introduced for penitential and perhaps ordinary ferial seasons, and was frequently, though not necessarily, adopted in private prayer" (*Liturgy of the ante-Nicene Church*, 145).

It is noteworthy that, early in the sixth century, St. Benedict (*Reg.*, c. 1) enjoins upon his monks that when absent from choir, and therefore compelled to recite the Divine Office as a private prayer, they should not stand as when in choir, but kneel throughout. That, in our time, the Church accepts kneeling as the more fitting attitude for private prayer is evinced by such rules as the Missal rubric directing that, save for a momentary rising while the Gospel is being read, all present kneel from the beginning to the end of a low Mass; and by the recent decrees requiring that the celebrant recite kneeling the prayers (though they include collects which, liturgically, postulate a standing posture) prescribed by Leo XIII to be said after Mass. It is well, however, to bear in mind that there is no real obligation to kneel during private prayer. Thus, unless conditioned on that particular posture being taken, the indulgence attached to a prayer is gained, whether, while reciting it, one kneel or not (*S. Cong. of the Index*, 18 Sept., 1862, n. 398). The "Sacrosanctæ", recited by the clergy after saying the Divine Office, is one of the exceptions. It must be said kneeling, except when illness makes the doing so physically impossible. Turning now to the liturgical prayer of the Christian Church, it is very evident that standing, not kneeling, is the correct posture for those taking part in it. A glance at the attitude of a priest officiating at Mass or Vespers, or using the Roman Ritual, will be sufficient proof. The clergy in attendance also, and even the laity assisting, are, by the rubrics, assumed to be standing. The Canon of the Mass designates them as "circumstantes". The practice of kneeling during the Consecration was introduced during the Middle Ages, and is in relation with the Elevation which originated in the same period. The rubric directing that while the celebrant and his ministers recite the Psalm "Judica", and make the Confession, those present who are not prelates should kneel, is a mere reminiscence of the fact that these introductory devotions were originally private prayers of preparation, and therefore outside the liturgy properly so

called. It must not, in this connexion, escape attention that, in proportion as the faithful have ceased to follow the liturgy, replacing its formulæ by private devotions, the standing attitude has fallen more and more into disuse among them. In our own time it is quite usual for the congregation at a high Mass to stand for the Gospel and Creed; and, at all other times either to remain seated (when this is permitted) or to kneel. There are, nevertheless, certain liturgical prayers to kneel during which is obligatory, the reason being that kneeling is the posture especially appropriate to the supplications of penitents, and is a characteristic attitude of humble entreaty in general. Hence, litanies are chanted, kneeling, unless (which in ancient times was deemed even more fitting) they can be gone through by a procession of mourners. So, too, public penitents knelt during such portions of the liturgy as they were allowed to assist at. The modern practice of Solemn Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for public adoration has naturally led to more frequent and more continuous kneeling in church than formerly. Thus, at a Benediction service it is obligatory to kneel from beginning to end of the function, except during the chant of the *Te Deum* and like hymns of praise.

It has been remarked that penitents knelt during public prayer, the rest of the faithful standing. A corollary easily drawn from this was that in Lent and other penitential seasons, when all Christians without distinction professed themselves to be "penitents", the whole congregation should kneel during the celebration of the Divine Mysteries and during other liturgical prayers. This has given occasion to the Missal rubric, requiring the clergy and by implication the laity, to kneel in Lent, on vigils, ember-days, etc., while the celebrant recites the collects and post-communions of the Mass, and during the whole of the Canon, that is, from the *Sanctus* to the *Agnus Dei*. In early times an attempt was made to insist yet more emphatically on the character of penitents as that most befitting ordinary Christians. A practice crept in of posing in church as penitents, that is, of kneeling, on all days alike. It was a principle akin to that which deemed it a great virtue to fast even on Sundays and feast days. In both cases the exaggeration was condemned and severely repressed. In the twentieth canon of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) the fathers lay down (the canon, though passed over by Rufinus, is undoubtedly genuine):—"Because there are some who kneel on the Lord's Day and in the days of Pentecost [the fifty days between Easter and Whit-Sunday]: that all things may be uniformly performed in every parish or diocese, it seems good to the Holy Synod that the prayers [*τὰς εὐχὰς*] be by all made to God, standing". The canon thus forbids kneeling on Sundays; but (and this is carefully to be noted) does not enjoin kneeling on other days. The distinction indicated of days and seasons is very probably of Apostolic origin. Tertullian, long before Nicæa, had declared kneeling on the Lord's Day to be *nefas* (De Cor. Mil., c. iii). See also pseudo-Justin (Quæst. et Resp. ad Orthodox., Q. 115); Clement of Alexandria (Strom., VII); Peter of Alexandria (can. xv); with others. For post-Nicene times, see St. Hilary (Prolog. in Psalm.); St. Jerome (Dial. contra Lucif., c. iv); St. Epiphanius (Expos. Fidei, 22 and 24); St. Basil (De Spir. Sanct., c. xxvii); St. Maximus (Hom. iii, De Pentec.); etc. Note, however, with Hefele (Councils, II, ii, sect. 42) that St. Paul is expressly stated to have prayed kneeling, during paschal time (Acts, xx, 36; xxi, 5). Moreover St. Augustine, more than fifty years after the Council of Nicæa, writes: "Ut autem stantes in illis diebus et omnibus dominicis oremus utrum ubique servetur nescio" (i.e. but I do not know whether there is still observed everywhere the custom of standing, whilst praying, on those days and on all Sundays). Ep. cxix ad Januar. By canon law (II Decretal., bk., IX, ch. ii) the prohibition to kneel is extended to all principal

festivals, but it is limited to public prayer, "*nisi aliquis ex devotione illud facere velit in secreto*", i. e. (unless anyone, from devotion, should wish to do that in private). In any case, to have the right to stand during public prayer was looked upon as a sort of privilege—an "*immunitas*" (Tertull., loc. cit.).

On the other hand, to be degraded into the class of the "*genuflectentes*", or "*prostrati*", who (Fourth Council of Carthage, can. lxxxii) were obliged to kneel during public services even on Sundays and in paschal time, was deemed a severe punishment. St. Basil calls kneeling the lesser penance (*μετάνοια μικρά*) as opposed to prostration, the greater penance (*μετάνοια μεγάλη*). Standing, on the contrary, was the attitude of praise and thanksgiving. St. Augustine (loc. cit.) considers it to signify joy, and therefore to be the fitting posture for the weekly commemoration by Christians of the Lord's Resurrection, on the first day of the week (See also Cassian, Coll., XXI). Hence, on all days alike, the faithful stood during the chant of psalms, hymns, and canticles, and more particularly during the solemn Eucharistic or Thanksgiving prayer (our Preface) preliminary to the Consecration in the Divine Mysteries. The diaconal invitation (*Στάμεν καλῶς, κ. τ. λ.; ὁρθοί*; Arab. *Urthi*; Armen. *Orthi*) is frequent at this point of the liturgy. Nor have we any grounds for believing, against the tradition of the Roman Church, that during the Canon of the Mass the faithful knelt on weekdays, and stood only on Sundays and in paschal time. It is far more likely that the kneeling was limited to Lent and other seasons of penance. What precisely were the prayers which the Fathers of Nicæa had in view when insisting on the distinction of days is not at once evident. In our time the decree is observed to the letter in regard to the *Salve Regina* or other antiphon to Our Lady with which the Divine Office is concluded, and also in the recitation of the *Angelus*. But both these devotions are of comparatively recent origin. The term prayer (*εὐχή*) used at Nicæa, has in this connection always been taken in its strict significance as meaning supplication (Probst, *Drei ersten Jahrhund., I, art. 2, ch. xlix*). The diaconal litany, general in the East, in which all conditions of men are prayed for, preparatory to the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, comes under this head. And in fact in the Clementine Liturgy (Brightman, 9; Funk, *Didascalia*, 489) there is a rubric enjoining that the deacon, before beginning the litany, invite all to kneel down, and terminate by bidding all to rise up again. It remains however unexplained why the exception for Sundays and paschal time is not expressly recalled. In the Western or Roman Rite, traces of a distinction of days still exist. For instance at the end of the Complin of Holy Saturday there is the rubric: "*Et non flectuntur genua toto tempore Paschali*", which is the Nicene rule to the letter. The decree has likewise (though slightly varied in wording) been incorporated into the canon law of the Church (Dist. iii, De consecrat., c. x). It may be added that, both in the East and in the West, certain extensions of the exemption from the penitential practice of kneeling appear to have been gradually insisted upon. "The 29th Arabic Canon of Nicæa extends the rule of not kneeling, but only bending forward, to all great festivals of Our Lord" (Bright, *Canons of Nicæa*, 86). Consult Mansi, xiv, 89, for a similar modification made by the Third Council of Tours, A.D. 813. See also the c. Quoniam (II Decretal., bk. 9, c. 2) cited above.

To fix with some precision the import of the Nicene canon, as it was understood and reduced to practice by the ancients, the supplications, to which the name "*bidding prayers*" has sometimes been given, merit careful notice. They are the Western analogues of the Eastern diaconal litanies, and recur with great frequency in the old Gallican and Mozarabic uses. In their full form they seem peculiar to the Roman Rite. The officiating bishop or priest invites the faithful

present, who are supposed to be standing, to pray for some intention which he specifies. Thereupon, the deacon in attendance subjoins: "*Flectamus genua*" (Let us kneel down). He is obeyed. Anciently a pause more or less long, spent by each one in private and silent prayer, ensued. This ended at a sign given by the celebrant, or for him by some inferior minister, who, turning to the people with the word "*levate*", bade them stand up again. They having done so, the celebrant summed up, as it were, or collected their silent petitions in a short prayer, hence called a collect. "*Cum is qui orationem collecturus est e terra surrexerit, omnes pariter surgunt*" (Cassian, Instit., II, vii). The stress put in the early Church upon the due performance of this ceremonial explains why, before receiving baptism, a catechumen was required to rehearse it publicly. He is standing before the bishop who addresses him: "*Ora, electe, flecte genua, et dic Pater noster*". This is the "*Oremus, flectamus genua*" of the liturgy. The direction to say the Lord's Prayer in preference to any other, or at least previously to any other, is very natural. A glance at the Roman liturgical books will show what other *preces* were usually added—Kyrie eleison (repeated several times) and certain Psalm verses concluding, as a rule, with "*Domine exaudi orationem meam. Et clamor meus ad te veniat*" (Ps., ci, 1). Then the catechumen is told: "*Leva, comple orationem tuam, et dic Amen*". The words of the prayer in which the officiating priest will collect his supplications and those of the rest of the faithful are omitted, as it is only the catechumen's part in the common prayer which is being dealt with. The catechumen rises and says "*Amen*". This is gone through three times and the catechumen having shown that he has learned how to comport himself during the "*oratio fidelium*" of the liturgy in which he will henceforth take part, the baptismal ceremony is proceeded with (See Roman Ritual, De Baptismo Adultorum; and Van der Stappen, IV, Q. cxvii).

Of silent kneeling prayer the characteristic example is the group of prayers for all conditions of men in our Good Friday liturgy. They have retained the name "*Orationes solemnes*" (usual prayers) because, in primitive ages, gone through in every public Mass. They are the Latin "*Oratio Fidelium*", and their place in the daily liturgy is still marked by the "*Oremus*" invitation at the Offertory (Duchesne, Origines du culte chrétien, ch. vi, art. 5). The same form of prayer obtains at ordinations and in some few other rites. But it has long since been shorn of its most striking feature. The faithful are indeed bidden to kneel down; but straightway follows the order to stand up again, the impressive pause being suppressed. Again, nowadays, the object of the prayer is mostly no longer announced. The single word "*Oremus*" uttered by the celebrant is followed immediately by "*Flectamus genua*", with its momentary genuflexion, "*Levate*", and the collect (see, in the Roman Missal, the ember-day Masses, etc.). The learned Bishop Van der Stappen (Sacra Liturg., II, Q. lxxv) is of opinion that anciently on all days alike, there was a pause for silent prayer after every "*Oremus*" introducing a collect; and that on Sundays and other non-penitential days this same silent prayer was made by all standing and with hands raised to Heaven. The invitation *Flectamus genua* merely reminded the faithful that the day was one of those on which, by the custom of the Church, they had to pray kneeling. The rubrics for the Pentecost ember-days which occur in paschal time, and that prefixed to the last collect in the blessing of candles on the feast of the Purification, strengthen this view. Another instance of kneeling prayer (probably replaced by one said standing, on Sundays and in paschal time) is that of the benedictions or short collects which, in early ages, it was usual to add after the recitation of each psalm, in public, and often in private, worship. The short prayers called

"absolutions" in the Office of Matins are a survival of this discipline. (For a complete set of these prayers see Mozarabic Breviary in P.L., LXXXV). These collects were said kneeling, or at least were preceded by a brief prayer gone through in that attitude. They are probably the "*genuflectiones*", the multiplicity of which in the daily life of some of the earlier saints astonishes us (see for instance the Life of St. Patrick in the Roman Breviary, 17 March). The kneeling posture is that at present enjoined for the receiving of the sacraments, or at least confirmation, Holy Eucharist, penance and Holy orders. Certain exceptions, however, seem to show that this was not always the case. Thus, the supreme pontiff, when solemnly celebrating, receives Holy Communion in both kinds, seated; and, remaining seated, administers it to his deacons who are standing. In like manner, should a cardinal who is only a priest or deacon be elected pope; he is ordained priest (if he has not yet taken the step) and consecrated bishop, while sitting on his faldstool before the altar. It seems reasonable to suppose that at the Last Supper the Apostles were seated round the table when Christ gave them His sacred Body and Blood. That, in the early Church, the faithful stood when receiving into their hands the consecrated particle can hardly be questioned. Cardinal Bona indeed (Rer. Liturg., II, xvii, 8) hesitates somewhat as to Roman usage; but declares that in regard to the East there can be no doubt whatever. He inclines moreover to the view that at the outset the same practice obtained in the West (cf. Bingham, XVI, v). St. Dionysius of Alexandria, writing to one of the popes of his time, speaks emphatically of "one who has stood by the table and has extended his hand to receive the Holy Food" (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., VII, ix). The custom of placing the Sacred Particle in the mouth, rather than in the hand of the communicant, dates in Rome from the sixth, and in Gaul from the ninth century (Van der Stappen, IV, 227; cf. St. Greg., Dial., I, III, c. iii). The change of attitude in the communicant may perhaps have come about nearly simultaneously with this. Greater reverence was being insisted upon; and if it be true that in some places each communicant mounted the altar-steps, and took for himself a portion of the consecrated Eucharist (Clem. Alex., Strom., I, i) some reform was sorely needed.

II. A GESTURE OF REVERENCE.—This is peculiar to the Roman Rite, and consists in the momentary bending of one or both knees so as to touch the earth. Genuflexion, understood in this sense, has now almost everywhere in the Western Church been substituted for the profound bowing down of head and body that formerly obtained, and that is still maintained in the East as the supreme act of liturgical reverence. It is laid down by modern authorities that a genuflexion includes every sort of inclination, so that any bowing while kneeling is, as a rule, superfluous (Martinucci, Man. Sac. Cærem., I, i, nn. 5 and 6). There are certain exceptions, however, to this rule, in the liturgical cultus of the Blessed Sacrament. The practice of genuflexion has no claim to antiquity of origin. It appears to have been introduced and gradually to have spread in the West during the later Middle Ages, and scarcely to have been generally looked upon as obligatory before the end of the fifteenth century. The older Roman Missals make no mention of it. Father Thurston gives A.D. 1502 as the date of the formal and semi-official recognition of these genuflexions. Even after it became usual to raise the consecrated Host and Chalice for the adoration of the Faithful after the Consecration, it was long before the priest's preceding and following genuflexions were insisted upon (see Thurston in "The Month", Oct., 1897). The genuflexions now indicated at such words as "*Et incarnatus est*", "*Et Verbum caro factum est*", and the like, are likewise



of comparatively recent introduction, though in some cases they replace a prostration that was usual, in ancient times, when the same sacred words were solemnly uttered (see, for instance, in regard to the "Et incarnatus", the curious passage in the work of Radulphus Tongrensis (De can. observ.). The Carthusian custom of bending the knee, yet so as not to touch the ground, is curious; and has interest from the historical point of view as testifying to the reluctance formerly felt by many to the modern practice of genuflecting. See also the Decree of the S. Cong. of Rites (n. 3402) of 7 July, 1876, insisting that women as well as men must genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament. The simple bending of the knee, unlike prostration, cannot be traced to sources outside Christian worship. Thus, the pagan and classical gesture of adoration consisted in the standing before the being or thing to be worshipped, in putting the right hand to the mouth (ad ora), and in turning the body to the right. The act of falling down, or prostration, was introduced in Rome when the Cæsars brought from the East the Oriental custom of worshipping the emperors in this manner as gods. "Caium Cæsarem adorari ut deum constituit cum reversus ex Syria non aliter adire ausus esset quam capite velato circumvertens se, deinde procumbens" (Suet., Vit., ii). The liturgical rules for genuflecting are now very definite. (1) All genuflect (bending both knees) when adoring the Blessed Sacrament unveiled, as at Expositions. (2) All genuflect (bending the right knee only) when doing reverence to the Blessed Sacrament, enclosed in the Tabernacle, or lying upon the corporal during the Mass. Mass-servers are not to genuflect, save when the Blessed Sacrament is at the altar where Mass is being said (cf. Wapelhorst, *infra*). The same honour is paid to a relic of the True Cross when exposed for public veneration. (3) The clergy in liturgical functions genuflect on one knee to the cross over the high altar, and likewise in passing before the bishop of the diocese when he presides at a ceremony. From these genuflections, however, an officiating priest, as also all prelates, canons, etc., are dispensed, bowing of the head and shoulders being substituted for the genuflection. (4) On Good Friday, after the ceremony of the Adoration of the Cross, and until Holy Saturday, all, clergy and laity alike, genuflect in passing before the unveiled cross upon the high altar.

HEFELE, *Hist. des Conciles*, I (Paris, 1907), 618; BONA, *Recur. Liturgicarum libri duo*; MARTENE, *De Antiquis Ecclesie Ritibus* (Rouen, 1700-02); VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1904); MERATI, *Commentar. in Gasarum*, I, bk. XV, etc.; THURSTON in *The Month* (Oct., 1897); *Ephemeres Liturgice*, II, 583; XVI, 82; XIX, 16; BINGHAM, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, XIII, viii, sect. 3 (London, 1875); HOOK, *Church Dictionary*, 424 sqq. (ed. 1859); SCUDAMORE in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. (London, 1893); RIDGLEY, *Christian Antiquities*, IV, 1, 4; WARREN, *Ante-Nicene Church*, ch. ii, 17 (London, 1897); LECLERCQ, *Man. d'Archéol. Chrét.* (Paris, 1907); WAPELHORST, *Comp. sac. liturg.* (New York, 1904); *Baltimore Cereemonial*.  
F. THOMAS BERGH.

**Geoffrey of Clairvaux**, a disciple of St. Bernard, was b. between the years 1115 and 1120, at Auxerre; d. some time after the year 1188, probably at the abbey of Haute Combe, Savoy. At an early age he entered the ranks of the clergy, and followed for some time the course of lectures given by Abelard. In 1140 St. Bernard of Clairvaux came to Paris, and before the assembled scholars preached a sermon "De conversione ad clericos" (P. L., CLXXXII, 832 sqq.), in which he dwelt on the vanities of a life in the world, on the necessity of a sincere conversion, and on the peace to be found in the monastic profession. Geoffrey was so struck by this forcible discourse that, with several others, he followed St. Bernard and joined the monastic community of Clairvaux. Soon he won the special confidence of the saintly abbot, became his *notarius*, or secretary, and his permanent companion. In 1145 he accompanied him to Toulouse and other cities of Southern France, where the saint preached against

the Manichæan or Albigensian heresy of a certain Henry and his partisans. During the years 1146-47 he travelled with St. Bernard through France and Germany, where the saint aroused the people for a crusade to the Holy Land. At the council held at Reims in 1148 he took an active part in the discussion concerning the errors of Gilbert de la Porrée. In 1159 he was made abbot of the monastery of Igny in the Diocese of Reims, and in 1162 he became the fourth Abbot of Clairvaux. Owing to difficulties with the monks, he was forced to resign in 1165; but in 1170 he was appointed to the abbey of Fossa Nuova in the diocese of Terracina, Italy, and in 1176 to that of Haute Combe, Savoy. In the political events of the time he had only a small share; thus, in 1167 and 1168, he took part in the negotiations tending towards the reconciliation of Alexander III (1159-81) with the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa (1152-90) and King Henry II of England (1154-89).

Most of the literary activity of Geoffrey has reference to the life and work of St. Bernard. Thus, while still *notarius* of the saint, he collected the letters of his abbot, variously estimated at 243 or 310 (P. L., CLXXXII, 67 sqq.). He was the chief author of a life of St. Bernard in five books, furnishing materials for the first two books, revising them, and adding three of his own (P. L., CLXXXV, 225 sqq.). He also wrote fragments of a life of St. Bernard, probably used in the first books of the complete life (P. L., CLXXXV, 523 sqq.); an account of the saint's journey to Toulouse, in a letter to his teacher Archenfredus (P. L., CLXXXV, 410 sqq.); an account of the saint's journey through Germany, the third part of the sixth book of St. Bernard's life in P. L., CLXXXV, 395 sqq. (this description and the parts in the life of St. Bernard relating to Germany were edited also by Waitz, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, XXVI, 109-20, 133-37); a panegyric delivered in 1163 on the anniversary of St. Bernard's death (in P. L., CLXXXV, 573 sqq.); "Declamationes de colloquio Simonis cum Jesu" (in P. L., CLXXXIV, 437 sqq.), an ascetical work compiled from the sermons of St. Bernard; "Libellus contra capitula Gilberti Pictaviensis Episcopi" (in P. L., CLXXXV, 595 sqq.), a refutation of the errors of Gilbert de la Porrée; a letter to Albinus, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, on the same subject (in P. L., CLXXXV, 587 sqq.); a life of St. Peter, Archbishop of Tarentaise (1175), published in *Acta Sanctorum* Boll., May, II, 330 sqq.; a letter to the above-named Cardinal of Albano, as to whether the water added to the wine in the chalice is changed into the blood of Our Lord (Baronius, *Ann. Eccl.*, ad an. 1188, n. 27); sermons and commentaries on books of Scripture, partly in print and partly manuscript.

HUFFER, *Der hl. Bernard von Clairvaux* (Münster, 1886); VACANDARD, *Vie de St. Bernard*, I (3rd ed., Paris, 1902); STREBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Gottfried von Clairvaux*; DEUTSCH in *Realencyklopädie*, s. v. *Gottfried von Clairvaux*.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

**Geoffrey of Dunstable**, also known as GEOFFREY OF GORHAM, Abbot of St. Alban's, d. at St. Alban's, 26 Feb., 1146. He was a scholar from the province of Maine, then annexed to the Dukedom of Normandy, who was invited by Richard, Abbot of St. Alban's, to become master of the abbey school. On his arrival, he found that owing to his long delay another had been appointed, whereupon he opened a school at Dunstable. Having borrowed some copes from St. Alban's Abbey for a miracle play to be acted by his scholars, he had the misfortune to lose his house and all its contents by fire on the evening after the performance. To make up to God and the saint for the loss of the copes, he determined to become a monk of St. Alban's Abbey. Here he rose to be prior, and finally was elected abbot on the death of Richard, in 1119. He ruled firmly for twenty-six years, and the abbey prospered under his wise admin-



istration. He added to the buildings a guest hall and an infirmary with chapel attached, and spent large sums on a new shrine to which he translated the body of St. Alban, 2 Aug., 1129. Geoffrey endowed the nunnery at Sopwell, and founded another at Markyate, in Bedfordshire, for his friend and counsellor, Christina the recluse. He also opened a leper hospital near St. Alban's. Finally, he succeeded in saving the abbey when it was threatened with destruction during the Civil War in the reign of Stephen.

*Gesta Abbatum S. Albani in Rolls Series*, I, 72-105 (London, 1867); *Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit.* (London, 1844), II, 109; *Hunt in Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1890), s. v. *Geoffrey of Gorham*, with references to medieval sources.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Geoffrey of Monmouth** (GAUFRIDUS ARTURUS, GALFRIDUS MONEMUTENSIS, GALLFRAY OF GRUFFYD AB ARTHUR), Bishop of St. Asaph and chronicler; b. at Monmouth about 1100; d. at Llandaff, 1154. He was the son of Arthur, a priest, and was educated by his uncle Uchtryd, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff. It has been surmised that he became a Benedictine monk, but this is uncertain. At Oxford he met Walter the Archdeacon, who suggested to him the idea of his great work, "*Historia Regum Britanniae*". About 1140 he accompanied Uchtryd to Llandaff, where he became archdeacon of St. Teilo's, and opened schools in which many clerics and chieftains were educated. The "*Historia*" had appeared before 1139, but Geoffrey continued to work at it, and in 1147 he completed it in its final form. In 1151-2 he was elected Bishop of St. Asaph and was consecrated at Lambeth by Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, on 24 Feb., having been ordained priest a week before; but he died without having entered his diocese. Geoffrey's "*History*" has been one of the great influences in English literature, making itself especially felt in the national romance from Layamon to Tennyson. Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Pope, and Wordsworth have all used his legends, while many of the earlier chroniclers followed him as an historian. But the twelve books of his "*History*", recounting how Brut, great-grandson of Æneas, founded the kingdom, and narrating the adventures of subsequent kings, are in truth not history at all but the beginning of English story-telling. Among his legends is that of King Arthur, which became the most famous of the great cycles of romance so popular in the Middle Ages. Geoffrey's legend having received a new form from Sir Thomas Malory in the fifteenth century has again been given fresh life by Tennyson in the "*Idylls of the King*". Geoffrey claimed that his work was founded on a "most ancient book"—probably a collection of British legends no longer extant. Geoffrey also wrote a Latin version of the Cymric "*Prophecies of Merlin*" and a life of Merlin is attributed to him. His stories exercised a wide influence in Germany, France, and Italy, while in England they furthered the unification of the English people by spreading belief in a common origin of Briton, Saxon, and Norman. The "*Historia Britonum*" was first printed at Paris, 1508; the latest editions being those of Giles (London, 1844) and Schulz (Halle, 1854).

*Wright, Biographia Brit. Lit.*, Anglo-Norman period (London, 1846), 143-50; *Idem, Literary History of Geoffrey of Monmouth's History of the Britons in Archaeologia*, XXXII (1847), 335-49; *HARDY, Descriptive Catalogue*, giving list of MSS. (1862-71); *WARD, Catalogue of Romances in the MSS. Department Brit. Museum* (1883); *ZIMMER, Zeitschr. neuphranz. Sprache und Lit.* (1890), XII, i, 231-256; *TEDDER in Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; *DUCHESNE, L'Historia Britonum in Revue Celtique*, XVII (1896), 1-5; *CHEVALIER, Bio-Bibl.* (Paris, 1905), p. 1707.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Geoffrey of Vendôme**, (GOFFRIDUS ABBAS VINCINENSIS), cardinal, b. in the second half of the eleventh century of a noble family, at Angers, France; d. there, 26 March, 1132. At an early age he entered the Benedictine community of the Blessed Trinity at

Vendôme in the diocese of Chartres; and in 1093, while still very young and only a deacon, was chosen abbot of the community. During all his lifetime he showed a great attachment to the Holy See. Thus, in 1094, he went to Rome in order to help Pope Urban II (1088-99) to take possession of the Lateran still held by the faction of the antipope Clement III (1080-1100); the money which he offered to the custodian brought about the surrender. In compensation he was created a cardinal-priest by Urban II, with the titular church of St. Prisca on the Aventine. No less than twelve times did he make the journey to Italy in the interest of the Church of Rome during the pontificates of Urban II, Paschal II (1099-1118), and Callistus II (1119-24); and on three different occasions he was made a captive. In 1096 and 1107 he extended the hospitality of his monastery to Popes Urban and Paschal. He took part in the councils held at Clermont, in 1095, by Pope Urban; at Saintes, in 1096, by the Apostolic Legate Amatus of Bordeaux; and at Reims, in 1131, by Innocent II (1130-43). He also strenuously defended the ecclesiastical principles in the question of investitures, which he qualified in several small tracts as heresy and simony; he wrote in the same spirit to Pope Paschal II when the latter made concessions (1111) to Emperor Henry V (1106-25). Finally, he always defended firmly the prerogatives, the rights, and the property of his abbey at Vendôme against the encroachments of either bishops or secular princes. Geoffrey was one of the distinguished men of his age, and was in correspondence with many eminent personalities of that time. His writings consist of a number of letters; of a series of tracts on the investitures of ecclesiastics by laymen, on the Sacraments of the Holy Eucharist, Baptism, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction, on ascetic and pastoral subjects; hymns to the Blessed Virgin and St. Mary Magdalene; sermons on the feasts of Our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, Mary Magdalene, and St. Benedict.


The best edition of his works is that of Sirmond (Paris, 1610), reprinted in P. L., CLVII. The tracts on the investitures are found also in "*Mon. Germ. Hist.: Libelli de Lite*", II, 680 sqq.

*COMPAIN, Etude sur Geoffroi de Vendôme* (Paris, 1891); *Notitia historica literaria in P. L.*, CLVII, 9 sqq.; *SACKUR in Mon. Germ. Hist.: Lib. de Lite*, II, 676 sqq.; *IDEM in Neues Archiv*, XVII (1892), 329 sqq.; XVIII (1893), 866 sqq.; *MIRBT in Realencykl. für prot. Theol.*, s. v. *Geoffroy von Vendôme*; *CHEVALIER, Bio-Bibl.*, s. v. *Geoffroy d'Angers*.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

**Geography, BIBLICAL.**—With the exception of the didactic literature, there is no book in the Bible which, to a greater or less extent, does not contain mention of, or allusions to, the geography and topography of the Holy Land. In early times, when the perusal of the Sacred Books was confined within the limits of the country in which they had come to light, there was little need of any special attention to geographical details. Palestine has a small area, and every one of its inhabitants was acquainted with almost every by-corner and nook in it. Not so, however, the outside reader—the Jew of the Diaspora, for instance. But little did he care, in many cases, for such trifles as topographical niceties; God's message was all he was looking for in Holy Writ; as to those who longed for a fuller knowledge of the land of their forefathers, an occasional pilgrimage thither, at a time when local traditions were still alive, afforded ample opportunities. After A.D. 70, Jewish pilgrims ceased to flock to Palestine; on the other hand, zealous Christians, whilst at times casting a glance towards the land whence the light of the Gospel had come, would rather "stretch forth themselves to the things that are before", and direct their conquering steps to new shores. It thus happened that when the Church obtained her long-delayed freedom from the throes of persecution, and her scholars turned their minds to a searching study of





MAP OF PALESTINE IN THE OLD-TESTAMENT PERIOD

NOTE: THE PORTION WEST OF THE RIVER JORDAN IS TAKEN FROM THE SURVEYS OF THE PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND



the Bible, they realized that much of the book would remain sealed to them unless they were acquainted with the Holy Land. To this deeply-felt need Biblical geography, as a help to the study of the Scriptures, owes its birth (cf. St. Aug., *De Doctr. Chr.*, II, xvi, 24; Cassiod., *De Institut. div. lit.*, xxv; St. Jer., *Ad Rom.*, et Rogat. in I Paralip., *Præf.*). Its necessity has never since been questioned, and its growth has kept abreast of the strivings after a better knowledge of the literal and historical sense of the Scriptures. The study of Biblical geography is pursued more than ever in our time, and it may not be amiss to mention here the principal sources and means at its disposal.

First of all, of course, stands the Bible, some parts of which, however, must be singled out, owing to their importance from the present point of view. The ethnographical list in Gen., x, is a valuable contribution to the knowledge of the old general geography of the East, and its importance can scarcely be overestimated. The catalogues of stations of the Hebrew people in their journeyings from Egypt to the bank of the Jordan supply us with ample information concerning the topography of the Sinaitic Peninsula, the southern and eastern borders of the Dead Sea. In the Book of Josue is to be found a well-nigh complete survey of Palestine (especially of Southern Palestine) and the territory allotted to Juda in particular. Later books add little to the wealth of topographical details given there, but rather give a casual glimpse of an ever-growing acquaintance with places abroad—in Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia. The centuries following the Exile were for the adventurous Israelites a period of expansion. Colonies of thrifty merchants multiplied wonderfully East and West, above all throughout the Greek and Roman world, and Palestinian folks had to train their ears to many new, "barbarous" names of places where their kinsmen had settled. The Church at Jerusalem, therefore, was well prepared to listen with interest to the accounts of Barnabas's and Paul's missions abroad (Acts, xv, 12; xxi, 19).

While the authors of the English Authorized Version (A.V.) have made efforts to preserve proper names in their old Hebrew mould, our Douay Version (D.V.) adheres, as a rule, to the Latin transliteration. This imperfection is, however, by no means to be compared with that which arises from the astounding transcriptions of the Codex Vaticanus from which the Greek *textus receptus* was printed. To cite at random a few instances, Baurim has become Βαράκι; Deb-baseth, Heb. *Dabbasheth*, Βαυβάραβα; Eglon, 'Οδολλάμ or ΑΔΔάμ; Gethremmon, 'Ιεθαθά, etc., not to speak of the frequent confusion of the sounds *d* and *r* or of the proper names wrongly translated, as 'En Shemesh by ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ ἡλίου, etc. Thanks to a systematic correction of the whole text, such divergences are not to be found in the Codex Alexandrinus. Biblical information is in a good many instances paralleled, and not unfrequently supplemented, by the indications gathered from the documents unearthed in Egypt and Assyria. No fewer than 119 towns of Palestine are mentioned in the lists of Thothmes III (about 1600 B.C.); the names of some 70 Canaanite cities occur in the famous Tell-el-Amarna letters (about 1450 B.C.); on the walls of Karnak the boastful records of the conquests of Sheshonk I (Sesac) exhibit a list of 156 names of places, all in Central and Southern Palestine (935 B.C.); the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings Tukulti Pal-Esarra III (Teglathphalasar, 745-27), Sarru-kinu (Sargon, 722-05), and Sin-akhi-erba (Sennacherib, 705-681) add a few new names. From the comparison of all these lists, it appears that some hundred of the Palestinian cities mentioned in the Bible are also recorded in documents ranging from the sixteenth to the eighth centuries B.C.

"The immovable East" still preserves under the present Arabic garb a goodly proportion (three-fourths, according to Col. C. R. Conder) of the old

geographical vocables of the Bible; in most instances the name still cleaves either to the modern city which has supplanted the old one (e.g. *Beit-Lahm* for Bethlehem), or to the ruins of the latter (e.g. *Khirbet 'Almūth*), or the site it occupied (e.g. *Tell Jezer* for Jazer; *Tell Ta'annak* for Taanach); sometimes it has shifted to the neighbouring dale, spring, well, or hill (as *Wady Yabis*). The history of the Palestinian cities and of the changes which some local names have undergone in the intervening centuries is traced, and the identification helped, by the information supplied by geographers, historians, and travellers. In this regard, parts of the works of classical geographers, such as Strabo and Ptolemy, are consulted with profit; but they cannot compete with Eusebius's "Onomasticon", the worth of which was already recognized by St. Jerome, any more than the Peutinger Table, however useful, can rival the Madaba Mosaic Map (dating probably from Justinian's time) discovered in the autumn of 1897. The "Peregrinatio Silvæ" (whatever the true name of the authoress), the descriptions of the Bordeaux pilgrim, the accounts of those whom the piety of the Middle Ages brought to the Holy Land, the histories of the Crusades and of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, and, lastly, the Arab geographers afford valuable material to the student of Biblical geography.

The topography, as well as the history, of Palestine is a favourite study of the present day. Governments commission to the East diplomatic agents who are masters of archaeology; schools have been founded at Jerusalem and elsewhere to enable Biblical students, as St. Jerome recommended (in lib. Paralip., *Præf.*), to acquire a personal acquaintance with the sites and the natural conditions of the country; and all—diplomats, scholars, masters, and students—scour the land, survey it, search its innermost recesses, copy inscriptions, make excavations, sift on the spot the evidences furnished by the Bible and all available authorities. The results of their labours are published in periodicals founded for that particular purpose (such as the "Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement", the "Zeitschrift", and the "Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palästina-Vereins", the "Palästina-jahrbuch") or appear as important contributions in reviews of a wider scope (like the "Revue Biblique", the "Mélanges d'Archéologie orientale" or the "American Journal of Archaeology"). In the bibliography given at the end of this article the reader will find a list of the works of scholars who, especially in the last fifty years, have earned fame in the field of Biblical geography, and a right to the gratitude of all students of Sacred Scripture.

The name *Palestine*, first used to designate the territory of the Philistines, was, after the Roman period, gradually extended to the whole southern portion of Syria. It applies to the country stretching from the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon to the Sinaitic Desert, and from the Mediterranean to the Arabian Desert. Politically, the limits varied in the course of Biblical times. The old Land of Canaan was relatively small: it included the region west of the Jordan between a line running from the foot of the Hermon Range to Sidon, and another line from the southern end of the Dead Sea to Gaza. David's and Solomon's possessions were considerably larger; they probably extended north-eastward to the Syrian, and eastward to the Arabian Desert. Two classical expressions occur frequently in the Bible to designate the whole length of the land in historical times: "from the entrance of Emath [i.e., probably, the *Merj Ayūn*] to the river of Egypt [*Wady el-Arish*]", or "to the Sea of the Wilderness [Dead Sea]" and "from Dan to Bersabee". This represents, in the estimate of St. Jerome, about 160 Roman miles (141 Engl. m.). As to the breadth of the country, the same Father declared himself ashamed to state it, lest heathens might take occasion from his assertions to blaspheme (Ep.



ad Dardan, 129). According to the measurements of the English surveyors, the area of the Holy Land is about 9700 square miles, a trifle over that of the State of Vermont. These figures are humble indeed compared to those found in the Talmud, where (Talm. Babyl., "Sotah," 49b) Palestine is given an area of 2,250,000 Roman square miles—more than half the area of the United States.

The Land of Israel is a "land of hills and plains" (Deut., xi, 11). To the north, two great ranges of mountains, the Lebanon and the Anti-Lebanon, or Hermon, separated by the deep valley of Coelesyria (El-Beqá'a), raise their summits to a height of 9000 or 10,000 feet. The Lebanon was never within the borders of Israel; it remained the possession of the Phœnicians and of their Syrian successors; but the Hebrews liked to speak about its majestic grandeur, its slopes covered with oaks, firs, and cedars, its peaks capped with nearly perennial snow. Glistening closer on the northern frontier, Mt. Hermon—*Sirion* of the Sidonians, *Sanir* of the Amorrites, *Jebel esh-Sheikh*—was perhaps more familiar. On both sides of the Jordan the mountains of Palestine prolong these two ranges. West of the upper course of the river, the mountains of Galilee gradually decrease towards the plain of Esdrelon which alone divides the highland. Only a few hills, among which Thabor (A.V. Tabor; *J. et-Tôr*), Moreh (*Nebi-Dahi*, "Little Hermon"), and the heights of Gelboe (A.V. Gilboa; *J. Fuq'á'a*), bordering the plain to the east, connect the lesser ranges of Galilee with the mountains of Ephraim. The country then rises steadily, studded with rounded hills—among them Ebal and Garizim (A.V. Gerizim)—riven east and west by torrents, and is continued in the "Mountains of Juda" (3000 ft.), to decrease farther south (Bersabee, 700 ft.) and be connected through the "Mountains of Seir" (*Jebel Madera*, *J. Maqra*, *J. 'Aráif*) and the *J. et-Tih*, with the first approaches of Sinai. The mountains of Ephraim and those of Juda decline gradually towards the Mediterranean Sea, the last western hillocks bordering on the rich plain of Saron (A.V. Sharon), south of Mount Carmel, and on the Sephelah (A.V. Shephelah). As the Jordan Valley sinks while the plateau rises, the eastern ravines are the deeper (the Cedron falls 4000 ft. between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea), and west of the Dead Sea, the wilderness of Juda becomes a labyrinth of rugged and precipitous gorges, the favourite haunt of outlaws at all times (cf. I Sam., D.V.I Kings, xxii, xxiii, xxiv), the last stronghold of Jewish independence (Masada, April, A.D. 73), and the time-honoured retreat of the Essenes and of the early Christian hermits.

East of the Jordan, the Hermon range is prolonged by the "mountains of Basan" [A.V. Bashan] (*Jólan*), to the north of the Yarmúk (*Sheri'at el-Menadhireh*), the "mountains of Galaad" [A.V. Gilead] from the Yarmúk to the Arnon (*J. 'Ajlán* and *J. Jil'ad*), north and south respectively to the Jaboc, or *Wády Zerká*, the Abarim Mountains, and the highlands of Moab, east of the Dead Sea; farther south this orographic system is continued by the ranges east of the 'Araba (*Jebá*, *J. esh-Sherá*), the *J. Táuran* and the mountains of Western Arabia (*Hedjaz*, etc.). Tumbling down abruptly towards the Jordan and the Dead Sea, the mountains of Basan, of Galaad, and of Moab buttress the plateaux of the desert, where from time immemorial the nomad tribes of Bedouin have roamed. Only east of the watershed of the Yarmúk, some fifty miles from the Jordan, does the plateau rise to an altitude of 3500 feet in the volcanic region of the Hauran, where some peaks tower to a height of over 5000 feet, and north-east of which stretches, 25 miles long and 20 miles wide, and with the average depth of 500 feet, the broken sea of lava of the Trachon (*Lejdh*). With the exception of the Trachon, and the mountains of Hauran—which lie beyond the limits of classical Palestine—and of a small volcanic section in the

north-east, which lies between Mount Hermon and the river Yarmúk, and extends westwards to Mount Thabor, the surface rock of Palestine is a soft limestone containing many fossils; it is hollowed by numberless caverns, some of which are mentioned in Scripture, once, probably, the dwelling-places of the early inhabitants of the country; in later times the favourite cells of anchorites.

The most wonderful geographical and geological feature of Palestine is the gigantic depression which divides the country into two halves. It is the natural continuation of the ravine through which the Orontes (*Nahr el-'Asi*) and the Leontes (*N. el-Lutáni*) have furrowed their beds. From "the entrance of Emath", the *Ghôr*, as this depression is called by the Arabs, runs directly south, falling persistently with an average gradient of 15 feet per mile, and passes at an altitude of 1285 feet below the sea level, under the blue waters of the Bahr Lût, the bed of which reaches a depth of more than 1300 feet below the water level, this being the lowest point of this unparalleled depression. Towards the south the bed of the Salt Sea rises, but the furrow is continued through the 'Araba, which, although in some places it goes to a height of 781 feet above the Red Sea, remains much lower than the bordering regions, and finally plunges into the Gulf of 'Aqaba. From the "waters of Merom" (*Bahr el-Hüleh*) to the Lake of Tiberias (*Bahr Tabartyeh*) the *Ghôr* is scarcely more than a narrow gap; it broadens to about four miles south of the lake, then narrows to a mile and a half before reaching the plain of Beisan, where it spreads to a breadth of eight miles. South of *'Ain es-Saqût*, down to the confluence of the Jaboc, the valley is only two miles wide; but it soon expands again and north of the Dead Sea measures twelve to fourteen miles.

Inside the *Ghôr* the Jordan has ploughed its double bed. The larger bed, the *Zôr*, is an alluvial plain, the width of which varies from 1200 feet to a mile and a half; it is sunken eighteen to twenty feet in the upper course of the river, forty to ninety feet in the middle course, and about one hundred and eighty feet at some distance north of the Dead Sea. The *Zôr* is very fertile except in its few last miles (the 'Arabah or "desert" of Scripture), where the salt-saturated soil is barren and desolate. Sunken within the *Zôr*, and hidden behind a dense screen of oleanders, acacias, thorns, and similar shrubbery, the Jordan (*esh-Sheri'at el-Kebir*, "the Great Trough") follows its serpentine course, swiftly rolling its cream-coloured waters through a succession of rapids which render it practically unnavigable. "The Great Trough" of Palestine is much narrower than its celebrity might lead one to suppose. A few miles below Lake Hüleh, its width is only 75 feet; about twenty miles, as the crow flies, north of the Dead Sea, it measures some 115 feet; but as it goes down towards the Sea, the river broadens to 225 feet. Before the Roman period no bridges existed over the Jordan; communications were active, nevertheless, between both banks, thanks to the shallowness of the water, which is fordable in five or six places (Jos., ii, 7; Judges, iii, 28; vii, 24; xii, 5, 6, etc.). Early in the spring, however, this is utterly impossible, for the river, swollen by the melting snow of Mount Hermon, overflows its banks and spreads over the whole area of the *Zôr* (Jos., iii, 15; I Par., xii, 15; Eccles., xxiv, 36). The Jordan is formed by the union of three springs, respectively known as Nahr el-Hasbáni, N. el-Leddán, and N. Baniyas, which meet nine miles north of Lake Hüleh. On both sides it receives many tributaries, very few of which are explicitly mentioned in Scripture. We may mention, on the west side, the N. el-Bîreh, which comes down from Mount Thabor, the N. el-Jalúd, bringing down from Nebi Dahi the waters of 'Ain-Jalúd, possibly the site of the trial of Gideon's companions (Judges, vii, 4, 6), the *Wády Far'ah*, which originates near Mount

Hebal and Mount Garizim, the W. Nawaimeh, the pass to the heights of Bethel (*Beitn*; cf. Jos., xvi, 1), and, below Jericho, the W. el-Kelt, the "torrent of Carith (A.V. Cherith)" mentioned in III (A.V. I) Kings, xvii, 3, according to many Biblical geographers. On the east, besides many brooks draining the hill country of Galaad, the Jordan receives, south of the Lake of Tiberias, the Sheri 'at el-Menadhreh, not spoken of in the Bible (Yarmūk of the Talmud, Hieromax of the Greek writers), the W. Yabis, the name of which recalls that of the city of Jabes-Galaad W. (I Kings, xi; xxxi, 11-13), the Jaboc (V. *ez-Zerqa*), the Nimrin (cf. Bethemra, Num., xxxii, 36; Jos., xiii, 27), and, a few miles from the Dead Sea, the united waters of the W. Kefrein and W. Hesbān (cf. Hesebon, A.V. Heshbon, Num., xxi, 26; Jos., xxi, 39, etc.).

Among the rivers and torrents debouching into the Dead Sea from the mountains of Juda, only one deserves notice, viz., the Wādy en-Nār, made up of the often dry Cedron (Wādy Sitti Maryam), east of Jerusalem, and the "Valley of Ennon" (W. er-Rabābi) to the south of the Holy City. Many torrents stream from the highlands of Moab; among these may be mentioned the Wādy 'Ayn Mūsā, the name of which preserves the memory of the great leader of Israel, the Arnon (W. el-Mojib), the Wādy of Kerak, probably the Biblical Zared, the "waters of Nemrim [A.V. Nimrim]" (Is., xv, 6; Jer., xlviii, 34.—W. Nemeira), and finally the W. el-Qurāh, very likely the "torrent of the willows" of Is., xv, 7.

In the Mediterranean watershed, from the extreme north of Phœnicia, the most famous rivers are the Eleutherus (I Mach., xi, 7; xii, 30.—Nahr el-Kebīr), the N. el-Qasimiyeh (Leontes of the Greeks), the N. el-Muqattā (Cison; A.V. Kishon), the N. ez-Zerqā, very likely the "flumen Crocodilon" of Pliny (Hist. Nat., V, xvii) and the Sichor Labanah of the Bible (Jos., xix, 26.—A.V. Shihōr-libnath), the N. el-Falēq, possibly the Nahal Qanah (D.V. "valley of reeds"; A.V. Kanah) of Jos., xvi, 8 and xvii, 9, the N. Rābīn, one of the confluent of which, the W. es-Sarār, runs through the famous "valley of Sorek" (A. V. Sorek.—Judges, xvi, 4, etc.), the N. Sukreir, into which opens the "valley of the terebinth" (A.V. "valley of Elah".—I Kings, xvii, 2, 19; xxi, 9—probably the W. es-Sunt), the W. el-Hasy, the main branch of which passes at the foot of Lachis (Tell el-Hasy), while another originates near Khirbet Zuhellīqā, not unlikely the site of Siceleg (A.V. Ziklag.—Jos., xv, 31, etc.); the W. Ghazzeḥ, into which flows the W. esh-Sherī'a, perhaps the "torrent Besor" (I Kings, xxx, 9, etc.), and the W. es-Seba', which recalls to the mind the city of Bersabee (Beer-Sheba), both being the natural outlets of all the hydrographic system of the Negeb; finally, the W. el-Arīsh, or "torrent of Egypt", Shihōr of the Hebrews and Rhinocolurus of the Greeks, which drains all the northern and north-eastern portions of the Sinaitic Peninsula. The Scriptures mention likewise a few inland rivers, particularly two in the territory of Damascus: the Abana (N. Barāda), which, after watering the city of Damascus, loses itself some twenty miles east in the Bahrat el-Ateibeh, and the Pharphar, which feeds the Bahrat el-Hijāneh.

Besides the two lakes just mentioned, which are outside of Palestine proper, and the Lakes Hūleh and Tiberias, in the course of the Jordan, the Holy Land possesses no other lakes of any extent except the Birket er-Ram (the Lake Phiala of Josephus—Bell. Jud., III, x, 7) to the south of *Banīyas*; but ponds and marshes are numerous in certain parts of the land. Marshes near the lower Jordan, at a short distance from the Dead Sea, are mentioned in I Mach., ix, 46.

Deut., viii, 7, describes Palestine as "a land of brooks and of waters and of fountains". Many springs are mentioned in Scripture, and nearly all

belong to Western Palestine. Going from north to south, and leaving aside those in the neighbourhood of cities to which they gave their names (Engannim, Enhazor, etc.) we may mention here: the "fountain of Daphnis" (Num., xxxiv, 11, in the Vulgate only; other texts have merely: "the fountain") identified by Robinson with 'Ain el-'Asy, the main spring of the Orontes in Cœlesyria; the "fountain which is in Jezrahel" (I Kings, xxix, 1) generally recognized in the 'Ain Jalūd, near the Little Hermon; the "fountain that is called Harad" (Judges, vii, 1), possibly the same, or 'Ain el-Meiyteh, 180 feet below 'Ain Jalūd; the "fountain of Taphua" (Jos., xvii, 7), near the city of that name; the "fountain of Jericho" or "of Elisha" (D.V. Elisha.—IV Kings, ii, 19, 22), 'Ain es-Sūltān, to the north of Jericho; the "fountain of the Sun" (Jos., xv, 7), 'Ain el-Haūd, or Apostles' Fountain, on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho; the "fountain of the water of Nephtoa" (Jos., xv, 9), near Lifta, north-west of Jerusalem; the "source of the waters of Gihon" (II Par., xxxii, 30), 'Ain Ūmm ed-Derej, or, as the Christians call it, 'Ain Sitti Maryam, on the south-east slope of the Temple hill at Jerusalem; the "fountain Rogel" (Jos., xv, 7), Bir Eiyūb in the W. en-Nār, south of Jerusalem; the "dragon-fountain" (Neh., D.V. II Esdras, ii, 13), somewhere in the neighbourhood of the Holy City, unidentified; "The Spring of him that invoked from the jawbone" (so D.V.; A.V. Enhakkore.—Judges, xv, 19—rather, "the Spring of the partridge, which is in Lehy"), identified by Conder with some 'Ayn Qāre, north-west of Sor'a; the "water" where Philip baptized the eunuch of Candace (Acts, viii, 36) 'Ain ed-Dirweh, near the high-road from Jerusalem to Hebron; "the fountain of Misphat that is Cades" (A.V. "Enmishpat, which is Kadesh"—Gen., xiv, 7) 'Ain Kedais in the desert.

In places where the supply of water was scanty the ancient inhabitants constructed pools, either by damming up the neighbouring valley or by excavation. Of the former description were very likely the pools of Gabaon [A.V. Gibeon.—II Kings (A.V. II Samuel), ii, 13], Hebron (II Kings, iv, 12), Samaria (III Kings, xxii, 38), Hesebon (Cant., vii, 4), and certainly the lower pool of Siloe near Jerusalem (Is., xxii, 9, 11); of the latter description are the "upper pool" of Siloe (IV Kings, xx, 20) and the famous "pools of Solomon", probably alluded to in Eccl., ii, 6, near Bethlehem. These pools, frequent in the East, are supplied either by natural drainage, or by springs, or by aqueducts bringing water from a distance.

In its *climate*, as well as in everything else, Palestine is a land of contrasts. At Jerusalem, which is 2500 feet above the sea level, the mean temperature of the whole year is about 63° F.; during the winter months, although the mean temperature is about 50°, the mercury occasionally plays around the freezing-point; whereas in June, July, August, and September, the average being between 70° and 75°, the thermometer sometimes rises to 100° or higher. For six or seven months there is no rain; the dry wind from the desert and the scorching sun parch the land, especially on the plateaux. The first rains generally fall about the beginning of November; the "latter rain", in the month of April. Plenty or famine depend particularly on the April rains. On clear nights, all the year round, there falls a copious dew; but in summer time there will be no dew if no westerly breeze, bringing moisture from the sea, springs up towards the evening. Snowfalls are only occasional during the winter, and usually they are light, and the snow soon melts; not seldom does the whole winter pass without snow (as an average, one winter in three). Owing to the neighbourhood of Lebanon and Hermon, the Upper Galilee enjoys a more temperate climate; but in the lowlands the mean temperature is much higher. Along the coast, however, it is relieved almost every evening by the breeze from the sea. In the Ghôr, the

climate is tropical; harvesting, indeed, begins there in the first days of April. During the winter months, the temperature is warm in the daytime, and may fall at night to 40°; in summer the thermometer may rise in the day to 120° or 140°, and little relief may be expected from the night. "The valley concentrates the full radiance of an eastern sun rarely mitigated by any cloud, though chilled at times by the icy north winds off the snows of Lebanon and Hermon; it is parched by the south wind from the deserts of the South, yet sheltered from the moist sea breezes from the West that elsewhere so greatly temper the climate of the Holy Land" (Aids to the Bible Student). The flora and fauna of the lowest portions are accordingly similar to those of India and Ethiopia. The coast of the Dead Sea, sunken deeper than the Ghôr, has a deadly equatorial climate, perhaps the hottest in the world.

These orographic, hydrographic and climatic conditions of the Holy Land explain the variety—wonderful, if we consider the size of the country—of its fauna and flora. It is "a good land. . . . A land of wheat, and barley, and vineyards, wherein fig trees, and pomegranates, and oliveyards grow: a land of oil and honey. Where without any want thou shalt eat thy bread, and enjoy abundance of all things" (Deut., viii, 7-9). Palestine, indeed, even now, but much more so in Biblical times, may be said fairly to repay the labour of its inhabitants. The north, on both sides of the Jordan, is a most fertile region; the plains of Esdrelon and of Saron (A.V. Sharon, except in Acts, ix, 35), the Sephelah and the Ghôr were at all times considered the granaries of the country. Even the land of Juda contains rich and pleasant dales, an ideal home for gardens, olive-groves, vineyards, and fig trees; and the high country, with the exception of the sun-baked and wind-parched desert, affords goodly pastures. (See ANIMALS IN THE BIBLE; PLANTS IN THE BIBLE.)

Palestine seems to have been inhabited about the fourth millennium B. C. by a population which may be called, without insisting upon the meaning of the word, aboriginal. This population is designated in the Bible by the general name of *Nephilim*, a word which, for the Hebrews, conveyed the idea of dreadful, monstrous giants (Num., xiii, 33, 34). We hear occasionally of them also as *Rephaim*, *Enacim*, *Emim*, *Zuzim*, *Zamzommim*, and *Horites*, these last, whose name means "cave-dwellers", being confined to the deserts of Idumæa. But what were the ethnological relations of these various peoples, we are not able to state. At any rate, the land must have been thinly inhabited in those early times, for about 3000 B.C. it was styled by the Egyptians "an empty land". Towards the third millennium B.C., a first Semitic Canaanite element invaded Palestine, followed, about the twenty-fifth century, by a great Semitic migration of peoples coming from the marshes of the Persian Gulf, and which were to constitute the bulk of the population of Canaan before the occupation of the land by the Hebrews. From the twentieth century B.C. onwards, Aram continued to pour on the land some of its peoples. Palestine had thus, at the time of Abraham, become thickly inhabited; its many cities, united by no bond of political cohesion, were then moving in the wake of the rulers of Babylon or Susa, although the influence of Egypt, fostered by active commercial communications, is manifest in the Canaanite civilization of that period. As a result of the battle of Megiddo, the Land of Canaan was lost to Babylon and added to the possessions of Egypt; but this change had little effect on the internal conditions of the country; administrative reports continued to be written, and business transacted, in the Cananeo-Assyrian dialect, as is shown from the Tell el-Amarna and the Ta'annak discoveries. About the same epoch the Hethites came in from the North and some of their



settlements were established as far south as the valley of Juda, while the Amorrites were taking hold of the trans-Jordanic highland. Speaking generally, when the Hebrews appeared on the banks of the Jordan and the Philistines on the Mediterranean shore (c. 1200 B.C.), the Amalecites held the Negeb, the Amorrites the highlands east of the river, the Canaanites dwelt in the valleys and plains of the west, and some places here and there were still in possession of the aborigines. The Philistines drove the Canaanites from the coast and occupied the Sephela, whereas the Zakkala settled on the coast near Mount Carmel. We know in detail from the Bible the progress of the Hebrew conquest of the rest of the land: the remnant of the former settlers were absorbed little by little into the new race.

Needless to tell here how the different tribes, at first without any other bond of unity than that of a common origin and faith, gradually were led by circumstances to join under a common head. This political unity, however, was ephemeral and split into two rival kingdoms—that of Israel in the north, and that of Juda in the south. The vicissitudes of these two tiny kingdoms fill several books of the Old Testament. But they were doomed to be merged into the mighty empires of the Euphrates and to share their fate. A Babylonian province in 588, a Persian satrapy after Cyrus's victories, Palestine became for a few years part of Alexander's vast dominion. At the division of his empire the Land of Israel was allotted to Seleucus, but for fifteen years was a bone of contention between Syria and Egypt, the latter finally annexing it, until, in 198 B.C., it passed by right of conquest to King Antiochus III of Syria. A short period of independence followed the rebellion of the Machabees, but finally Rome assumed over Palestine a protectorate which in time became more and more effectual and intrusive. Josephus narrates how Palestine was divided at the death of Herod; St. Luke (iii, 1) likewise describes the political conditions of the country at the beginning of Christ's public life. West of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, Palestine included Galilee, Samaria, Judea, and Idumæa (Edom); east of that river, Gaulanitis corresponded to the modern Jolan; Auranitis was the administrative name of the plateau of *Jebel-Hauran*; north-west of it, the Lejah formed the main part of Trachonitis; Iturea must have been the country south-east of Hermon; north of Iturea, on the banks of the upper *Barâda*, at the foot of the Anti-Lebanon, was situated the small, but rich, tetrarchy of Abilene; south of Iturea, between Gaulanitis and Auranitis extended Batanea; finally, under the name of Perea was designated the land across the Jordan from Pella to Moab, and westwards to the limits of Arabia, determined by the cities of Gerasa (Jerash), Philadelphia (Ammân), and Hesebon.

It is very difficult to form an estimate of the population of Palestine, so conflicting are the indications supplied by the Bible. We are told in II Kings, xxiv, 9, that in the census undertaken at David's command, there were found 1,300,000 fighting men. These figures, which may represent a total population of from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000, undoubtedly overshoot the mark. From what may be gathered in various places of Holy Writ, the figures given in II Kings might fairly represent the whole population at the best epochs.

In the foregoing portions of this article Palestine alone has been spoken of and described. However, as has been intimated above, Genesis, Exodus, Daniel, Esther, in the Old Testament, the Acts, the Epistles, and the first chapters of the Apocalypse, in the New, contain geographical indications of a much wider range. To attempt a description of all the countries mentioned would be to engage in the whole geography of the Assyrian, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Roman empires, a task which the allusions made—with the





MAP OF PALESTINE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST

NOTE: THE PORTION WEST OF THE RIVER JORDAN IS TAKEN FROM THE SURVEYS OF THE PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND





exception of the detailed description of the Israelites' journey from Egypt to the Jordan—would hardly justify. On the other hand, it is certain that Palestine is the theatre where most, and those the most vital, of the events of sacred history took place. The following list, which gives the names of most places, within and without Palestine, mentioned in Holy Writ, briefly supplies the indications needed. From the variety of countries to which these places belonged the reader may form an idea of the range of geographical knowledge possessed by the Biblical writers, and acquired by them, either from personal experience or by hearsay.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.—Many of the more important places mentioned below are subjects of special articles in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA; where the title of such an article is identical with the local name given in the list, the reader will be referred to that article simply by the letters "q. v." (*quod vide*); where the special article is headed with a different name or a modified form of the same name, the cross-reference gives that name in CAPITALS AND SMALL CAPITALS. Cross-references to other titles in the list itself are given in the ordinary type.

*Abana*: river of Damascus. See LEBANON.

*Abarim* (q. v.): mountains in N. Moab.

*Abdon* (Jos., xxi, 30, etc.): Khirbet 'Abdeh, N. of the Wady el-Karn.

*Abel* (the great: I Kings, vi, 18) is a common name, "stone", as the D.V. suggests in the parenthesis.—*Abel* (Judges, xi, 33; Heb. *Abel Kerāmim*).—*Abela* (IV Kings, xx, 14)—*Abeldomum Maacha* (III Kings, xv, 20; IV Kings, xv, 29);—*Abelmaim* (II Par., xvi, 4);—*Abelmehula* (Judges, vii, 23, etc.); *Abelsatim* (Num., xxxiii, 49), the place where the Israelites were enticed into the impure worship of Beelphegor; in the Ghôr, E. of the Jordan, at a short distance from the Dead Sea.

*Aben-Boen* (Jos., xviii, 18), also "the stone of Boen" (Jos., xv, 6): a conspicuous rock marking the limit of Juda and Benjamin between *Beth Hagla* and the Ascent of Adommim.

*Abes* (Jos., xix, 20; Issachar): prob. Kh. eb-Beidâ, in the plain of Esdrelon, between Nazareth and Mt. Carmel.

*Abila* (not mentioned in the Bible), after which Abilene was named: Sûk Wady Barâda, S. of Anti-Lebanon.

*Abran* (Jos., xix, 28; Aser): perhaps a mistake for Abdon. Unknown.

*Accad* (Achad; Akkad). See BABYLONIA.

*Accain* (Jos., xv, 57): mtn. of Juda, Kh. Yâqîn.

*Accaron* (q. v.).

*Accho*. See ACRE.

*Achazib*, 1 (Jos., xix, 21; Aser): Ez-Zib, betw. Accho and Tyre.—2 (Jos., xv, 44; Mich., i, 14; W. Juda): 'Ain el-Kezbeh.

*Achor*: a valley near Jericho, possibly Wady el Qelt. *Achsaph* (Jos., xi, 1, etc.; Aser): prob. Kefr Yâsif, N.E. of Acre.

*Achzib*. See Achazib 2.

*Acrobatane*: 1. Toparchy of Judea, including region betw. Neapolis (Naplûs) and Jericho.—2 (I Mach., v, 3), region of the Ascent of Acrabim.

*Acrabim* (Ascent of; D.V.: "Ascent of the Scorpion"; Jos., xv, 3; S. limit of Juda): most prob. Naqb eş-Şâfâ, S.W. of the Dead Sea, on the road from Hebron to Petra.

*Acron* (Jos., xix, 43). See ACCARON.

*Adada* (Jos., xv, 22; S. limit of Juda): 'Ad'ada, E. of Bersabee.

*Adadremmon* (Zach., xii, 11): in the plain of Esdrelon; in later times, Maximianopolis (St. Jerome): Rûmmâneh, S. of Lejûn.

*Adama* (Deut., xxix, 23): city of the Pentapolis.

*Adami* (Jos., xix, 33): also *Adam*: Damieh, S.W. of the L. of Tiberias. The Jordan may be forded there.

*Adar* (Num., xxxiv, 4; Jos., xv, 3), also *Addar* and *Adder*: S. limit of Juda, N.W. of Cades. There is in that region a Jebel Hadhîreh.

*Adarsa* (I Mach., vii, 40), also *Adazer* (I Mach., vii, 45): Kh. 'Adaseh, N. of Jerusalem and E. of El-Jib.

*Adiada* (I Mach., xii, 38), also *Addus*, in the Sephela: Haditeh, E. of Lydda.

*Adithaim* (Jos., xv, 36)—text perhaps corrupt; as it stands, designates a place, hitherto unidentified, in the neighbourhood of Gaza.

*Adom* (Jos., iii, 16): Tell-Damieh, a little S. of the confluence of the Jaboc and the Jordan.

*Adommim*: (Ascent of; Jos., xv, 7; xviii, 18), limit of Benjamin and Juda; seems to correspond to Tal-'at ed-Dûmm, on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, a place notorious for the thieves who lurked round about (Luke, x, 30-35).

*Adon* (I Esd., ii, 59), also *Addon* (II Esd., vii, 61): a city of Chaldaea, the same as *Eden* in Is., xxxvii, 12; Ezech., xxvii, 23.

*Adrumetum* (Acts, xxvii, 2): city and seaport in Mysia, over against the island of Lesbos; mod. Adramiti or Edremid, also Ydremid.

*Adullam* (q.v.).

*Aduram* (II Par., xi, 9, S. Juda), also *Ador* (I Mach., xiii, 20): Dûra, W. of Hebron.

*Enon* (q.v.).

*Agar's Well* (Gen., xvi, 14), "between Cades and Barad": Bir Mâyîn.

*Ahalab* (Judges, i, 31; Aser): poss. the same as *Mehebel* (Jos., xix, 29; D.V. "from the portions"), the Makhalliba of the third campaign of Sennacherib. Unknown.

*Ahava*: stream, or perhaps canal, in Babylonia, possibly not far W. of Babylon.

*Ahion* (III Kings, xv, 20, etc.), also *Aion* (IV Kings, xv, 29): the name seems to be preserved in Merj 'Ayûn, between the valley of the Leontes and that of the Upper Jordan. The site was possibly Tell-Dibbîn, or Khiam, a near-by place.

*Aialon*, 1 (Jos., x, 12, etc.) town and valley: Yâlô, W.N.W. of Jerusalem, E. of Amwâs.—2 (Judges, xii, 12; Zabulon): Kh. Jalim, E. of Acre.

*Ai*: D.V. for Hai.

*Atath* (Is., x, 28): the same as Hai.

*Aila*, *Ailath*: the same as Elath.

*Ain* (Jos., xix, 7; Juda), also called *En-Rimmon*: Kh. Umm er-Rûmmânîm, N. of Bersabee, on the road to Beit-Jibrin.

*Alexandria* (q.v.).

*Alima* (I Mach., v, 26): poss. Kh. 'Ilma.

*Almath* (I Par., vi, 60; Heb. 45) also *Almon* (Jos., xxi, 18), in Benjamin: Kh. 'Almith, N.E. of Jerusalem, between Jebâ' and 'Anâtâ.

*Alus* (Num., xxxiii, 13), encampment of the Israelites on their way to Sinai: poss. Wady el-'Ech, N.W. of Jebel Mûsa.

*Amaad* (Jos., xix, 26; Aser): Kh. el-'Amud, N. of Acre, or Umm el-'Amed, W. of Bethlehem of Zabulon.

*Amam* (Jos., xv, 26; S. Juda). Unidentified.

*Amana* (Cant., iv, 8): poss. the same as Mt. Hor of the N.

*Amma* (Jos., xix, 30; Aser): perhaps 'Alma esh-Shâ'ûb, W. of the Scala Tyriorum (Râs en-Nâqûra).

*Amona* (Ezech., xxxix, 6): if we should see in it the name of a town, might stand for Legio-Mageddo, mod. El-Lejûn.

*Amosa* (Jos., xviii, 26; Benjamin): either Colonieh (so Talmud), or Beit-Mizzeh, N. of Colonieh.

*Amphipolis* (Acts, xviii, 1): in Macedonia, 30 m. from Philippi; mod. Jenikoei.

*Amthar* (Jos., xix, 13; Zabulon): prob. not a proper name, seems to mean "turns towards".

*Ana*: a town in Babylonia, on the Euphrates, possibly 'Anah.

*Anab* (Jos., xi, 21): mount. of Juda, once belonging to the Enacim; Kh. 'Anab, S. of Beit-Jibrin.

*Anaharath* (Jos., xix, 19); Issachar; Egypt.: Anūhertū: En-Na'ūra, N.E. of Zerā'in.

*Anania* (II Esd., ii, 32; Benjamin): Beit-Hanina, N. of Jerusalem.

*Anathoth* (q. v.).

*Anem* (I Par., vi, 73, Heb., 58; Issachar), perhaps a contraction for Engannim, which stands in the same place, Jos., xix, 21. However, poss. 'Anim, S. of Lejūn.

*Aner* (I Par., vi, 70; Heb. 55; W. Manasses), perhaps a corruption for Thanach of Jos., xxi, 25; poss. also 'Ellar, N.W. of Sebastiyeh.

*Ange* (Judith, ii, 12), a mount. in Cappadocia: Erjias.

*Anim* (Jos., xv, 50; mount. of Juda): Kh. Ghuwein.

*Antioch*: 1. Of Pisidia.—2. Of Syria (q. v.).

*Antipatris* (q. v.).

*Apadno* (Dan., xi, 45); doubtful as a proper name.

*Apamea* (Judith, iii, 14), country and city of Syria: Qal at el-Mūdhīq.

*Aphaerema* (I Mach., xi, 34; not in the Vulg.), one of the toparchies of Juda: see Ephraim.

*Aphara* (Jos., xviii, 23; Benjamin), commonly identified with Tell el-Fārah, S.E. of Beitin.

*Aphec* 1 (Jos., xii, 18; N.W. Juda): poss. Merj-Fikieh (Conder).—2 (Jos., xix, 30, etc.; Aser). Unknown.—3 (I Kings, iv, 1; Benjamin): perhaps Qastūl.—4 (I Kings, xxix, 1; Issachar): El-Afūleh, N.W. of Zerā'in.—5 (III Kings, xx, 26, etc.) Assy.: *Apqū*: prob. Fig., E. of the L. of Tiberias.

*Apheca*, 1 (Jos., xiii, 4): Afkā, N.E. of Beirūt.—2 (Jos., xv, 53; mount. of Juda), Egypt.: Apūken: prob. Fūqin, W. of Bethlehem.

*Apollonia* (Acts, xvii, 1), in Mygdonia, a prov. of Macedonia: mod. Pollina.

*Appiiforum* (Acts, xxviii, 15), 43 m. S.E. of Rome, on the Appian Way, on the edge of the Pontine Marshes.

*Ar*, *Ar Moab* (Num., xxi, 15, etc.) N. of Moab, and S. of the river Arnon; some suggest Rabba; others Umm er-Resāḡ; others Mūhātet el-Haj.

*Arab* (Jos., xv, 52; mount. of Juda), also *Arbi* (II Kings, xxiii, 25): Kh. er-Rābīyeh, W. of Ziph.

*Arach*, 1 (Gen., x, 10), cuneif. *Arkū*, a town in Babylon. Warka, on the left bank of the Euphrates, 125 m. S.E. of Babylon.—2. See Archi.

*Arad* (q. v.).

*Arada*, a station of the Israelites in their journey between Sinai and Cades. Unknown.

*Arama*, 1 (Jos., xix, 36; Nephtali): Rameh, N.W. of the L. of Tiberias.—2 (I Kings, xxx, 30). See Horma.

*Ararat*. See ARK.

*Arbatis* (I Mach., v, 23); doubtful whether it is a district or a city. Unknown.

*Arbee*. See HEBRON.

*Arbella* (I Mach., ix, 2), according to Josephus, in Galilee, in the neighbourhood of Sepphoris; prob. Kh. 'Irbid, W. of the L. of Tiberias.

*Archi* seems rather a gentile name, derived from Arach, Erech, or Erech, 'Ain 'Arik, between Beitin and Beit Ūr.

*Arebba* (Jos., xv, 60; mount. of Juda): Kh. Rebba S.W. of Jerusalem, near Beit Nettif(?).

*Arecon* (Jos., xix, 46; Dan): Tell er-Raqkeit, N. of Jaffa.

*Areopolis*, Greek name of Ar Moab.

*Ariel* (Is., xxix, 1, 2), symbolical name of Jerusalem: "city of God".

*Arimathea*. See Rama.

*Arnon*, river of Moab: Wādī el-Mōjib.

*Aroer*, 1 (Deut., ii, 36, etc.; Moab S., l. 26): 'Arā'ir, N. of the Arnon river.—2 (Judges, xi, 33), "over against Rabba", i.e. E. of Ammān. Unknown.—3 (I Kings, xxx, 28; S. Juda), Egypt.: *Har-horar*: 'Ar'arah, E.S.E. of Bersabee.

*Arpad* A. V. for Arphad.

*Arphad* (IV Kings, xviii, 34, etc.), Assy.: *Arpaddū*: Tell 'Erfād, 12 m. N. of Aleppo.

*Aruboth* (III Kings, iv, 10), poss. Wādī 'Arrūb, near Bersabee.

*'Arūmah* (Judges, ix, 31; D.V.: "privately"), a proper name: perhaps El-Orme, S. of Naplūs.

*'Ašāl* (Zach., xiv, 5; D.V.: "the next"). A proper name is demanded by the context: perhaps the Wādī 'Asūl, S. of Jerusalem.

*Asan* (Jos., xv, 42, etc.; Juda): poss. 'Aseileh (?) between Bersabee and Hebron.

*Asaramel* (I Mach., xiv, 27); wrongly given as a proper name; either some court, or a title of Simon: "prince of the people of God".

*Asasonthamar*. See ENGADDI.

*Ascalon*. See PHILISTINES.

*Asem* (Jos., xv, 29, etc.; S. Juda), also *Asom* (I Par., iv, 29). Unknown.

*Asemona* (Num., xxxiv, 4; Jos., xv, 14; S. Juda): poss. 'Ain Qaseimeh, W. of Cades.

*Asena* (Jos., xv, 33, plain of Juda): perhaps 'Aslīn; perh. Kefr Hāsan.

*Aser* (q. v.) 1 (Jos., xvii, 7; W. Manasses).—2 (Tob., i, 2; Nephtali) poss. the same as Asor 1.

*Asergadda* (Jos., xv, 27; S. Juda). Unidentified.

*Ashdod*, A.V. for Azotus.

*Asiongaber* (q. v.).

*Asor*, 1 (Jos., xi, 1, etc.; Nephtali), also *Hasor*, *Ĥeser*. Egypt.: *Hūsar*: the site seems to have been in the neighbourhood of L. Hūleh, but its exact location is the object of great discussions.—2 (Jos., xv, 23; S. Juda). Unknown; perhaps connected with Jebel Hādhīreh, N.E. of Cades.—3 (Jos., xv, 25; S. Juda). Unknown.—4 (II Esd., xi, 33, Benjamin), poss. Kh. Hazzūr, N. of Jerusalem.

*Asphar* (I Mach., ix, 33), a pool in the desert of Thecue, perh. Bīr ez-Zāferāneh.

*Assedim* (Jos., xix, 35; Nephtali). Some: Hattin el-Kedim; others: Eš-Šattiyeh; perhaps not a proper name.

*Asson*, 1 (Acts, xx, 13, 14), seaport in Mysia: Behram Kalessi.—2 (Acts, xxvii, 13); not a proper name, but compar. of ἄγγε, "near".

*Astath* (Deut., i, 4, etc.), capital of Og, king of Basan: Tell Aštāra, in Hauran.

*Astarothcarneim* (Gen., xiv, 5), prob. Tell As'āri, in Hauran.

*Ataroth*, 1 (Num., xxxii, 1, etc.; Moab S., l. 10; Moab): Khirbet 'Aṭṭarus, S. of the Wādī Zerqā Ma'in.

—2 (Jos., xvi, 2; S. Ephraim), also *Ataroth Addar* (Jos., xvi, 5; xviii, 13); some: 'Atāra, S. of El-Bīreh; others: Kh. ed-Darleh, near Lower Bethoron.—3 (Jos., xvi, 7; E. Ephraim), poss. Tell et-Trūny (Conder).

*Athach* (I Kings, xxx, 30), possibly the same as Ether.

*Athar*. See Ether.

*Athens* (q. v.).

*Athmatha* (Jos., xv, 54; mount. of Juda). Unidentified.

*'Athrōth bēth Yō'āb* (I Par., ii, 54; D.V.: "the crowns of the house of Joab"), name of a place. Site unknown.

*Attalia* (q. v.).

*Ava* (IV Kings, xvii, 24, etc.), also *Avah*, a Babylonian city conquered by the Assyrians. Possibly Hit, on the right bank of the Euphrates.

*Avim* (Jos., xviii, 23, Benjamin). Some identify it with Hai. Otherwise unknown.

*Aviḥ* (Gen., xxxvi, 35; Edom), perhaps in the neighbourhood of the Jebel el-Ghūweiteh, E. of the Dead Sea.

*Avoth Jair* (III Kings, iv, 13). See Havoth Jair.

*Azaph*. See Achsaph.

*Ayephīm* (II Kings, xvi, 14; D.V.: "weary"), possibly, rather, a place E. of Bahurim.

*Aza* (I Par., vii, 28; N.W. of Ephraim). Unknown.

*Azanothabor* (Jos., xix, 34; Nephtali), in the neighbourhood of Mt. Thabor. Unknown.

*Azeca* (Jos., x, 10, etc.; plain of Juda), in the environs of Tell Zakariyah. No agreement as to the exact identification.

*Azmaveth* (I Esd., ii, 24): Hīzmeh, N. of 'Anāta.

*Azotus* (q. v.).

*Baal* (I Par., iv, 33), probably identical with *Baalath Beer Ramath* (Jos., xix, 8; Simeon), poss. Biâr Mâyîn, or Tell el-Lekiyeh, N. of Bersabee.

*Baala* 1 (Jos., xv, 9, etc.; Juda) old name of Cariathiarim.—2 (Jos., xv, 29, etc.; S. Juda), also *Bala*; perhaps Kh. Umm-Baghle, N.E. of Bersabee.

*Baalam* (I Par., vi, 70; Heb. 55; W. Manasses), also *Balaam*; possibly *Jebbaam* (Jos., xvii, 11): Bir Bel'ameh, S. of Jenin.

*Baalath* (Jos., xix, 44; N. Dan), also *Balaath* (II Par., viii, 6), prob. Bel'ain, N.W. of Beit Ūr.

*Baalath Beer Ramath*. See *Baal*.

*Baalbek* (q.v.).

*Baalgad* (Jos., xi, 17, etc.), at the foot of Mt. Hermon: Baniyas.

*Baal Hamon* (Cant., viii, 11; D.V. "that which hath people"), poss. identical with *Balamon* (Judith, viii, 3); perh. Kh. Bel'ameh, S. of Jenin.

*Baalhasor* (II Kings, xiii, 23), poss. Tell 'Ašûr, N.E. of Beitin.

*Baal Hermon* (Judges, iii, 3, etc.). Whether it is a city or a mountain is doubtful; supposed to be the same as *Baalgad*.

*Baalmeon* (Jos., xvii, 17, etc.), also *Baalmaon*, *Beelmeon*, *Bethmaon*: Tell Mâ'in, S.W. of Madâba.

*Baal Peor*, A.V. for *Beelphegor*.

*Baal Pharasim* (II Kings, iv, 20), in the neighbourhood of the Valley of Raphaim, S. of Jerusalem.

*Baal Salisa* (IV Kings, iv, 42): prob. Kh. Sarisia, 15 m. N.E. of Lydda.

*Baalthamar* (Judges, xx, 33; Benjamin), N.W. of Gabaa, about Kh. Adase.

*Babylon*. See *BABYLONIA*.

*Bahurim* (II Kings, iii, 16, etc.), on the slope of Mt. Olivet, poss. Kh. ez-Zambi, or Kh. Bûqei'dan.

*Bala*, 1 (Gen., xiv, 2). See *Segor*.—2. See *Baala* 2.

*Balaam*. See *Balam*.

*Balaath*. See *Baalath*.

*Baloth* (Jos., xv, 24; S. Juda), poss. identical with *Baalath Beer Ramath*. Otherwise unknown.

*Bamoth* (Num., xxi, 19; Moab). Site unknown, between Dîbân and Mâ'in.

*Bamothbaal* (Jos., xiii, 17), prob. the same.

*Bane* (Jos., xix, 45; Dan), also *Bane Barach*; Assy.: *Banaabarga*; prob. 'Ibn-'Ibrâk, E. of Jaffa.

*Bantas*. See *CÆSAREA PHILIPPI*.

*Barach*. See *Bane*.

*Barad* (Gen., xvi): Umm el-Bâred, S.E. of Cades.

*Barasa* (I Mach., v, 26): Bosra, in the Hauran.

*Basan* (Deut., iii, 4), a region S. of the Plain of Damascus; at first the Kingdom of Og, then given to the tribe of Manasses.

*Bascama* (I Mach., xii, 23), perh. Tell-Bâzûk, in Jolan.

*Bascath* (Jos., xv, 39; plain of Juda), somewhere around Lachis. Unknown.

*Bashan*, A.V. for *Basan*.

*Bathuel* (I Par., iv, 30; Simeon). See *Bethul*.

*Baziothia* (Jos., xv, 28; S. Juda), an unidentified city in the neighbourhood of Bersabee—unless the text is corrupt.

*Beelmeon*. See *Baalmeon*.

*Beelphegor* (q.v.).

*Beelsephon* (Ex., xiv, 2); Egypt.: Bali Şapûna. If a mountain, poss. Jebel 'Attâka, S.W. of Suez.

*Beer* (Num., xxi, 16; D.V.: "the well"), prob. in the Wâdy Themed, S.S.E. of Madâba.

*Beer Elim* (Is., xv, 8; D.V.: "the well of Elim"); the same as *Beer*.

*Belamon*. See *Baal Hamon*.

*Belma*. See *Baal Hamon*.

*Belmen* (Judith, iv, 4 omitt. in Vulg.), between *Bethoron* and *Jericho*.

*Benejaacan* (Num., xxxiii, 31), Bîrein, north of Cades.

*Benennom* (II Par., xxviii, 3), valley S. of Jerusalem. See *JERUSALEM*.

*Beon* (Num., xxxii, 3). See *Baalmeon*.

*Bera* (Judges, ix, 21), prob. El-Bireh, N. of Jerusalem.

*Berdan* (Gen., xxi, 32; D.V.: "well of oath"), Tell el-Qady, W.S.W. of Bersabee.

*Berea* (I Mach., ix, 4), commonly identified with El-Bîreh.

*Beræa* (q.v.).

*Beromi* (II Kings, xxiii, 31), the same as *Bahurim*.

*Beroth* (q.v.).

*Berotha* (II Kings, viii, 8), Bereitân, S. of *Baalbek*.

*Bersabee* (q.v.).

*Besecath* (IV Kings, xxii, 1). See *Bascath*.

*Besor*, a river S.W. of Gaza, prob. Wâdy esh-Sherî'a.

*Bessur* (Jos., xv, 58). See *Bethsur*.

*Betane* (Judith, i, 9; omitt. in Vulg.), a name poss. misspelled, points to a place S. of Jerusalem.

*Bete* (II Kings, viii, 8; I Par., xviii, 8, has *Thebath*), possibly Tayîbeh, on the road from Hamath to Aleppo; or more prob. Tayîbeh, S. of *Baalbek*.

*Beten* (Jos., xix, 25; Aser): El-Bāneh, E. of Acre.

*Bethabara*. See *BETHANY BEYOND THE JORDAN*.

*Bethacad* (IV Kings, x, 12; D.V.: "shepherd's cabin"), more prob. a proper name: Beit Qād, betw. Mt. Gelboe and Jenin.

*Bethacarem* (Jer., vi, 1; II Esd., iii, 14; Juda), also *Bethacharam*. Unknown; supposed to be some place on the Jebel el-Fûreidis, S.E. of *Bethlehem*.

*Bethanan* (III Kings, iv, 9; Benjamin), perhaps Beit 'Anân, W. of Nebi Samwil.

*Bethanath* (Jos., xix, 38; Nephtali), prob. 'Ainita, near Cades of Nephtali.

*Bethany* (q.v.).

*Bethanoth* (Jos., xv, 59; mount. of Juda), Kh. Beit-'Anûn, N.E. of Hebron.

*Betharaba* (Jos., xv, 6, etc.; E. of Juda), unknown; must have been in the neighbourhood of *Jericho*.

*Betharam* (Jos., xiii, 27). See *BETHARAN*.

*Betharan* (q.v.).

*Beth Arbel* (Osee, x, 14; D.V. "the house of him that judgeth *Baal*"), prob. the same place as *Arbella*.

*Bethaven* (Gen., xii, 8): poss. Kh. Haiyân, also called El-Jir, E. of Beitin.—I Kings, xiii, 5, *Bethoron* should probably be read instead of *Bethaven*.

*Bethazmoth* (I Esd., ii, 24). See *Azmaveth*.

*Beth Baal Meon* (Moabite Stone, line 30). See *Baalmeon*.

*Bethbera* (Judges, vii, 24), a ford of the Jordan, either N. of the confluence of the W. Jalûd, or in the neighbourhood of *Jericho*.

*Bethberai* (I Par., iv, 31; Simeon), poss. Bîrein, betw. Cades and *Khalasa*.

*Bethbessen* (I Mach., ix, 62), prob. the same place as *Beth Hagla*.

*Bethchar* (I Kings, xvii, 11), an unknown place in the neighbourhood of *Maspha* of Benjamin.

*Bethdagon* (q.v.).

*Beth Deblathaim* (Jer., xlviii, 22; D.V.: "the house of *Deblathaim*"); Moabite Stone, line 30). See *Deblathaim*.

*Beth Eden* (Amos, i, 5; Lebanon). Some: Jûsieh el-Kadimeh; others: Beit el-Jaune, between *Baniyas* and *Damascus*.

*Bethel*, 1 see *s.v.*—2 (Jos., xii, 16; Simeon) another name for *Bethul*.

*Bethemec* (Jos., xix, 27; Aser), prob. 'Amqâ, N.E. of Acre.

*Bether* (Cant., ii, 17; mount. of Juda), Kh. Bettîr, S.W. of Jerusalem, the last stronghold of the Jewish rebels in the second century.

*Beth Esel* (Mich., i, 11; D.V. "the house adjoining"), perhaps the same place as *Aşal* (Zach., xiv, 5); some place it E. of Mt. Olivet; some others S. of Jerusalem; some, finally, in the *Sephela*.

*Bethgader* (I Par., ii, 51). See *Gader*.

*Bethgamul* (Jer., xlviii, 23; Moab), Kh. Jemâil, N.E. of Dîbân.

*Beth-Haggan* (IV Kings, ix, 27; D.V.: "garden-house"), prob. the same as *Engannim*, i.e. *Jenin*.

*Beth Hagla* (Jos., xv, 6, etc.; Benjamin): Qasr Hajlā, S.E. of Jericho.

*Beth Hammerhug* (II Kings, xv, 17; D.V. "afar off from the house") likely the name of some place in the Cedron Valley.

*Bethsimoth* (Jos., xiii, 30), *Bethsimoth* (Num., xxxiii, 49), Kh. Sūweimeh, in the Ghôr, 1½ m. N. of the Dead Sea, 2 m. E. of the Jordan.

*Beth Le 'āphrah* (Mich., i, 10; D.V.: "the house of Dust"), el-Thaiyebah, N.E. of Beitin.

*Beth Lebā'ōth* (Jos., xv, 32), perhaps the same as Bethberai.

*Bethlehem* (q.v.).

*Bethmaacha*. See Abel.

*Bethmaon*. See Baalmeon.

*Bethmarchaboth* (Jos., xix, 5; S. Simeon; Jos., xv, 31, has Medemena). If we should distinguish, Bethmarchaboth might poss. be El-Merqeb, S.W. of the S. end of the Dead Sea.

*Beth Millo* (Judges, ix, 6), probably some stronghold in the neighbourhood of Sichem, perhaps Kh. ed-Dūrah, S. of Naplūs.

*Bethnemra* (Num., xxxii, 36, etc.), Tell-Nimrin, on the Wady Nimrin.

*Bethoron*, two cities of Ephraim, about 12 m. N.W. of Jerusalem: Upper Bethoron, Beit 'Ūr el-Fōqā, to the E.; and Lower Bethoron, Beit 'Ūr el-Tahtā, to the W.—In I Mach., iv, 29, Bethsur should be read instead of Bethoron.

*Bethphage* (Matt., xxi, 1; Luke, xix, 29), on Mt. Olivet, near the road from Jerusalem to Jericho; poss. Habulat el-Amirā, or Kehf Abū Laiān.

*Bethphalet* (Jos., xv, 27; II Esd., xi, 26; S. Juda). Also *Bethphelet*. Unknown.

*Bethpheses* (Jos., xix, 21; Issachar), in the neighbourhood of Jenin. Unknown.

*Bethphogor* (Deut., iii, 29. D.V. "temple of Phogor"; A.V. Bethpeor), prob. an abbreviation for Beth Beelphegor. See BEELPHEGOR.

*Bethsaida* (q.v.).

*Bethsames*, 1 (Jos., xv, 10, etc.; Dan); also *Bethsames* (I Par., vi, 59): 'Ain-Shems, 15 m. W. of Jerusalem.—2 (Jos., xix, 22; Issachar), possibly 'Ain esh-Shemsiyeh, S. of Beisān; or Kh. Shemsin, S. of the L. of Tiberias.—3 (Jos., xix, 33; Nephtali), perhaps Kh. Shem'ā (?), W. of Safed.

*Bethsan* (q.v.).

*Bethsetta* (Judges, vii, 23), possibly Shūttah, N.W. of Beisān.

*Bethsimoth*. See Bethjesimoth.

*Bethsur*, *Bethsura* (Jos., xv, 58, etc.; mount. of Juda). Beit-Sūr, N. of Hebron.

*Beththaphua* (Jos., xv, 53; mount. of Juda), Taffūh, W. of Hebron.

*Bethul* (Jos., xix, 4, etc.; Simeon), perhaps Beit-Ūlā, N.W. of Hebron (doubtful).

*Bethulia* (q.v.).

*Bethzachara* (I Mach., vi, 32, 33): Beit-Skāria, S.W. of Bethlehem.

*Bethzecha* (I Mach., vii, 19), a much controverted site. Some think that it is the hill of Bezetha, which was enclosed within the walls of Jerusalem by Herod Agrippa.

*Betomesthaim* (Judith, iv, 6; omitt. in Vulg.): Kh. Ūmm el-Bothmeh, S. of Jenin.

*Betonim* (Jos., xiii, 26; Gad): Batneh, 4 m. S. of Es-Salt.

*Bezec*, 1 (Judges, i, 4), possibly Bezqāh, S.E. of Lydda; some, however, think the text corrupt, and would read Azeca.—2 (I Kings, xi, 18; Issachar): Kh. 'Ibziq, on the road from Naplūs to Beisān.

*Bokim* (Judges, ii, 1, 5), unknown place near or at Bethel.

*Bosra*, 1 (Deut., iv, 43, etc.; Moab. S., i, 27), prob. Qesūr el-Besheir, S.W. of Dibān.—2 (I Mach., v, 26, 36), very likely Buṣr el-Harīrī, in the Ledjah.—3 (I Mach., v, 28): Boṣra in Hauran. See Bostra.

*Bosphorus* (Abd., 20). So Vulg. and the versions thereof, for Sepharad.

*Bosra*, 1 (Is., lxiii, 1; Edom): Būseireh, S. of the Dead Sea.—2 (Jos., xxi, 27), mistranslation for Astaroth.—3 (Jer., xlviii, 24): Bosor, 1.

*Bubastus* (Ezech., xxx, 17), Egypt.: *Pi-Beset*, Tell el-Basta, N.E. of Cairo.

*Cabseel* (Jos., xv, 21; S. Juda). Unknown.

*Cabul* (Jos., xix, 27; Aser): Kabūl, S.E. of Acre.

*Cademoth* (Deut., ii, 26, etc.), also *Cedemoth*. Seems to have been N. of the Arnon; poss. Ūmm Reṣṣās.

*Cades* (q.v.).

*Cadumim* (Judges, v, 21), perhaps not a proper name; possibly also a corrupt. of the text for Cades: "torrent of Cades" (of Nephtali), another name for the Cison.

*Cæsarea*. See CÆSAREA PALESTINÆ; C. PHILIPPI.

*Calano* (Gen., x, 10; Is., x, 9; Amos, vi, 2), in S. Babylonia, perhaps mod. Zerghūl.

*Caleb Ephrata* (II Par., ii, 24). So Heb.; most probably Sept. and Vulg. are right in translating: "Caleb went to Ephrata".

*Camon* (Judges, x, 5), a town E. of the Jordan, in the neighbourhood of Pella: Qimeim or Tabekat-Fakil.

*Cana* (q.v.).

*Canath* (Num., xxxii, 42). See CANATHA.

*Caphara* (Jos., ix, 17, etc.; Benjamin), also *Caphira*, *Cephira*: Kh. Kefireh, W. of Nebi Samwil.

*Capharnaum* (Matt., iv, 13, etc.), on the L. of Tiberias; identified by some with Tell Hūm, on the W. shore; by others with Minieh, S.W. of Tell Hūm.

*Capharsalama* (I Mach., vii, 31) was likely near Jerusalem. Unknown.

*Carcaa* (Jos., xv, 3; S. Juda); W. of Cades. Unknown.

*Carehim* (I Par., xii, 6) is not, as would seem at first sight, a place-name, but a gentile name.

*Carem* (q.v.).

*Cariath* (Jos., xviii, 28; Benjamin), prob. for Caria-thiarim.

*Cariathaim*, 1 (Gen., xiv, 5, etc.): Qreiyat, 10 m. S.W. of Madaba.—2 (I Par., vi, 76; Nephtali). Unknown. Jos., xxi, 32, has Carthan, instead of Caria-thaim.

*Cariatharbe*. See HEBRON.

*Cariathbaal*. See Cariathiarim.

*Cariath Chuzoth* (Num., xxii, 39), a place between the Arnon and Bamothbaal. Unidentified.

*Cariathiarim* (N.W. Juda), also called *Cariathbaal*, *Cariath*: Qaryet el-'Enāb, or Abū-Gosh, W. of Jerusalem.

*Cariathsenna*. (Jos., xv, 49). See Dabir 1.

*Cariathsepher* (Jos., xv, 15; Judges, i, 12). See Dabir 1.

*Carioth*, 1 (Jos., xv, 25; S. Juda), rather *Carioth Hesron*, the birthplace of Judas, "the man of Carioth": Kh. el-Qūreitein, S. of Hebron.—2 (Amos, ii, 2; Jer. xlviii, 24, 41; Moabite Stone, l. 13; Moab): prob. Er-Rabbāh.

*Carmel* (Jos., xv, 55; I Kings, xv, 12, etc.; S. Juda): El-Kermel, S. of Hebron.

*Carnaim* (I Mach., v, 26, etc.; Transjordan), the same, according to some, as Astarothcarnaim; others identify it with Sheikh-Sā'ād, near Astarothcarnaim.

*Carnion* (II Mach., xii, 21, 26). Many identify it with Carnaim; some with Qerein, in the Ledjah.

*Cartha* (Jos., xxi, 34; Zabulon), poss. Kh. Qireh.

*Carthan* (Jos., xxi, 32), perhaps another name for Cariathaim 2.

*Casaloith* (Jos., xix, 8; Issachar), most probably the same as Ceseleth-Thabor.

*Casbon* (I Mach., v, 36), very likely identical with *Casphin* (II Mach., xii, 13): Khisfin, N. of the Yarmūk, and E. of the L. of Tiberias.

*Casphin*. See Casbon.

*Casphor* (I Mach., v, 26), the same as Casbon.



*Cateth* (Jos., xix, 15; Zabulon), also *Cathed*, probably to be identified with Cartha.

*Cauda* (Acts, xxvii, 16; A.V. Claudia), a small island where St. Paul landed after leaving Crete; most probably the island of Gauda, S. of Crete, although some, though with little reason, would have it to be the island of Gozo, near Malta.

*Cedes* (q.v.).

*Cedimoth* (Jos., xiii, 18). See *Cademoth*.

*Cedron*, 1 (I Mach., xv, 39; xvi, 9), prob. Qatra, S.E. of Yebnâ and S.W. of 'Aqir.—2 A torrent E. of Jerusalem: Wâdy Sitti Maryam. See JERUSALEM.

*Ceelatha* (Num., xxxiii, 22), station of the Israelites on their journey from Sinai to Cades; prob. Contellet Qûreyeh.

*Ceila* (Jos., xv, 44, etc.; middle of Juda): Kh. Qilâ, N.W. of Hebron.

*Celesyria* (or Cœle-Syria.—I Mach., x, 69, etc.), the valley between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon: El-Beqâa.

*Cellon* (Judges, ii, 13), perhaps the country watered by the Chalos river (Nahr Kûâik), which flows through Aleppo.

*Cenchraë* (Acts, xviii, 18; A. V. Cenchrea), seaport of Corinth.

*Cenereth, Ceneroth*. See GENESARETH.

*Cenezites*, a clan named among the inhabitants of Palestine in patriarchal times (Gen., xv, 19); their original settlements were probably in Mt. Seir (Edom).

*Cenneroth*. See GENESARETH.

*Cephira* (I Esd., ii, 25; II Esd., vii, 29). See *Caphara*.

*Cerehi* (I Kings, xxx, 14, etc.); a tribe settled on the S. border of Canaan, and closely associated with the Philistines. Some think it originated in Crete.

*Ceseleth-thabor* (Jos., xix, 12): 'Iksâl, W. of Mt. Thabor.

*Cesil* (Jos., xv, 30), a mistaken form for Bethul.

*Ceslon* (Jos., xix, 20; xxi, 28), See *Cedes*.

*Cethis* (Jos., xv, 40; plain of Juda). Unknown.

*Chabul* (III Kings, ix, 13), name which seems to be ironical: "thorn land", given by Hiram, King of Tyre, to the twenty cities of Galilee handed over to him by Solomon; these cities very likely belonged to N. Aser and Nephtali.

*Chalane* (Gen., x, 10, etc.). See *Calano*.

*Chaldee*. See *BABYLONIA*.

*Chale* (Gen., x, 11, 12), city in the neighbourhood of Ninive; Assyr.: *Kalhû* or *Kalah*: Nimrûd, at the confluence of the Tigris and the Upper Zab.

*Chali* (Jos., xix, 25; Aser): prob. Kh. 'Alya, N.E. of Acre.

*Chamaam* (Jer., xli, 17), name of a caravanserai in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem. Site unidentified.

*Chanath* (Num., xxxii, 42). See *CANATHA*.

*Characa* (II Mach., xii, 17; Transjordan). Some: El-Harâk, N.W. of Boşra; others: Arâq el-Emîr, also El-Kerak. Perhaps not a proper name.

*Charan*, 1 (Judges, v, 9; Acts, vii, 2, 4). See *Haran*.—2 (Tob., xi, 1). The Greek *Textus Receptus* gives here no place-name. Impossible to determine the true reading.

*Charcamis*. See *HETHITES*.

*Chasphia* (I Esd., viii, 17), town or region inhabited by an important colony of exiled Jews. Unknown.

*Chebbon* (Jos., xv, 40; Juda): El-Qûbeibeh, S.W. of Eleutheropolis.

*Chebron* (I Mach., v, 65), for *HEBRON*.

*Chellus* (Judith, i, 9; omitt. in Vulg.), prob. Khalasah, S.W. of Bersabee and N. of Cades.

*Chelmad* (Ezech., xxvii, 23); poss. a town; in that case might be Chelmadeh, near Bagdad; or a region—Carmania; possibly also might be translated "as a disciple."

*Chelmon* (Judith, vii, 3, in Greek only), a town near Bethulia, likely Tell-Qaimûn, E. of Mt. Carmel; or Kûmieh, between the Little Hermon and Mount Gelboe.

*Chene* (Ezech., xxvii, 23). The Heb. has *Kalneh*. See *Calano*.

*Cherub* (I Esd., ii, 59; II Esd., vii, 61); the complete name was *Cherub Addon-Immer*. Unknown.

*Cheslon* (Jos., xv, 10; N.W. Juda). Keslâ.

*Chobar*, a river in "the land of the Chaldeans", commonly identified with the mod. Chabûr; but the names have roots absolutely different, and the position seems unsatisfactory. Perhaps we should see here one of the canals with which Babylonia was seamed, poss. the Nahr Malcha, or King's Canal, of Nabuchodonosor.

*Chorazin*, A.V. for *Corozain*.

*Chub* (Ezech., xxx, 5). Great divergences exist as to its identification. Some suggest Cobe, near the Indian Ocean; others Chobat, in Mauretania, or Cobion, in Mareotica; both these opinions are most unlikely. It has also been proposed to correct the text and read Lûb (Libya); not probable. One Heb. MS. has *Kenûb* (Egypt. *Keneb*, i.e. S. Egypt). Nothing can be said with certainty.

*Chun* (I Par., xviii, 8). In the parallel text of II Kings, viii, 8, instead of Chun, we find Berothai. If Chun was a distinct city, it might be recognized in Kûnâ, S.W. of Baalbek.

*Chus* (Judith, vii, 8; omitt. in Vulg.): poss. Qûzâ, 5 m. S. of Naplûs.

*Cibsaïm* (Jos., xxi, 22; Ephraïm), perhaps the same as *Jeemaam* (I Par., vi, 68). Tell el-Qabans, near Bethel, has also been suggested, but the identification is very doubtful.

*Cina* (Jos., xv, 22; S. Juda). Unknown.

*Cineans* (Gen., xv, 19, etc.), a clan closely allied to Israel, perhaps also to the Madianites. Its home seems to have been in the S. of Juda; however, we see in Judges, iv, 11, that Heber the Cinean dwelt in the plain of Esdrelon.

*Clauda*, A.V. for *Cauda*.

*Coa* (Ezech., xxiii, 23); Assyr.: *Kû (tû)* or *Gû (tû)* perhaps the same word as rendered in Hebrew *Gôyim*, Gen. xiv, 1. A country in the neighbourhood of Babylonia and Elam. Unidentified.

*Colossae* (q.v.).

*Corinth* (q.v.).

*Corozain* (Matt. xi, 21; Luke, x, 13), prob. Kh. Kerâzeh, N. of the L. of Tiberias.

*Cos* (I Mach., xv, 23; Acts, xxi, 1), an island in the Aegean Sea: mod. Stanko.

*Culon* (Jos., xv, 59, in Greek; omitt. in Heb. and Vulg.; Juda) prob. Qolonveh.

*Cutha* (IV Kings, xvii, 24); cuneif. *Gûdûa*, *Gûdû*, *Kûtû*; identif. with Tell Ibrahim, N.E. of Babylon.

*Cyprus* (q.v.).

*Cyrene* (q.v.).

*Dabereth* (Jos., xix, 21, etc.; Zabulon), Debûrtyeh, W., and at the foot of Mt. Thabor.

*Dabir*, 1 (Jos., xi, 22, etc.; S. Juda) the same as *Cariathsenna* and *Cariathsepher*: most prob. Darberiyeh, S.S.W. of Hebron.—2 (Jos., xv, 7; N. Juda): poss. Toghret ed-Debr.

*Dalmanutha* (Mark, viii, 10): perhaps El-Delhamtyeh, S. of the L. of Tiberias, on the left bank of the Jordan.

*Damascus* (q.v.).

*Damna* (Jos., xxi, 35; Zabulon; in the parallel passage, I Par., vi, 77, Heb. 62, *Remmono*). The true name is doubtful; poss. Rûmmâneh, N. of Nazareth.

*Dan* (q.v.).

*Danna* (Jos., xv, 49; mount. of Juda). Unknown.

*Daphca* (Num., xxxiii, 12, 13.) station of the Israelites on their journey from the Red Sea to Sinai: poss. Tabacca, near the Wâdy Lebweh.

*Daphne* (II Mach., iv, 33), a sacred grove and shrine near Antioch of Syria.

*Dathema* (I Mach., v, 9; Transjordan), either Er-Remtheh, or El-Hosn, S.W. of the Yarmûk.

*Debbusest* (Jos., xix, 11; Zabulon). Some: Jebáta, S.W. of Nazareth; others: Kh. ed-Dabsheh, or Zeb-däh.

*Debera* (Jos., xv, 7). See Dabir 2.

*Deblatha* (Ezech., vi, 14), in the land of Emath: prob. the same as Reblatha (Jer., xxxix, 5, 6).

*Deblathuon* (Jer., xlviii, 22; D.V.: "house of Deblathuon": Mouabte Stone, l. 30: *Diblathan*): Ed-Dleilet el-Gharbiyeh (Musil), doubtful.

*Decapolis* (q.v.).

*Delean* (Jos., xv, 38; Plain of Juda). Unknown.

*Delos* (I Mach., xv, 23), an island in the Ægean Sea. *Demabi* (Gen., xxxvi, 32; I Par., i, 43; Edom). Unidentified.

*Derbe* (Acts, xiv, 6, etc.), a town in Lycaonia; not identified.

*Dessau* (II Mach., xiv, 16; Judea). Unknown.

*Dibon* (q.v.).

*Dibona* (Jos., xv, 22; S. Juda: the same is called, prob. by a copyist's mistake, Dibon, in II Esd., xi, 25; Kh. et-Teibeh.

*Diospolis*. Greek name of Lod. See SEBASTE, DIOCESE OF.

*Dizhab* (Deut., i, 1; D.V. "where there is very much gold"). The name of a station of the Israelites: poss. Ed-Dhejbeh.

*Doch* (I Mach., xvi, 15): 'Ain-Dük, N.W. of Jericho.

*Dommim*. See Phesdommim.

*Dor* (Jos., xi, 2, etc.; Aser), Assyr. *Dürä*: Tanžura, on the Mediterranean shore, S. of Mt. Carmel.

*Dora* (I Mach., xv, 11). See Dor.

*Dothain*, *Dothan* (Gen., xxxvii, 17, etc.), Tell Dothan, betw. Sebastiyeh and Jenin.

*Duma* (Jos., xv, 52; S. Juda): Kh. Dómeh, S.W. of Hebron.

*Dura* (Dan., iii, 1), plain S.E. of Babylon; the name is preserved in the Telul (hills) Dúra, and Nahr Dúra.

*Ecbatana*, 1 (I Esd., vi, 2), capital of Major Media: Takti Soleiman.—2. Capital of the kingdom of Cyrus: Hamadan.

*Edema* (Deut., ix, 23; Nephtali), prob. Kh. 'Admäh, on the right bank of the Jordan, below the confluence of the Yarmúk. Some, however, identify it with Damiyeh, W. of the L. of Tiberias.

*Eder* (Jos., xv, 21; S. Juda), either Eh. el-'Adar, or Kh. 'Cmm 'Adreh.

*Edom*. See IDUMEA.

*Edrai*, 1 (Num., xxi, 33; E. Manasses): Der'at.—2 (Jos., xix, 37; Nephtali): Yá'ter, half way between Tyre and L. Hüleh.

*Eglon* (Jos., x, 3, etc.; plain of Juda): Kh. 'Ajlan, W. of Beit-Jibrin.

*Ekron*, A.V. for Accaron.

*Elam* (q.v.).

*Elath* (Deut., ii, 8, etc.), seaport on the 'Aqába Gulf: mod. 'Aqába.

*Elcesi*, or rather *Elqosh*, birthplace of the prophet Nahum. Some deem it to be El-Kauze, in Nephtali; others, Qessiyeh, S.E. of Beit-Jibrin, in the Sephela.

*Eleale* (Is., xv, 4, etc.; Moab): El-'Al, N. of Hesbân.

*Eleph* (Jos., xviii, 18; Benjamin). Unknown.

*Eleutheropolis* (q.v.), Greek name of Beit-Jibrin.

*Eleutherus*, river dividing Syria from Phœnicia: Nahr el-Kebir.

*Elim* (Ex., xvi, 1, etc.), station of the Israelites on their journey from the Red Sea to Sinai: somewhere about the Wády Gharandel.

*Ellasar* (Gen., xiv, 19): prob. Larsa, Larissa of the Greeks, on the left bank of the Euphrates, in Lower Babylonia.

*Elmelech* (Jos., xix, 26; Aser); Egypt. *Retemaraka* probably in the neighbourhood of Wády el-Málek, a tributary of the Cison (A.V. Kishon).

*Elon* (Jos., xix, 43; Dan): either Beit-'Ello, or more prob. 'Ellin.

*Eltecon* (Jos., xv, 59; mount. of Juda), Thecue,

birthplace of Amos, according to St. Jerome (little prob.). Unidentified.

*Elthece* (Jos., xix, 44, etc.; Dan); also *Elthece*: Assyr.: *Altaquü*, in the neighbourhood of Accaron. Not identified.

*Eltholad* (Jos., xv, 30; S.W. Juda). Unknown.

*Elymais* (II Mach., ix, 2), not a town, but the prov. Elymais is meant; although a city, poss. Susa, is alluded to in the context.

*Emath*, 1. Egypt.: *Ham(ü)*; Assyr.: *Amaatti*; Epiphania of the Greeks: Hamah, on the Orontes.—2 (Jos., xix, 35; Nephtali): prob. El-Hammân, S. of Tiberias.

*Emath Suba* (II Par., viii, 3), possibly the country of Emath 1.

*Emer*. See Cherub.

*Emmaus* (q.v.).

*Emmer* (I Esd., ii, 59; II Esd., vii, 61). See Cherub.

*Emona* (Jos., xviii, 24; Benjamin), poss. Kh. Keft 'Aná, N. of Beitin.

*Enaim* (Gen., xxxviii, 14, etc.; plain of Juda), near Odollam; but unknown.

*Enan*, rather *Hasar Enan*, "the village of Enan" (D.V., Num., xxxiv, 9, etc.). Some: Qiryatein, on the road from Damascus to Palmyra; others, and more prob.: Hazúreh, near Banías.

*Endor* (I Kings, xxviii, 7; Issachar): 'Endor, S. of Mt. Thabor.

*Engaddi* (q.v.), W. shore of the Dead Sea, towards the middle: 'Ain Jidí.

*Engallim* (Ezech., xlvii, 10): poss. 'Ain el-Feshkháh, N.W. shore of the Dead Sea; or 'Ain Hajláh.

*Engannim*, 1 (Jos., xv, 34; plain of Juda): perh. Beit el-Jemal.—2 (Jos., xix, 31; xxi, 29; Issachar): Jenin, S. of Zerá'in.

*Enhadda* (Jos., xix, 21; Issachar): prob. Keft 'Adan, N.W. of Jenin.

*Enhasor* (Jos., xix, 37; Nephtali): Kh. Hazíreh, W. of L. Hüleh.

*Ennom* (Valley of). See JERUSALEM.

*Ennon*. See ENON.

*Enon*. See ENAN.

*Ensemes* (Jos., xv, 7; xviii, 7), generally recognized in 'Ain el-Häüd, or "Apostles' Spring" of the Christians on the road from Jericho to Jerusalem.

*Epha* (Is., lx, 6), a branch of the Madianites, prob. settled in N. Arabia.

*Ephes Dammim* (I Kings, xvii, 1). See Phesdommim.

*Ephesus* (q.v.).

*Ephra*, 1 (Judges, vi, 11, etc.; W. Manasses), birthplace of Gedeon: perhaps Et-Tayebah, between Mt. Thabor and Beisán.—2 (Jos., xviii, 23; I Kings, xiii, 17, etc.; Benjamin): Et-Tayebah, N.E. of Beitin.

*Ephrata* (Gen., xxxv, 16, etc.), surname of Bethlehem, poss. the name of the surrounding region.

*Ephrem*. See Ephra 2.

*Ephron*, 1 (Jos., xv, 9). A mountain district on the N. border of Juda, between the spring of Nephtoa and Cariathiarim.—2 (II Par., xiii, 19). See Ephra 2.—3. (I Mach., v, 46; II Mach., xii, 27; Transjord.), a city perhaps identical with Gephurus of Polyb. (V. lxx, 12). The site is unknown, but was likely in the Wády el-'Arab, or the straits of the Sheri'at el-Mand-hür.

*Erek*. See Archi.

*Esaan* (Jos., xv, 22; mount. of Juda). The text is perhaps corrupt and should be read *Samma*, as I Par., ii, 43: Es-Samiyáh seems to be intended.

*Escol*. A valley with vineyards and pomegranates near Hebron, prob. the Wády Beit Iskahl, N.W. of the city.

*Esdrelon*: large plain in the watershed of the Cison (A.V. Kishon).

*Esem*. See Asem.

*Esna* (Jos., xv, 43; plain of Juda): 'Idhnáh, between Beit-Jibrin and Hebron.

*Esora* (Judith, iv, 4; omitt. in Vulg.) seems to be identical with Hasar of Nephtali.

*Estaol*. See *Esthaol*.

*Esthamo* (I Kings, xxx, 28 etc.; mount. of Juda), also *Esthemo*, *Istemo*: Es-Sem'û'a, S. of Hebron.

*Esthool* (Judges, xiii, 25, etc.; plain of Juda): 'Eshû'a, W. of Jerusalem, and S. of Amwas.

*Etam*, 1 (Jos., xv, 60, etc.; mount. of Juda): prob. near 'Ain 'Etân, S.W. of Bethlehem, perhaps Kh. el-Khûkh.—2 Cave of Etam (Judges, xv, 8), very likely in the neighbourhood of Jerrah, poss. the cave of Marmita, near Deir Aban. 3 (I Par., iv, 32; Simeon), Kh. 'Aitûn, S. of Beit-Jibrin.

*Etham* (Ex., xiii, 20; Num., xxxiii, 6), station of the Israelites on their journey from Egypt to Sinai: somewhere E. of El-Gisir.

*Ethan* ("rivers of", Ps. lxxiii [Hebr. lxxiv], 15), probably not a proper name, but the equivalent for "perennial".

*Ether* (Jos., xv, 42, etc.; plain of Juda), also *Athar*. In I Par., iv, 32, instead of *Ether* we read *Thoken*. Possibly Kh. el-'Atr, N.W. of Beit-Jibrin.

*Ethroth* (Num., xxxii, 35; Transjord.), prob. in the neighbourhood of Jebel Aţfârûs, S. of the W. Zerqâ Mâ'in, in Moab.

*Euphrates*. See *PERATÆ*.

*Ezel* (I Kings, xx, 19). An unknown conspicuous rock; perhaps the text is corrupt.

*Fair Havens*, A.V. for Good-havens.

*Gaas* (Jos., ii, 9; Ephraim), a mountain N. of which was Josue's tomb: Jebel el-Ghassâneh.

*Gabaa*, also *Gaba*, *Gabae*, *Gabee*, *Geba*, 1 (Jos., xviii, 24, etc.; Benjamin): Jeba', N.E. of Jerusalem.—2 (Jos., xv, 57, etc.; mount. of Juda): poss. Jeba'a, S.W. of Bethlehem.—3 (Judges, xix, 20, etc.; Benjamin): poss. Tell el-Fûl, or Kh. es-Sikkeh.—4 (Judith, iii, 14; Samaria): perh. Jeba', S. of Tell Dothan.

*Gabaa of Benjamin*. Gabaa 3.

*Gabaa of Saul*. Gabaa 3.

*Gabaa of Phinees* (Jos., xxiv, 33; Ephraim), burial place of Eleazar, Aaron's son: perh. Jib'â, N.W. of Jifneh.

*Gabae* (Jos., xxi, 17). See Gabaa 3.

*Gabaon* (Jos., ix, 3, etc.; Benjamin): El-Jib, N.N.W. of Jerusalem.

*Gabathon* (Jos., xxi, 23, etc.; Dan), also *Gebbethon*: poss. Qibbiyeh, E. of Lydda.

*Gabee* (Jos., xviii, 24; I Par., vi, 60). See Gabaa 3.

*Gabim* (Is., x, 31), wrongly interpreted as a proper name: seems to mean houses scattered in the country, outside of villages.

*Gad* (q. v.).

*Gadara*. A city of the Decapolis: Ümm Keis, S. of the Yarmûk.

*Gader* (Jos., xii, 13; S. Palestine), identical with *Bethgader*, I Par., ii, 51; also identified by some with *Gedor*; by others with *Gedera*. Otherwise unknown.

*Gaderoth* (Jos., xv, 41; II Par., xxviii, 18; plain of Juda), poss. Qatrah, S.E. of Yebna (doubtful).

*Gadgad* (Num., xxxiii, 32; D.V.: Mount Gadgad), is not a mountain; the Wâdy Ghâdhâghydh, S. of Qûreiyeh, on the road from 'Ain Kedeis to the 'Aqâba Gulf, has been proposed, and the identification does not lack probability.

*Gador* (Jos., xv, 58; mount. of Juda): Jedûr.

*Galaad*, 1. Country on the E. of the Jordan.—2 (Judges, xii, 7) should probably be completed, according to several Gr. MSS.: Maspha of Galaad.

*Galgol*, *Galgala*, 1. Place of the encampment of the Israelites in the Ghôr, commonly recognized in Tell Jeljûl, E. of Jericho.—2 (Jos., xii, 23; I Mach., ix, 2), a Canaanite royal city: Jiljûlyeh, N.E. of Jaffa, or Qalqilyeh, a little to the N.—3 (IV Kings, ii, 1, etc.) Jiljûlyeh, between Beitin and Naplûs.

*Gahlee* (q. v.).

*Gallim*, 1 (Jos., xv, 59; omitt. in Heb. and Vulg.) Beit Jâlâ, between Bettûr and Bethlehem.—2 (I K., xxv, 44; Is., x, 30; Benjamin) Kh. el-'Adâse, or Beit

Lêjâ, N. of Jerusalem.—3 (Is., xv, 8; Moab) Unknown; located by the Onomasticon 8 m. S. of Areopolis.

*Gamzo* (II Par., xxviii, 18): Jimzû, S.E. of Lydda.

*Gareb* (Jer., xxxi, 39), a hill in or near Jerusalem. From the text it would seem the Jebel Neby Daûd is intended; many, however, identify it with J. Abû Tôr. *Garizim*, mountain in the neighbourhood of Sichem: J. et-Tôr, S. of Naplûs.

*Gaulon* (Jos., xx, 8, etc.; E. Manasses), also *Golan*: probably Sâhem el-Jôlân, N. of the Wâdy el-Ehreir.

*Gaza* (q. v.).

*Gazara* (I Mach., vii, 45 etc.), later name for Gazer 1.

*Gazer*, 1. Tell Jezer, S. of Lydda.—2. See Jazer.

*Gazera* (I Par., xiv, 16). See Gazer 1.

*Geba*. See Gabaa 1.

*Gebal*. See BYBLOS.

*Gebbar* (I Esd., ii, 20), for Gabaon.

*Gebbethon*. See Gabathon.

*Gedera* (Jos., xv, 36; Sephela): poss. Kh. Jedîreh, S.E. of Lydda, or Qatrah, S.E. of Jabneh.

*Gederothaim* (Jos., xv, 36), poss. another reading for *Gedera*.

*Gedor*, 1 (Jos., xv, 58; mount. of Juda) Kh. Jedûr, between Bethlehem and Hebron.—2 (I Par., xii, 7) Perhaps Gedor 1.—3 (I Par., iv, 39) Unknown. Some think *Gerara* is intended.—4 (I Mach., xv, 39). See Cedron 1.

*Genesar*. See GENESARETH.

*Genesareth* (q. v.).

*Gerara* (Gen., x, 19, etc.). A city on the S.W. border of Palestine, commonly identified with Kh. Ümm Jerâr, S. of Gaza.

*Gerasa*, 1 (Transjord.), Jerash. See GERASA.—2 A city supposed by Matt., viii, 28, etc. (original text somewhat doubtful): poss. Kûren Jerâdeh, N. of the Wâdy Fîk, E. of the L. of Tiberias.

*Gerisim*, A.V. for Garizim.

*Gessen*. Region in Lower Egypt, between the Pelusian arm of the Nile and the wilderness.

*Gessur* (I Kings, xxvii, 8, etc.), a region the location of which is much disputed. Some think it to have been in the S. of Palestine (Cheyne); others locate it in the N. Jôlân, even in the Ledjâh.

*Gethaim* (II Kings, iv, 3; II Esd., xi, 33; in or near Benjamin), identified by some with Ramleh.

*Gethhepher* (Jos., xix, 13, etc.; Zabulon): El-Meshhad, N.E. of Nazareth.

*Gethremmon*, 1 (Jos., xix, 45, etc.; Dan) possibly identical with Gethaim.—2 (Jos., xxi, 25; W. Manasses)—I Par., vi, 70, Heb. 55, *Balaam*). If the text of Jos. be preferred, Gethremmon might possibly be *Kejr Rûmmân*, N.W. of *Sebastiyeh*.

*Gethsemani* (q. v.).

*Gezer*, *Gezeron*. See Gazer.

*Gibeon*, A.V. for Gabaon.

*Gideroth*. See Gaderoth.

*Gihon*. See JERUSALEM.

*Gilo* (Jos., xv, 51; mount. of Juda), birthplace of Achitophel; unlikely supposed by some to be Kh. Jâlâ, or Beit Jâlâ, near Bethlehem; really unknown. *Gnidus* (I Mach., xv, 23; Acts, xxvii, 7), a city in Caria.

*Gob* (II Kings, xxi, 18, 19). Unknown. Perhaps the text is corrupt.

*Golan*. See Gaulon.

*Golgotha*. See JERUSALEM.

*Gomorrha* (Gen., xiv, 2, etc.), a city of the Pentapolis. Site unknown.

*Good-havens* (Acts, xxvii, 8), Kalo Limniones, E. of C. Matala, on the S. coast of Crete.

*Gortyne* (I Mach., xv, 23), a city in Crete.

*Gosen* (Jos., xv, 51; mount. of Juda). Unknown.

*Gullath* (Judges, i, 15; D.V. "the Upper and the Nether watery ground"); proper names, poss. referring to Seil ed-Dilbeh.

*Gurbaal* (II Par., xxvi, 7): Tell el-Ghûr, N. of Bersabee.

*Habor* (q.v.).  
*Haweldama*. See JERUSALEM.  
*Hachula* (I Kings, xxiii, 19, etc.), a hill on the S. of the wilderness of Ziph (Juda); might be Dahr el-Kôûi, although the identification is by no means certain.  
*Hahissa* (Jos., xv, 37; plain of Juda), perh. 'Ebdîs, or 'Eddîs, E. of Ascalon.  
*Hadid* (I Esd., ii, 33), identical with Adiada.  
*Hadrach* (Zach., xi, 1); Assy.: *Ħatarika*, *Ħataraka*, a town in Syria; unknown.  
*Hai*, 1 (A. V. Gen., xii, 8, etc.), prob. Kh. Haiyân, E. of Beitin.—2 (Jer., xlix, 3), prob. an Ammonite city. Unknown.  
*Hala* (IV Kings, xvii, 6; xviii, 11), a place of exile of the Israelites in Assyria; Assy.: *Haluhhû*; perh. Glâ or Kalah, near the source of the Khabur.  
*Halcath* (Jos., xix, 25; xxi, 31): Yerkû, N.E. of Acre.  
*Halkul* (Jos., xv, 58; mount. of Juda): *Halhûl*, N. of Hebron, near Beit Sûr.  
*Halicarnassus* (q.v.).  
*Hammoth Dor* (Jos., xxi, 32). See Hamon 1.  
*Hamon*, 1 (I Par., vi, 76, Heb. 61; Nephtali): El-Hammâm, on the W. shore of the L. of Tiberias.—2 (Jos., xix, 28; Aser), poss. Kh. el-'Awâmîd, S. of Tyre.  
*Hanathon* (Jos., xix, 14; N. Zabulon): perh. Keffr Anân.  
*Hanes* (Is., xxx, 4), Egypt. *Hininsû*; Assy.: *Hiniin-shû*; a city in the Delta of the Nile, prob. Heracleopolis Parva of the classics: Ahnâs el-Medineh.  
*Hapharaim* (Jos., xix, 19; Issachar), Egypt. *Hapûr-ama*; Kh. el-Farriyeh, between Mt. Carmel and Lejûn.  
*Harân*. A town in Mesopotamia; Assy.: *Harraû*, on the river Belikh, a confluent of the Euphrates.  
*Hares* (Judges, i, 35). The exact name is doubtful; moreover Hares is equivalent to Shemesh (Sun); hence Har Hères, 'Ir Shamesh, and Beth Shamesh might be three forms of one name. After all, the name might not indicate a hill, but a village: 'Ain Shems.  
*Harma*. See Horma 1.  
*Haroseth* (Judges, iv, 2): El-Haritiyeh, on the right bank of the 'îson, between Haifa and Nazareth.  
*Hasarsuhal* (Jos., xv, 28 etc.; S. Juda). Unknown.  
*Hasarsusim* (Jos., xix, 5; S. Simeon); might be Sûsin or Beit Sûsin, on the road from Gaza to Egypt.  
*Haserim* (Deut., ii, 23), a common name meaning "the villages": Arab. Dwar.  
*Haseroth* (Num., xi, 35), a station of the Israelites in their journey from Mt. Sinai to Cades: 'Ain Haqdrâ, about eighteen hours N.E. of Mt. Sinai.  
*Hasersual*. See Hasarsuhal.  
*Hasersusa*. See Hasarsusim.  
*Hassemon* (Jos., xv, 27; S. Juda). Unknown.  
*Haroth Jair*. A group of cities E. of the Jordan in Galaad, Argob, and Basan.  
*Hebal*, a mountain in the Ephraim range, N. of Naplûs, over against Mt. Garizim: Jebel Slimâh.  
*Hebron* (q.v.).  
*Hebrona* (Num., xxxiii, 34), a station of the Israelites on their journey from Egypt to the Holy Land: near Asiongaber.  
*Helam* (II Kings, x, 16, 17), an unknown Ammonite city.  
*Helba* (Judges, i, 31). See Ahalab.  
*Helbon* (Ezech., xxvii, 18), a town in Syria renowned for its wine: Helbûn, on the E. slope of Anti-Lebanon, 12 m. N.W. of Damascus.  
*Heleath*. See Halcath.  
*Heleph* (Jos., xix, 33; Nephtali), poss. Beit Lîf, halfway between L. Hûleh and the sea.  
*Heliopolis*. See BAALBEK.  
*Helmondeblathaim*. See Deblathaim.  
*Helon*, 1 (I Par., vi, 58, Heb. 43, Gr. 57). See Holon.—2 (I Par., vi, 69, Heb. 54), for Aialon.—3 (Jer., xlviii, 21; Ruben). Unknown.  
*Hemath* (I Par., xviii, 3, 9). See Emath.  
*Henoch* (Gen., iv, 17), the first city built by Cain and called after his first-born son; of course, entirely unknown.

*Herma*. See Horma 1.  
*Hermom*. Mountain range on the N. border of Israel: Jebel el-Sheikh, or J. et-Telj.  
*Hesebon* (Num., xxi, 26, etc.; Moab). Heşbân.  
*Heser* (III Kings, ix, 15), the same as Asor 1.  
*Heshbon*, A.V. for Hesebon.  
*Hesmona* (Num., xxxiii, 29; xxxiv, 4), station of the Israelites on their way from Cades to Asiongaber: in the neighbourhood of 'Ain Kômeh.  
*Hesron*, 1 (Jos., xv, 3; S. Juda), prob. some Hasar. Unidentified.—2 (Jos., xv, 25). See Asor 3.  
*Hethalon* (Ezech., xlvii, 15; xlviii, 1): either Heitela, N. of Tripoli of Syria; or more prob. Adlûn, N. of the Leontes, on the road from Tyre to Sidon.  
*Hethites* (q.v.).  
*Hevites*. One of the petty clans of Canaanites dispossessed by Israel and the Philistines. The Gabaonites were Hevites.  
*Hevilah, Hevilath*. Country watered by the Phison. Unknown.  
*Hierapolis* (q.v.).  
*Hieromaz*, Greek name of the Sheri'at el-Menadhîreh, or Yarmûk.  
*Hirsemes*. See Bethsames.  
*Hoba* (Gen., xiv, 15), N. of Damascus; the identifications proposed are very unsatisfactory.  
*Hodsi* (II Kings, xxiv, 6), probably a copyist's mistake for Cedes.  
*Holon* (Jos., xv, 51; xxi, 15; mount. of Juda). Unknown.  
*Hor*, 1. A mountain by which Israel had their encampment in the desert, and the place of Aaron's death; commonly identified with Jebel Nebi Harûn, S.W. of Petra, a most unlikely location; must be looked for in the neighbourhood of Cades, possibly Jebel Mûeileh, N.W. of Cades.—2. According to common interpretation, another mountain at the N. limit of the Promised Land, and variously identified, although the Jebel esh-Shûqîf seems to be the most suitable location;—perhaps not a proper name, but an expression to be translated: "the rising up of the mountain", i.e. S. Lebanon.  
*Horeb* (q.v.).  
*Horem* (Jos., xix, 38; Nephtali), Kh. el-Hûrah, W. of L. Hûleh.  
*Horma*, 1 (Num., xiv, 45 etc.), formerly called Sêphath: prob. Sbaite, N.N.E. of Cades.—2 (Jos., xix, 29; Aser) Râmeh, S.E. of Tyre.  
*Hosa* (Jos., xix, 29; Aser. text doubtful), poss. Ezziyat, S. of Tyre.  
*Hucac*. See Halcath.  
*Hucuca* (Jos., xix, 34; Nephtali): Yaqtûq, W. of Capharnaum, S.S.W. of Sâfed.  
*Hus* (Job, i, 1; Jer., xxv, 20; Lam., iv, 21; perhaps different regions are intended). From what may be gathered concerning the "land of Hus" in Job, it was in Arabia, N. of Saba, W. of Chaldea, N. of Edom. See JOB.  
*Iconium* (q.v.), in Lycaonia: Konieh.  
*Idumea* (q.v.).  
*Ijeabarim* (Num., xxi, 11; xxxiii, 44), station of the Israelites in Moab: Kh. 'Ai, S.E. of Kerak.  
*India*, 1. (Esth., i, 1) the region on the right bank of the Indus.—2. The text (I Mach., viii, 8) seems to be at fault, and should perhaps be read Ionia.  
*Islands*, refers to the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean Sea.  
*Iturea* (Luke, iii, 1), originally the country of Jetur (I Par., i, 51; v, 19), on the E. slope of Anti-Lebanon, N. of Damascus.  
*Jabes* (I Par., ii, 55; Juda). Unknown.  
*Jabes Galaad* (I Kings, xi, 1 etc.), poss. Ed-Deir near which there is a Wâdy Yâbis.  
*Jabnia* (II Par., xxvi, 6). See Jamnia.  
*Jaboc*: Nahr es-Zerqâ, between the regions called Belqâ and 'Ajlûn, E. of the Jordan.

- Jacan*. See Benejaacan.
- Jachanan* (Jos., xii, 22), an unknown place about Mt. Carmel.
- Jagur* (Jos., xv, 21; S. Juda). Unknown.
- Jamnia* (I Mach., xiv, 15, etc.), a town of the Sephela: Yebná.
- Janoë*, 1 (Jos., xv, 6; xvi, 7; Ephraim): Yânûn, S.E. of Naplûs.—2 (IV Kings, xv, 29; Nephtali): Yânûh, E. of Tyre, according to some; more prob. Hûnûn, S. of the Merj 'Aiyûn.
- Janum* (Jos., xv, 53; mount. of Juda), poss. Beni Naim, E. of Hebron.
- Japhie* (Jos., xix, 12; Zabulon): Yâfâ, S.W. of Nazareth.
- Jaramoth* (Jos., xxi, 29; Issachar), called *Ramoth* in I Par., vi, 73, Heb. 58). Unidentified.
- Jarephel* (Jos., xviii, 27; Benjamin): Râphât, N. of El-Jib.
- Jasa* (Num., xxi, 23; Jer., xlviii, 21; Moab. S., l, 19); Onomasticon: "between Madaba and Dibon": Umm el-Wâlid (? Musil).
- Jaser* (Jos., xxi, 36). See *Jasa*.—2. See *Jazer*.
- Jassa*. See *Jasa*.
- Jazer* (Num., xxxii, 1, etc.; Transjord.), prob. Kh. Sâr, W. of Ammân.
- Jearbarim* (Num., xxi, 11, etc.). See *Ijeabarim*.
- Jeblaam* (Jos., xvii, 11; Issachar); Egypt.: *Ibra'amû*: Kh. Bel'ameh, S. of Jenin.
- Jebnael* (Jos., xix, 33; Nephtali): Yemmâ, between Thabor and the S. end of the L. of Tiberias.
- Jebneel*. See *Jamnia*.
- Jeboc*: the same as *Jaboc*.
- Jebus*. See JERUSALEM.
- Jecmaam* (I Par., vi, 68, Heb. 53), also *Jecmaan* (III Kings, iv, 12). In the parallel list of Jos., xxi, 22, *Cibsaïm* is to be found. Text doubtful.
- Jecnam* (Jos., xxi, 34; Zabulon): prob. Tell Qaimûn, E. of Mt. Carmel.
- Jecnam* (Jos., xix, 11). See *Jecnam*.
- Jecthel* (IV Kings, xiv, 7), name given to Petra by Amasias, King of Juda. See *PETRA*.
- Jecthel* (Jos., xv, 38; Sephela). Unknown.
- Jedala* (Jos., xix, 15; Zabulon): Jeidâ, S. of Bethlehem of Zabulon.
- Jegbaa* (Judges, viii, 11; Transjord.): Ajebthât, E. of Es-Salt.
- Jehoshaphat*, A.V. for Josaphat.
- Jemnaa*. See *Jamnia*.
- Jephtha* (Jos., xv, 43; plain of Juda). An unidentified place, S.E. of Beit Jibrin.
- Jericho* (q.v.).
- Jerimoth* (Jos., x, 23, 35; Sephela): Kh. Yarmûk, 6 m. N.N.E. of Beit Jibrin.
- Jerimuth* (II Esd., xi, 29). See *Jerimoth*.
- Jeron* (Jos., xix, 38; Nephtali): Yârûn, W. of L. Hûleh.
- Jerusalem* (q.v.).
- Jesania* (III Kings, xv, 17): 'Ain Siniya, N. of Beitin. Perhaps should be read also instead of *Sen*, I Kings, vii, 12.
- Jesimon*, 1 (Num., xxi, 20; xxiii, 28; Moab) desert N. of the Dead Sea, and E. of the lower Jordan.—2 (I Kings, xxiii, 15 etc.) country between the deserts of Ziph and of Maon, and Engaddi.
- Jesse* (Judith, i, 9), for Gessen.
- Jesue* (II Esd., xi, 26; S. Juda): Kh. Sâ'weh, E. of Bersabee.
- Jeta* (Jos., xxi, 16; Juda-Simeon): Yûtâ, S. of Hebron.
- Jeteba* (IV Kings, xxi, 19), birthplace of Messalemeth, Manasses' wife, prob. in Juda, but unknown.
- Jetebatha* (Deut., x, 7), station of the Israelites between Cades and Asiongaber. Unknown.
- Jethela* (Jos., xix, 42; Dan): Beit Tâl, S.E. of Yalô.
- Jether* (Jos., xv, 48; mount. of Juda): 'Attîr, between Hebron and Bersabee.
- Jethnam* (Jos., xv, 23; S. Juda). Unknown.
- Jethson* (Jos., xxi, 36). So Vulg., prob. by mistake; in other texts, *Cademoth*.
- Jezer*. See *Jazer*.
- Jezrael*, 1 (Jos., xvii, 16, etc.; Issachar): Zerâ'in, S.W. of Jebel Nebi Dahî (Little Hermon).—2 (Jos., xv, 56; I Kings, xxvii, 3; Juda), in the neighbourhood of Carmel and Ziph. Unknown.
- Jim* (Jer., xxvi, 18; S. Juda): perh. Beit 'Awwâ, not far from Bersabee.
- Joppe*. See JAFFA.
- Jordan* (q.v.).
- Josaphat* (Joel, iii, 2, 12), prob. an allegorical name: "the valley wherein Yahweh shall judge".
- Jota* (Jos., xv, 55). See *Jeta*.
- Jucadam* (Jos., xv, 56; mount. of Juda): apparently S.E. of Hebron. Unidentified.
- Jud* (Jos., xix, 45; Dan): El-Yehûdiyeh. N. of Lydda.
- Juda* (q.v.).
- Judea* (q.v.).
- Laban* (Deut., i, 1), station of the Israelites in their journey from Sinai to Cades. Unknown.
- Labanath* (Jos., xix, 26), is separated in Vulg. from preceding word, to which it should be joined: Sihor Labanath. See *Sihor*.
- Lacedemon* (II Mach., v, 9). See SPARTA.
- Lahela* (I Par., v, 26), a mistake for "to Hala", a region of Assyria.
- Lahem* (I Par., iv, 22; the text is not clear). Unknown.
- Lais*. See DAN.
- Laïsa* (Is., x, 30; I Mach., ix, 5): Kh. Q'âqûl, W. of 'Anâta.
- Lampsacus* (I Mach., xv, 23), a city of Mysia, on the Hellespont, possibly a mistake for *Sampsame*: Samsûn, a little seaport between Sinope and Trebizond, on the Black Sea.
- Laodicea*. (Col., ii, 1, etc.; q.v.).
- Lebaoth* (Jos., xv, 32). See Beth Leba'ôth.
- Lebna*, 1 (Num., xxxiii, 20) a station of the Israelites in the journey from Sinai to Cades. Unknown.—2 (Jos., x, 31; Sephela): poss. Kh. el-Benâwy, 10 m. S.E. of Lachis.
- Lebona* (Judges, xxi, 19): El-Lûbbân, S. of Naplûs.
- Lehi* (Judges, xv, 17; D.V. "jawbone"): Kh. 'Ain el-Lehi has been proposed, but is very doubtful; the above Arab. name seems to be rather 'Ain 'Alleik.
- Lecum* (Jos., xix, 33; Nephtali), site unknown, probably in the neighbourhood of L. Hûleh.
- Leheman* (Jos., xv, 40; plain of Juda), Kh. el-Laïhm, S. of Beit Jibrin.
- Lesâ* (Gen., x, 19), poss. Callirrhoe (St. Jerome): Hammâm ez-Zergâ, E. of the Dead Sea.
- Lesem* (Jos., xix, 47). See DAN.
- Lobna* (Jos., xxi, 13), the same as *Lebna* 2.
- Lod* (I Par., viii, 12, etc.): El-Lûdd. See SEBASTE.
- Lodabar* (II Kings, ix, 4, etc.; Transjord.) Greek has *Daïbon*: text unsettled.
- Lûith* (Is., xv, 5; Jer., xlviii, 5; Moab): Kh. Fâs (Musil); Nûchin (de Sauley); hardly identified.
- Luza*, 1 (Gen., xxviii, 19, etc.), an old name for Bethel.—2 (Judges, i, 26) A city of the Hethites, perh. Lûweiziyeh, N.W. of Tell el-Qâdî.
- Lyda* (I Mach., xi, 34), *Lydda* (Acts, ix, 32, etc.). Lod.
- Lystra*, 1 (Acts, xiv, 8, etc.), a city of Lycaonia: *Khatyn Serai*.—2 (Acts, xxvii, 5), in some MSS., a mistake for *Myra* in Lycia.
- Maara* of the Sidonians (Jos., xiii, 4): possibly "the cave" of Jezzîn, about 9 m. E. of Sidon; but the text seems corrupt and should perhaps be read: "from Gaza to Sidon".
- Maces* (III Kings, iv, 9; Dan). Unknown.
- Maceda* (Jos., x, 10, etc.), poss. El-Mûghâr, in the neighbourhood of Accaron.
- Maceloth* (Num., xxxiii, 25), station of the Israelites on the journey from Sinai to Cades: prob. Maqehelat.



*Mechabon* (II Par., ii, 49), prob. the same as Chebon.

*Mekmas* (I Kings, xiii, 2, etc.; Benjamin): Mikhmás N. of Jerusalem.

*Meknath* (Jos., xvi, 7, etc., limit of Ephraim and W. Manasse), perhaps not a city, but a region, poss. the Plain of El-Makhnâh (Guthie).

*Mekbesh* (Seph., i, 11; D.V.: "the Mortar"), a place near Jerusalem, "the Valley of Siloe" (St. Jerome).

*Medmonat* (I Par., ii, 49). See Medemena.

*Madon* (Jos., xi, 1, etc.) perh. should be read *Maron*; poss. Kh. Madin, W. of Tiberias, or Meiron, N.W. of Sateel.

*Magula* (I Kings, xvii, 20; xxvi, 37), wrongly interpreted by Vulg. as a proper name; means a fenced encampment.

*Magdal*, 1 (Ex., xiv, 2, etc.): perh. Serapeum—2 (Jer., xlv, 1, etc.) perh. the same; poss. Tell es-Semût, near Pelusium.

*Magdala* (Matt., xv, 39; Mark, viii, 10; text not certain): El-Mejdel; on the W. shore of the L. of Tiberias.

*Magdela* (Jos., xix, 38; Nephtali): poss. El-Mejdel; according to the Onomasticon, Athlit.

*Magdalgal* (Jos., xv, 37; Sephela), Assyr.: *Magdila*; either El-Mejdel, near Ascalon, or El-Mejleh, S. of Beit Jibrin.

*Magedan* (Matt., xv, 39). See Magdala, Dalmanutha.

*Mageddo*, *Mageddon*. See MAGEDDO.

*Mageth* (I Mach., v, 26, 36; Transjord.), prob. Kh. el-Mukatiyeh, W. of the confluence of the Rûqqâd and the Yarmûk.

*Magron*, 1 (I Kings, xiv, 2), prob. a common name indicating the top of the hill on the slope of which Jebel 'Ajlûn, N. of the Jaboc.

*Mahane Dan* (Judges, xiii, 25; xviii, 12), a place W. of Cariathiarim.

*Mallos* (II Mach., iv, 30), a city of Cilicia.

*Malta* (q.v.).

*Mambre*. See Hebron.

*Manaim* (Jos., xiii, 26, etc.). See Mahanaim.

*Manasses* (q.v.).

*Maon*, 1 (Jos., xv, 55; S. Juda): Kh. Ma'in.—2 (Judges, x, 12), perhaps Ma'an, E. of Petra; text poss. corrupt.

*Mara* (Ex., xv, 23), station of the Israelites between Egypt and Mt. Sinai, perh. 'Ain Hawâra, or Wady Mereira.

*Maresa*, a city in the Sephela; the name is preserved in Kh. Maresh, near Beit Jibrin; the site was prob. in Tell Sandahanna, a little S.E. of Kh. Maresh.

*Mareth* (Jos., xv, 59; mount. of Juda), poss. Beit Ūmmâr, S.W. of Bethlehem.

*Maroth* (Mich., i, 12). Unknown, although some deem it to be identical with Mareth.

*Masal* (Jos., xix, 26 etc.; Aser): perh. Khan Mithiliya, S.W. of Mt. Carmel.

*Masaloth* (I Mach., ix, 2), prob. a common name meaning "the steps"—i.e. the steps of the caves of Arbella.

*Masepha* (Jos., xv, 38; Sephela): Tell es-Saffiyeh, 7 m. N.W. of Beit Jibrin.

*Maserephoth* (Jos., xi, 8; xiii, 6). Unknown. Perhaps 'Ain Mûsherfi, on the Mediterranean shore, S. of Râs en-Nâqûra.

*Maspha*, *Maspath*, 1. Of Benjamin: site much disputed: Shâ'fat, Nebi Samwîl, El-Bireh, and Tell Nasbeh, all N. of Jerusalem, have been proposed with more or less probability.—2. Of Galaad: see Ramoth Galaad.—3. Of Juda: prob. Tell es-Saffiyeh.—4. Of Moab (I Kings, xxxii, 3, 4). Unknown.

*Masphe*. See Maspha of Galaad.

*Masreea* (Gen., xxxvi, 36; I Par., i, 47), N. of Idumea.

*Matthana*. Station of the Israelites in their journey through Moab; possibly Mechatta.

*Meldim* (Jos., xv, 61; wilderness of Juda). Unknown.

*Medemena*, 1 (Jos., xv, 31; S. Juda). Unknown.—2 (Is., x, 31; Benjamin): Kh. el-Qarâmi, N. of Jerusalem.

*Megiddo*. See MAGEDDO.

*Mejaron* (Jos., xix, 46; Dan), poss. the Nahr el-'Aujeh, betw. Joppe and Arecon.

*Melita*, A.V. for Malta (q.v.).

*Melothi* (Judith, ii, 3, Vulg. only), perhaps Melitine of Cappadocia.

*Memphis* (q.v.).

*Mennith* (Judges, xi, 33). Onomasticon: at a short distance from Hesebon; poss. Umm el-Qenâfid.

*Mephauth* (Jos., xiii, 18): Nefâ, S.S.E. of Ammân.

*Merala* (Jos., xi, 19, Zabulon): prob. Ma'lûl, S.W. of Nazareth.

*Merom* (Waters of). Lake Hûleh.

*Meroz* (Judges, v, 23): poss. El-Mahrûneh, between Dohân and Kûbatiyeh; or El-Mûrassas, near Beisân.

*Merrha* (Bar., iii, 23). Unknown. Perhaps we should read Madian.

*Mesopotamia* (q.v.).

*Mespe* (Jos., xviii, 26), for Maspha of Benjamin.

*Messa* (Gen., x, 30), in Arabia. Unknown.

*Messal* (Jos., xix, 26). See Masal.

*Methca* (Num., xxxiii, 28), station of the Israelites in the journey from Sinai to Cades. Unknown.

*Miletus* (q.v.).

*Misor* (Jos., xxi, 36), not found in the Hebr.; poss. a mistake.

*Mitylene* (Acts, xx, 14), in the island of Lesbos: Metelin.

*Mochona* (II Esd., xi, 28; Juda): Kh. el-Moqenna.

*Modin*, the birthplace of the Machabees; generally admitted to be El-Medieh, E. of Lydda.

*Molada* (Jos., xv, 26; S. Juda), perh. Tell el-Milh, between Bersabee and the Dead Sea.

*Moreseth Gath* (Mich., i, 1, etc.), birthplace of Micheas, E. of Eleutheropolis. Unidentified.

*Mortal* (Seph., i, 11). See Machtesh.

*Mosel* (Ezech., xvii, 19). As such, not a proper name; should be understood: "from Uzal".

*Mosera* (Deut., x, 6). See Moseroth.

*Moseroth* (Num., xxxiii, 30), station of the Israelites in the journey from Cades to Asiongaber. Unidentified.

*Myndus* (I Mach., xv, 23), a city in Caria, between Miletus and Halicarnassus.

*Myra* (Acts, xxvii, 5), not in the Vulg., but should be read instead of Lystra.

*Naalol* (Jos., xix, 15, etc.; Zabulon), prob. Ma'lûl, E. of Nazareth.

*Naama*, 1 (Jos., xv, 41; Sephela): perh. Na'ameh, S. of Lydda and E. of Jabneh.—2 (Job, ii, 11); there was prob. a city of that name in Nabathea. Unknown.

*Naaratha* (Jos., xvi, 7; E. Ephraim), poss. Tell Tahtâni, N. of Jericho.

*Naas* (I Par., iv, 12; Juda), perh. Deir Nâhâs, N.E. of Beit Jibrin.

*Naasson* (Tob., i, 1), prob. Aser 2.

*Nahaliel* (Num., xxi, 19), station of the Israelites E. of the Dead Sea, near the Arnon. Wady Enkeile (? Robinson).

*Naim* (Luke, vii, 11): Nain, on the N.W. slope of the Jebel Dahy.

*Naioth* (I Kings, xix, 18, etc.), "in Ramatha". Otherwise unknown.

*Nazareth* (q.v.).

*Neapolis* (Acts, xvi, 11; xx, 6), a city in Macedonia: Kavalla.

*Neballat* (II Esd., xi, 34): Beit Nebâla, N. of Lydda.

*Nebo*, 1 Mountain N. of Moab: Jebel Nebá.—2 (Num., xxxii, 3; Moabite Stone, l. 14), a town about the Jebel Nebá.

*Nebzan* (Jos., xv, 62; desert of Juda, near the Dead Sea). Unknown.

*Neceb* (Jos., xix, 33, in the Vulg.; Nephtali). See Adami.

*Nehelescol*. See Escol.

*Nehiel* (Jos., xix, 27; Aser). Some: Kh. Yânin, E. of Acre; others: Mi'âr.

*Nemra* (Num., xxxii, 3). See Bethnemra.

*Nemrim* (Is., xv, 6; Jer., xlviii, 34): Wâdy Nemeira, S.E. of the Dead Sea; there is a Kh. Nemeira.

*Nephath Dor*. See Dor.

*Nephtali* (q.v.).

*Nephtoa* (Jos., xv, 9; Juda-Benjamin): Liftâ, N.W. of Jerusalem.

*Nesib* (Jos., xv, 43; Sephela): Beit Nâsib, E. of Eleutheropolis.

*Nethuphati* (II Esd., xii, 28). See Netupha.

*Netupha* (I Par., ii, 54, etc.; Juda): prob. Beit Nettif, N.E. of Eleutheropolis.

*Nicopolis* (Titus, iii, 12), a city in Epirus: Paleoprevyza.

*Nineveh*, A.V. for Ninive.

*Ninive* (q.v.).

*No, No Amon* (Nahum, iii, 8; Ezech., xxx, 14): not Thebes of Upper Egypt, but Thebes in the Delta (Diospolis): Tell Balamûn.

*Noa* (Jos., xix, 23; Zabulon). Unknown.

*Nob* (II Esd., xi, 32; Benjamin): Beit Núbá, between Anâta and Jerusalem.

*Nobe*, 1 (Judges, viii, 11; Transjord.). Unknown.—2 (I Kings, xxi, 1, etc.). See Nob.—3 (Num., xxxii, 42). See Canath.

*Nophe* (Num., xxi, 30; Moab): text doubtful.

*Nopeth* (Jos., xvii, 11), a town, according to Vulg.; the clause should be rendered: "three villages".

*Noran*. See Naaratha.

*Oboth* (Num., xxxiii, 43). Station of the Israelites in the journey from Asiongaber to the frontiers of Moab; prob. Wady Weibeh, N. of Fenân.

*Odollam*: prob. Kh. 'Aid el-Mieh; the cave is near the summit of the S. hill. See ADULLAM.

*Odullam*. See ADULLAM.

*Olon* (Jos., xv, 51). See Holon.

*On*. See BAALBEK.

*Ono* (I Par., viii, 12; Dan); Egypt.: *Aunau*; Kefr 'Anâ, between Lydda and Jaffa.

*Ophel* (II Par., xxvii, 3), a part of Jerusalem.

*Opher* (IV Kings, xiv, 25). See Gethhepher.

*Ophera* (Jos., xviii, 23). See Ephra 2.

*Ophni* (Jos., xviii, 24); Benjamin: perhaps Jifneh, N.W. of Beitin.

*Oreb* (Judges, vii, 25, etc.): poss. 'Osh el-Ghûrâb, between the Jebel Qarantâl and the Jordan.

*Oronaim* (Is., xv, 5; Jer., xlviii, 3, etc.; Moabite Stone, l. 32): Wâdy Ghûweir (Conder): would seem rather S. of the Arnon.

*Orontes*, great river of Syria: Nahr el-'Asi.

*Orthosias* (q.v.—I Mach., xv, 37).

*Ozensara* (I Par., vii, 24): perhaps Beit Sîrâ, W.S.W. of Lower Bethoron.

*Palmyra* (q.v.).

*Paphos* (q.v.—Acts, xiii, 6, etc.), in Cyprus: Baffo. *Paros*. I Par., xxix, 2; Esth., i, 6, speak of "marble of Paros"; but this is not to be found in the original; only "white stone".

*Patarâ* (Acts, xxi, 1-3), a city in Lycia: Jelemish.

*Patmos*. One of the Sporades, S. of Samos, W. of Miletus: Patino.

*Pelusium* (Ezech., xxx, 15, 16); Copt.: *Peremûn*, *Pelusiû*, a city N.E. of the Delta of the Nile, on the branch called, after the name of the city, Pelusiatic: Sâ el-Haggâr.

*Pentapolis*. Region of the five cities: Sodom, Gomorrah, Adama, Seboim, in the Valley of Siddim.

*Pergamus* (Apoc., i, 11; ii, 12), metropolis of the prov. of Asia: Bergamo, or Bergama.

*Perge* (Acts, xiii, 13), second city of the prov. of Pamphilia: Murtana.

*Persia* (q.v.).

*Persepolis*. Whether it is spoken of in II Mach., xix, 2, is doubtful.

*Petra* (q.v.).

*Phalti*. See Bethphalet.

*Phanuel* (Gen., xxxii, 30, etc.; Transjord.), Egypt.: *Penûâlû*; on the banks of the Juboc. Site uncertain.

*Phara* (I Mach., ix, 50): the text seems uncertain; perhaps the same as Pharon.

*Pharan*. General term to designate the wilderness between Sinai and Palestine.

*Pharaton* (Judges, xii, 13, etc.): birthplace of Abdon, one of the Judges of Israel. Prob. Fer'ata, 7 m. S.W. of Naplûs.

*Pharpar*, river of Damascus: Nahr el-'Awaj.

*Phaselis* (I Mach., xv, 23): a city of Asia Minor on the borders of Lycia and Pamphilia.

*Phasga*. Whether this is a common or a proper name is doubtful. At any rate, it indicates a place connected with Mt. Nebo, prob. Ras Siaghâh, W. and at a very short distance of the Jebel Nebá.

*Phatures* (Is., xi, 11; Jer., xlv, 1, etc.): Egypt.: *Patarisi*. Upper Egypt.

*Phau* (Gen., xxxvi, 39; I Par., i, 50): Phau'ârâ has been proposed.

*Phesdommim* (I Kings, xvii, 11; I Par., xi, 13): poss. Dâmim, on the road from Jerusalem to Beit Jibrin, N. of Shûweikeh.

*Phihahiroth* (Ex., xiv, 29; Num., xxxiii, 7); Egypt.: *Pikeheret*. A station of the Israelites in their flight from Egypt. Unidentified.

*Philadelphia* (q.v.).

*Philippi* (q.v.).

*Phinon*. See Phunon.

*Phithom*, a town in Lower Egypt: Tell el-Maskhûtâ, W. of Lake Timsah.

*Phœnicia* (q.v.).

*Phogor*, 1 Mountain N. of the Abarim range, variously identified: El-Mareighât, Tell-Matâba, El-Benât.—2 See Bethphogor.—3 (Jos., xv, 60, Greek): one of the 11 cities added in the Greek to the list of the Hebrew: Kh. Beit Foghûr, S.W. of Bethlehem.

*Phrygia*. See ASIA MINOR.

*Phunon* (Num., xxxiii, 42), a station of the Israelites on the journey from Asiongaber to Moab: Kh. Fenân, on the edge of the 'Araba.

*Psidia* (q.v.).

*Pontus*, territory N.E. of Asia Minor, on the shore of the Black Sea.

*Ptolemais* (I Mach., xii, 48, etc.): Greek name of Acre.

*Puteoli* (Acts, xxviii, 13), a seaport near Naples: Pozzuoli.

*Qibroth Hattawah* (Num., xi, 3; D.V.: "graves of lust"), station of the Israelites on their journey from Sinai to Cades: possibly in Wâdy Khbebeh.

*Qir Moab* (Is., xv, 1; D.V.: "the wall of Moab"), a proper name: Kerak.

*Qir Heres* (Is., xvi, 7, etc.; D.V.: "brick walls"; Moabite Stone, l. 3). See Qir Moab.

*Rabba*, *Rabbath Ammon*, principal city of the Ammonites: Ammân. See PHILADELPHIA.

*Rabbath Moab*. See Ar.

*Rabbath* (Jos., xix, 20; Issachar): Râbâ, 7 m. S.E. of Jenîn.

*Rachal* (I Kings, xxx, 29; Septuag.: "in Carmel"). A city in S. Juda; the text, however, is doubtful, and several commentat. prefer the Greek reading.

*Ragau* (Judith, i, 5, 15): a prov. in Media.

*Rages* (Tob., i, 14, etc.): principal city in Ragau: Rai, S.E. of Teheran.

*Rama*, 1 Of Aser: prob. Rāmīā, E. of Tyre.—2 Of Benjamin Er-Ram, 5 m. N. of Jerusalem.—3 Of Galaad. See Ramoth Galaad.—4 Of Nephtali: Rameh, 6 m. S.W. of Safed. See Arama.—5 Of Samuel. Some: Ram-Allāh, 3 m. S.W. of Beitin; others: Beit Rīmā, 13 m. E.N.E. of Lydda; others: Rameh: more probably Rentis, W. of Beit Rīmā.—6 Of Simeon: possibly Kubbet el-Baul, S. of Hebron.

*Ramatha*, birthplace of Samuel. See Rama 5.

*Ramathaim Sophim*. See Rama 5.

*Ramesses* (Gen., xlvii, 11; Lower Egypt). The site has not yet been identified; some see it in Šan, the Tanis of the ancients; others in Es-Šalīhieh.

*Rameth*. See Jaramoth.

*Ramoth*, 1 Of Galaad, usually called in the Bible Ramoth Galaad: perhaps Reimūn (Conder); more probably Es-Salt.—2 See Jaramoth.

*Ramoth Masphe*. See Ramoth of Galaad.

*Raphaim*, 1 Generic term designating the early population of Palestine: the Emim, Enacim, Horim, Zuzim, were Raphaim.—2 (Valley of). A valley which seems to have been S. of Jerusalem, perh. the plain El-Būqe'a.

*Raphidim* (Ex., xvii, 8, etc.). A station of the Israelites in their journey from the Red Sea to Sinai; may correspond to Wādī 'Erphād.

*Raphon* (I Mach., v, 37; Transjord.): poss. Er-Rāfe, E. of the Jerb el-Hajj.

*Rebla*, 1 (Num., xxxiv, 11): N. boundary of Israel; its site is much disputed: 'Arbin, N.E. of Damascus; Rebleh, between Baulbek and Homs; Halibna or Zor Ramlieh being proposed, the latter with perhaps more probability.—2 Also called

*Reblatha* (IV Kings, xxv, 6, etc.): Rebleh, in the Beq'a'a.

*Reccath* (Jos., xix, 35; Nephtali): an old name of

Tiberias, according to the Talmud.

*Recem* (Jos., xviii, 27; Benjamin). Unidentified.

*Recha* (I Par., iv, 12). Unknown.

*Rechoboth* (Gen., xxxvi, 37), a well near Bersabee: Naqb er-Rūbā'i (?).

*Remmon*, 1 (Jos., xv, 32, etc.; S. Juda): prob. Kh. Ūmm er-Rūmmāmin, N. of Bersabee.—2 (Jos., xix, 13; Zabulon): Rūmmāneh, N. of Nazareth.

*Remmono* (I Par., vi, 77, Heb. 62): see Remmon 2. *Remmonphars* (Num., xxxiii, 19), station of the Israelites on their journey from Sinai to Cades. Unknown.

*Rephidim*, A.V. for Raphidim.

*Resen* (Gen., x, 12), one of the four cities which made up Greater Nineve: poss. Šelamiyeh.

*Reseph* (IV Kings, xix, 12; Assyria); Assyr.: *Rasapa*: identified with Rušāfā, between Palmyra and the Euphrates.

*Ressa* (Num., xxxiii, 21), station of the Israelites, between Sinai and Cades: Wādī Sūweiqā (?).

*Rethma* (Num., xxxiii, 18), another station in the same neighbourhood. Unknown.

*Rhegium* (Acts, xxvii, 40): Reggio di Calabria.

*Rhodes* (q.v.—I Mach., xv, 23; Acts, xxi, 1).

*Rogelim* (II Kings, xvii, 27, etc.; Galaad). Unknown.

*Rohob*, 1 (Num., xiii, 22, etc.), in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi: poss. Hibbariyeh.—2 (Jos., xix, 23; Aser): prob. Tell er-Rāhib, at a short distance from Sidon.—3 (Jos., xix, 30; Judges, i, 31), near the Sea and the Cison. Unknown.

*Rohoboth*. See Rechoboth.

*Rome* (q.v.).

*Ruben* (q.v.).

*Ruma*, 1 (Jos., xv, 52: should be Duma; S. Juda): Ed-Dôme, S.E. of Eleutheropolis.—2 (IV Kings, xxiii, 36). Unknown.

*Saananim* (Jos., xix, 33; Nephtali): poss. Sin en-Nābrā, S. of the L. of Tiberias.

*Saaram* (Jos., xv, 36; S. Simeon): prob. identical with Sarohen.

*Sabama* (Jos., xiii, 19; Ruben): poss. Shānāb, N.W. of Hesbān.

*Saban*. See Sabama.

*Sabarim*, 1 (Jos., vii, 5; D.V.: "quarries"), on the descent from Hai towards the Ghôr. Unknown.—2 (Ezech., xlvii, 16), a town in Syria "between the border of Damascus and the border of Emath."

*Sabee* (Jos., xix, 2; Simeon); text not certain.

*Sachacha* (Jos., xv, 61; desert of Juda): prob. Kh. es-Sikkheh.

*Salebim* (Jos., xix, 42, etc.; Dan): Kh. Selbīt, N.W. of Yalō.

*Salecha* (Deut., iii, 10, etc.; E. limit of Basan): Salkhād, S. of Jebel Hauran.

*Salem*, 1 (Gen., xiv, 18), commonly identified with Jerusalem; this identification, however, is far from certain.—2 (Gen., xxxiii, 18), perhaps not a proper name; if one, Salim, E. of Naplūs.

*Salim* (John, iii, 23). See ÆNON.

*Salmona* (Num., xxxiii, 41), station of the Israelites in the journey from Asiongaber to Moab; must be between the Gulf of 'Aqāba and Kh. Fenān. Unidentified.

*Salmone* (Acts, xxvii, 7), a promontory at the N.E. end of Crete: C. Sidero.

*Sama* (Jos., xix, 2; S. Juda): perhaps *Saba* should be read; might be Tell es-Seba, E. of Bersabee.

*Samaraim* (Jos., xviii, 22; Benjamin): prob. Kh. es-Sūmrā, 5 m. N. of Jericho.

*Samaria* (q.v.).

*Samir*, 1 (Jos., xv, 48; mount, of Juda): poss. Kh.

Šomerāh, S.W. of Hebron.—2 (Judges, x, 1, 2), the home and burial place of Tola: Sanūr (?), between Samaria and Engannim.

*Samos* (q.v.).

*Samothracia*, an island in the Ægean Sea, S. of the Coast of Thracia, N.W. of Troas.

*Sanan* (Jos., xv, 37; Sephela): perhaps the same city as indicated in Mich., i, 11 (D.V.: "pass away"): Šendān.

*Sanir*. Name given to Mt. Hermon by the Amorheans.

*Saphon* (Jos., xiii, 27; Gad). Some: El-Hammeh; others: Tell Amāteh, N. of the Jaboc.

*Saraa* (Jos., xv, 33, etc.; Dan): Šūr'ah, W. of Jerusalem.

*Saraim* (Jos., xv, 36; plain of Juda): Kh. Sa'freh, N.E. of Zanū'a.

*Sarathasar* (Jos., xiii, 19; Ruben): Šārā, a little S. of the Zerqā.

*Sardis* (Apoc., iii, 1), principal city of Lycia.

*Sarea*. See Saraa.

*Sared*. See Sarid.

*Sareda*. Prob. Sarthan.

*Saredatha*. See Sarthan.

*Sarephtha*, *Sarepta* (III Kings, xvii, 9, etc.): Šara-fend, about 8 m. S. of Sidon.

*Sarid* (Jos., xix, 10; Zabulon): poss. Tell Shādūd, S.W. of Nazareth.

*Sarion*. Name given by the Sidonians to Mt. Hermon.

*Sarohen* (Jos., xix, 6; S. Simeon): prob. Tell esh-Sherfah. N.W. of Bersabee.

*Saron*, 1 Maritime plain between Jaffa and Mt. Carmel.—2 Country between Mt. Thabor and the L. of Tiberias.—3 (I Par., v, 16): either some region E. of the Jordan, or 1.

*Sarona* (Acts, ix, 35). See Saron 1.

*Sarthan*, *Sarthana* (Jos., iii, 16, etc.): poss. Qarn Šartabeh, W. of the Jordan, S. of the Wādī Fār'a.

*Scorpion* (Ascent of the). See Acrabim.

*Scythopolis* (II Mach., xii, 30): Beisān. See BETH-SAN.

*Seboim*, 1 (Gen., x, 19, etc.). A city of the Pentapolis.—2 (I Kings, xii, 18). A valley leading from the Ghôr to the heights of Machmas (Benjamin): Wādī Abū Dāba', which debouches into the Wādī el-Kelt.

- Sechrona* (Jos., xv, 11; N. Juda): Kh. Sūkereir (?).  
*Sedada* (Num., xxxiv, 8): prob. Kh. Šerādā, E. of the Merj 'Aiyūn.  
*Segor* (Gen., xiii, 10), generally identified with Eš-Šafīyeh, in the Ghôr of the same name, S. of the Dead Sea.  
*Sehesima* (Jos., xix, 22; Issachar), prob. E. of Mt. Thabor. Unknown.  
*Seir*, 1 (Gen., xxxvi, 8, etc.) practically synonymous with Edom: the mountainous region between the S. end of the Dead Sea, the Wādy el-Emāz and the Wādy Ar'arah.—2 (Jos., xv, 10), a point defining the limit of Juda, S.W. of Cariathiarim.  
*Seira* (IV Kings, viii, 21; Edom), poss. Ez-Zūweireh, W. of the S. end of the Dead Sea.  
*Seirath* (Judges, iii, 26), likely in the hill-country of Ephraim, and not far from Galgala. Site unknown.  
*Sela*, 1. See PETRA.—2 (Judges, i, 36): prob. Cades.—3 (Jos., xviii, 23; Benjamin): poss. Kh. Tabaqāt, at a short distance S.E. of Tell el-Fūl.  
*Selcha*. See Salecha.  
*Selebin*. See Salebin.  
*Seleucia* (q.v.—I Mach., xi, 8; Acts, xiii, 4).  
*Selim* (Jos., xv, 32; S. Juda), prob. the same as Sarohen.  
*Selmon*, 1 (Judges, ix, 48): prob. Sheikh Selmān, S.W. of Mt. Garizim.—2 (Ps. lxxviii, 14): the text is not altogether certain; perhaps the Asalmanus of Ptolemy: Jebel Hauran.  
*Semerom*, 1 (Jos., xix, 15, etc.; Zabulon): perh. Semūniyeh, 5 m. W. of Nazareth; or Es-Semeiriyeh, 3 m. N. of Acre.—2 (II Par., xiii, 4): a hill S. of Beitin.  
*Senaa*. Unknown.  
*Sene* (I Kings, xiv, 4), one of two conspicuous rocks on the way from the Wādy Sūweinit, which seems to have retained the name, to Machmas.  
*Senna*. See Sin 2.  
*Sennaar*: prob. Upper and Lower Babylonia.  
*Sennim*. See Saananim.  
*Sensenna* (I Par., iv, 31); Jos., xix, 5, has *Hasersusa*, prob. identical.  
*Seon* (Jos., xix, 19; Issachar): 'Ayūn esh-Shā'in (?), N.W. of Mt. Thabor.  
*Sephaath* (Judges, i, 17; S. Juda): prob. Sbaite.  
*Sephama* (Num., xxxiv, 10, 11), N. limit of the Holy Land; prob. Ofāni, S.E. of Baniyas.  
*Sephemoth* (I Kings, xxx, 28; S. Juda), near Aroer. Unknown.  
*Sephar* (Gen., x, 30), limit of the country of the sons of Jectan, commonly identified with Zaphar, in S. Arabia.  
*Sepharad* (Abd., 20; D.V.: "Bosphorus"): some prov. in the Persian empire.  
*Sepharvaim* (IV Kings, xvii, 24, etc.): poss. Sippar, in Babylonia: mod. Abū Habbā; more prob. a city in Syria, poss. Sabarim 2.  
*Sephata* (II Par., xiv, 9-10): text unsettled. Some: Tell es-Šafīyeh; others: a valley near Maresa; others, with Sept. "northwards".  
*Sephela*: maritime plain from Jaffa to the "torrent of Egypt".  
*Sepher* (Num., xxxiii, 23), a station of the Israelites in their journey between Sinai and Cades: prob. the defiles of the Jebel 'Arāif.  
*Sephet* (Tob., i, 1; Aser): poss. Šāfēd, in Upper Galilee.  
*Ser* (Jos., xix, 35; Nephtali). Unknown.  
*Sesach* (Jer., xxv, 26; ii, 41), cryptographic name of Babylon, according to the system called the Athbash (i.e.: *Alaph*=*Thau*; *Beth*=*Shin*; etc.).  
*Setim*, *Settim*. See Abel.  
*Siceleg* (Jos., xv, 31, etc.; S. Simeon): prob. Kh. Zūhelliqā, N. of the Wādy esh-Sherī'a.  
*Sichar* (John, iv, 5), very prob. Sahel 'Askar, E. of Naplūs.  
*Sichem* (q.v.).  
*Sicyon* (I Mach., xv, 23), a town N.W. of Corinth, on the Gulf of Corinth.
- Siddim* (Gen., xvi, 3, etc.; D.V.: "Woodland Vale"): plain of the Pentapolis, believed to be about the Dead Sea, perhaps towards the S. end.  
*Side* (I Mach., xv, 23), a city on the coast of Pamphilia: Eski Adalia.  
*Sidon* (q.v.).  
*Silo* (Jos. xviii, 1, etc. Ephraim). A famous place of worship of the Israelites in early times; the Ark of the Covenant was kept there until the last days of Heli. Silo was situated "on the N. of the city of Bethel, and on the E. side of the way that goeth from Bethel to Sichem, and on the S. of the city of Lebona" (Judges, xxi, 19): Seilūn. See ARK.  
*Siloe*. See SILOE; JERUSALEM.  
*Sin*, 1. Desert in the Sinaitic Peninsula, through which the Israelites went on leaving Egypt: Debbet er-Ramleh.—2. Egypt: *Sān*: Pelusium.  
*Sinai* (q.v.).  
*Sion*, 1. See JERUSALEM.—2. Another name for Mt. Hermon.  
*Sior* (Jos., xv, 44; mount. of Juda): Sā'ir, N.N.E. of Hebron.  
*Sis* (II Par., xx, 16), a steepy passage from Engaddi up to the desert above: prob. Wādy Hāšāšā.  
*Smyrna* (q.v.).  
*Soba*, Assy.: *Šūbīti*: a region in Syria, possibly S. of Damascus, in the neighbourhood of the Jebel Hauran.  
*Sobal* (Judith, iii, 1, 14; Ps. lix, 2), for Soba.  
*Socchoth*, 1. (Ex., xii, 37) first station of the Israelites on leaving Ramesses, prob. about Ismailiya or El-Gisir.—2 (Gen., xxxiii, 17, etc.; Gad); prob. Tell Dar'āla, N. of the Nahr ez-Zerqā.  
*Socho*, 1 (I Kings, xvii, 1), where David overcame Goliath: Kh. esh-Shūweikeh, N.E. of Eleutheropolis.—2 (Jos., xv, 48; mount. of Juda): prob. Kh. esh-Shūweikeh, S.W. of Hebron.—3. See Socchoth 2.  
*Sochoth*, *Sochoth*. See Socchoth 2.  
*Sodom* (q.v.).  
*Sorec* (Judges, xvi, 4, etc.), a valley famous in the story of Samson; prob. the Wādy es-Šarār; the name has been preserved in the neighbouring Kh. Šūriq.  
*Sparta* (q.v.).  
*Sual* (I Kings, xiii, 17), a place which seems to have been in the N. of Benjamin.  
*Suba*. See Soba.  
*Sunam*, *Sunem* (Jos., xix, 18, etc.; Issachar): Sūlem, at the foot of Jebel Dāhy, 4 m. N. of Zerā'in.  
*Sur*, 1. Desert E. of Egypt, also called Desert of Etham, perhaps around Tharū, which the Egyptians considered their E. frontier.—2 (Judges, ii, 28), perhaps another form of the name Tyre (Hebr. *Ṭūr*).  
*Susa*, *Susan*. See SUSA.  
*Syene* (q.v.).  
*Syracuse* (q.v.).  
*Syria* (q.v.).
- Taberah* (A.V.). See Qibroth Hatthawah.  
*Tanis*, a city in the Delta of the Nile: Zoan.  
*Taphna*, a town in Lower Egypt, in the neighbourhood of Tanis and Pelusium: Tell Defenne.  
*Taphua*, 1 (Jos., xv, 34; S. Juda). Unknown.—2 (Jos., xii, 17): "between Bethel and Epher". Unidentified.—3 (Jos., xvi, 8, etc.), on the borders of Ephraim and Manasse, perh. the same as Taphua 2.  
*Tarsus* (q.v.).  
*Tebbath* (Judges, vii, 22), a city in the Ghôr, near Abelmehula. Unidentified.  
*Telaim* (I Kings, xv, 4; D.V.: "as lambs"): prob. Telem.  
*Telem* (Jos., xv, 24; S. Juda), S. of Tell el-Milh, there is a tribe of Arabs whose name, Dhāllām, bears analogy with the present Biblical name; moreover, all the district of Molada is called Tūlam (Schwartz), possibly also a relic of the old name.  
*Temptation* (Ex., xvii, 7, etc.). See Raphidim.  
*Terebinth* (Valley of; I Kings, xvii, 2, etc.): between Socho and Azeca, most prob. Wādy es-Sanf.

*Thabor*. 1. Mountain (q.v.).—2 (Jos., xix, 22; Judges, viii, 18; Issachar). Unknown.—3 (I Par., vi, 77; Zabulon); in Jos., xvi, 28, instead of Thabor, we read Daberath; Debiriyeh.

*Thaenun* (Jos., xix, 13; Zabulon): possibly Corozain.

*Thadmor*. See PALMIRA.

*Thabath* (Num., xxxiii, 26), given as a station of the Israelites in their journey from Sinai to Cadès; poss. a gloss added to the text.

*Thalassa* (Acts, xxvii, 8), a city in Crete, near Good-havens.

*Thalassar* (Isa., xxxvii, 12), a region in W. Mesopotamia, prob. along the Euphrates, between Balis and Birejik.

*Thalhar* (Jos., xix, 7, Septuag.), for Ether.

*Thamar* (Ezech., xlvii, 19; xlviii, 28): poss. Thamarā of the classics, and Thamaro of the Peutinger Table, on the road from Hebron to Elath.

*Thamna*, 1 (Judges, xiv, 1, 25; Benjamin) Kh. Tibneh, W. of 'Ain Shems.—2 (Gen., xxxviii, 12-14; Jos., xv, 57; N. Juda; Assy.: *Tamna*; perh. Tibneh, N.W. of Jebel 'a; more prob. Tibnäh, S.E. of Deir Abän.

*Thamnata* (I Mach., ix, 50), between Bethel and Pharaon: poss. El-Taiyebah, or Tammün, in the Wädy Fār'a.

*Thamnathasara*, *Thamnathasare*, burialplace of Josue: prob. Kh. el-Fakhkhir, in Ephraim.

*Thanac*, *Thanach* (Jos., xxi, 25, etc.): Tell Ta'annak, S.W. of Lejün.

*Thanathselo* (Jos., xvi, 6; N. Ephraim): Ta'anā, S.E. of Naplūs.

*Thapsa*, 1 (III Kings, iv, 24), N. limit of Solomon's kingdom: Thapsacus, on the Euphrates, above the confluence of the Belik. Kala'at Dibseh.—2 (IV Kings, xv, 6), city taken by Manahem, after he had overthrown Sellum: prob. a mistake for Thersa.

*Thare* (Num., xxxiii, 27), supposed to be a station of the Israelites on the journey from Sinai to Cadès; poss. a gloss.

*Tharela* (Jos., xviii, 7; Benjamin). Unknown.

*Tharsis*, 1. A maritime country far to the W. of Palestine, and on the location of which there is much variance of opinions, some deeming it to be Spain (Tartessos); others Carthage, in Spain (Tarseion); others, the Tyrrhenians (Tiras of Gen., x, 12), or Etruscans.—2 (Judges, ii, 13), poss. Tarsus of Cilicia.

*Thebath* (I Par., xviii, 8), identical with Bete.

*Thebes* (Judges, ix, 50; II Kings, xi, 21; Samaria): Túbās, N.E. of Naplūs.

*Thecua*, *Thecue* (Amos, i, 1), birthplace of Amos: Kh. Teq'ua, S. of Bethlehem.

*Thelassar*. See Thelassar.

*Thelharsa* (I Esd., ii, 59; II Esd., vii, 61), an unknown Babylonian city.

*Thelmala* (I Esd., ii, 59; II Esd., vii, 61), another unknown Babylonian city.

*Theman* (Jer., xlix, 7, etc.): poss. Chobak, in the Wädy Gharandel, S. of the Dead Sea.

*Thelmela*. See Thelmala.

*Themna*. See Thamna.

*Thenac*. See Thanac.

*Thersa* (Jos., xii, 24, etc.; Samaria), the capital of Jeroboam's kingdom: poss. Tullúzah, N. of Mt. Hebal, or Et-T'reh, near Mt. Garizim.

*Thesbe*, birthplace of Elias; whether Thisbe of Galilee (see below), or Thesbon of Galaad (Kh. el-Istib, near the Wädy 'Ajlün, 10 m. N. of the Jaboc), is not absolutely certain, although the Greek favours the latter opinion.

*Thessalonica* (q.v.).

*Thisbe* (Tob., i, 2), birthplace of Tobias, S. of Cedès of Nephtali.

*Thochen*. See Ether.

*Thogorma* (Gen., x, 3, etc.): Phrygia, according to Josephus and Targum; others generally identify it with Armenia, and especially W. Armenia. Cf. Assy.: *Til-Garimmü*.

*Tholad*. See Eltholad.

*Thophel* (Deut., i, 1): poss. Tefileh, S.E. of the Dead Sea.

*Thopha* (I Mach., ix, 50; Judea), perh. identical with Taphua 1.

*Three Taverns* (Acts, xxviii, 15), a place likely near the mod. Cisterna on the Appian Way.

*Thyatira* (Apoc., ii, 20), a city in Lydia: Ak-Hissar.

*Tiberias*. See GALILEE.

*Tichon* (Ezech., xlvii, 16; D.V.; "the house of Tichon"): possibly El-Hadr, E.N.E. of Baniyas, on the Nahr Mughanniyeh.

*Tob*. A country E. of the Jordan; Geographers are at variance as to its location: some place it S.W. of Soba; others, S. of Gadara; others E. of the bridge called Jisr Benät Yäküb.

*Topheth*. See JERUSALEM.

*Tripoli* (q.v.).

*Trous* (Acts, xvi, 8-9), a seaport in Mysia: Eski Stambul.

*Trogyllium* (Acts, xx, 15, accord. to MS.D; omitt. in the principal other MSS.), a promontory in Asia Minor, over against the E. end of Samos: C. Mycale.

*Tubin* (I Mach., v, 13). See Tob.

*Tyre* (q.v.).

*Ur* (Gen., xi, 28, etc.); Assy.: *Ūrū*: el-Mughair, on the right bank of the Lower Euphrates.

*Vale Casis* (Jos., xviii, 21), a place in the Ghôr, in the neighbourhood of Jericho.

*Vedun* (Ezech., xxvii, 19), poss. Egypt.: *Uethen*, a city E. of Egypt; the text is not clear.

*Zabulon* (q.v.).

*Zanoa*, *Zanoë*, 1 (Jos., xv, 34, etc.; Sephela): Zanū'a.—2 (Jos., xv, 56, etc.; mount. of Juda): Kh. Zanūtā.

*Zephrona* (Num., xxxiv, 9; N. limit of the Holy Land): perh. Kh. Senbariyeh.

*Ziklag*, A.V. for Siceleg.

*Ziph* (Jos., xv, 24, etc.; desert of Juda): Tell ez-Ziph, betw. Hebron and Carmel.

*Zohemoth* (III Kings, i, 9), a rocky place near Jerusalem; the name seems preserved in the mod. Ez-Zehweileh.

The bibliography of Biblical Geography is very extensive. In his *Bibliotheca Geographica Palestina* (Berlin, 1890), RÖRICH attempted a classification of the whole literature of the subject, from 333 to 1878. TOBLER had already paved the way by a similar work, some twenty-five years before. A systematic enumeration has been undertaken by Prof. THOMSEN, of the German Palestinian Institute. We must limit ourselves here to a selection of: I. Serials and periodicals; II. Studies on old sources; III. General works; IV. Special subjects.

I. First and foremost, the publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund, since 1865. Besides the maps of E. and W. Palestine (1 inch to the mile), seven volumes of *Memoirs* on W. Palestine, Moab, Jerusalem, special papers, name-lists, three volumes of studies on natural history, botany, geology, have been issued, and others are forthcoming. The *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* announces the progress of the work accomplished by the society. Germany has likewise her Palestine Association, issuing the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* (abbreviated *ZdDPV*), the *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des DPV*. The Imperial Palestinian Institute began in 1905 the publication of a *Palästina-Jahrbuch*. The Ecole pratique d'Etudes Bibliques of the French Dominicans at Jerusalem started in 1892 the excellent *Revue Biblique*; the Faculté Orientale of the St. Joseph University at Beirut has been issuing yearly since 1906 a stout volume of *Mélanges*; while the members of the American School of Oriental Study and Research in Palestine publish their contributions mostly in the *Biblical World* and the *American Journal of Archaeology*. Valuable articles on Biblical geography are likewise to be found in CLERMONT-GANNEAU: *Mélanges d'Archéologie Orientale*, also in the *Oriens Christianus*, and the *Revue de l'Orient Latin*.

II. 1. PETRIE, *Syria and Egypt from the Tell el Amarna letters* (London, 1898); ZIMMERN, *Palästina um das Jahr 1400 v. Chr.* (s. d.); CLAUS, *Die Städte der El Amarna Briefe und die Bibel in ZdDPV*, t. XXV (1907), parts 1 and 2; DHORME, *Les pays bibliques au temps d'El Amarna in Revue Biblique* (1908, Octob.). 2. MAX MÜLLER, *Asien und Europa nach Ägyptischen Denkmälern* (Leipzig, 1893); Id., *Die Palästinaliste Thutmosis III, in Mittheilungen der Vorderas. Gesellschaft* (1907), I, 3. SCHRADER-WINKLER, *Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament* (3rd ed.; a new edition, entitled *Keilschriften und Bibel*,



is forthcoming; vol. II, to be published by H. WINCKLER, will be devoted to history and geography). 4. *Notitia dignitatum et administrationum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus Orientis et Occidentis* (BOCKING edit., 1839-1853); *Peutinger Table* (ed. princ. 1591; ed. DESJARDINS, Paris, 1875). 5. DE LAGARDE, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen, 1870); KLOSTERMANN, *Eusebii Onomasticon der Bibl. Ortsnamen* (Leipzig, 1904); THOMSEN, *Palästina nach dem Onomasticon des Eusebios in ZDPPV, XXVIII, 97-141*; ID., *Loca sacra: Verzeichniss der 1. bis 6. Jahrh. n. Chr. erwähnten Ortschaften Palästinas* (Halle, 1907). 6. NEUBACHER, *Die Geographie des Talmud* (Paris, 1868). 7. Descriptions of the Holy Land by early Christian pilgrims may be found in P. L., VIII (PILGRIM OF BORDEAUX); CLV, and P. G., CXXXIII. The Palestine Pilgrims Texts Society have printed these and other texts, even of Moslem writers; some likewise (BURKARD, *Descriptio Terræ Sanctæ*, in particular), may be found in LAURENT, *Peregrinatores Mediævi quatuor* (Leipzig, 1873); others in GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell' Oriente Francescano* (Quaracchi, 1906). A good criticism of some of these Pilgrims' texts is given in BAUMSTARK, *Abendlandische Palästinaliter des ersten Jahrtausends und ihre Berichte* (Cologne, 1906). 8. PARIS, *Guillaume de Tyr et ses continuateurs* (Paris, 1879-80); *Recueil des historiens des Croisades, publié par les soins de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres—Historiens Orientaux* (Paris, 1884-); REY, *Recherches géographiques et historiques sur la domination des Latins en Orient* (Paris, 1877); *Colonies Françaises de la Syrie au XII<sup>e</sup> et au XIII<sup>e</sup> s.* (Paris, 1883).

III. BAEDERER (BENZIGER), *Palestine and Syria* (4th ed., Leipzig, 1906); CONDER, *Handbook to the Bible* (London, 1887); ID., *Palestine* and numerous articles on Bibl. geography in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*; HURLBET, *Manual of Biblical Geography* (Chicago, 1894); RITTER, *The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula* (Edinburgh, 1866); SMITH, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (New York, 1908, 13th ed.); STANLEY, *Sinai and Palestine* (London, 1886); THOMSON, *The Land and the Book* (3 vols., London, 1881-86); WILSON, *The Lands of the Bible* (Edinburgh, 1847); BENZIGER, *Hebräische Archæologie* (Tübingen, 1907); BÜHL, *Geographie des Alten Palästina* (Freiburg and Leipzig, 1896); RIESS, *Biblische Geographie* (Freiburg, 1872); ID., *Atlas Scripturæ Sacræ* (re-edited by RÜCKERT; Freiburg, 1906); FILLION and NICOLLE, *Atlas Géographique de la Bible* (Lyons and Paris, 1890); GRATZ, *Théâtre des événements racontés dans les divines écritures*, Fr. tr., by GIMAREY, revised by BUGNIOT (Paris, 1889); GUÉRIEN, *Description géographique, historique et archéologique de la Palestine* (3 vols., Paris, 1893-1898); LEGENDRE, *Carte de la Palestine ancienne et moderne* (Paris, s. d.); ID., *Palestine*, and numerous geographical and topographical articles in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*; LÉVIEN de HAMME, *Guide indicateur de la Terre Sainte* (Jerusalem, 4th ed., 1897); HAGEN, *Atlas biblicus* (Paris, 1897); RELAND, *Palestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata* (Utrecht, 1714).

IV. I. ROBINSON, *Physical Geography of the Holy Land* (London, 1865); HULL, *Memoir on the Geology and Geography of Arabia Petrea, Palestine and adjoining districts* (London, 1889); LARTET, *Essai sur la géologie de la Palestine et des contrées avoisinantes*, in *Annales des sciences géologiques*, I (1869); BLANCHET-HORN, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Toten Meeres*, in *ZDPPV, XIX* (1896). 2. VAN KASTEREN, *La frontière septentrionale de la Terre Promise*, in *Revue Biblique*, IV (1895), 23 seq. 3. FURRER, *Die antiken Städte und Ortschaften im Libanongebiete*, in *ZDPPV, VIII* (1885). 4. FURRER, *Zur Ostjordanischen Topographie*, in *ZDPPV, XIII* (1890); SCHUMACHER, *Der Descholan*, in *ZDPPV, IX* (1886), tr. *The Jaulan* (London, 1888). 5. DE LUYNES, *Voyage d'Exploration à la Mer Morte* (Paris, s. d.); DE SAULCY, *Voyage autour de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1853); GACTIER, *Autour de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1898). 6. CONDER, *Helh and Moab* (London, 1889); TRISTRAM, *The Land of Moab* (London, 1874); BRÜNNOW and VON DOMASZEWSKI, *Die Provincia Arabia* (Strasbourg, 1904); MUSIL, *Karte von Arabia Petrea* (Vienna, 1906); ID., *Arabia Petrea: Topographischer Reisebericht*; I, *Moab*; II, *Edom* (Vienna, 1907). 7. PALMER, *The Desert of the Exodus* (Cambridge, 1871); DE LABORDÉ, *Commentaire géographique sur l'Exode et les Nombres* (Paris, 1841); LAGRANGE, *Le Sinai biblique*, in *Revue Biblique* (1889), 369-92; ID., *L'Itinéraire des Israélites du pays de Gessen aux bords du Jourdain*, in *Revue Biblique* (1900), 63-86; 273-87; 443-49; SZCZEPANSKI, *Nach Petra und zum Sinai* (Innsbruck, 1908).

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

**Geography, ECCLESIASTICAL.** See STATISTICS, ECCLESIASTICAL.

**Geography and the Church.**—The classic historians of geography, Alexander von Humboldt, Carl Ritter, and Oscar Peschel, never forgot to acknowledge how greatly their science was indebted to the Church. Of course the beginnings of all profane knowledge can be traced back to the time when "priest" and "scholar" meant one and the same thing. But with geography especially the Church had very close relations—relations which are readily explained by the nature of this science and the course of its evolution.

The object of geography is to extend our knowledge of the earth's surface and to determine the position of

our planet in relation to cosmic and physical phenomena. For the fulfilment of its first and more important task, the accumulation of geographic information, the prerequisites were at hand even in the earlier days. It needed only intrepid men to penetrate from known to unknown countries. But the powerful incentive of a purely scientific interest was still lacking. The motives that led to geographical progress at that time were greed and lust of conquest, as well as a far nobler motive than these—the spread of Christianity. To this mission the most intelligent, the most upright, and the most persevering of all explorers devoted themselves. Consequently, it was they who achieved the greatest success in the field of discovery during the Middle Ages and far into later days, right up to the time when modern scientific research became its successor. The second purpose, geographical theory, commonly called universal geography, could only be profitably attempted after adequate progress had been made in the auxiliary sciences of astronomy, mathematics, and physics. But herein, too, medieval clerical scholars were the first to show their clear-sightedness. For them there was no more attractive pursuit than to trace the vestiges of the Creator in all the marvellous harmony of the universe. How, then, was it possible that the laws governing this globe of ours could escape their search for truth? Of course, they could only have a presentiment of these laws, but frequently enough their ideas came very close to the precise results of the great modern scientists, equipped with the best of modern instruments. Again, one of the greatest of them all was a theologian—Copernicus.

Under these circumstances it was inevitable that the part contributed by the Church to this branch of human knowledge should be of great importance, as the most distinguished geographers bear witness. We may therefore rightfully present a coherent picture thereof. To this end we have divided the subject according to the following aspects: I. The Influence of the Activity of the Church on the Discoveries of New Lands and Races during the Middle Ages; II. The Views and Statements of Medieval Theologians; III. The Opening up of Foreign Lands by Missionaries from the Age of Discovery down to the Present Day, and the Part Borne by Catholic Scholars in Modern Geographical Research.

I.—The confines of the world as known to geographers at the beginning of the Christian Era are shown in the famous geography of the Alexandrian, Claudius Ptolemaeus (150 A. D.). Southwards they extended to the White Nile and the northern boundary of the Sudan; in the west they included the Canary Isles and the British Isles; to the north they reached as far as the German Seas and thence over the Low Countries of Russia and the Aral Sea to the sources of the Indus and the Ganges. In the Orient they took in Arabia and the coasts of India and Indo-China as far as the Archipelago. Their certain knowledge, however, did not extend beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire when it was at its zenith. At the very time when this empire was falling to pieces, it was overrun by the peaceful missionaries of the new spiritual power, Christianity. Even in the first few hundred years they found their way to the Far East. According to tradition, the Apostle Thomas himself reached Meliapur. In any case Christianity had been spread in Malabar, on the coast of Coromandel, in Socotra and Ceylon as early as the fourth century, as Cosmas Indicopleustes informs us in his "Christian Topography", a very important work from a geographic standpoint. Even in Abyssinia and in Southern Arabia the Faith found a footing. Simultaneously the frontier lands on the Rhine and the Danube were opened up. The subsequent centuries were spent in exploring the North. To this end a centre of operations was established which, for the pur-

pose of the scientific discoverer, could not have been more wisely selected in the conditions then prevalent. Then followed the foundation of monasteries in the British Isles which sent out in all directions their monks, well equipped with learning and well fitted to become the pioneers of culture. To these missionaries we owe the earliest geographical accounts of the northern countries and of the customs, religions, and languages of their inhabitants. They had to define the boundaries of the newly established dioceses of the Church. Their notes, therefore, contained the most valuable information, though the form was somewhat crude, and Ritter very justly traces the source and beginning of modern geography in these regions back to the "Acta Sanctorum". The world is indebted to the diaries of St. Ansgar (d. 865) for the first description of Scandinavia. The material in them was employed later on by Adam of Bremen in his celebrated work "De situ Danie". The accounts of these countries that Archbishop Axel of Lund (d. 1201), the founder of Copenhagen, furnished to the historian Saxo Grammaticus were also of great value. Reports brought in by monks enabled Alfred the Great (901) to compile the first description of Slavonic lands. Then followed the Chronicle of Regino of Prüm (907-968)—a work equally important for the historian and the geographer, as it contains the reports of St. Adalbert, who made his way into Russia in 961. Of similar merit are the historical works of the monk Nestor of Kiev (d. 1100) and the country pastor Helmsold (d. 1170). Bishops Thietmar of Merseburg (d. 1019) and Vincent Kadlubeck of Cracow (1206-18) bring us the earliest information regarding the geography of Poland, while the letters of Bishop Otto of Bamberg contain the earliest description of Pomerania. In like manner the geography of Prussia, Finland, Lapland, and Lithuania begins with the evangelization of these countries. And even if it be difficult to-day to estimate at their proper value the discovery of these regions, now so familiar to us, the first voyages of civilized Europeans on the high seas, which started from Ireland, will always challenge our admiration. Groping from island to island, the Irish monks reached the Faroe Isles in the seventh century and Iceland in the eighth. They thus showed the Northmen the route which was to bring about the first communication between Europe and America, and finally set foot on Greenland (1112). The earliest accounts of these settlements, with which, owing to unpropitious political and physical conditions, permanent intercourse could not be maintained, we owe to Canon Adam of Bremen, to the reports sent by the bishops to their metropolis at Drontheim (Trondhjem), and to the Vatican archives.

Meanwhile, communication with the East had never ceased. Palestine was an object of interest to all Christendom, to which the eyes of the West had been turned ever since the days of the Apostles. Thousands and thousands of pilgrims flocked thither in bands. Not a few of them possessed sufficient ability to describe intelligently their experiences and impressions. Thus the so-called "Itineraries", or guide-books, by no means confined themselves to a description of the Sacred Places. Besides giving exact directions for the route, they embraced a great deal of information about the neighbouring countries and peoples, about Asia Minor, Egypt, Arabia, Persia, and even India. These works were very popular reading and undoubtedly infused an entirely new element into the study of geography in those days. A still greater stimulus was given to it by the Crusades—those magnificent expeditions which, inspired and supported by the Church, brought huge masses of people into contact with the Orient. They made a knowledge of the lands they sought to conquer, a commonplace in Europe. They were the means of spreading the geographic theories and methods of Arabian scholarship, at that

time quite advanced, thereby placing the research of Western scholars on entirely new bases, and putting before them new aims and objects. Finally, in the effort to secure new allies for the liberation of the Holy Land, they brought about intercourse with the rulers of Central Asia. This intercourse was of the utmost importance in the history of medieval discoveries.

Stray communities of Christians were scattered throughout the interior of Asia, even in the early centuries, thanks to the zeal of the Nestorians. It is true that they were separated from Rome and were suppressed by rigorous persecutions in China as early as the eighth century. But even during the Crusades some Mongolian tribes showed such familiarity with the new faith that the popes had great hopes of an alliance with these nations. The general council held at Lyons in 1245 under Innocent IV decided to send out legates. Men duly qualified for these missions were found among the newly established Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic. The Dominican Ascalinus in 1245 reached the court of the Khan of Persia on the eastern shore of the Black Sea after a voyage of fifty-nine days, but his errand was fruitless. His companion, Simon of St-Quentin, wrote an account of the voyage, as did also his great contemporary, Vincent of Beauvais. The enterprises of the Franciscans were politically more successful, and far more productive of scientific results. Under the leadership of John de Plano Carpini of Perugia, they travelled through Germany, Bohemia, Poland, and Southern Russia as far as the Volga, and thence to the Court of the Grand Khan at Karakorum (1246). Their reports embrace the political conditions, ethnography, history, and geography of the Tatar lands. They were excellently supplemented by Friar Benedict of Poland of the same order in regard to the Slav countries. Both these works, however, are surpassed by the Franciscan William Rubruck (Rubruquis) of Brabant, whose report Peschel pronounces to be "the greatest geographical masterpiece of the Middle Ages". He was the first to settle the controversy between medieval geographers as to the Caspian Sea. He ascertained that it was an inland lake and had not, as was supposed for a long while, an outlet into the Arctic Ocean. He was the first Christian geographer to bring back reliable information concerning the position of China and its inhabitants. He knew the ethnographic relations of the Hungarians, Bashkirs, and Huns. He knew of the remains of the Gothic tongue on the Tauric Chersonese, and recognized the differences between the characters of the different Mongolian alphabets. The glowing pictures he drew of the wealth of Asia first attracted the attention of the seafaring Venetians and Genoese to the East. Merchants followed in the path he had pointed out, among them Marco Polo, the most renowned traveller of all times. His book describing his journeys was for centuries the sole source of knowledge for the geographical and cartographical representations of Asia. Side by side with Marco Polo, friars and monks pursued untiringly the work of discovery. Among them was Hayton, Prince of Annania (Armenia), afterwards Abbot of Poitiers, who in 1307 made the first attempt at a systematic geography of Asia in his "Historia orientalis". Also the Franciscans stationed in India who followed the more convenient sea route to China at the end of the thirteenth century. Special credit is due to John of Monte Corvino (1291-1328), Odoric of Pordenone (1317-31), whose work was widely circulated in the writings of John Mandeville, and John of Marignolla. Of India, also, the missionaries gave fuller information. Menentillus was the first to prove the peninsular shape of the country and, in contradiction to Ptolemy, described the Indian Ocean as a body of water open to the South. The Dominican Jordanus Catalani (1328) records his observations on the physical peculiarities

and natural history of India. At the same time more frequent visits were made to Northern Africa and Abyssinia: and towards the middle of the fourteenth century settlements were made in the Canary Isles.

However, the immense tracts of land in the interior of Asia were soon closed again to scientific investigation. With the fall of the Mongol dynasty, which had been favourably disposed to Christians, China became forbidden ground to Europeans. But the East remained the goal of Western trade, to which the missions had shown the way. The rich lands on the Indian Ocean remained open, and henceforth they were the objective point of all the great exploring expeditions, undertaken by the sea-loving Portuguese, which culminated in the discovery of America by Columbus. It is well known how much these undertakings were furthered by the all-pervading idea of spreading Christianity. The main object of Henry the Navigator in equipping his fleet with the revenues of the Order of Christ was the conversion of the heathen. He was working to the same purpose on the continent of Africa, where he sought to establish communications with the Christian ruler of Abyssinia. His efforts led to the circumnavigation of Africa by his successors, and to the systematic exploration of the highland states of East Africa begun by Portuguese missionaries in the sixteenth century. Columbus, too, was regarded in his time as pre-eminently the envoy of the Church. Furthermore, the strange results expected from his expedition and his own projects were the last echo of all the aspirations of medieval Christendom, which contemplated a way to the Kings of Cathay (China) whose disposition to embrace Christianity had been repeatedly emphasized by Toscanelli, as well as the discovery of the Earthly Paradise, which Columbus placed somewhere near the gulf of Paria, the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre by means of the treasures he expected to find, and, finally, the extension of the Kingdom of God over the entire earth before the approaching end of the world.

II.—Philosophical speculation also had a share in the magnificent success that crowned the practical work of the Middle Ages. Although geography as a science for its own sake was no more the chief purpose of this speculation than exploration for its own sake was that of the missionaries, it had arrived at truths that are admitted to-day, even when tested by the light of modern research—truths that must be recognized as real progress. As might be expected, in the early centuries of the Church men strove above all things to reconcile deductions from the observation of the facts of nature with the beliefs that were then supposed to be taught in Holy Scripture. The earliest Christian literature was so predominantly exegetical that the teachings of the ancients were always tested in order to see whether they were in harmony with Holy Writ. Hence it was that several of the Fathers pronounced in favour of the theory of the flatness of the earth's surface which had been put forward in later Roman cosmographies. Among the advocates of this error were Theodore of Mopsuestia, St. John Chrysostom, Severian of Gabala, Procopius of Gaza, and others. Cosmas Indicopleustes advanced an especially grotesque elaboration of this doctrine. In his exaggeratedly narrow interpretation of the phraseology of Holy Writ he claimed that the world was constructed in the shape of the Tabernacle of the Covenant in the Old Testament. But long before his day there were men who believed in the sphericity of the earth. It was recognized by Clement and Origen; Ambrose and Basil also upheld it. Gregory of Nyssa even sought to explain the origin of the earth by means of a physical experiment, and advanced hypotheses that come very close to the modern theories of rotation. Augustine declared that the doctrine of the sphericity of the earth in no way conflicted with Holy Writ, and later authors, especially the Venerable Bede, also at-

VI.—29

tempted to prove it on scientific grounds. For a considerable period the question of the Antipodes was beset with controversy. It was absolutely denied by Lactantius and several others, principally on religious grounds, as the people of the Antipodes could not have been saved. The learned Irishman, Bishop Virgilius, patron saint of Salzburg (d. 784) was the first to openly express the opinion that there were men living beyond the ocean. Individual physiographical phenomena also began to come under the observation of the learned, such as the influence of the moon on the tides, the erosive action of the sea, the circulation of water, the origin of hot springs and volcanoes, the division of land and water, the position of the sun at different latitudes. The learning and opinions of the first few hundred years were comprehensively set forth in the tremendous work of Isidore of Seville (d. 636), the "Etymologia" or "Origines", which for a long time enjoyed unlimited authority. During the next few centuries, which were comparatively barren of literary achievements, the only men to attain any celebrity, besides Bede and Virgilius of Salzburg, were the anonymous geographer of Ravenna (c. 670), the Irish monk Dicuil, author of the well-known "Liber de mensurâ Orbis terre" (c. 825), and the learned Pope Sylvester (999–1003), otherwise known as Gerbert of Aurillac, the most illustrious astronomer of his century. The oldest cartographic documents we have also date from the same period. They rely for their information on the earth's surface substantially on the Roman methods of delineation. The lost map of the world as known to the Romans can now be reconstructed only by means of the medieval *Mappæ mundi*; consequently, they exhibit all the deficiencies of the model they followed; they are circular in plan and were drawn neither on projection nor according to scale, the boundaries of the provinces being indicated by straight lines. The central point was in the Ægean Sea; at the time of the Crusades it was transferred to Jerusalem, the East being at the top of the maps. In addition to adhering to the Roman form, these maps have preserved for us also the contents of the Roman maps; and therein lies the principal value of these interesting documents. They were often draughted with the greatest and most artistic care. Especial importance attaches to the map of the world made by the Spanish monk Beatus. Numerous copies of this show the entire area of the globe as known in 776 after Christ. Of the big wall maps only those in the cathedral at Hereford and the nunnery at Ebsdorf have survived. Both of them are of the latter half of the thirteenth century and are representative of the ancient type of map. Small atlases were largely circulated in cosmographical codices. These are known as Macrobius atlases, Zone atlases, Ranulf atlases, and so forth. Special maps have also come down to us; two of them, showing south-eastern Europe with Western Asia and Palestine are even attributed to St. Jerome. There is a representation of Palestine in mosaic in the church at Madaba; this dates from the middle of the sixth century. The English monk, Matthew Paris, draughted some modern maps in the thirteenth century which were quite free from the influence of Ptolemy and the Arabians.

But geographical problems made great and unexpected progress when they received a more scientific basis. This basis was provided by the scholastics when they made the Aristotelean system the starting-point of all their philosophical researches. Their thorough logical training and their strict critical method gave to the work of these commentators on Aristotle the value of original research, which strove to comprehend the entire contemporary science of nature. As at the same time the Almagest of Ptolemy was brought to light again by the presbyter, Gerard of Cremona (1114–87), there was not a single problem of modern physical and mathematical geography the

solution of which was not thus attempted. The fact that the writings of Aristotle and Ptolemy, on which they founded their investigations, had already passed through the hands of Arabian scholars, who, however, probably received them at some time from Syrian priests, proved of advantage to the consequent geographical discussions. The most eminent representative of physical studies was Albertus Magnus; of mathematics, Roger Bacon. Their precursor, William of Conches, had already given evidence of independent conception of the facts of nature in his "Philosophia Mundi". Also Alexander Neckham (1150 to about 1227), Abbot of Cirencester, whose "Liber de naturā rerum" contains the earliest record of the use of the mariner's compass in navigation and a list of remarkable springs, rivers, and lakes. Blessed Albertus Magnus (1193-1280), a master with whom in the universality of his knowledge only Alexander von Humboldt is comparable, opened up to his contemporaries the entire field of physiography, by means of his admirable exposition of Aristotle, laid the foundations of climatology, botanical geography, and, in a certain sense, even of comparative geography. His work "De cœlo et mundo" treats of the earth as a whole; his "libri meteororum" and "De passionibus aeris" include meteorology, hydrography, and seismology. In the "De naturā locorum" he enlarges upon the system of the zones and the relations between man and the earth. He furnished proofs of the sphericity of our planet that are still popularly repeated to-day; he calculated accurately the duration of the day and the seasons in the different quarters of the globe. Ebb and flow, volcanology, the formation of mountain-ranges and continents—all these subjects furnish him material for clever deductions. He carefully recorded the shifting of coastlines, which men at that time already associated with the secular upheaving and subsidence of continents. He also ascertained the frequency of earthquakes in the neighbourhood of the ocean. He closely observed fossilized animals. He knew that the direction of the axes of mountain-ranges influenced the climate of Europe, and, on the authority of Arabian writers, he was the first to refute the old error that the intertropical surface of the earth must necessarily be quite parched. His fellow-friar, Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264), also proved himself to be a very keen observer of nature. A great mass of geographical material is stored up in his "Speculum naturale". Among other things he recognized that mountain-ranges constantly lose in height, owing to the influence of climate and of rain, and that in high altitudes the temperature falls because of the decrease of atmospheric density. Finally, we must mention the original views of St. Thomas Aquinas on geography, as well as those of the laymen Ristoro of Arezzo, Brunetto Latini (1210-94), his great disciple, Dante (1265-1321), and, lastly the "Book of Nature" by Conrad of Megenberg, canon of Ratisbon (1309-1378). For all of these Albertus Magnus had opened the door to the rich treasure-house of Greek and Arabian learning. Still more far-reaching in their results were the labours of the scholars who applied themselves principally to mathematical geography. At the head of them all stands Roger Bacon, the "Doctor Mirabilis" of the Order of St. Francis (1214-94). Columbus was emboldened to carry out his great project on the strength of Bacon's assertion that India could be reached by a westerly voyage—a claim based on mathematical computation. Even before Ptolemy's "Geography" had been rediscovered, Bacon attempted to sketch a map, determining mathematically the positions of places, and using Ptolemy's Almagest, the descriptions of Alfraganus, and the Alphonsine Tables. Peschel pronounces this to be "the greatest achievement of the scholastics". Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly (1350-1425), whose "Imago Mundi" was also a favourite book of Columbus's, founded it on

Bacon's works. It is to him and Cardinal Filiaster that Western civilization owes the first Latin translation of Ptolemy's "Geography", which Jacopus Angelus finished and dedicated to Pope Alexander V (1409-10). The circulation of this book created a tremendous revolution, which was particularly beneficial to the development of cartography for centuries thereafter. As early as 1427 the Dane (Clausius Clavius added to Filiaster's priceless manuscript of Ptolemy's work his map of Northern Europe, the oldest map of the North which we possess. Domnus Nicolaus Germanus, a Benedictine (of Reichenbach?) (1466), was the first scholar who modernized Ptolemy by means of new maps and made him generally accessible. The Benedictine Andreas Walsperger (1448) made a map of the world in the mediæval style. That of the Camaldolese Fra Mauro (1457) is the most celebrated of all monuments of mediæval cartography. It was already enriched by data furnished in Ptolemy's work. The map of Germany designed by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64), a pupil of Toscanelli (1387-1492), was printed in 1491. This prelate was the teacher of Peuerbach (1432-61), who in turn was the master of Regiomontanus (1436-67), the most illustrious astronomer since Ptolemy. Cardinal Bessarion enabled Regiomontanus to study Greek, and Pope Sixtus IV (1474) entrusted the reformation of the Calendar to him. We must also mention Æneas Sylvius (afterwards Pope Pius II) and the papal secretaries Poggio and Flavio Biondo, who made several valuable contributions to the science of geography, also Cardinal Bembo and the Carthusian Reisch (1467-1525).

III.—In order to set forth properly the achievements in discovery and research in modern times by Catholic scholars, we adopt Peschel's arrangement. He divides this period of the development of geography into two main epochs: (1) That of discovery, up to the middle of the seventeenth century; (2) That of geographical measurement, from 1650 down to the present day. We cannot set down all the names of priests and missionaries which we find in both these periods. Their chief usefulness lay in their contributions to the general knowledge of various countries and races. But they also made contributions of the greatest value to the theoretical development of our science. They were the first and foremost promoters of many studies auxiliary to geography that sprang up in the course of time, such as ethnology, meteorology, volcanology, and so forth.

(1) Even on their earliest voyages the great discoverers took with them learned priests. These men wrote glowing accounts of the wonders they saw in the newly discovered lands to their brethren at home, so that they might spread the information broadcast. In a short time monastic settlements sprang up in the great colonial possessions of Spain and Portugal. The Dominicans were the first missionaries to America, and Franciscans are heard of in India as early as 1500, while the Augustinians accompanied Magellan to the Philippines in 1521. They were equipped with the best available aids and assistants. Among the Jesuits especially these received a thorough and systematic training. The Jesuits established missions on the Congo, in 1547, in Brazil, in 1549, in Abyssinia, 1555, in South Africa, 1559, in Peru, 1568, in Mexico, 1572, in Paraguay, 1586, and in Chile, 1591. They even penetrated into the old heathen civilizations of Japan (1549) and China (1563).

Soon after the discovery of the West Indies, the Hieronymite Fray Roman wrote a valuable study of the mythology of their inhabitants, which Ferdinand Columbus incorporated in his "Vida del Almirante". It became the corner-stone of American ethnology. The Dominican Blas de Castillo explored the crater of Masaya in Nicaragua, in 1538, which Oviedo also visited and described later. The much-admired work "De rebus oceanicis et novo orbe" was written by



# FRA MAURO'S MAP OF THE WORLD (1459)

ORIGINAL IN THE BIBLIOTECA MARCIANA, VENICE

IN THIS REPRODUCTION THE ORIENTATION OF THE ORIGINAL IS REVERSED; THE CONTOURS ARE REPRODUCED WITH EXACTNESS, BUT THE MOUNTAIN-RANGES ONLY APPROXIMATELY; CITIES ARE DENOTED BY NAME AND NOT BY BIRD'S-EYE VIEW AS IN THE ORIGINAL





Peter Martyr d'Anghiera (1475-1526), prior of Granada, and a friend of Columbus. It is especially noteworthy for its intelligent observations on ocean currents and volcanoes, which its author doubtless derived from missionaries. A most signal contribution was the "Historia natural y moral de las Indias" (1588), by the Jesuit José d'Acosta (1539-1600), who lived in Peru from 1571 to 1588, and proved himself one of the most brilliant writers on the natural history of the New World and the customs of the Indians. The first thorough exploration of Brazil was made by Jesuit missionaries, under Father Ferre (1599-1632) and others. Starting from Quito, Franciscans visited the region around the source of the Amazon in 1633. Father Laureano de la Cruz penetrated as far as the River Napo in 1647, and in 1650 made a journey by boat as far as the Pará River.

To missionaries, also, we owe important information concerning the interior of Africa during the sixteenth, and at the beginning of the seventeenth, century. The Portuguese priests Alvarez and Bermúdez accompanied the embassy of King Emanuel to King David III of Abyssinia. They sent home valuable reports regarding the country. They were followed by the Jesuits. A. Fernández crossed Southern Abyssinia, as far as Melinde, in 1613, and set foot in regions which until recently were closed to the Europeans. Father Paez (1603) and Father Lobo (1623) were the first to reach the source of the Blue Nile. As early as the middle of the seventeenth century the Jesuits drew a map of Abyssinia on the information supplied by these two men and by Fathers Almeida, Méndez, and Téllez. It was the best map of Abyssinia until the time of Abbadie (1810-97). At the request of Bishop Migliore of S. Marco, the Portuguese Duarte López (1591) wrote an important description of the Congo territory. The "Etiopia Oriental" (1609) by the Dominican Juan dos Santos was an authority on the lake country and eastern Central Africa until Livingstone's transcontinental expedition. The Jesuit missionaries Machado, Afonso, and Paiva in 1630 even thought of establishing communication between Abyssinia and the Congo territory. The Arabian Leo Africanus, whom Pope Leo X had educated, and who was named after him, wrote a book describing the Sudan. It was published by Ramusio in 1552 and was considered the only reliable authority on this country till the nineteenth century. More careful research led to the sending of missionaries to Central Asia. The Augustinian González de Mendoza made the first really intelligible map of China in 1585, and Father Benedict Goes opened the land route thither, after a perilous journey from India, in 1602. Thereupon the Jesuits Ricci and Schall, both learned mathematicians and astronomers, prepared the cartographic survey of the country. Ricci (1553-1610), as the "geographer of China", is justly compared to Marco Polo, the "discoverer of China". Using his notes, Father Trigault issued an historical and geographical treatise on China in 1615. Father Andrada visited Tibet in 1624, and published, in 1626, a book describing it which was afterwards translated into five languages. Borrus and Rhodes published reports on Farther India.

The science of cartography now made a quite unexpected advance, due to the frequent and repeatedly enlarged editions of Ptolemy's work that were issued by the Benedictine Ruysch (1508), by Bernardus Sylvanus (1511), Waldseemüller (1513), and others. Canon Martin Waldseemüller's map of the world (St-Dié, 1507) was his most distinguished achievement. It was the first to give to the New World the name of America. Bishop Olaus Magnus, one of the most illustrious geographers of the Renaissance, made a map of Northern Europe in 1539. He also undertook a long journey in the North in 1518-19 and was the first man to propound the idea of a north-east passage. The

great map-makers Mercator and Ortelius also received devoted help and encouragement from ecclesiastics.

The most important result of the astronomical and physiographical observations made during this period was the discovery and establishment of the heliocentric system by Copernicus, canon of Königsberg (1473-1543). Celio Calcagnini (1479-1541) had prepared the way for this theory. In spite of the fact that his hypothesis was in direct contradiction to hitherto accepted interpretations of Holy Writ, such high dignitaries of the Church as Schomburg, Giese, Dantiscus, and others encouraged Copernicus to make public his discovery. Moreover Pope Paul III graciously accepted the dedication of the work "De revolutionibus orbium coelestium" which appeared in 1543. Among the foremost astronomers was the Jesuit Scheiner (1575-1650). He and his assistant Cysatus were the first to notice the spots on the sun (1612), and founded the science of heliographic physics, of which Galileo had not even thought. The Capuchin monk Schyrl (Schyrlæus) de Rheita built a terrestrial telescope in 1645 and drew a chart of the moon. Nor did isolated physical phenomena pass unnoticed; attempts had already been made to classify them systematically. Giovanni Botero (1560-1617), secretary to St. Charles Borromeo, ranked with Peter Martyr among the first writers on deep-sea research—or thalassography, and is considered to be the founder of statistical science. His "Relatione del mare" (1599) is the earliest known monograph on the subject of the ocean. He was followed by the Jesuit Fournier, whose significant "Hydrographie" (1641) treats encyclopedically of oceanic science. At Ingolstadt (Eck and Scheiner) and Vienna (Celts, Stabius, Tannstatter) geography was treated with especial care. The first professor of geography at Wittenberg was Barthel Stein, who entered a monastery at Breslau in 1511 and completed a description of Silesia in 1512-13. Cochläus (1479-1552), humanist and theologian, sought to make the scientific study of ancient authors (Meteorology of Aristotle, Geography of Mela) a part of higher education. He instilled a knowledge of geography into his pupils which at that time was without equal. Johann Eck, Luther's opponent, wrote a much-praised work on the physical geography of mountains and rivers for his lectures at Freiburg. The Jesuit Borrus was the forerunner of Halley the astronomer. He drew up a chart showing the magnetic variations of the compass in 1620.

(2) About the middle of the seventeenth century it was left almost exclusively for missionaries, going about their unselfish, silent, and consequently much under-estimated labours, to continue geographical research until, towards the end of the eighteenth century, great expeditions were sent out, supported by states and corporations and equipped with every possible scientific and technical aid and appliance. The missionaries achieved results from their work that entitle them to the credit of having been the pioneers of scientific geography and its strenuous co-operators. Bold expeditions exploring the interior of continents became more frequent. Numerous reports on Canada from the hands of Jesuit missionaries, dated between the years 1632 and 1672, have been preserved. The Franciscan Friar Gabriel Sagard, commonly called Theodat, sojourned among the Hurons from 1624 to 1626. The Jesuits Bouton (1658) and de Tertre (1687) devoted a few pamphlets to the Antilles and the Carib tribes. It was at that time that the great rivers of America for the first time became adequately known. Under the leadership of La Salle, the Franciscans Hennepin, de la Ribourde, and Membre penetrated to the Great Lakes and Niagara Falls in 1680 and the following years. The same men navigated the Mississippi, of which even the Delta had been scarcely known until then. Mexico and California as far as the Rio Colorado were traversed by the Jesuits

Kino (1644-1711), Sedlmayer (1703-1779), and Baegert (1717-1777). We find that between 1752 and 1766—eighty years before Meyer, the celebrated circumnavigator of the globe—the Jesuit Wolfgang Beyer reached Lake Titicaca. Father Manuel Ramon sailed up the Cassiquiare from the Rio Negro to the Orinoco in 1744 and anticipated La Condamine, Humboldt, and Bonpland in proving that this branch connected these streams. Father Samuel Fritz, from 1684 on, recognized the importance of the Marañon as the main river and source of the Amazon. He drew the first reliable map of the entire course of the stream. The Jesuits Techo (1673), Harques (1687), and Duran (1638) wrote about Paraguay, and d'Ovaglia (1646) about Chile. Abyssinia, the most interesting country in Africa, was suddenly closed to missionaries about 1630. It was not until 1699 that the Jesuit Father Brévedent, with the physician Poncet, once more ventured up the Nile and into the interior of the country; but in so doing he lost his life. The Capuchins Cavazzi (1654), Carli (1666), Merolla (1682), and Zucchelli (1698) accomplished remarkable results in the Congo region. Even as late as the year 1862 the geographer Petermann made use of their writings to construct a map of that region.

But the greatest scientific triumphs attended the work of the missionaries in Asia. Especially remarkable were the successful attempts to penetrate into Tibet, a feat which Europeans did not repeat until our times. After Andrada, whom we have already mentioned, followed Fathers Grueber and d'Orville, who reached Lhasa from Peking in 1661 and went down into India through the Himalaya passes. The Jesuit Desideri (1716-29) and the Capuchins Della Penna (1719-1746) and Beligatti (1738) spent considerable time in this country.

To these travels must be added the splendid achievements in cartography and astronomy of the Jesuits, which, about 1700, caused a complete revolution in the development of geography. It was due chiefly to them that one of the most powerful States of that time, France, lent its support to this science, thus offering an example that resulted in a series of governmental subventions giving the development of geography its most powerful impetus. In 1643 the Jesuit Martin Martini (1614-61) landed in China. During his sojourn he acquired a personal knowledge of most of the provinces of that immense empire and collected his observations in a complete work, that appeared in 1651, entitled "Atlas Sinensis". In Richthofen's opinion it is "the fullest geographical description of China that we have". Moreover, it contains the first collection of local maps of that country. Athanasius Kircher further drew the attention of scholars the world over to the Celestial Empire in his "China monumentis illustrata" (1667). He, too, had at his disposal information gathered by missionaries. And finally the Belgian Jesuit Verbiest succeeded in arousing the interest of Louis XIV by the advices he sent home to Europe. At his request, six of the most learned Jesuits went to China in 1687; they were Fathers Bouvet, Fontaney, Gerbillon, Le Comte, and Visdelou. They bore the title of "royal mathematicians" and at the expense of the French Crown were equipped with the finest instruments. From 1691 to 1698 Gerbillon, court astronomer to the emperor, made several excursions to the hitherto unknown region on the northern boundary of China. He presented a map of the environs of Peking to the emperor who then ordered the survey of the Great Wall, which was completed by Fathers Bouvet, Régis, and Jartoux. This achievement was followed in the succeeding years by the mapping of the entire empire. Fathers Jartoux, Fridelli, Cardoso, Bonjour (Augustinian), de Tartre, de Mailla, Hinderer, and Régis undertook the work. By 1718 the map was finished. In addition to China proper it embraced Manchuria

and Mongolia, as far as the Russian frontier. Simultaneously, a delineation of Tibet as far as the sources of the Ganges was begun. The map ranks as a masterpiece even to-day. It appeared in China itself in 120 sheets and since that time has formed the basis of all the native maps of the country. Fathers Espinha and Hallerstein extended the survey to Ili. The Jesuit Du Halde edited all the reports and letters sent to him by his brethren and published them in 1735 in his "Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique et physique de l'empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise" (4 vols.). The material for the maps in this work was prepared by d'Anville, the greatest geographer of his time. All modern maps can be traced back to his "Atlas de la Chine". Still later, there were published in fifteen volumes the "Mémoires concernant l'histoire . . . des Chinois, par les missionnaires de Pekin" (Paris, 1776-91).

Many of the missionaries belonged to the learned societies of Paris, London, and St. Petersburg. They exchanged letters on scientific topics with such renowned scholars as Leibniz, Linnæus, John Ray, Du Perron, Delisle, Marinoni, Simonelli, and others. The influence of widely read periodical publications is also noteworthy. Among them were the "Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des missions étrangères", numerous volumes and repeated editions of which were published in the eighteenth century. They contained a mass of geographical material. The science of geography profited by this intercourse between the Jesuits and the European scientists. The greatest need at that time was the definite determination of astronomical positions in order to construct a really faultless map of the world. Thanks to the sound training in astronomy of the Jesuit missionaries before they went abroad, their missionary stations soon gathered many excellent determinations of latitude and longitude. As early as the middle of the seventeenth century they produced a great mass of reliable data from China. Between 1684 and 1686 they determined the exact position of the Cape of Good Hope, of Goa and Louveau (Siam). This enabled them to make a correct map of Asia which had until then shown an error of nearly 25 degrees of longitude towards the east. By order of the French Academy, Father Louis Feuillée, the learned Franciscan, and pupil of Cassini, revised uncertain positions in Europe and America. He made surveys in Crete, Salonica, Asia Minor, and Tripoli, in 1701-02, in the Antilles and Panama, 1703-05, in South America, 1707-12, and in the Canary Isles, 1724. Thus Delisle and d'Anville, the reformers of map-making, built up their work on the scaffolding furnished them by the Jesuits. In the attempts to determine the length of a degree of longitude made in the seventeenth century, the Jesuits took a very prominent part. As early as 1645 Fathers Riccioli and Grimaldi tried to determine the length of a degree on the meridian. Similar work was done in 1702 by Father Thoma in China; in 1755, by Fathers Bosovich and Maire in the Papal States; in 1762, by Father Liesganig in Austria, and in the same year by Father Christian Mayer, in the Palatinate, also by Fathers Beccaria and Canonica in northwestern Italy (1774).

Besides the Jesuits engaged in geodetic work in Abyssinia, South America, and China, we meet with Father Velarde (1696-1753), who published the first approximately accurate map of the Philippines about 1734. G. Matthias Vischer, parish priest of Leonstein in Tyrol (1628-95), drew a map of Upper Austria in 1669 that was republished as recently as 1808. Father Liesganig, in conjunction with Fathers von Mezburg and Guessmann, designed maps of Galicia and Poland. Father Christian Mayer drew a map of the Rhine from Basle to Mainz, and Father Andrian, a chart of Carinthia. Fathers Grammatici (1684-1736), Dechalles, and Weinhart must also be mentioned.

In view of the lively intercourse between the mis-

sionaries and the members of their orders in Europe it is not surprising that the latter also compiled voluminous geographical summaries. Such are the works of the Jesuit Riccioli (1598-1671), the "Almagestum Novum" and "Geographia et Hydrographia reformata" (1661). Riccioli was a worthy contemporary of the great Varenus, and was really entitled to rank as a reformer, especially in cartography. Father Athanasius Kircher (1602-80) among other things devoted himself to physics. His most original observations are set down in his "Magnes, sive de arte magnetica" (1641) and his "Mundus subterraneus" (1664). He made the ascent of Vesuvius, Etna, and Stromboli, at the risk of his life in order to measure their craters. On the basis of his observations he advanced a theory concerning the interior of the earth which was accepted by Leibniz and, after him, by an entire school of geologists, the Neptunists. He also was the author of the first attempt at a physical map, to wit, the chart of ocean currents (1665).

The Jesuit Father Heinrich Scherer (1628-1704), professor at Dillingen, devoted his entire life to geographical study. He incorporated in his works all that was then known of the earth. His "Geographica hierarchica" contains the earliest mission atlas. The science of map-making owes much to him. His "Geographia naturalis" contains the first orographical and hydrographical synoptic charts. His "Geographia artificialis" recommends a system of cartographic projection which the geographer Bonne, in 1752, accepted and carried out as one of the best. Alongside of these mighty works, which, in imitation of the great encyclopedic works of the Middle Ages, attempt to give a survey of the whole geographical knowledge of a period, we now meet in increasing numbers the equally important treatises on special subjects which resemble the works of our modern scientists. The name of the Dane Nicholas Steno is one of the foremost in the history of geology. He was tutor to the sons of Grand Duke Cosimo III and later vicar-general of the Northern Missions (1638-87). In the opinion of Zittel he was far in advance of his time. He was the first scientist to attempt the solution of geological problems by induction. He was also the first scholar who clearly conceived the idea that the history of the earth could be inferred from its structure and its component parts. His little monograph "De solido intra solidum naturaliter contento" (1669) was the foundation of crystallography and stratigraphy, or the science of the earth's strata. One of the most painstaking geologists of the eighteenth century was the Abbate Lazzaro Spallanzani (1729-99). With him rank Fathers de la Torre (Storia e fenomeni del Vesuvio, 1755), Fortis (1741-1803), Palassou (La minéralogie des Monts Pyrénées, 1782), Torrubia (1754, in America and the Philippines), Canon Recupero, at Catania (d. 1787), and many others.

The history of meteorology tells the same story as that of mathematical geography. This science also depended on widely scattered observations which could only be obtained from the monasteries scattered over Europe. Rainieri, a pupil of Galileo, made the first records of the fluctuations of the thermometer. The first meteorological society, the "Societas Meteorologica Palatina" (1780-95), accomplished splendid results. Its founder was the former Jesuit and court chaplain Johann Jacob Hemmer. Almost all of its correspondents belonged to the various religious orders of Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, and Italy. The rapid growth of ethnography and linguistics was rendered possible solely by the vast accumulation of materials made by the missionaries in the course of the centuries. There was hardly a writer of travels who did not to some extent contribute to them. While many of them occupied themselves with this science exclusively, we mention here only the "pioneers of comparative ethnography", Fathers Dobrizhoffer

(1718-91), in Paraguay, and Lafiteux in Canada; the noted Sanskrit scholars Fathers Hanzleden (1681-1732), Cœurdeuse (1707), and Paulinus a Santo Bartholomeo (1776-89, in India), and, finally, the able Father Hervas (1733-1809). The latter's chief work, the "Catalogo de las lenguas" (1800-03), was published in Rome, whither all the members of the suppressed Jesuit Order had flocked.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century the progress of geographical science, as was to be expected, is due chiefly to laymen, who, without religious aims, have continued the work on the foundations already provided. The co-operation of the clergy was of secondary importance, but it never entirely ceased, and, true to its great traditions, it has won a place of honour even amid the stupendous achievements of modern research. By way of proof, we close with the names of the theologian Moigno (1804-84), the founder and publisher of the natural science periodicals "Le Cosmos" (1852-) and "Les Mondes" (1863-); of the astronomer Secchi (1818-78), who, among other things, invented the meteorograph in 1838; also of the Lazarist Fathers Huc (1839-60), Gabet, and Armand David (d. 1900). The last-named made themselves famous by their explorations in China, Manchuria, and Tibet. Finally, we should remember the astronomical, meteorological, seismological, and magnetic observatories established by the Society of Jesus all over the world (Rome, Stonyhurst, Kalocsa, Granada, Tortosa, Georgetown near Washington, Manila, Belen in Cuba, Ambohidempona in Madagascar, Calcutta, Zi-ka-wei, Boroma, and Bulawayo on the Zambesi, etc.) and their periodical reports.

DE BACKER, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la C. de J.* (Liège and Paris, 1876); BEAZLEY, *The Dawn of Modern Geography* (vols. I-III, London, 1897-1906); BINDGENS, *Was veranlaßt die Länder- u. Völkerkunde den mittelalterlichen Mönchen u. Missionaren? in Frankfurter zeitgenössische Broschüren*, N.S., X, nos. 6, 7 (Frankfurt, 1889); CORDIER, *Bibliotheca Sinica*, I, II (Paris, 1904-06); FISCHER, *Die Entdeckungen der Normannen in Amerika in Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, Suppl., XXI (Freiburg, 1903); GÜNTHER, *Studien zur Geschichte der mathematischen und physikalischen Geographie* (Halle, 1877-79); HARTIG, *Ältere Entdeckungsgeschichte und Kartographie Afrikas in Mitteilungen der k. k. geograph. Gesellschaft*, XLVIII (Vienna, 1905), 283-383; HUMBOLDT, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die historische Entwicklung der geogr. Kenntnisse von der neuen Welt*, I-III (Berlin, 1852); IDEM, *Kosmos*, I-IV (Stuttgart, 1869); HÜNDER, *Deutsche Jesuitenmissionare des 17. u. 18. Jahrhunderts in Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, Suppl., XIX (Freiburg, 1899); HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, I-III (Paderborn, 1907-08); KRETSCHMER, *Die physische Erdkunde im christlichen Mittelalter* (Vienna, 1889); IDEM, *Die Entdeckung Amerikas* (Berlin, 1892); LEIBELTER, *Katholische Missionare als Naturforscher und Aerzte* (Vienna, 1902); MILLER (ed.), *Mappa mundi: Die ältesten Weltkarten*, I-VI (Stuttgart, 1895-98); MARINELLI, *Die Erdkunde bei den Kirchenvätern*, Germ. tr. by NEUMANN (Leipzig, 1884); PESCHEL, *Abhandlung zur Erd- u. Völkerkunde* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1877-79); IDEM, *Geschichte der Erdkunde* (Munich, 1877); RICHTHOFEN, *China* (Berlin, 1877-85); RIGGE, *Beteiligung und Leistungen der Jesuiten auf dem Gebiete der Astronomie im 19. Jahrhundert in Natur u. Offenbarung*, LI (Münster, 1905), 193-208; 273-287; RITTER, *Die Erdkunde im Verhältniss zur Natur und Geschichte des Menschen*, I-XIX (Berlin, 1822-59); IDEM, *Geschichte der Erdkunde und der Entdeckungen* (Berlin, —); RUGE, *Geschichte des Zeitalters der Entdeckungen* (Berlin, 1881); SCHREIBER, *Die Jesuiten des 17. u. 18. Jahrhunderts und ihr Verhältniss zur Astronomie in Natur und Offenbarung*, XLIX (Münster, 1903), 129-143; 208-221; DE SAINT-MARTIN, *Histoire de la géographie* (Paris, 1873); ZURLA, *Dei Vantaggi della Cattolica Religione derivati dalla Geografia* (Venice, 1825).

O. HARTIG.

George, SAINT, martyr, patron of England, suffered at or near Lydda, also known as Diospolis, in Palestine, probably before the time of Constantine. According to the very careful investigation of the whole question recently instituted by Father Delehaye, the Bollandist, in the light of modern sources of information, the above statement sums up all that can safely be affirmed about St. George, despite his early cultus and pre-eminent renown both in East and West (see Delehaye, "Saints Militaires", 1909, pp. 45-76). Earlier studies of the subject have generally been based upon an attempt to determine which of the various sets of legendary "Acts" was most likely to preserve traces of a primitive and authentic record. Delehaye rightly

points out that the earliest narrative known to us, even though fragments of it may be read in a palimpsest of the fifth century, is full beyond belief of extravagances and of quite incredible marvels. Three times is George put to death—chopped into small pieces, buried deep in the earth and consumed by fire—but each time he is resuscitated by the power of God. Besides this we have dead men brought to life to be baptized, wholesale conversions, including that of "the Empress Alexandra"; armies and idols destroyed instantaneously, beams of timber suddenly bursting into leaf, and finally milk flowing instead of blood from the martyr's severed head. There is, it is true, a mitigated form of the story, which the older Bollandists have in a measure taken under their protection (see Act. SS., 23 Ap., §9). But even this abounds both in marvels and in historical contradictions, while modern critics, like Amélineau and Delehaye, though approaching the question from very different standpoints, are agreed in thinking that this mitigated version has been derived from the more extravagant by a process of elimination and rationalization, not vice versa. Remembering then the unscrupulous freedom with which any wild story, even when pagan in origin, was appropriated by the early hagiographers to the honour of a popular saint (see, for example, the case of St. Procopius as detailed in Delehaye, "Legends", ch. v) we are fairly safe in assuming that the Acts of St. George, though ancient in date and preserved to us (with endless variations) in many different languages, afford absolutely no indication at all for arriving at the saint's authentic history. This, however, by no means implies that the martyr St. George never existed. An ancient cultus, going back to a very early epoch and connected with a definite locality, in itself constitutes a strong historical argument. Such we have in the case of St. George. The narratives of the early pilgrims, Theodosius, Antoninus, and Arculphus, from the sixth to the eighth century, all speak of Lydda or Diospolis as the seat of the veneration of St. George, and as the resting-place of his remains (Geyer, "Itinera Hierosol.", 139, 176, 288). The early date of the dedications to the saint is attested by existing inscriptions of ruined churches in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, and the church of St. George at Thessalonica is also considered by some authorities to belong to the fourth century. Further the famous decree "De Libris recipiendis", attributed to Pope Gelasius in 495, attests that certain apocryphal Acts of St. George were already in existence, but includes him among those saints "whose names are justly revered amongst men, but whose actions are only known to God". There seems, therefore, no ground for doubting the historical existence of St. George, even though he is not commemorated in the Syrian, or in the primitive Hieronymian Martyrologium, but no faith can be placed in the attempts that have been made to fill up any of the details of his history. For example, it is now generally admitted that St. George cannot safely be identified with the nameless martyr spoken of by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles., VIII, v), who tore down Diocletian's edict of persecution at Nicomedia. The version of the legend in which Diocletian appears as persecutor is not primitive. Diocletian is only a rationalized form of the name Dadianus. Moreover, the connexion of the saint's name with Nicomedia is inconsistent with the early cultus at Diospolis. Still less is St. George to be considered, as suggested by Gibbon, Vetter, and others, a legendary double of the disreputable bishop, George of Cappadocia, the Arian opponent of St. Athanasius. "This odious stranger", says Gibbon, in a famous passage, "disguising every circumstance of time and place, assumed the mask of a martyr, a saint, and a Christian hero, and the infamous George of Cappadocia has been transformed into the renowned St. George of England, the patron of arms, of chivalry, and of the Garter." "But this theory",

says Professor Bury, Gibbon's latest editor, "has nothing to be said for it." The cultus of St. George is too ancient to allow of such an identification, though it is not improbable that the apocryphal Acts have borrowed some incidents from the story of the Arian bishop. Again, as Bury points out, "the connexion of St. George with a dragon-slaying legend does not relegate him to the region of the myth, for over against the fabulous (Christian) dragon-slayer Theodore of the Bithynian Heraclea, we can set Agapetus of Synnada and Arsacius, who, though celebrated as dragon-slayers, were historical persons". This episode of the dragon is in fact a very late development, which cannot be traced further back than the twelfth or thirteenth century. It is found in the Golden Legend (Historia Lombardica) of James de Voragine and to this circumstance it probably owes its wide diffusion. It may have been derived from an allegorization of the tyrant Diocletian or Dadianus, who is sometimes called a dragon (*ὁ βόδιος δράκων*) in the older text, but despite the researches of Vetter (Reinbot von Durne, pp. lxxv-cix) the origin of the dragon story remains very obscure. In any case the late occurrence of this development refutes the attempts made to derive it from pagan sources. Hence it is certainly not true, as stated by Hartland, that in George's person "the Church has converted and baptized the pagan hero Perseus" (The Legend of Perseus, iii, 38). In the East, St. George (*ὁ μεγαλόμαρτυρ*), has from the beginning been classed among the greatest of the martyrs. In the West also his cultus is very early. Apart from the ancient origin of St. George in Velabro at Rome, Clovis (c. 512) built a monastery at Baralle in his honour (Kurth, Clovis, II, 177). Arculphus and Adamnan probably made him well known in Britain early in the eighth century. His Acts were translated into Anglo-Saxon, and English churches were dedicated to him before the Norman Conquest, for example one at Doncaster, in 1061. The crusades no doubt added to his popularity. William of Malmesbury tells us that Saints George and Demetrius, "the martyr knights", were seen assisting the Franks at the battle of Antioch, 1098 (Gesta Regum, II, 420). It is conjectured, but not proved, that the "arms of St. George" (argent, a cross, gules) were introduced about the time of Richard Cœur de Lion. What is certain is that in 1284 in the official seal of Lyme Regis a ship is represented with a plain flag bearing a cross. The large red St. George's cross on a white ground remains still the "white ensign" of the British Navy and it is also one of the elements which go to make up the Union Jack. Anyway, in the fourteenth century, "St. George's arms" became a sort of uniform for English soldiers and sailors. We find, for example, in the wardrobe accounts of 1345-49, at the time of the battle of Crécy, that a charge is made for 86 penoncells of the arms of St. George intended for the king's ship, and for 800 others for the men-at-arms (Archæologia, XXXI, 119). A little later, in the Ordinances of Richard II to the English army invading Scotland, every man is ordered to wear "a signe of the arms of St. George" both before and behind, while the pain of death is threatened against any of the enemy's soldiers "who do bear the same crosse or token of Saint George, even if they be prisoners". Somewhat earlier than this Edward III had founded (c. 1347) the Order of the Garter, an order of knighthood of which St. George was the principal patron. The chapel dedicated to St. George in Windsor Castle was built to be the official sanctuary of the order, and a badge or jewel of St. George slaying the dragon was adopted as part of the insignia. In this way the cross of St. George has in a manner become identified with the idea of knighthood, and even in Elizabeth's days, Spenser, at the beginning of his Faerie Queene, tells us of his hero, the Red Cross Knight:—

But on his breast a bloody Cross he bore,  
The dear remembrance of his dying Lord,



For whose sweet sake that glorious badge he wore  
And dead (as living) ever him adored.  
We are told also that the hero thought continually of  
wreaking vengeance.—

Upon his foe, a dragon horrible and stern.

Ecclesiastically speaking, St. George's day, 23 April, was ordered to be kept as a lesser holiday as early as 1222, in the national synod of Oxford. In 1415, the Constitution of Archbishop Chichele raised St. George's day to the rank of one of the greatest feasts and ordered it to be observed like Christmas day. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries St. George's day remained a holiday of obligation for English Catholics. Since 1778, however, it has been kept, like many of these older holidays, as a simple feast of devotion, though it ranks liturgically as a double of the first class with an octave.

**SAINT GEORGE AND THE DRAGON.**—The best-known form of the legend of St. George and the Dragon is that made popular by the "Legenda Aurea", and translated into English by Caxton. According to this, a terrible dragon had ravaged all the country

already in the dragon's clutches, while an abbot stands by and blesses the rescuer.

STEMMER in *Kirchener*, s. v.; DELEHAYE, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires* (Paris, 1909), pp. 45-76; DELEHAYE, *The Legends of the Saints* (Eng. tr., London, 1907), pp. 190 and 212; STOKES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. Georgius (43); MATZKE, *Contributions to the History of St. George in Publications of the Modern Language Association* (Baltimore, 1902-3), XVII, 464-535 and XVIII, 99-171; GALTIER in *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* (Paris, 1905), IV, 220; HUBER, *Zur Georgslegende* (Erlangen, 1906); STRZYGOWSKI, *Der Koptische Reiterheilige und der heilige Georg* (Leipzig, 1902); GORRES, *Ritter St. Georg in Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theologie*, XVI, pp. 454 sqq; *Act. SS.*, 25 Apr.; DILLMANN, *Apok. Martyrergeschichten in den Sitzungsberichte der Berlin Academy*, 1887; AMÉLINEAU, *Les Actes des Martyrs de l'Eglise Copte* (Paris, 1890); GUTSCHMID, *Die Sage vom H. Georg in den Berichten der Saxon Academy*, XIII (Leipzig, 1861); ZARNCKE, *Fassio S. Georgii in den Berichten der Saxon Academy*, XXVII (Leipzig, 1875); CLERMONT-GANNEAU, *Horus et St. Georges in the Revue Archéologique*, new series, XXII, pp. 196-204 and 372-99; ZWIERZINA, *Bemerkungen zur Georgius-Legende in Prager deutsche Studien* (Prague, 1908), VIII, 1-10; DEFFLESEN in *Sitzungsberichte K. K. Acad.* (Vienna, 1858), XXVIII, 386-95; VETTER, *Der heilige Georg des Reinbot von Durne* (Halle, 1896); WALLIS BUDGE, *The Martyrdom and Miracles of St. George*, the Coptic texts and translation (London, 1888); THURSTON in *The Month* (April, 1892); FRIEDRICH, *Der geschichtliche heilige Georg in the Vienna Sitzungsberichte*, 1889, II, 159-203; VESOLOV-



ST. GEORGE AND THE DRAGON  
Carpaccio, Hospital of San Giorgio de' Schiavoni, Venice

round a city of Libya, called Selena, making its lair in a marshy swamp. Its breath caused pestilence whenever it approached the town, so the people gave the monster two sheep every day to satisfy its hunger, but, when the sheep failed, a human victim was necessary and lots were drawn to determine the victim. On one occasion the lot fell to the king's little daughter. The king offered all his wealth to purchase a substitute, but the people had pledged themselves that no substitutes should be allowed, and so the maiden, dressed as a bride, was led to the marsh. There St. George chanced to ride by, and asked the maiden what she did, but she bade him leave her lest he also might perish. The good knight stayed, however, and, when the dragon appeared, St. George, making the sign of the cross, bravely attacked it and transfixed it with his lance. Then asking the maiden for her girdle (an incident in the story which may possibly have something to do with St. George's selection as patron of the Order of the Garter), he bound it round the neck of the monster, and thereupon the princess was able to lead it like a lamb. They then returned to the city, where St. George bade the people have no fear but only be baptized, after which he cut off the dragon's head and the townsfolk were all converted. The king would have given George half his kingdom, but the saint replied that he must ride on, bidding the king meanwhile take good care of God's churches, honour the clergy, and have pity on the poor. The earliest reference to any such episode in art is probably to be found in an old Roman tombstone at Conisborough in Yorkshire, considered to belong to the first half of the twelfth century. Here the princess is depicted as

seen in the *Sbornik* of the St. Petersburg Academy (1881), XXI, 172-89; ARNDT in the *Berichte of the Academy of Saxony*, XXVI, pp. 49-70 (Leipzig, 1874); on St. George in Art see especially: SCHARF, *On a Votive Painting of St. George and the Dragon in Archaeologia*, XLIX, pp. 243-300 (London, 1885); GORDON, *St. George Champion of Christendom* (London, 1907); BULLY, *St. George for Merrie England* (London, 1903); on the Flag and Arms of St. George: CUMBERLAND, *History of the Union Jack* (London, 1901); GREEN, *The Union Jack* (London, 1903).

HERBERT THURSTON.

**George, SAINT, DIOCESE OF.** See SAINT GEORGE.

**George, SAINT, ORDERS OF.** See SAINT GEORGE, ORDERS OF.

**George Hamartolus**, a monk at Constantinople under Michael III (842-867) and the author of a chronicle of some importance. Hamartolus is not his name but the epithet he gives to himself in the title of his work: "A compendious chronicle from various chroniclers and interpreters, gathered together and arranged by George, a sinner (*ὁ τὸν Γεωργίου ἁμαρτολοῦ*)". It is a common form among Byzantine monks. Krumbacher (Byz. Litt., 358) protests against the use of this epithet as a name and proposes (and uses) the form *Georgios Monachos*. Nothing is known about him except from the internal evidences of his work, which establishes his period (in the preface he speaks of Michael III as the reigning emperor) and his calling (he refers to himself several times as a monk). The chronicle consists of four books. The first treats of profane history from Adam to Alexander the Great; the second, of the history of the Old Testament; the third, of Roman history from Julius Caesar to Constantine; and the fourth down to the author's own time.

As usually in the case of such medieval chronicles, the only part to be taken seriously is the account of more or less contemporary events. The rest is interesting as an example of Byzantine ideas on the subjects, and of the questions that most interested Byzantine monks. George describes his ideal and principles in the preface. He has used ancient and modern sources (all Greek, of course), has especially consulted edifying works, and has striven to tell the truth rather than to please the reader by artistic writing. But of so great a mass of material he has chosen only what is most useful and necessary. In effect, the questions that seemed most useful and necessary to ecclesiastical persons at Constantinople in the ninth century are those that are discussed. There are copious pious reflections and theological excursions. He writes of how idols were invented, the origin of monks, the religion of the Saracens, and especially of the Iconoclast controversy that was just over. Like all monks he hates Iconoclasts. The violence with which he speaks of them shows how recent the storm had been and how the memory of Iconoclast persecutions was still fresh when he wrote. He writes out long extracts from Greek Fathers. The first book treats of an astonishingly miscellaneous collection of persons—Adam, Nimrod, the Persians, Chaldees, Brahmins, Amazons, etc. In the second book, too, although it professes to deal with Bible history only, he has much to say about Plato and philosophers in general. George Hamartolus ended his chronicle with the year 842, as a colophon in most manuscripts attests. Various people, among them notably "Symeon Logothetes", who is probably Symeon Metaphrastes, the famous writer of saints' lives (tenth century, see Krumbacher, 358), continued his history to later dates—the longest continuation reaches to 948. In spite of his crude ideas and the violent hatred of Iconoclasts that makes him always unjust towards them, his work has considerable value for the history of the last years before the schism of Photius. It was soon translated into Slav languages (Bulgarian and Serbian) and into Georgian. In these versions it became a sort of fountain-head for all early Slav (even Russian) historians. As a very popular and widely consulted book it has been constantly re-edited, corrected, and rearranged by anonymous scribes, so that the reconstruction of the original work is "one of the most difficult problems of Byzantine philology" (Krumbacher, 355).

Combes first published the last part of Book IV of the chronicle and the continuation (813-948) under the title, *Βίαι τῶν νέων Βασιλέων*, in the "Maxima bibliotheca (Scriptores post Theophanem)" (Paris, 1685; reprinted, Venice, 1729). The first edition of the whole work was edited by E. de Muralt: "Georgii monachi, dicti Hamartoli, Chronicon ab orbe condito ad annum p. chr. 842 et a diversis scriptoribus usq. ad ann. 1143 continuatum" (St. Petersburg, 1859). This is the edition reprinted in Migne, P. G., CX, with a Latin translation. It does not represent the original text, but one of the many modified versions (from a Moscow twelfth-century MS.), and is in many ways deficient and misleading (see Krumbacher's criticism in "Byz. Litt.", p. 357). A critical edition is still wanted.

NOLTE, *Ein Exzerpt aus dem grössten Teil noch ungedruckten Chronicon des Georgios Hamartolos in Tübinger Quartalschrift* (1862), 464-68; DE BOOR, *Zur Kenntnis der Welchronik des Georgios Monachos in Historische Untersuchungen*, Arnold Schäfer . . . gewidmet (Bonn, 1882), 276-95; HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien* (Göttingen, 1876), 1-88; LACHMANN, *Zur Textüberlieferung der Chronik des Georgios Monachos in Byz. Zeitschrift* (Munich, 1895), 493-513; KRUMBACHER, *Byzantinische Literatur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897), 352-358, with further bibliography.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**George of Laodicea.** See SEMI-ARIANS.

**George of Trebizond,** a Greek scholar of the early Italian Renaissance; b. in Crete (a Venetian possession from 1206-1669), 1395; d. in Rome, 1486. He

assumed the name "of Trebizond" because his family came from there. He was one of the foremost of the Greeks to arrive in Italy (c. 1420) before the fall of Constantinople. Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446) taught him Latin, and in return he taught Greek in the famous school at Mantua. After teaching for a time at Venice and Florence he came to Rome, and when Eugenius IV (1431-47) restored the University of Rome (1431), one of its most important professorships was assigned to George of Trebizond, who had acquired the highest reputation as a master of Latin style. By Nicholas V (1447-1455) he was much sought after as a translator of Greek works—such as the "Syntaxis" of Ptolemy and the "Preparatio Evangelica" of Eusebius. His incompetence, arrogance, and quarrelsomeness led to difficulties with Bessarion, Theodore Gaza, Perotti and Poggio, and he was obliged to leave Rome, and take refuge with Alfonso, King of Naples. Under the pontificate of his former pupil, Paul II (1464-1471), he returned to Rome and was appointed a papal abbreviator, but became involved in fresh quarrels; in 1465 he visited Crete and Byzantium, and then returned to Rome, where he wrote the account of the martyrdom of Bl. Andrew of Chios (Acta SS., 29 May). He died resenting the obscurity into which he had fallen, and was buried in the Minerva. "George of Trebizond is the most unpleasant of the Greeks of that day. Conceited, boastful and spiteful, he was universally hated" (Pastor, II, 202, note). He sided with the partisans of Aristotle in the controversy raised by Georgios Gemisthos Plethon (1356-1450). His onslaught on Plato lost him the friendship of Bessarion and led to the latter writing (1464) his great work, "In calumniatorem Platonis", in the fifth book of which he points out 259 mistakes in Trebizond's translation of the "Laws" of Plato. His numerous translations included the "Rhetoric" and "Problems" of Aristotle, and St. Cyril's "Commentary on St. John", but, as Pastor notes, they are almost worthless (II, 198, note). A list of some forty-six works will be found in Migne, P. G., CLXI, 745-908.

JOVITS, *Elogia doctorum Vrorum* (Basle, 1558); HODY, *De Graecis illustribus linguae Graecae litterarumque humanarum instauratoribus, eorum vitis scriptis et elogii libri duo*; ed. S. Jebb (London, 1742), 102-135; BOEMER, *De doctis hominibus Litterarum Graecarum in Italia Instauratoribus* (Leipzig, 1750), 105-120; SHEPHERD, *Life of Poggio Bracciolini* (Liverpool, 1802); VOIGT, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums, oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus* (3rd ed., Berlin), II, 45, 137-143; PASTOR, *The History of the Popes* (Eng. tr., London, 1891), II; WOODWARD, *Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators* (Cambridge, 1897); GREGOROVITS, *Hist. of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, Eng. tr., VII, part II (London, 1900); SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908).

EDWARD MYERS.

**George Pisides** (or THE PISIDIAN), a Byzantine poet, lived in the first half of the seventh century. From his poems we learn he was a Pisidian by birth, and a friend of the Patriarch Sergius and the Emperor Heraclius, who reigned from 610 to 641. He is said to have been a deacon at St. Sophia's, Constantinople, where he filled the posts of archivist, guardian of the sacred vessels, and referendary. He evidently accompanied Heraclius in the war against the Persians (622), in which campaign the true Cross, which the enemy had captured some years before at Jerusalem, was recovered. His works have been published in the original Greek with a Latin version and are to be found in P. G., XCII, 1160-1754.

About five thousand verses of his poetry, most in trimetric iambs, have come down to us. Some of the poems treat of theology and morals, the others being a chronicle of the wars of his day. They are: (1) "De expeditione Heraclii imperatoris contra Persas, libri tres",—an account of the Persian war, which shows him to have been an eyewitness of it; (2) "Bellum Avanicum", descriptive of the defeat of the Avars—a Turkish horde, that attacked Constantinople in 626,

and were defeated, during the absence of the emperor and his army; (3) "Heraclius" or "De extremo Chosroë Persarum regis excidio"—written after the death of Chosroes, who was assassinated by his mutinous soldiery at Ctesiphon, in 628; this poem treats mostly of the deeds of the emperor and contains but little concerning Chosroes; it is valued not so much for any literary merit, as for being the principal source for the history of the reign of Heraclius; (4) "In sanctam Jesu Christi, Dei nostri resurrectionem", in which the poet exhorts Flavius Constantinus to follow in the footsteps of his father, Heraclius; (5) "Hexaameron", or "Opus sex dierum seu Mundi officium", this is his longest and most elaborate poem and is dedicated to Sergius; (6) "De vanitate vitæ"; (7) "Contra impium Severum Antiochie", written against the Monophysite heresy; (8) "In templum Deiparæ Constantinopoli, in Blachernissitum"; and finally (9) one piece in prose, "Encomium in S. Anastasium martyrem". From references in Theophanus, Suidas, and Isaac Tzetzes, we know he wrote other works which have not reached us. George's verse is considered correct and elegant, but he is sometimes dull and frigid. He was greatly admired by his countrymen in succeeding ages and preferred even to Euripides. But later critics are not so laudatory. Finlay in his *History of Greece*, I (Oxford, 1877) says, "It would be difficult in the whole range of literature to point to poetry which conveys less information on the subject which he pretends to treat than that of George the Pisidian. In taste and poetical inspiration he is as deficient as in judgment and he displays no trace of any national characteristics." But to be just we must remember that he was a courtier and wrote with the intention of winning the favour of the emperor and the patriarch. Literature, if we except the production of religious controversy, was practically extinct in Europe and George stands forth as its sole exponent, the only poet of his century.

DAVIDSON in *Dict. Christ. biog.*, s. v.; STERNBACH, *Georgii Pisida carmina inedita in Wien. Stud.* (Vienna, 1892), XIV, 51-68; HILBERG, *Textkritische Beiträge zu Georgios Pisides in Wien. Stud.* (Vienna, 1887), IX, 207-22; TEZA, *Essaemero di Giorgio Piside* (Rome, 1893).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**George Scholarius.** See GENNADIUS II.

**George the Bearded**, also called **THE RICH**, Duke of Saxony, b. at Dresden, 27 August, 1471; d. in the same city, 17 April, 1539. His father was Albert the Brave of Saxony, founder of the Albertine line of the Wettin family, still the ruling line of Saxony; his mother was Sidonia, daughter of George of Podiebrad, King of Bohemia. Elector Frederick the Wise, a member of the Ernestine branch of the same family, known for his protection of Luther, was a cousin of Duke George. Albert the Brave had a large family and George, a younger son, was originally intended for the Church; consequently he received an excellent training in theology and other branches of learning, and was thus much better educated than most of the princes of his day. The death of his elder brother opened to George the way to the ducal power. As early as 1488, when his father was in Friesland fighting on behalf of the emperor, George was regent of the ducal possessions, which included the Margravate of Meissen with the cities of Dresden and Leipzig. George was married at Dresden, 21 November, 1496, to Barbara of Poland, daughter of King Casimir IV of that country. George and his wife had a large family of children, all of whom, with the exception of a daughter, died before their father. In 1498, the emperor granted Albert the Brave the hereditary governorship of Friesland. At Maastricht, 14 February, 1499, Albert settled the succession to his possessions, and endeavoured by this arrangement to prevent further partition of his domain. He died 12 September, 1500, and was succeeded in his German territories by George as the head

of the Albertine line, while George's brother Heinrich became hereditary governor of Friesland. The Saxon occupation of Friesland, however, was by no means secure and was the source of constant revolts in that province. Consequently Heinrich, who was of a rather inert disposition, relinquished his claims to the governorship, and in 1505 an agreement was made between the brothers by which Friesland was transferred to George, while Heinrich received an annuity and the districts of Freiberg and Wolkenstein. But this arrangement did not restore peace in Friesland, which continued to be an unceasing source of trouble to Saxony, until finally the duke was obliged, in 1515, to sell it to Burgundy for the very moderate price of 100,000 florins. These troubles outside of his Saxon possessions did not prevent George from bestowing much care on the government of the ducal territory proper. When regent, during the lifetime of his father, the difficulties arising from conflicting interests and the large demands on his powers had often brought the young prince to the verge of despair. In a short time, however, he developed decided ability as a ruler; on entering upon his inheritance he divided the duchy into governmental districts, took measures to suppress the robber-knights, and regulated the judicial system by defining and readjusting the jurisdiction of the various law courts. In his desire to achieve good order, security, and the amelioration of the condition of the people, he sometimes ventured to infringe even on the rights of the cities. His court was better regulated than that of any other German prince, and he bestowed a paternal care on the University of Leipzig, where a number of reforms were introduced, and Humanism, as opposed to Scholasticism, was encouraged.

From the beginning of the Reformation in 1517, Duke George directed his energies chiefly to ecclesiastical affairs. Hardly one of the secular German princes held as firmly as he to the Church; he defended its rights and vigorously condemned every innovation except those which were countenanced by the highest ecclesiastical authorities. At first he was not opposed to Luther, but as time went on and Luther's aim became clear to him, he turned more and more from the Reformer, and was finally, in consequence of this change of attitude, drawn into an acrimonious correspondence in which Luther, without any justification, shamefully reviled the duke. The duke was not blind to the undeniable abuses existing at that time in the Church. In 1519, despite the opposition of the theological faculty of the university, he originated the Disputation of Leipzig, with the idea of helping forward the cause of truth, and was present at all the discussions. In 1521, at the Diet of Worms, when the German princes handed in a paper containing a list of "grievances" concerning the condition of the Church, George added for himself twelve specific complaints referring mainly to the abuse of Indulgences and the annates. In 1525 he combined with his Lutheran son-in-law, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, and his cousin, the Elector Frederick the Wise, to suppress the revolt of the peasants, who were defeated near Frankenhausen in Thuringia. Some years later, he wrote a forcible preface to a translation of the New Testament issued at his command by his private secretary, Hieronymus Emser, as an offset to Luther's version. Lutheran books were confiscated by his order, wherever found, though he refunded the cost of the books. He proved himself in every way a vigorous opponent of the Lutherans, decreeing that Christian burial was to be refused to apostates, and recreant ecclesiastics were to be delivered to the bishop of Merseburg. For those, however, who merely held anti-Catholic opinions, the punishment was only expulsion from the duchy. The duke deeply regretted the constant postponement of the ardently desired council, from the action of which so much was expected. While awaiting its convocation, he thought

to remove the more serious defects by a reform of the monasteries, which had become exceedingly worldly in spirit and from which many of the inmates were departing. He vainly sought to obtain from the Curia the right, which was sometimes granted by Rome, to make official visitations to the conventual institutions of his realm. His reforms were confined mainly to uniting the almost vacant monasteries and to matters of economic management, the control of the property being entrusted in most cases to the secular authorities. In 1525, Duke George formed, with some other German rulers, the League of Dessau, for the protection of Catholic interests. In the same way he was the animating spirit of the League of Halle, formed in 1533, from which sprang in 1538 the Holy League of Nuremberg for the maintenance of the Religious Peace of Nuremberg.

The vigorous activity displayed by the duke in so many directions was not attended with much success. Most of his political measures, indeed, stood the test of experience, but in ecclesiastico-political matters he witnessed with sorrow the gradual decline of Catholicism and the spread of Lutheranism within his dominions, in spite of his earnest efforts and forcible prohibition of the new doctrine. Furthermore, during George's lifetime his nearest relations, his son-in-law, Philip of Hesse, and his brother Heinrich, joined the Reformers. He spent the last years of his reign in endeavours to secure a Catholic successor, thinking by this step to check the dissemination of Lutheran opinions. The only one of George's sons then living was the weak-minded and unmarried Frederick. The intention of his father was that Frederick should rule with the aid of a council. Early in 1539, Frederick was married to Elizabeth of Mansfeld, but he died shortly afterwards, leaving no prospect of an heir. According to the act of settlement of 1499, George's Protestant brother Heinrich was now heir prospective; but George, disregarding his father's will, sought to disinherit his brother and to bequeath the duchy to Ferdinand, brother of Charles V. His sudden death prevented the carrying out of this intention.

George was an excellent and industrious ruler, self-sacrificing, high-minded, and unwearying in the furtherance of the highest interests of his land and people. As a man he was upright, vigorous and energetic, if somewhat irascible. A far-seeing and faithful adherent of the emperor and empire, he accomplished much for his domain by economy, love of order, and wise direction of activities of his state officials. The grief of his life was Luther's Reformation and the apostasy from the Old Faith. Of a strictly religious, although not narrow, disposition, he sought at any cost to keep his subjects from falling away from the Church, but his methods of attaining his object were not always free from reproach.

*Histor.-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland* (Munich, 1860), XLVI; von WELCK, *Georg der Bärtige, Herzog von Sachsen* (Brunswick, 1900); Grass, *Die Klosterinstitutionen des Herzogs Georg von Sachsen* (Leipzig, 1888); Irmke, *Akten und Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen* (Leipzig, 1905), I, containing the years 1517-24, other volumes to appear.

H. A. CREUTZBERG.

**Georgetown University**, Washington, District of Columbia, "is the oldest Catholic literary establishment in the United States. It was founded immediately after the Revolutionary War, by the incorporated Catholic Clergy of Maryland, who selected from their Body Trustees, and invested them with full power to choose a President and appoint Professors. Since the year 1805, it has been under the direction of the Society of Jesus" (The Laity's Directory, 1822).

**ORIGIN—FOUNDER.**—In treating of the origin of Georgetown University, its chroniclers and historians are wont to refer to earlier schools in Maryland, projected or carried on by the Jesuits. It is true that

Father Ferdinand Poulton, a few years after the settlement of St. Mary's, wrote to the general of the society about the prospects of founding a college in the infant colony; and the general answered, in 1640: "The hope held out of a college I am happy to entertain; and, when it shall have matured, I will not be backward in extending my approval." But the times were not favourable. The laws against Catholic education and educators were so stringent during the greater part of the Maryland colonial period that it was only at intervals, for brief spaces of time, and by stealth, that the Jesuits, always solicitous for the education of youth, were able to conduct a school. Such a school was at Bohemia, in Cecil County; it numbered among its scholars John Carroll, the founder of Georgetown College. He is the link, moral and personal, between Georgetown and earlier schools; and with his name the history of Georgetown College is indissolubly connected. He had a large share in its foundation and upbuilding, and the sons of Georgetown, to honour his memory, have formally instituted the observance of "Founder's Day", in January of each year. His life and character are detailed elsewhere (see CARROLL, JOHN). Even before he became the first bishop of the United States, he saw and impressed upon his former brethren of the Society of Jesus the urgent need of a Catholic college. Having secured their co-operation, he drew up the plan of the institution and issued a prospectus appealing to his friends in England for financial assistance. It was he who selected the site; and, although unable to give personal supervision to the undertaking, burdened as he was with the solicitude of all the churches, he watched with paternal interest over the early growth of the college. Georgetown still possesses his portrait, by Gilbert Stuart, relics from his birthplace at Upper Marlborough, the manuscript of his course in theology, the Missal which he used when a rural missionary at Rock Creek, the attestation of his consecration as bishop at Lulworth Castle, the circular which he issued detailing the plan and scope of the college, and many letters, original or copied, relating to its standing and prospects.

In 1889 the college celebrated with befitting pomp the hundredth anniversary of its foundation. Georgetown, in 1789, was the chief borough of Montgomery County, Maryland. Father Carroll selected it for the site of the academy, influenced, no doubt, by a knowledge of the locality acquired during his missionary excursions. In speaking of the present site, he describes it as "one of the most lovely situations that imagination can frame". The first prospectus says: "In the choice of Situation, Salubrity of Air, Convenience of Communication, and Cheapness of Living have been principally consulted, and Georgetown offers these united advantages". In regard to the "Salubrity of Air", it is significant that the college records show the first death among the students to have occurred in 1843. In 1784, Father Carroll was appointed prefect-Apostolic, or superior, of the Church in the United States. In 1785 he wrote to his friend, Father Charles Plowden, in England: "The object nearest my heart now, and the only one that can give consistency to our religious views in this country, is the establishment of a school, and afterwards of a Seminary for young clergymen." At a meeting of the clergy, held at White Marsh, in 1786, he presented a detailed plan of the school, and recommended the site which had impressed him so favourably. The clergy sanctioned the project, adopted a series of "Resolves concerning the Institution of a School", and directed the sale of a piece of land belonging to the corporation, in order that the proceeds might be applied to the erection of the first building. The Reverends John Carroll, James Pellentz, Robert Molyneux, John Ashton, and Leonard Neale were appointed directors. In 1788, the first building was undertaken. The work



proceeded slowly, from want of funds, and 1789 is considered to be the year of the foundation of the college, as the deed of the original piece of ground was dated 23 January of that year. The land—one and a half acres—was acquired by purchase, for the sum of £75 current money. The "Old Building", as it was called, was not ready for occupancy until 1791; it was removed in 1904, to make way for Ryan Hall.

In its material growth the college has expanded from the solitary academic structure of early days into the clustering pile that crowns the ancient site, consisting of nine distinct constructions, known in order of erection as the North Building (begun 1791, completed 1808), the Infirmary (1831-1848), the Mulledy Building (1831), the Observatory (1843), the Maguire Building (1854), the Healy, or Main, Building (1879), the Dahlgren Chapel (1893), the Ida M. Ryan Hall (1903), and the Ryan Gymnasium (1908). To the original classical academy have been added, as opportunity arose or expediency prompted, the astronomical observatory, in 1843; the medical school, in 1851; the law school, in 1870; the university hospital, in 1898; the dental school, in 1901; the training school for nurses, in 1903.

Since 1805, when the Society of Jesus was restored in Maryland, Georgetown has been a Jesuit College, with the traditions, the associations, courses of study, and methods of instruction which the name implies. Until 1860 the Superior of the Mission and Provincial of Maryland generally resided at the college; the novitiate was there for some years; and it was the provincial house of higher studies for philosophy and theology, during the greater part of the period preceding the opening of Woodstock Scholasticate, in 1869. Naturally, under such conditions, the college exercised considerable influence upon the religious development of the country and Catholic progress in the early days. The first three Archbishops of Baltimore had intimate relations with it: Carroll, as founder; Neale, as president; and Maréchal, as professor. Bishop Dubourg of New Orleans was president; the saintly Bishop Flagnet, of Bardonia, was professor; as also Bishop Vandeveld of Chicago. Bishops Carrell of Covington and O'Hara of Scranton were students. Bishop Benedict J. Fenwick, of Boston, one of the first students at Georgetown, and afterwards professor and president, founded the College of the Holy Cross, at Worcester, Mass., a direct offshoot of Georgetown. The Rev. Enoch Fenwick, S. J., president, had a large share in building the cathedral of Baltimore. Bishop Neale founded the Visitation Order in America. Fathers James Ryder and Bernard A. Maguire, presidents, were distinguished pulpit orators. Father Anthony Kohlmann, president, was a profound theologian, and his work, "Unitarianism Refuted", is a learned contribution to controversial literature. Father Camillus Mazzella, afterwards Cardinal, is famous as a dogmatic theologian. Father James Curley, in a modest way, promoted astronomical science; the renowned Father Secchi was for a time connected with the observatory, as was also Father John Hagen, now Director of the Vatican Observatory. Georgetown has exerted its influence on education and morals indirectly through various other colleges that have sprung from it, and directly by the host of its own alumni, nearly five thousand in number, many of them distinguished in every walk of life.

Upon the opening of the college, in 1791, the first name upon the Register is that of William Gaston of North Carolina, who, despite the constitutional disqualifications of Catholics in his native State, represented it in Congress, and rose to its Supreme Bench. The number of students enrolled in 1792 was 66; on the opening day of 1793, 47 new students entered. This was a promising beginning, but growth was slow, and for several years following there was even a falling off. In 1813 the boarders numbered 42; the average for the

preceding ten years had been 25. The century mark (101) was reached for the first time in 1818; the highest number (317) in 1859. The majority of the students at that period were from the Southern States, and the breaking out of the Civil War caused a rapid exodus of young men from class-room to camp. There were only 120 registered in 1862.

The printed prospectus of 1798, issued by Rev. Wm. Dubourg (president, 1796-99), furnishes details of the studies pursued at that date, and holds forth promise of an enlarged course. This promise was fulfilled under his immediate successor, Bishop Leonard Neale (president, 1799-1806). In 1801, there were seven members of a senior class, studying logic, metaphysics, and ethics. Father John Grassi (president, 1812-17) infused new life into the administration of the college: he promoted the study of mathematics and secured the necessary apparatus for teaching the natural sciences. During his term of office, the power to grant degrees was conferred by Act of Congress, March 1, 1815, the bill being introduced by Georgetown's proto-alumnus, a member from North Carolina. This power was first exercised in 1817. The formal incorporation of the institution was effected by Act of Congress in 1844, under the name and title of "The President and Directors of Georgetown College". By this Act the powers granted in 1815 were increased. The Holy See empowered the college, in 1833, to confer in its name degrees in philosophy and theology. Degrees have been conferred, from 1817 to 1908 inclusive, as follows: Doctors—D.D., 27; LL.D., 101; Ph.D., 42; M.D., 950; D.D.S., 59; Phar.D., 3; Mus.D., 7; total 1,189. Licentiates, Ph.L., 9. Masters: LL.M., 743; A.M., 432; M.S., 2; total, 1,177. Bachelors: LL.B., 1,708; A.B., 872; Ph.B., 13; Phar.B., 6; B.S., 14; Mus.B., 1; total, 2,614.—Grand total of degrees conferred, 4989.

The Rev. Robert Plunket was chosen to be the first president. The corporation defrayed the expenses of his passage from England to America. He entered upon his duties in 1791, served for two years, and was succeeded by Father Robert Molyneux, who became the first superior of the restored society in Maryland, and held the presidency of the college for a second term at the time of his death, in 1808. The school began with very elementary classes, but the original plan contemplated a rounded academic course, and gradually the standard of classes was raised, and their number increased. Some of the assistant teachers were aspirants to Holy orders, and a class in theology was formed. In 1808, four of this class were elevated to the priesthood, Benedict Fenwick, Enoch Fenwick, Leonard Edelen, and John Spink, the first members of the Society of Jesus to be ordained in the United States.

*Present Status.*—Georgetown University consists of the college, the school of medicine, the school of dental surgery, and the school of law. The number of students at present (1909) is: college, 101; medical school, 82; dental department, 54; hospital training school, 17; law school, 495. Total, 749. The faculties, including officials, professors, special lecturers, assistants and associates, are distributed as follows: college, 26; medical school, 65; dental school, 27; law school, 24. Clinical instruction is given in the University Hospital; the amphitheatre accommodates over 180 students. The hospital is in charge of the Sisters of St. Francis, and has a training school for nurses attached. The hospital staff numbers 8 physicians in chief, with 9 associates and 18 assistants. Post-graduate courses of study are carried on in the law and medical schools, and are offered in the college. A preparatory department, or classical high school, is attached to the college and in 1909 had 97 students. The college grounds comprise 78 acres, a large part of which is occupied by "The Walks", famous for their woodland scenery. The hospital is in close proximity to the college; the law and medical schools are in the heart



of the city. The Riggs Memorial Library contains more than 95,000 volumes, among which are many rare and curious works, early imprints, and ancient MSS. Among the special libraries incorporated in the Riggs is that of the historian, Dr. J. Gilmory Shea, valuable for Americana and Indian languages. The Hirst Library is for the use of the students of the undergraduate school; it contains about 5000 volumes. There are also special libraries for the post-graduate course, for the junior students, and for Maryland colonial research. The Coleman Museum is a large hall in which are displayed various collections; here three thousand specimens illustrate the whole field of mineralogy, while in geology and paleontology there are excellent collections. Mosaics, valuable sets of coins, pontifical and other medals, autographs, photographs, curios in great variety make the museum one of the most interesting institutions of its kind.—The College Archives are deposited in a spacious fire-proof vault, well lighted and ventilated. Connected with the archives, there is a hall for the exhibition of Missals, chalices, vestments, bells, and other memorials of the early Jesuit missions of Maryland. Gaston Hall, where commencement and other exercises are held, owes its artistic ornamentation and finish to the liberality of the Alumni Association. The Philodemic Debating Society Room is decorated with portraits of distinguished graduates and college worthies. The College Journal and the literary and scientific societies furnish opportunity for mental improvement; the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, which is the oldest in the United States, helps to piety. The Athletic Association encourages sport and promotes physical training by means of the gymnasium, ball clubs, boat clubs, etc. The spirit of loyalty towards Alma Mater is fostered by the National Society of Alumni and by the local societies of New York, Philadelphia, Northeastern Pennsylvania, the Pacific Coast, Wisconsin, and the Georgetown University Club of New England. The Triennial Graduate List gives in alphabetical order the names of all those who have received degrees from the university, together with information concerning the present occupation and residence of living graduates. The General Catalogue, and the Circular of Information, Georgetown University publications issued annually, furnish detailed information in regard to courses of studies, requirements for admission and graduation, fees, expenses, etc., in all departments.

CARROLL, *Letters* (in relation to the college, original and copied, preserved at Georgetown and Stonyhurst Colleges, and in Baltimore diocesan and Maryland Province Archives. These letters are generally referred to, and sometimes quoted *in extenso*, by the writers mentioned below); HUGHES, *History of the Society of Jesus in N. America* (London and Cleveland, 1908, 1909), Documents, I, II; SHEA, *Memorial of First Centenary* (New York, 1891); ID., *Hist. Cath. Church in U. S.* (New York, 1888-1890), II, III; BRENT, *Biography of Archbishop Carroll* (Baltimore, 1843), 76-95; EASBY-SMITH, *Georgetown University, Its Founders, Benefactors, Officers and Alumni* (New York and Chicago, 1907); McLAUGHLIN, *College Days at Georgetown* (Philadelphia, 1899); JACKSON, *Chronicles of Georgetown* (Washington, 1878), 215; LAY'S *Directory* (New York, 1822), 84; *Catholic Almanac* (Baltimore, 1833—); SCUMMER, *Woodstock Letters*, VII, 3, 60, 135, VIII, 3, 52; CASSELY in *Scribner's Magazine*, XX, 665; McLAUGHLIN, *Catholic World*, XLVI, 610; BECKER, *Cosmopolitan*, VIII, 449; TAGGAR in *Records Columbia Hist. Soc.*, XI, 120; DEVIET, *ibid.*, XII; *Metropolitan*, IV, 287; *College Journal* (1872—), *passim*; *Annual Catalogues* (1851—); *College Archives* (a voluminous collection of original manuscript sources, consisting of registers, deeds and records, account books, diaries, academic exercises, proceedings of societies, and letters with printed discourses, programmes, notices of persons and events—135 vols., classified and indexed).

E. J. DEVIET.

**Georgia.**—STATISTICS.—The area of Georgia is 59,475 sq. m., and it is the largest of the original thirteen United States; bounded on the north by Tennessee and North Carolina, on the east by the Savannah River and the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by Florida, and on the west by Florida and Alabama. Population in 1790, 82,548; in 1830, 516,823; in 1870, 1,184,109; and in 1900, 2,216,331, including 1,034,813 ne-

groes, 204 Chinese, 1 Japanese, and 19 Indians. The population of Savannah, the largest city, was, in 1900, 54,244. The present Constitution was adopted in 1877. The State is divided into 10 congressional districts, 44 senatorial districts, and 137 counties. No State in the American Union has such a variety of agricultural products. Cotton is the chief. Before the Civil War one-sixth of the total cotton crop of the United States was raised in Georgia. In 1883, 824,250 bales were produced; in 1907, 1,920,000. Georgia now ranks as the second cotton-producing State. Among other agricultural products, Georgia produced in 1907 5,010,000 bushels of oats, 57,538,000 bushels of corn, and 2,673,000 bushels of wheat. Georgia is likewise remarkable for the extent and variety of its woodland, its pine being world-famous. It possesses coal, iron, and gold mines, as well as silver, copper, and lead. In 1905 the value of its products of manufacture was \$151,040,455, the capital employed being \$135,211,551. Its favourable location, extensive railroads, and numerous navigable streams give Georgia excellent commercial advantages. Situated between the North and the South-West, the West and the Atlantic, trade between these sections passes through the State. Atlanta and Savannah are its principal commercial centres. The value of foreign commerce is estimated at \$30,000,000. There is no Southern State equal to Georgia in the number of its railroad enterprises. Atlanta, Columbus, Macon, Savannah, and Augusta are the principal railroad centres. The mileage of railroads in 1907 was 6786-33.



SEAL OF GEORGIA

**EDUCATION.**—The Constitution provides for a "thorough system of common schools", maintained by taxation "or otherwise", and free for "white and colored races". The State school commissioner is appointed by the governor for a term of two years. Every county has a board of education and a superintendent, and is provided with free schools. Atlanta, Savannah, Augusta, Macon, and Columbus are separately organized under local laws. The State university, at Athens, founded in 1785, is non-sectarian and in 1908 had 199 instructors and 3375 students. Connected with it are agricultural colleges, a law school, and a medical school in various parts of the State. The other prominent institutions of learning are Atlanta University at Atlanta, founded in 1869, non-sectarian, with 20 instructors and 340 students; Clark University at Atlanta, founded in 1870, Methodist Episcopal, with 25 instructors and 532 students; Emory College at Oxford, founded in 1836, Methodist Episcopal, with 14 instructors and 265 students; Morris Brown College at Atlanta, founded in 1881, Methodist, with 28 instructors and 940 students; Shorter College at Rome, founded in 1877, Baptist, with 30 instructors and 250 students; and Wesleyan Female College at Macon, the first institution of learning for women in America, founded in 1836, Methodist Episcopal, with 33 instructors and 474 students. In the common schools of Georgia there were enrolled in 1907 499,103 pupils and 10,360 teachers.

**CIVIL HISTORY.**—The swamps and pine lands of Georgia, the last colonized of the original thirteen American settlements, were all but untrod by the feet of white men before the eighteenth century. Tradition has it that De Soto, in his ill-starred march to his

grave in the Mississippi, camped for a while in 1540 near the present city of Augusta; a more unreliable tradition asserts that Sir Walter Raleigh, on his initial voyage, "landed at the mouth of Savannah River, and visited the bluff on which the city was afterwards built". For a century and a half the Uchees, Creeks, and Cherokees were left undisputed masters of their hunting-grounds—Lords of the Marches—between the English frontier to the north and the Spanish to the south. In the nature of things this could not long endure. By the voyage of John Cabot, in 1497, England laid claim to the Atlantic seaboard; by the settlement of St. Augustine, in 1565, Spain established its authority over the southern coast. The vastness of the new world deferred the inevitable clash of these overlapping claims until the settlement of South Carolina in 1670, when Spain, alarmed at this territorial expansion of the Protestant English colonies, began, by intrigues with Indians and negro slaves, to harass the safety of the latter colony. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Parliament began to feel that a military colony on the southern frontier was imperative, and this conclusion was felicitously complemented by the belief that the mulberry and the vine could be successfully cultivated on the southern hills and savannas; while a third great philanthropic consideration contributed to the final adoption of the scheme. James Oglethorpe, who had followed up a brilliant military career as aide-de-camp to the Prince Eugene by a still more brilliant parliamentary career, had conceived the plan of settling a colony in the New World with worthy, though unfortunate and economically unproductive, inmates of the wretched English prisons. With this threefold purpose in view, a petition was presented and accepted by the Privy Council and the Board of Trade, and the charter of the Colony of Georgia, named after the king and embracing the territory lying between the Savannah and the Altamaha Rivers, received the great seal of England on 9 June, 1732. This charter created a board of trustees for twenty-one years, who were to possess entire rights in the governing and the financing of the project, but who were not to profit, either directly or indirectly, by the venture. The board thus created, composed of many leading noblemen, clergymen, and members of Parliament of the day, met forthwith and drew up one of the most remarkable governmental documents in English colonial history. A military governor was appointed. Transportation, food, and land were given settlers for the feudal returns of labour and military service; but tenure of land was to descend only along the line of direct male issue. Other salient limitations in these by-laws were the prohibition of liquor, as well as that of negro slaves, and freedom of worship was to be granted to all prospective colonists "except papists". With this document and 126 passengers, carefully selected for the most part from the more worthy inmates of English prisons, Oglethorpe himself, who had been appointed "general" of the new colony, embarked on the "Anne," on 12 November, 1732, arrived at Charleston the following January, and in the spring of that year founded Savannah, which took its name from that of the river above which the little cabins of the settlers were first reared.

During the twenty-one years of its proprietary government, Georgia struggled along, rather in spite of the remote designs and unpractical restrictions of its trustees than because of their indefatigable labour, sterling integrity, and single-minded philanthropy. As a frontier settlement against the Catholic colonies of Spain, Georgia speedily justified its existence. War between the rival countries was declared in 1739. Oglethorpe invaded Florida in 1740, and with an insufficient force unsuccessfully besieged St. Augustine. Two years later Spain retaliated, attempting by land and sea the complete annihilation of the English col-

ony. By a splendid bit of strategy on Oglethorpe's part the invasion was repulsed, and the last blow had been struck by Spain against the English colonies in the New World. Less successful was the attempt of the board of trustees to plant the mulberry and the vine in the new colony. The warfare with Spain, the lack of adequate skilled labour, and the general thriftlessness of the colonists made the cultivation of such products practically impossible. The vine, which was to have supplied all the plantations, and to cultivate which they had imported a Portuguese *vigner*, resulted in only a few gallons and was then abandoned. The hemp and flax, which were to have sustained the linen manufactures of Great Britain and to have thrown the balance of trade with Russia into England's favour, never came to a single ship-load; and the cultivation of the mulberry seems to have expired with its crowning achievement when, on the occasion of His Majesty's birthday in 1735, Queen Caroline appeared at the levee in a complete court dress of Georgia silk. Least successful of all was the philanthropic attempt to colonize Georgia with non-productive inmates from English prisons. It was this class that early began to cry for rum and slavery; and had it not been for the settlement of Ebenezer, in 1734, with industrious Salzburgers, expelled from Germany by reason of their religious beliefs; that of Fort Argyle, in 1735, with a colony of Swiss and Moravian immigrants; and that of New Inverness, in 1736, with a hardy band of thrifty Scotch mountaineers, the philanthropic plans of Oglethorpe would have been speedily wrecked. As it was, the energies of the general were mainly directed towards placing Savannah upon an economically self-sufficient basis.

One of the restrictions that acted most forcibly against labour and thrift, the tenure of land along the line of male descent, was repealed in 1739. Another, the prohibition of slavery, a restriction which served to make restless and impermanent an unskilled and thriftless population settled so close to the slave-holding settlements of South Carolina, was removed in 1747. Even the attempt to rouse up spiritual energy in Savannah proved too great a task for the Wesleys, although in 1738 the eloquent Whitefield seems to have won at least a hearing for his strenuous moral code. But neither an energetic general governor, a concessive board of trustees, nor the zealous bearers of a fresh and fiery spiritual code could establish the philanthropic or commercial success of the proprietary colony of Georgia. Mutiny was widespread. Oglethorpe's life was threatened and actually attempted. The trustees were disheartened. Letters of dissent and charges against Oglethorpe, written under the pseudonym of "The Plain Dealer", reached Parliament. In 1743 Oglethorpe returned to England to face a general court martial on nineteen charges. He was entirely exonerated from charges, which were pronounced "false, malicious and without foundation". But he had done with the colony and never returned to Savannah; while the board of trustees, in 1751, at the expiration of their charter, formally and wearily surrendered their right of government to the Lords of the Council, and Georgia became a royal province.

In the generation before the Revolution Georgia steadily increased in population under royal governors. The cultivation of rice by slaves made the colony economically self-supporting. A better class of colonists were induced to immigrate to its woodlands and rice fields from England and the Carolinas. On 11 January, 1758, the Assembly passed an Act "for constituting the several Divisions and Districts of this Province into Parishes, and for establishing Religious Worship therein, according to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England". This was designed not to interfere with other classes of worshippers, but to provide by law for supplying the settlements with

the ministrations of religion, by which Act a salary of £25 per annum was allowed every clergyman of the Established Church. The law excluding Roman Catholic colonists was not, however, repealed; a restriction which put to the test the loyalty of a Georgian Tory governor when four hundred Acadian refugees sought shelter at Savannah, bringing letters from the governor of Nova Scotia to the effect: "That, for the better security of that province, and in consequence of a resolution of his Council, he had sent these people to Georgia". Governor Reynolds distributed them about the colony for the succeeding winter and maintained them at the public expense. But in the spring, "by leave of the Governor, they built themselves a number of rude boats, and in March most of them left for South Carolina; two hundred of them in ten boats going off at one time, indulging the hope that they might thus work their way along to their native and beloved Acadie". No other form of civic or religious exclusiveness, however, hampered the steady growth of the colony. Aside from spasmodic Indian incursions, incited by the French, Georgia developed the arts of peace, immigrants continued to flock in, and between 1763 and 1773 the exports of the colony increased from £27,000 to £121,600.

The preponderating Tory element in the colony at the outbreak of the Revolution, made up for the most part of a new generation of wealthy landowners and their 14,000 slaves, who spelt commercial ruin in revolution and who persuaded a second generation of parasitic idlers to share their views, allowed the British Parliament to boast throughout the Revolution that Georgia was a royalist province. The distance of the colony from the centre of operations, the blundering inaptitude of such provincial generals as Howe, the early capture and long retention by the British of both Savannah and Atlanta, and the hostility of the Indians to the colonial cause gave some historical warrant to such a point of view. But if the fervour of the revolutionary spirit was restricted to but a few, it gained, in consequence, in expressive momentum. In spite of British military successes along the coast; in spite of the disheartening and devastating guerilla incursions of Indians and Florida Rangers to the south and west; in spite of Washington's enforced neglect of the frontier colony's safety, the spirit of the Georgian Americans slumbered fiercely under an intense repression, bursting forth in sporadic flames of personal heroism and stoical fortitude. Nancy Hart is as heroic a heroine, if a coarser one, as Molly Pitcher, and Savannah is hallowed by the lifeblood of Pulaski. Georgia served by waiting, and when at last Washington could assign Greene and Lee to the army of the South, the recapture of Savannah followed closely upon that of Atlanta, and the last British post had been abandoned in the colony before the surrender at Yorktown.

In the meantime, in 1777, Georgia had passed its first State Constitution. A second was adopted in 1789 and a third in 1798, which, several times amended, endured up to the time of the passage of the present Constitution. The fifty-sixth article of the first Constitution established religious toleration. The second Constitution closed the membership of both houses against clergymen, but the test of Protestantism, in respect to office-holding, required by the first Constitution, was dispensed with, and the elective franchise was extended to all male tax-paying freemen. On 2 June, 1788, the National Constitution was ratified, and Georgia was the fourth State to enter the Union. In the first thirty years of its statehood Georgia was embroiled in difficulties with the Indians, following the Yazoo land scandals and the treaty of 1802, by which Georgia ceded all its claims to lands westward of its present limits, and the Creeks ceded to the United States a tract afterwards assigned to Georgia and now forming the south-western coun-

ties of the State. Triangular difficulties between a State jealous of its rights, a government jealous of its federal power, and Indians jealous of their tribal property rights resulted in much ill-feeling and bloodshed, with all but the extermination of the Creeks by General Floyd's Georgian troops in the War of 1812. Indeed these difficulties were not finally settled until the removal of the Cherokees by the Union to a Western reservation in 1838, by which Georgia came into possession of the full quota of land she now holds.

The relation between State and Government in these Indian affairs during the first three decades of the century induced in Georgia, in particular, that spirited endeavour to safeguard the rights of local government which later characterized the State's Right doctrine of the entire South before the outbreak of the Civil War; and upon the election of Lincoln to the presidency of the nation, the politicians of Georgia took active measures towards accomplishing the secession of their State from the Union. The delegates to the Confederate convention at Montgomery, Alabama, were conspicuously energetic, and a Georgian, Alexander H. Stephens, was made Vice-President of the Confederacy. In the war that followed the State reaped a rich harvest of havoc and devastation, the culmination of its suffering being Sherman's March to the Sea, through its territory, in 1864. After the termination of hostilities Georgia violated the Reconstruction Act by refusing to allow negroes, upon election, a seat in the Legislature; but the Supreme Court of the State decided that negroes were entitled to hold office; a new election was held; both houses were duly reorganized; the requirements of Congress were acceded to, and by Act of 15 July, 1869, Georgia was readmitted to the Union. Since the close of the war the material development of Georgia has been remarkable, principally along the lines of manufactured industries. At present its cotton mills are among the largest in the world. The Cotton Exposition in 1881 and The Cotton States and International Exposition in 1895, both held in Atlanta, were eloquent of the fact that Georgia has been the first of the seceding States to recognize the spirit of the new commercial life of the South.

RELIGION.—*Church History.*—The Diocese of Savannah, which comprises the State of Georgia, was established in 1850. As late as the period of the American Revolution there was scarcely a Catholic to be found in the colony or State of Georgia, nor was there a priest in the State for many years thereafter. Bishop England states that there were not twenty-five priests in all the colonies at that time. About 1793 a few Catholics from Maryland moved into Georgia and settled in the vicinity where the church of Locust Grove was subsequently built. Previous to their removal these earliest Georgian Catholics had applied for a clergyman to accompany them, but were unable to obtain their request. Shortly after the French Revolution, Catholic *émigrés* from the French colony of Santo Domingo, then enduring the horrors of a negro revolution, settled at Augusta and Savannah. One of their priests began to discharge the duties of his ministry at Maryland, a little colony fifty miles above Augusta, a fact which is recorded as "the commencement of the Church in Georgia". In a few years this settlement was abandoned; Savannah became the fixed residence of a priest; the congregation was incorporated by the Legislature of the State; the city council gave a grant of land, and a wooden edifice with a small steeple was erected. In the year 1810 the Legislature incorporated the Catholics of Augusta, an Augustinian friar, Rev. Robert Browne, became pastor, and the brick church of the Holy Trinity, fifty feet in length and twenty-five wide, was erected from funds raised by subscription. In 1820 Georgia and the Carolinas were separated from the See of Baltimore, the Rev. Doctor England being appointed

to the newly formed see. At that time there were about five hundred Catholics in Savannah, with fewer still in Augusta. In 1839 Bishop England announced that there were but eleven priests in the State.

The most salient feature of the work of the Church in Georgia at the present time is the evangelical energy directed towards the conversion of the negroes, a task which is being undertaken by the Society of the African Missions. The population of the State is about equally divided between white and coloured, and of the million negroes not above five hundred are Catholics. There is a mission with church and school and two resident priests in Savannah, with about four hundred Catholic people. In the school 110 children are taught by Franciscan Sisters. In Augusta a new mission has been established with a church and a school with twenty pupils. Among the 30,000 coloured in the city of Augusta there are not above twenty Catholics.

*Church Statistics.*—In the Diocese of Savannah there are, according to the census of 1908, 23,000 Catholics, 18 secular priests, 41 priests of religious orders, 13 churches with resident priests, 18 missions with churches, 81 stations, and 14 chapels.

*Church Educational Facilities.*—There are three Catholic colleges in Georgia with 342 students: the College of Marist Fathers at Atlanta, the College of the Sacred Heart at Augusta, and St. Stanislaus Novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Macon. There are ten academies, one seminary for small boys, while twelve parishes in the diocese possess parochial schools in charge of Sisters and Brothers. The State furnishes these schools no financial support.

*Church Charitable Institutions.*—There are in Georgia 2 Catholic hospitals owned by and in charge of the Sisters of Mercy, one of which secures aid from the county for the care of the poor—a *per capita* assignment. There are 170 orphans cared for at St. Joseph's Orphanage, Washington, in charge of 6 Sisters of St. Joseph; St. Mary's Home for Female Orphans, Savannah, in charge of 7 Sisters of Mercy; and 2 coloured orphanages. In addition to these there is a Home for the Aged, at Savannah, in charge of 10 Little Sisters of the Poor, with 94 inmates.

*Religious Polity.*—Under the Constitution of the United States, as well as under the State Constitution, full liberty of conscience in matters of religious opinion and worship is granted in Georgia; but it has been held that this does not legalize wilful or profane scoffing, or stand in the way of legislative enactment for the punishment of such acts. It is unlawful to conduct any secular business, not of an imperative nature, on Sunday. There are no specific requirements for the administration of oaths; such may be administered by using the Bible to swear upon, by the uplifted hand, or by affirmation, the form being: "You do solemnly swear in the presence of the ever living God" or "You do sincerely and truly affirm, etc." The sessions of the Legislature are opened with prayer, those of the courts are not. Georgia recognizes as State holidays 1 January and 25 December, but no church Holy Days, as such, are recognized as holidays. The law allows the same privileges to communications made to a priest under the seal of confession as it does to confidential communications made by a client to his counsel, or by a patient to his physician. The statutes contain no provisions making any exception between the rights and privileges of civil or ecclesiastical corporations. The property of the Church in the diocese is held by the bishop and his successors in office.

*Excise and Wills.*—Georgia from the very beginning seems to have steadily pursued a restrictive policy in the granting of excise privileges. The initial steps in legislation looking towards the prohibition of the sale of liquors were taken in 1808, when the Legislature passed an Act making it unlawful to sell intoxicating drink within one mile of any "meeting-house" or

other "places of public worship" during the time "appropriated to such worship", under the penalty of thirty dollars, a fact which has been regarded as "the first attempt at the restriction of the traffic". By 1904 there were 104 prohibition counties out of 134, and Georgia has been a prohibition State since 1 January, 1908.

Every person is entitled to make a will unless labouring under some disability of law arising from want of capacity or want of perfect liberty of action. Children under fourteen years of age cannot make a will. Nor can insane persons. A married woman may make a will of her separate property without her husband's consent. All wills, except such as are nuncupative, disposing of real or personal property, must be in writing, signed by party making same, or by some other person in his presence and by his direction, and shall be attested and subscribed in presence of testator and three or more competent witnesses. If a subscribing witness is a legatee or devisee under will, witness is competent, but legacy or devise is void. A husband may be a witness to a will by which legacy creating a separate estate is given to his wife, the fact only going to his credit. No person having a wife or child shall by will devise more than two-thirds of his estate to any charitable, religious, educational, or civil institution to the exclusion of his wife or child; and in all cases a will containing such a devise shall be executed at least ninety days before death of testator or such devise shall be void. A year's support of family takes precedence in wills as a preferred obligation. There is no inheritance tax.

*MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.*—The marriage laws of Georgia require parental consent when the contracting male is under twenty-one years and the female under eighteen years, while all marriages are prohibited within the Levitical degrees. Marriages by force, menace, or duress, of white with a negro, or when either party is mentally or physically incapable, or insane, or when there has been fraud in the inception, as well as bigamous marriages, are considered by statute void or voidable. The grounds for divorce are mental and physical incapacity, desertion for three years, felony, cruelty, habitual drunkenness, force, duress, or fraud in obtaining marriage, pregnancy of wife by other than husband at marriage, relationship within the prohibited degrees, and adultery. One year's residence in the State is required before the issuance of a decree of divorce. From 1867 to 1886 the State granted 3959 decrees of divorce; from 1887 to 1906 10,401 were decreed. In 1880 the divorce rate per 100,000 population was 14; in 1900, 26.

WHITE, *Historical Collections of Georgia* (New York, 1855); STEVEN, *History of Georgia*, I (New York, 1847), II (Philadelphia, 1859); ARTHUR and CARPENTER, *History of Georgia* (Philadelphia, 1852); EVANS, *Student's History of Georgia* (Macon, 1884); ENGLAND, *Works*, V (Cleveland, 1908).

JARVIS KEILEY.

**Georgius Syncellus** (Gr. Γεώργιος ὁ Σύγκελλος); d. after 810; the author of one of the more important medieval Byzantine chronicles. Not much is known of his life. He had lived many years in Palestine as a monk; under the Patriarch Tarasius (784-806) he came to Constantinople to fill the important post of *syncellus*. The syncellus is the patriarch's private secretary, generally a bishop, always the most important ecclesiastical person in the capital after the patriarch himself, often the patriarch's successor. But George did not succeed Tarasius. Instead, when his patron died he retired to a monastery and there wrote his chronicle. The only date we know at the end of his life is 810 (6302 an. mundi), which he mentions (Dindorf's edition, 389, 20, see below) as the current year. The chronicle, called by its author, "Extract of Chronography" (Ἐκλογὴ χρονογραφίας), contains the history of the world from the Creation to the death of Diocletian (316). It is arranged strictly in order of



time, all the events being named in the year in which they happened. The text is continually interrupted by long tables of dates, so that Krumbacher describes it as being "rather a great historical list [*Geschichtstabelle*] with added explanations, than a universal history." *Byzantinische Literatur*, 2nd ed., Munich, 1897, 340. The author has taken most trouble over the Bible history, the chronology of the life of Christ and the New Testament. For later times he is content with a compilation from Eusebius (*Church History* and *Canon*) and one or two other historians (the Alexandrines Panodorus and Annianus especially; see Gelzer, *op. cit. infra*). He took trouble to secure good manuscripts of the Septuagint and did some respectable work as a critic in collating them. He also quotes Greek Fathers—Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom especially. His interest is always directed in the first place to questions of chronology. The "Extract of Chronology" has merit. Krumbacher counts it as the best work of its kind in Byzantine literature (*op. cit.*, 341). That the author thinks the Septuagint more authentic than the Hebrew text—of which he could read nothing at all—is a harmless and inevitable weakness in a Greek monk. Georgius Syncellus's chronicle was continued by his friend Theophanes Confessor (Θεοφάνης ὁμολογητής). Anastasius Bibliothecarius composed a "Historia tripartita" in Latin, from the chronicle of Syncellus, Theophanes, and Nicephorus the Patriarch (806–815). This work, written between 873 and 875 (Anastasius was papal librarian), spread Syncellus's chronological ideas in the West also. In the East his fame was gradually overshadowed by that of Theophanes.

GOAR published the *editio princeps*: *Georgii monachi . . . Syncelli chronographia et Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolis breviorum chronographicum* (Paris, 1652). DINDORF reprinted Goar's edition (2 vols., Bonn, 1829). TEBNER, at Leipzig, announces a new one in his *Scriptores sacri et profani* series, that was to be edited by GELZER (d. 1906) and REICHHARDT. GELZER, *Severus Julius Africanus* (1885), II, 1, 176–249. Further literature in KRUMBACHER, *Byzantinische Literatur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897, 339–342).

#### ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**Gerace, DIOCESE OF (HIERACENSIS)**, in the province of Reggio in Calabria (Southern Italy), on a lofty site overlooking the Ionian Sea, not far from Cape Spartivento. The city probably owes its origin, or at least its importance, to the ruin of the town of Locri Epizephyrii, one of the earliest Greek colonies in Lower Italy, founded by the Ozolian Locrians (684–680 B. C.) and endowed with a code of laws by Zaleucus. Through its advanced civilization and its trade Locri Epizephyrii was brought into prominence. It suffered much during the wars of Dionysius the Younger and of Pyrrhus, and in the Second Punic War, when it passed into the hands of the Romans, retaining, however, the ancient constitution of Zaleucus. Its decay dates from this period. Before its total ruin, Locri Epizephyrii had a bishop of its own; but in 709, under Bishop Gregory, the see was transferred to Gerace.

The name *Gerace* is probably derived from Saint Cyriaca, whose church was destroyed by the Saracens in 915. They captured the town in 986, but in 1059 it fell into the hands of the Normans. Until 1467 the Greek Rite was in use at Gerace, and such had probably been the custom from the beginning. As early as the thirteenth century efforts were made to introduce the Latin Rite, which accounts for the schism between Latins and Greeks about 1250–1253. The latter demanded as bishop the monk Bartenulfo, a Greek, whereas Innocent IV, in 1253, appointed Marco Leone. In 1467, Bishop Atanasio Calceofilo introduced the Latin Rite. Among bishops of note are: Barlaam II (1342), Abbot of San Salvatore at Constantinople, and ambassador from the Emperor Andronicus to Benedict XII, apropos of the union of the two Churches. Barlaam at one time had opposed the idea, but later

recognized his error, and Clement VI bestowed on him the See of Gerace. He taught Greek to Petrarch, Boccaccio, and others, and was thus one of the first of the Italian humanists. Bishop Ottaviano Pasqua (1574) wrote a history of the diocese. Another bishop, Giovanni Maria Belletti (1625), wrote "Disquisitiones Clericales"; Giuseppe Maria Pellicano (1818) rebuilt the cathedral, destroyed by an earthquake in 1783. Gerace is a suffragan of Reggio; it has 69 parishes, and 132,300 souls; 1 religious house for men, and 3 for women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (1870), XXI, 165–71

U. BENIGNI.

**Gerald, SAINT**, Bishop of Mayo, an English monk, date of birth unknown; d. 13 March, 731; followed St. Colman, after the Synod of Whitby (664), to Ireland, and settled at Innisboffin, in 668. Dissensions arose, after a time, between the Irish and the English monks, and St. Colman decided to found a separate monastery for the thirty English brethren. Thus arose the Abbey of Mayo (*Magh Eo*, the yew plain), known as "Mayo of the Saxons", with St. Gerald as first abbot, in 670. St. Bede writes: "This monastery is to this day (731) occupied by English monks . . . and contains an exemplary body who are gathered there from England, and live by the labour of their own hands (after the manner of the early Fathers), under a rule and a canonical abbot, leading chaste and single lives." Although St. Gerald was a comparatively young man, he proved a wise ruler, and governed Mayo until 697, when, it is said, he resigned in favour of St. Adamnan. Some authors hold that St. Adamnan celebrated the Roman Easter at Mayo, in 703, and then went to Skreen, in Hy Fiachrach, and that after his departure the monks prevailed on St. Gerald to resume the abbacy. The Saxon saint continued to govern the Abbey and Diocese of Mayo till his death. His feast is celebrated on 13 March. Mayo, though merged in Tuam for a time, remained a separate see until 1579.

COLGAN, *Acta Sanct. Hib.* (Louvain, 1645), 13 March; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.), III, 13 March; HEALY, *Insula Sanctorum et Doctorum* (4th ed., Dublin, 1902); KNOX, *Notes on the Diocese of Tuam* (Dublin, 1904); BEDE, *Ecc. Hist. of England*, ed. PLUMMER (London, 1907); GRATTAN-FLOOD, *The Diocese and Abbey of Mayo in Ir. Ecc. Record*, June, 1907.

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Geraldton, DIOCESE OF (GERALDTONENSIS)**, in Australia, established in 1898, comprises the territory lying between the southern boundary of the Kimberley district and a line running eastward from the Indian Ocean along the 30th parallel of south latitude until it reaches the 120th degree of longitude, whence it follows the 29th degree of latitude to the south Australian border. It is a suffragan of Adelaide. There are 28 churches in the diocese, attended by 10 secular and 4 regular priests; 5 boarding and 12 primary schools with 747 pupils in charge of 51 sisters. The Presentation nuns, who made a foundation from Ireland in 1890, have 28 sisters in 6 communities; Dominican nuns from Dunedin, New Zealand, arrived in 1899, and have 4 communities with 24 sisters. The first bishop of the see, Right Rev. William Bernard Kelly, was consecrated 14 August, 1898. The Bishop of Geraldton also has jurisdiction over the Vicariate of Kimberley.

*Australian Catholic Directory* (Sydney, 1909); *The Sower* (Geraldton, 1908).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Géramb, BARON FERDINAND DE**, in religion, Brother Mary Joseph, Abbot and procurator-general of La Trappe, came of a noble and ancient family in Hungary; b. in Lyons, 14 Jan., 1772; d. at Rome, 15 March, 1848. Some historians wrongfully call in question both the place and date of his birth, as also his noble



descent. Being of a fiery and chivalrous disposition, he took an active part in the struggles of the monarchies in Europe against the French Revolution, and rose to the rank of lieutenant-general. In 1803 he fell into the hands of Napoleon, who imprisoned him in the fortress of Vincennes until 1814, the time when the allied powers entered Paris. After bidding farewell to the Tsar and Emperor of Austria, he resolved to leave the world. It was at this time that he providentially met the Rev. Father Eugene, Abbot of Notre Dame du Port du Salut, near Laval (France), of whom he begged to be admitted as a novice in the community. He pronounced his vows in 1817. After having rendered great services to that monastery, he was sent, in 1827, to the monastery of Mt Olivet (Alsace). During the Revolution of 1830 de Gérando displayed great courage in the face of a troop of insurgents that had come to pillage the monastery; though the religious had been dispersed, the abbey was at least, by his heroic action, spared the horrors of pillage. It was at this time that Brother Mary Joseph made his pilgrimage to Jerusalem. On his return in 1833, he went to Rome, where he held the office of procurator-general of La Trappe. He soon gained the esteem and affection of Gregory XVI, who, though he was not a priest, named him titular abbot with the insignia of the ring and pectoral cross, a privilege without any precedent. Abbot de Gérando is the author of many works, the principal of which are: "Letters to Eugene on the Eucharist"; "Eternity is approaching"; "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem"; "A Journey from La Trappe to Rome", besides many others of less importance and of an exclusively ascetical character. They were often reprinted and translated. His style is easy and without affectation. The customs, manners, and incidents of the journey which he describes, all are vividly and attractively given, and the topographical descriptions are of an irreproachable accuracy. Even under the monk's cowl the great nobleman could occasionally be seen distributing in alms considerable sums of money which he had received from his family to defray his expenses.

In 1796, Baron de Gérando married his cousin Theresa de Adda, who died, in 1808, at Palermo. Six children had been born to him, of which number two died in their youth. On his entrance into La Trappe he confided the surviving children to the care of his brother, Léopold de Gérando, after having placed them under the protection of the Tsar and the Emperor of Austria.

*Archives of the Monastery of N. D. du Port du Salut; RUFF, Trappisten Abtei Oelenberg (Freiburg, 1898); GÉRANDO, De la Trappe à Rome (Paris, 1858); IDEM, Voyage à Jérusalem (Paris, 1862); IDEM, Lettres à Eugène sur l'Eucharistie (Paris, 1828); HÄGELE in Kirchenlex., s. v.; MICHAUD, Biog. Univ. (Paris, 1880).*

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

**Gérando, JOSEPH-MARIE DE**, a French statesman and writer, b. at Lyons, 29 February, 1772; d. at Paris, 10 November, 1842. After completing his studies with the Oratorians at Lyons, he took part in the defence of the city against the besieging armies of the French Convention. Wounded and taken prisoner, he barely escaped being put to death, and later took refuge in Switzerland and at Naples. He enlisted again in the army and was at Colmar when the French Institute announced the offer of a prize for the best essay on "The influence of signs on the formation of ideas". Gérando sent a paper, which was awarded the first honours. This was a turning-point in his life; for, having come to Paris, he was appointed to many important functions, political, administrative, and educational. In 1815, he was one of the founders of the Société pour l'instruction élémentaire, which introduced into France the monitorial system, established in England by Lancaster, and thus made education possible for the poor classes. He was a member of the state-council under Napoleon and

under Louis XVIII, member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and of the Académie des Sciences morales et politiques, and officer of the Legion of Honour. In 1819, he opened a course in the faculty of law in Paris; and, in 1837, became a member of the Chambre des Pairs. He consecrated his talent to the causes of education and charity, taking part in the foundation and administration of schools, hospitals, and charitable institutions of all kinds. His works are very numerous; among the most important must be mentioned the following. Philosophical: "Des signes et de l'art de penser considérés dans leurs rapports naturels" (Paris, 1800), a development of his prize-essay in which the author follows Condillac, but differs from him on many points; "De la génération des connaissances humaines" (Berlin, 1802), awarded a prize by the Academy of Sciences of Berlin; "Histoire comparée des systèmes de philosophie considérés relativement aux principes des connaissances humaines" (Paris, 1803). Educational: "Du perfectionnement moral, ou de l'éducation de soi-même" (Paris, 1824); "Cours normal des instituteurs primaires" (Paris, 1832); "De l'éducation des sourds-muets de naissance" (Paris, 1832); "Institutes du droit administratif français" (Paris, 1830). Charitable: "Le visiteur du pauvre" (Paris, 1820); "De la bienfaisance publique" (Paris, 1839).

*Nouvelle biographie générale (Paris, 1858), XX, 142; MOREL, Essai sur la vie et les travaux de Gérando (1846); MIGNET, Notice sur de Gérando (1854); JOURDAIN in FRANCK, Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques (2nd ed., 1885), 350; GOSSOT in BUISSON, Dictionnaire de pédagogie (Paris, 1887), I, 1, 1167.*

C. A. DUBRAY.

**Gérard, SAINT**, Abbot of Brogne, b. at Staves in the county of Namur, towards the end of the ninth century; d. at Brogne or St-Gérard, 3 Oct., 959. The son of Stance, of the family of the dukes of Lower Austria, and of Plectrude, sister of Stephen, Bishop of Liège, the young Gérard, like most men of his rank, followed at first the career of arms. His piety, however, was admirable amid the distractions of camp. He transformed into a large church a modest chapel situated on the estate of Brogne which belonged to his family. About 917, the Count of Namur charged him with a mission to Robert, younger brother of Eudes, King of France. He permitted his followers to reside at Paris, but himself went to live at the Abbey of St-Denis, where he was so struck by the edifying lives of the monks that, at the conclusion of his embassy, with the consent of the Count of Namur and Bishop Stephen, his maternal uncle, he returned to St-Denis, took the religious habit, and after eleven years was ordained priest. He then requested to be allowed to return to Brogne, where he replaced the lax clerics with monks animated by a true religious spirit. Thereupon he himself retired to a cell near the monastery for more austere mortification. From this retreat he was summoned by the Archbishop of Cambrai who confided to him the direction of the community of St-Ghislain in Hainault. Here also he established monks instead of the canons, whose conduct had ceased to be exemplary, and he enforced the strictest monastic discipline. Gradually he became superior of eighteen other abbeys situated in the region between the Meuse, the Somme, and the sea, and through his efforts the Order of St. Benedict was soon completely restored throughout this region. Weighed down by age and infirmities, he placed vicars or abbots in his stead, in the various abbeys with which he was charged, and retired to that of Brogne. He still had courage to take a journey to Rome in order to obtain a Bull confirming the privileges of that abbey. On his return he paid a final visit to all the communities which he had reorganized, and then awaited death at Brogne. His body is still preserved at Brogne, now commonly called St-Gérard.

*SERVAIS, Essai sur la vie de S. Gérard, abbé de Brogne (Namur,*

1885; TOUSSAINT, *Hist. de S. Gérard fondateur de l'abbaye de Brogne* (Namur, 1884; *Anal. Bolland.* (Brussels, 1886), 385-388.

LÉON CLUGNET.

**Gerard**, SAINT, Bishop of Toul, b. at Cologne, 935; d. at Toul, 23 April, 994. Belonging to a wealthy and noble family, he received an excellent education in the school for clerics at Cologne, and throughout his youth was a model of obedience and piety. He was eventually ordained to the priesthood, in which office his virtues were a source of edification to the city of Cologne. At the death of Gauzelin, Bishop of Toul (963), he was appointed to succeed him by the Archbishop of Cologne, was well received by the clergy and people of Toul, and bore the burdens of his episcopal office without any of its comforts. Although he avoided paying long visits to the court of the Emperor Otto II, who was desirous of keeping Gerard near him, he nevertheless obtained from the emperor the confirmation of the privilege in virtue of which Toul, although united to the empire about 925, formed an independent state of which the Emperor Henry the Fowler reserved to himself only the protectorate, abandoning to Gerard's predecessor, Gauzelin, the suzerainty of the city and the countship. Gerard is therefore rightly considered as the true founder of the temporal power of the bishops of Toul. He was energetic in his opposition to powerful personages who were inimical to his authority, and governed his county wisely, promulgating administrative measures, traces of which subsisted to the time of the French Revolution. He died at the age of fifty-nine, and was buried with pomp in the choir of his cathedral. Leo IX, one of his successors in the See of Toul, canonized him in 1050.

BENOIST, *La Vie de S. Gérard, évêque de Toul* (Toul, 1700); BAILLET, *Vies des saints* (Paris, 1701), III, 3 Oct.; DUPRÉNE in *Mém. de la Soc. des Antiq. de France* (Paris, 1840), 81-89.

LÉON CLUGNET.

**Gerard**, Archbishop of York, date of birth unknown; d. at Southwell, 21 May, 1108. He was a nephew of Walkelin, Bishop of Winchester, of Simon, Abbot of Ely, and connected with the royal family. Originally a precentor in Rouen cathedral, he became clerk in the chapel of William Rufus, who employed him in 1095 on a diplomatic mission to the pope. His success was rewarded with the Bishopric of Hereford, and he was consecrated by St. Anselm 8 June, 1096, having been ordained deacon and priest on the previous day. On the accession of Henry I, in 1100, he was made Archbishop of York and began a long contest with St. Anselm, in which he claimed equal primacy with Canterbury and refused to make his profession of canonical obedience before him. When he journeyed to Rome for the pallium, he was entrusted with the mission of representing the king against Anselm in the controversy about investitures. The pope's decision was against the king, but Gerard professed to have received private assurances that the decrees would not be enforced. This was denied by the monks who represented St. Anselm; and the pope, when appealed to, repudiated the statement and excommunicated Gerard till he confessed his error and made satisfaction.

Eventually he professed obedience to St. Anselm, but continued to assert the independence of York. When Anselm refused to consecrate three bishops, two of whom had received investiture from the king, Gerard attempted to do so, but two refused to accept consecration at his hands. The pope reprimanded him for his opposition to the primate, and finally the two prelates were reconciled. Gerard carried out many reforms in York, though by his action against St. Anselm he incurred great unpopularity, and the writers of the time charge him with immorality, avarice, and the practice of magic. He died suddenly on the way to London to attend a council, and

his death without the sacraments was regarded as a Divine judgment. The canons refused to bury him within the cathedral, and the people pelted the hearse with stones. Some Latin verses by him are preserved in the British Museum (Titus. D. XXIV. 3).

ST. ANSELM, *Epistola in P. L.*, XXX, 158-9; EADMER, *Hist. Novorum in R. S.* (1884); SYMEON OF DUREHAM, *Opera in R. S.* (1882-83); WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *De gestis Pontificum in R. S.* (1870); HUGH THE CHANTER, *Lives of Four Archbishops in RAINE, Historians of the Church of York, II (Rolls Series, 1886); VENABLES in Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; RULE, *Life and Times of St. Anselm* (London, 1883). Raine and Venables give references to all original authorities. EDWIN BURTON.

**Gerard**, JOHN, Jesuit; b. 4 Oct., 1564; d. 27 July, 1637. He is well known through his autobiography, a fascinating record of dangers and adventures, of captures and escapes, of trials and consolations. The narrative is all the more valuable because it sets before us the kind of life led by priests, wherever the peculiar features of the English persecution occurred. John was the second son of Sir Thomas Gerard of Bryn, for a time a valiant confessor of the Faith, who, however, in 1589, tarnished his honour by giving evidence against the Ven. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel (q. v.). Different opinions are held (by Morris and Gillow) as to the permanence of his inconstancy. John left his father's house at New Bryn at the age of thirteen, and went first to Douai seminary; matriculated at Oxford (1579), and thence proceeded to the Jesuits' College at Paris (1581). Having come to England for his health's sake, he was arrested on 5 March, 1584, and suffered two years' imprisonment in the Marshalsea. He was bailed out in 1586, and, with the consent of his sureties, once more made his way to the Continent, and was received at the English College, Rome, 5 August, 1586. At first he paid for himself, but in April, 1587, he became a scholar of the pope. Next year, 15 August, 1588, he entered the Jesuit novitiate; but so great was the dearth of missionaries in England that he was dispatched thither in the ensuing September.

His romantic adventures began on landing, for he was set ashore alone on the Norfolk coast at a moment when the country was in a turmoil of excitement after the defeat of the Armada, and when feeling against Catholics ran so high that fifteen priests had been butchered in two days in London, and twelve others sent to the provinces for the same purpose, though half of these eventually escaped death. Gerard, being an accomplished sportsman and rider, succeeded in making his way about the country, now as a horseman who had lost his way in the chase, now as a huntsman whose hawk had strayed. Ere long he had won the steadfast friendship of many Catholic families, with whose aid he was able to make frequent conversions, to give retreats and preach, and to send over many nuns and youths to the convents, seminaries, and religious houses on the Continent. Dr. Jessopp, a Protestant, writes:—

"The extent of Gerard's influence was nothing less than marvellous. Country gentlemen meet him in the street and forthwith invite him to their houses; high-born ladies put themselves under his direction almost as unreservedly in temporal as in spiritual things. Scholars and courtiers run serious risks to hold interviews with him, the number of his converts of all ranks is legion; the very gaolers and turnkeys obey him; and in a state of society when treachery and venality were pervading all classes, he finds servants and agents who are ready to live and die for him. A man of gentle blood and gentle breeding—of commanding stature, great vigour of constitution, a master of three or four languages, with a rare gift of speech and an innate grace and courtliness of manner—he was fitted to shine in any society and to lead it. From boyhood he had been a keen sportsman, at home in the saddle, and a great proficient in all country sport. His powers of endurance of fatigue and pain were

almost superhuman; he could remain in hiding days and nights in a hole in which he could not stand upright, and never sleep, and hardly change his position: he could joke on the gyves that were ulcerating his legs. He seems never to have forgotten a face or a name or an incident. Writing his autobiography twenty years after the circumstances he records, there is scarcely an event or a name which recent research has not proved to be absolutely correct. As a literary effort merely, the *Life* is marvellous." ("Academy", 9 July, 1881.)

In those times of danger, no prudence could always effectually ensure a priest against capture. Gerard was taken prisoner, July, 1594, through a servant, whose secret treachery was not suspected. He passed two years in smaller prisons, and was then sent to the Tower, where he was cruelly tortured, being hung up by his hands, of which torment he has left a very vivid description. His courage and firmness, however, were such, that his examiners lost hope of extracting secrets from him, and he was relegated to the Salt Tower, where he cleverly contrived to say Mass. In 1597, he managed to escape by means of a string thrown one night by a friend from Tower Wharf into the Cradle Tower. By this string a rope was drawn across the moat, and with its assistance he managed eventually to get across, but with great difficulty, as his hands were still helpless from the torture.

Until the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot (q. v.), at the end of 1605, he continued his adventurous life as a missionary in England, but he was then obliged to slip away disguised as a footman in the train of the Spanish Ambassador. The rest of his life was spent in the English colleges on the Continent. He wrote, in 1607, "A Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot", and afterwards his autobiography, "Narratio P. Joannis Gerardi de Rebus a se in Anglia gestis". He strongly befriended Mary Ward (q. v.) in her attempt to found an active religious order for women, and passed the last ten years of his life as spiritual director of the English College at Rome.

MORRIS, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers* (London, 1871); *The Life of John Gerard* (3rd ed., London, 1881); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Gerard, MILES, VENERABLE, martyr**; b. about 1550 at Wigan; executed at Rochester 13 (30?) April, 1590. Sprung perhaps from the Gerards of Ince, he was, about 1576, tutor to the children of Squire Edward Tyldesley, at Morleys, Lancashire. Thence in 1579 he went to the seminaries of Douai and Reims, where he was ordained 7 April, 1583, and then stayed on as professor until 31 August, 1589 (O. S.), when he started for England with five companions. At Dunkirk the sailors refused to take more than two passengers; so the missionaries tossed for precedence, and Gerard and Francis Dicconson, the eldest (it seems) and youngest of the party, won. Though bound for London, they were driven out of their course into Dover harbour, where they were examined and arrested on suspicion (24 Nov., N. S.). A contemporary news-letter says that they were wrecked, and escaped the sea only to fall into the hands of persecutors on shore, but this is not consistent with the official records. These show that the prisoners at first gave feigned names and ambiguous answers, but soon thought it better to confess all. After many tortures in the worst London prisons under the infamous Topcliffe, they were condemned as traitors, and "taken to Rochester, where they were hanged and quartered", says Father John Curry, S. J., writing shortly afterwards, "and gave a splendid testimony to the Catholic Faith".

POLLEN, *Acts of English Martyrs* (1891), 314; CHALLONER; GILLOW; *Catholic Record Society* (1908), V, pp. 169-171, 173 sqq.; *Spanish Calendar, 1587-1603*, under 5 March (May ?) 1590; KNOX, *Douay Diaries*, pp. 160 sqq.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Gerard, RICHARD, confessor**; b. about 1635; d. 11 March, 1680 (O. S.). The Bromley branch of the Gerard family, which divided off from the original stock of Bryn in the fourteenth century, grew to power and affluence through Gilbert, solicitor-general to Queen Elizabeth, and as such an active persecutor of Catholics. Indeed he is said to have obtained the estate of Gerard's Bromley, through a court intrigue, from the Catholic Sir Thomas Gerard of Bryn (father of John Gerard, S. J.), as the price for which the knight bought off the prosecution against him for adhering to Mary Queen of Scots. In 1603 Gilbert's son Thomas was made Baron Gerard of Gerard's Bromley, Co. Stafford, but his grandson (the subject of this article), Richard of Hilderstone, Co. Stafford (by John, a younger son, d. 1673), was a Catholic, though how he became one is not known. Richard was a friend of the Jesuit missionaries, had three sons at their college of St-Omer, and was trustee for them for some small properties. It would seem that he had been invited to a little function on the feast of the Assumption, 1678, when Father John Gavan (the future martyr) made his profession, at the house of the Penderels at Boscobel, who had sheltered Charles II after the battle of Worcester; and that after dinner the party visited the celebrated "Royal Oak", in which Charles had hidden. This came to the knowledge of Stephen Dugdale, afterwards an infamous informer, and became the occasion of Richard's imprisonment and death. For, during the fury of Oates's Plot, when witnesses were being sought to attest the innocence of the Catholic lords who were impeached, Richard Gerard manfully came forward, and his evidence was likely to have proved of capital importance. To obviate this, Dugdale accused him of having contributed to the funds of the alleged plotters (perhaps with some reference to the pensions paid for his boys at St-Omer) and of having conspired to murder the king. Examined by the Lords' committee (19 May, 1679) he confessed to the innocent meeting at Boscobel, and was thrown into Newgate, where he languished ten months without trial before he was freed by death. He was fortunate in being attended during his last hours by Father Edward Petre, who, in a letter written 29 March, 1680, speaks of his constancy and of his dying wish to be buried by the side of his friend, Father Whitbread, then recently martyred.

Several years later his third son, Philip (b. 1 Dec., 1665), having entered the Society of Jesus 7 Sept., 1684, unexpectedly became seventh and last Lord Gerard of Gerard's Bromley (12 April, 1707, O. S.), through the deaths of various cousins and older brothers. Philip never claimed the title, and gave up all rights to the estates for a small yearly pension of £60, being obliged to leave the country by the action of a near connexion, the Duke of Hamilton, who advertised the reward of £1,000 for his arrest as a priest. It is curious that the four lords who have been among the English Jesuits all lived at the same time. Philip Gerard (d. 1733) was the contemporary of Father Gilbert Talbot (d. 1743), who became Earl of Shrewsbury in 1717; also of Father William Molyneux (d. 1754), who was Viscount Sefton in 1745; also of Father Charles Dormer (d. 1761), who was Baron Dormer in 1728.

FOLEY, *Records S. J.*; *Journals of the House of Lords*; KIRK, *Biographies of English Catholics* (1909), 95; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Gerard Majella, SAINT**, b. in Muro, about fifty miles south of Naples, in April, 1726; d. 16 Oct., 1755; beatified by Leo XIII, 29 January, 1893, and canonized by Pius X, 11 December, 1904. His only ambition was to be like Jesus Christ in His sufferings and humiliations. His father, Dominic Majella, died while Gerard was a child. His pious mother, owing to poverty, was obliged to apprentice him to a tailor. His

master loved him, but the foreman treated him cruelly. His reverence for the priesthood and his love of suffering led him to take service in the house of a prelate, who was very hard to please. On the latter's death Gerard returned to his trade, working first as a journeyman and then on his own account. His earnings he divided between his mother and the poor, and in offerings for the souls in purgatory. After futile attempts first to become a Franciscan and then a hermit, he entered the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer in 1749. Two years later he made his profession, and to the usual vows he added one by which he bound himself to do always that which seemed to him more perfect. St. Alphonsus considered him a miracle of obedience. He not only obeyed the orders of superiors when present, but also when absent knew and obeyed their desires. Although weak in body, he did the work of three, and his great charity earned for him the title of Father of the Poor. He was a model of every virtue, and so drawn to Our Lord in the tabernacle that he had to do violence to himself to keep away. An angel in purity, he was accused of a shameful crime; but he bore the calumny with such patience that St. Alphonsus said: "Brother Gerard is a saint". He was favoured with infused knowledge of the highest order, ecstasies, prophecy, discernment of spirits, and penetration of hearts, bilocation, and with what seemed an unlimited power over nature, sickness, and the devils. When he accompanied the Fathers on missions, or was sent out on business, he converted more souls than many missionaries. He predicted the day and hour of his death. A wonder-worker during life, he has continued to be the same since his death.

*Vita del Beato Gerardo Majella* (Rome, 1893); VASSALL, *Life of Bl. Gerard Majella* (London, 1893); SAINT-OMER, *Life, Virtue, and Miracles of St. Gerard Majella* (Boston, 1907).

J. MAGNIER.

**Gerard of Cremona**, a twelfth-century student of Arabic science and translator from Arabic into Latin; b. at Cremona, in 1114; d. in 1187. The place and date of Gerard's birth are not given in any document prior to the fourteenth century. Tiraboschi, in his "*Storia della letteratura italiana*", is at pains to refute the contention of some Spanish writers that Gerard was born, not at Cremona in Italy, but at Carmona in Spain. While conceding that Gerard spent a good many years at Toledo, Tiraboschi shows that Cremona and not Carmona is his birthplace. In fact, the MSS. of his writings style him *Cremonensis*, or *Chermonensis* (which seems to be a corrupt form of *Cremonensis*). From the "Chronicle" of the Dominican Francisco Pipino, who flourished about the year 1300, we learn, besides the place and date of his birth and death, that impelled by his interest in the works of the astronomer Ptolemy, he went to Toledo, and, applying himself to the study of Arabic, soon acquired so great a proficiency in that language that he was able to translate not only the "Almagest", but also the entire works of Avicenna, into Latin. He died in the year 1187 and was buried in the church of St. Lucy at Cremona, to which he bequeathed his valuable library. The number of books which he translated from Arabic into Latin is said by Pipino to be seventy-six. Whether he is the author of original treatises is uncertain. The works sometimes attributed to him are almost certainly to be ascribed to Gerard of Sabionetta, who lived in the thirteenth century. He must have been a man of extraordinarily wide taste in scientific matters, for he translated, according to the "Chronicle" of Pipino, works on dialectic, geometry, philosophy, physics, and several other sciences. His activity as a translator, combined with the efforts in the same line of Michael Scott, and of the group of men who formed a regular college of translators at Toledo under the direction of Bishop Raymond, brought the world of Arabian learning within the reach of the scholars of Latin Christen-

dom and prepared the way for that conflict of ideas out of which sprang the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century. In this work Gerard was a pioneer. If the description of his moral qualities given by Pipino is not overdrawn, he was a man whose single-minded devotion to the cause of science enabled him to overcome the difficulties which in those days were inevitable in a task such as he undertook.

MURATORI, *Re. Ital. Scriptores*, IX, 600 sqq.; TIRABOSCHI, *Storia della letteratura ital.* (Florence, 1806), II, 2, 376-382.

WILLIAM TURNER.

**Gerardus Odonis**, also GERALDUS OTHONIS, or OTTONIS, a medieval theologian and Minister General of the Franciscan Order; b. probably at Châteauroux, in the present department of Indre, France, date unknown; d. at Catania, Sicily, 1348. Whether he was the son of Count André de Chauvigny is very doubtful. After he had entered the Order of St. Francis, most probably at Châteauroux, and consequently had belonged to the Touraine province of the order, he became a member of the Aquitanian province and still belonged to this latter (without, however, being provincial minister) when he was elected minister general of the order, 10 June, 1329, at the general chapter. The presiding officer of this chapter was Cardinal de la Tour, a Franciscan, whom John XXII (1316-34) had appointed vicar-general of the order. The previous minister general, Michael of Cesena, had been deposed by John XXII on 6 June, 1328, on account of his rebellious attitude towards the Holy See in the discussion regarding the rule of poverty (see FRATICELLI and MICHAEL OF CESENA). Gerardus Odonis was inclined to give up poverty, the principle of the order, on account of which Michael of Cesena had come into conflict with the pope. The general chapter held at Paris (1329) took a position, in the name of the entire order, on the side of the pope and formally expelled the small party made up of Michael of Cesena's adherents which opposed the Holy See.

Gerardus Odonis openly showed his readiness to abandon the rule of poverty at the general chapter of Perpignan (1331), where he won over to his side fourteen provincial ministers. In reference to this question they presented a petition to John XXII which the pope rejected in the consistory of 1 August, 1331. Owing to his lax views concerning poverty Gerardus also became entangled in a dispute with King Robert and Queen Sanzia of Naples and Sicily. These rulers were unwavering protectors of the rigid adherents to the rule of poverty as well as of the followers of Michael of Cesena and of the Fraticelli. Notwithstanding the papal letters of admonition and the fact that John XXII sent Gerardus Odonis as his representative to the Court of Naples in 1331 and the following year, Gerardus had new statutes drawn up with the view of changing the form of the Franciscan Order to that of the old orders of monks. These regulations were confirmed, 28 November, 1336, by Benedict XII (1334-42); consequently Gerardus was able at the chapter held at Cahors, 7 June, 1337, to obtain, in spite of strong opposition, the enactment of the so-called "Constitutiones Benedictinæ". Nevertheless, he was in danger of being removed from his position, nor did the statutes remain in force longer than the lifetime of Benedict XII and the period during which Gerardus was general. The general chapter of Assisi abrogated, 1 June, 1343, the "Constitutiones Benedictinæ" and re-enacted, with some additions, the constitutions of Narbonne (1260).

There is some truth in the assertion made as to Gerardus Odonis that he both resembled and imitated Brother Elias, the lax minister general second in succession from St. Francis of Assisi; indeed, he even exceeded Elias. However, it must be said to his credit that, in union with the pope, he zealously promoted Franciscan missions, constantly sending fresh

missionaries to Persia, Georgia, Armenia (1329); Malabar (1330), China and Tataria (1331); Bosnia (1340). In 1329 John XXII sent him to King Charles Robert of Hungary and to Ban Stephen of Bosnia for the purpose of bringing about the extermination of the heretics, largely Pataraenes, in these countries. On 5 Sept., 1333, Gerardus and the Dominican Arnould de Saint-Michel (Arnaldus de S. Michaelae) were appointed papal legates to make peace between the Kings of England and Scotland. The procurator of the Scotch king in Paris having reported, however, that his master was not to be found in Scotland, John recalled the commission of the legates, 31 Oct., 1333. Gerardus remained in Paris and defended before a large number of professors of the university, on 18 Dec., 1333, the opinion of John XXII concerning the *Visio beatifica*, namely, that the saints do not enjoy the complete Beatific Vision until after the Last Judgment. The University of Paris was greatly agitated by the controversy, and the next day, 19 Dec., Philip VI called together twenty-nine professors at Vincennes to discuss the question. This assembly dissented from the opinion of the pope, as did also a second assembly which met 2 Jan., 1334. As is known, John XXII withdrew his opinion, 3 Dec., 1334. Gerardus Odonis was also one of the commission of sixteen masters of theology which met by command of Benedict XII from 4 July to 4 Sept., 1334, at Pont-Sorgues near Avignon, to discuss, under the pope's presidency, the question of the *Visio beatifica*. On 27 Nov., 1342, Benedict XII appointed him Patriarch of Antioch and at the same time administrator of the Diocese of Catania, Sicily.

Apart from the "Constitutiones Benedictinae" and the "Officium de stigmatibus S. Francisci", still recited in the Franciscan Order and commonly attributed to Gerardus, the best known of his writings is his "Commentarius [Expositio] in Aristotelis Ethicam" (Brescia, 1482, Venice, 1500). This work brought him the honour later of being called *Doctor Moralis*. He also wrote on logic and a treatise entitled "Philosophia Naturalis", in which he is said to have apparently taught Atomism; another work was a "Commentarius in IV libros Sententiarum". Among his exegetical works are: "De figuris Bibliorum", and treatises on the Psalter, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Galatians, besides "Sermones". In addition to taking severe measures against the adherents of the deposed Michael of Cesena, Gerardus addressed to the latter the writing "Quid niteris", to which, however, Cesena soon made a rejoinder beginning "Teste Salomone".

EGBEL, *Bullarium Franciscanum* (Rome, 1898, 1902). V, VI; WADDING, *Annales Minorum* (2nd ed., Rome, 1733), VII, VIII; DENIFLE and CHATELAIN, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1891), II, 321-442; *Analecta Franciscana* (Quaracchi, 1887), II, 146-81; (1897), III, 488-537; MICHAELIS A. NEAPOLI, *Chronologia historico-legalis Ord. Frat. Minorum* (Naples, 1650), I, 46-63; WADDING, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum* (Rome, 1650), 145; 2nd ed. (Rome, 1806), 99; 3rd ed. (Rome, 1906), 99-100; SHARALEA, *Supplementum ad Script. Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1806), 306-7; 2nd ed. (Rome), I, 324-25; JEILER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Gerhard Odonis*; JELENIĆ, *De Pataraenis Bosnia* (Serajevo, 1908), 98 sqq.; *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* (Quaracchi, 1909), II, nn. 160 sqq.; II, nn. 269 sqq.; III, nn. 412 sqq.

MICHAEL BIHL.

**Gerasa**, a titular see in the province of Arabia and the Patriarchate of Antioch. According to Josephus, it was a city of Decapolis in which a number of Jews resided. Alexander Jannæus took possession of it, although it was surrounded by a triple wall (Bell. Jud., I, 4, 8). In 68 A. D. Vespasian ravaged the country and sacked the city because the Jews were all-powerful there (op. cit., IV, 9, 1). Simon, the son of Gioras, one of the principal leaders of the rebellious Jews, was born at Gerasa. The city is mentioned as forming a part, sometimes of Arabia, sometimes of Syria, by Ptolemy, Pliny, and Stephen of Byzantium, who also

speak of several notable persons of the place. Coins and a number of inscriptions prove that it was sometimes called Antioch on the Chrysorroas, the little river by which it is watered. In the Gospel (Matt., viii, 28; Mark, v, i; Luke, viii, 26, 37) there is question of the country of the Gerasans, but if this name is to be read instead of Gadarenians or Gergesians, the reference is to another locality, near the lake of Tiberias. The prosperity of Gerasa, once considerable, dates from the first centuries of our era, its buildings date from the emperors of the second and third centuries. Its destruction was brought about by earthquakes and the Arab invasions. We know three Greek Bishops of Gerasa: Exairesius, fourth century; Planeus, 451; Aeneas, who built the church of St. Theodore in the sixth century. In 1121 Baldwin II attempted in vain to conquer it, and at the beginning of the thirteenth century the geographer Yakut informs us that it was no longer inhabited. In modern times, several thousand Tcherkesses have established themselves amid its ruins and have unfortunately destroyed most of the Græco-Roman monuments which time had spared. Until recently Djerash was the best preserved city of Roman antiquity and the one which afforded us the most exact idea of Roman civilization. Its ramparts, in a state of partial preservation, are still to be seen; also a magnificent triumphal arch, with three openings about 82 feet wide by 29 high; a "naumachia", or circus for naval combats; two theatres; the forum with fifty-five columns still standing; the great colonnade which crosses the city from north to south, and which still retains from 100 to 150 of its columns; several aqueducts; some *propylæa*; a temple of the Sun, the columns of which are about 40 feet high, and several other temples, baths, etc. Greek and Latin inscriptions are very numerous among the ruins. The ramparts of the city cover a distance of about three miles.

GERMER-DURAND, *Exploration épigraphique de Gérasa in Revue biblique*, 1895, 374-400; *Nouvelle exploration épigraphique de Gérasa in Revue biblique*, 1899, 5, 39; and 1900, 93-95; see also FERDIZET in *Revue biblique*, 1900, 429-443; and the various guidebooks to Palestine and Syria.

S. VAILLÉ.

**Gerberon**, GABRIEL, a Benedictine of the Maurist Congregation; b. at St-Calais, Department of Sarthe, France, 12 Aug., 1628; d. in the monastery of St-Denis, near Paris, 29 March, 1711; educated by the Oratorians at Vendôme; became a Benedictine in the monastery of St-Mélaine, at Rennes, 11 Dec., 1649; studied theology in the monastery of Mont St-Michel; ordained priest in 1655; and taught philosophy and theology in the monasteries of Bourgeuil, St-Denis, and St-Benoît-sur-Loire until 1663. His departure from the Scholastic method of teaching theology, and his leaning towards Jansenism, influenced his superiors to relieve him of his professional duties. In 1663 he was sent to the monastery of La Couture, near Le Mans, and three years later, to St-Germain-des-Prés, where he devoted six years (1666-1672) to the care of souls and to literary pursuits. In 1672 he was sent to the monastery of Argenteuil, and in 1675 he was appointed subprior of the monastery of Corbie. Here he openly opposed the encroachments of Louis XIV in ecclesiastical and monastic affairs, and when it became known that he was the author of the second volume of "L'Abbé commendataire" (Cologne, 1674), a work which severely condemned the abuse of setting commendatory abbots over monasteries, the king ordered his arrest (1682). Gerberon escaped the hands of the law by fleeing to Brussels, thence to Holland, where he lived a few years under the assumed name of Augustin Kergé. In 1690 he returned to Brussels, and, in union with Quesnel and other Jansenists, wrote numerous pamphlets in favour of Jansenism. On 30 May, 1703, he was arrested at the command of the Archbishop of Mechlin, who intended to



give him over to his monastic superiors. Louis XIV. however, imprisoned him at Amiens (1703-1707) and at Vincennes (1707-1710). After retracting all his Jansenistic errors, Gerberon was set free, and returned to the monastery of St-Germain-des-Prés, 25 April, 1710. He deeply regretted his errors, and died a repentant son of the Catholic Church.

Gerberon was one of the most prolific writers of the Maurist Congregation. Tassin (loc. cit. below) ascribes one hundred and eleven works to him, many of which, however, are spurious. Of the sixty-one works ascribed to him by de Lama (loc. cit. below), the following are the most important: "Apologia pro Ruperto Abbate Tuitiensi" (Paris, 1669), in which he proves against Salmasius and other Protestants that Abbot Rupert of Deutz held the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence; "Histoire générale du Jansénisme" (Amsterdam, 1700), 3 vols.; "Acta Marii Mercatoris" (Brussels, 1673); "Histoire de la Robe sans couture de N. S. Jésus-Christ, qui est révéree dans l'église des Bénédictins d'Argenteuil" (Paris, 1676). His chief Jansenistic work is entitled "Le Miroir de la Piété chrétienne" (Brussels, 1676). He also edited the works of St. Anselm: "S. Anselmi opera omnia, necnon Eadmeri monachi Cantuar. Historia Novorum et alia opuscula" (Paris, 1675).

TASSIN, *Hist. littéraire de la congr. de Saint-Maur* (Brussels, 1780), 343-354; BERLIFRE, *Nouveau Supplément* to the preceding work (Paris, 1908), I, 242-245; KERKER in *Kirchenlex.*; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, DE LAMA, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la congr. de St. Maur* (Munich, 1882), 93-102; LE CERF, *Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la Congr. de St. Maur* (La Haye, 1726), 157-169.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Gerbert**, MARTIN, Prince-Abbot of Saint-Blaise, liturgist and musical writer; b. at Horb-on-the-Neckar, in the Black Forest, 12 August, 1720, by birth being entitled Baron von Hornau; d. in his monastery of Saint-Blaise, 13 May, 1793. He studied the humanities successively at Ehingen, Suabia, at Freiburg-im-Breisgau and at Klingenu, and philosophy and theology at the Abbey of Saint-Blaise, whose prince-abbot remarked his talents and undertook the direction of his studies, having in mind to make him his successor. Having entered at Saint-Blaise in 1736, he was ordained priest in 1744, and was almost immediately appointed professor of philosophy and theology. Besides, he fulfilled the duties of librarian. His first researches in liturgy and music date from this time. In 1760, in the course of a sojourn in France and Italy, he made the acquaintance at Bologna of Martini, who was collecting materials for his "Histoire générale de la musique" and to whom he made known his own discoveries. Gerbert states that he was much surprised to learn of the existence of so extensive a literature on a special subject, but that his own studies led to the knowledge of many other works which he made known to Martini, with whom he kept up a correspondence.

In 1762 Gerbert announced through a prospectus his intention of writing a history of church music, and he laboured unceasingly at this task, despite the cares imposed upon him by the administration of the Abbey of Saint-Blaise, of which he was named prince-abbot in 1764. The first volume was completed and the second much advanced when a fire destroyed the church, the library and a part of the manuscripts of Saint-Blaise (1768). Gerbert set to work once more, and the work appeared in 1774. The researches made necessary by the preparation had brought about the discovery of a number of manuscripts of the Middle Ages. Gerbert published more than forty of them in his "Scriptores de musicâ" (1784). Between whiles he published various writings, some of which are still of real importance, such as the "Iter Alemannicum",—in which, like Mabillon, Montfaucon, and Martène, he shares with us the treasures he has discovered in the libraries of Germany, France, and Italy—and use-

ful works on Rudolph I and the house of Hapsburg, on the history of Sweden, and on the ancient liturgy of Germany.

List of works: "Martini Gerberti et Remigii Klee-sati XXIV Offertoria Solemnia in festis Domini, B. V. M. et SS. opus I" (in fol. Augsburg, 1747); Apparatus ad eruditionem theologicam (Saint-Blaise), 1754; Iter Alemannicum, accedit Italicum et Gallicum (8°, Saint-Blaise, 1765); "Pinacotheca principum Austriæ" (1768); "Codex epistolaris Rudolphi I Romanorum regis" (Saint-Blaise, 1772); "De Cantu et Musicâ Sacra à primâ ecclesiæ ætate usque ad præsens tempus" (2 vols. 4°, Saint-Blaise, 1774); "Taphographia principum Austriæ, monumentorum domus Austriacæ tomus IV et ultimus" (2 vols. in fol., 1772); "Vetus liturgia Alemannica, disquisitionibus præviis, notis et observationibus illustrata" (2 vols. 4°, Saint-Blaise, 1776); "Monumenta veteris liturgiæ Alemanniæ ex antiquis manuscriptis codicibus" (2 vols. 4°, Saint-Blaise, 1777-79); "Historia Silvæ Nigræ" (3 vols. 4°, 1783); "Scriptores ecclesiastici de musicâ sacrâ" (3 vols. 4°, Saint-Blaise, 1784); "De Rudolpho suevico comite de Rhinfelden, duce, rege, deque ejus industriâ familiâ" (4°, Saint-Blaise, 1785); "Observationes in Bertholdi seu Bernoldi, Constantiniensis presbyteri opuscula" (in the "Mon. res Aleman. illust.", of Uffermann, 2 vols., 1792); "De sublimi in evangelio Christi juxta divinam Verbi incarnati æconomiam" (8°, 1793).

FÉTIS, *Dictionnaire de musiciens*; MISARD, *Biographie de D. M. Gerbert* (Paris, 1867); *Freiburger Diocesan-Archiv* (1898), XXVI, 299 sq.

H. LECLERCQ.

**Gerbert of Aurillac.** See SYLVESTER II.

**Gerbet**, OLYMPE-PHILIPPE, a French bishop and writer; b. at Poligny (Jura), 1798; d. at Perpignan (Pyrénées Orientales), 1864. He studied at the Aca-

démie and the Grand - Séminaire of Besançon, also at St-Sulpice and the Sorbonne. Ordained priest in 1822, he joined Lamennais at "La Chesnaie" (1825) after a few years spent with Salinis at the Lycée Henri IV. Although an enthusiastic admirer of Lamennais he nevertheless accepted the papal Encyclical "Mirari vos" of 15 Aug., 1832, and the "Singularem nos" of 13 July, 1834, which condemned the traditionalism of Lamennais; and, after fruitless efforts to convert the master, he withdrew to the "Collège de Juilly" (1836). The years 1839-49 he spent in Rome, gathering data for his "Esquisse de Rome Chrétienne". Recalled by Monseigneur Sibour, he became successively professor of sacred eloquence at the Sorbonne, Vicar-General of Amiens, and Bishop of Perpignan (1854). His episcopate was marked by the holding of a synod (1865), the reorganization of clerical studies, various religious foundations, and, above all, by the famous pastoral instruction of 1860 *sur diverses erreurs du temps présent*, which served as a model for the Syllabus of Pius IX. Gerbet has been called the Fénelon of the nineteenth century. Besides many articles in "Le Mémorial catholique", "L'Avenir", "L'Université catholique", and some philosophical writings ("Des doctrines



OLYMPE-PHILIPPE GERBET

philosophiques sur la certitude", Paris, 1826; "Sommaire des connaissances humaines", Paris, 1829; "Coup d'œil sur la controverse chrétienne", Paris, 1831; "Précis d'histoire de la philosophie", Paris, 1834: under the names of Salinis and Scorbias, all more or less tinctured with Lamennais's errors, he wrote the following: "Considérations sur le dogme générateur de la piété chrétienne" (Paris, 1829); "Vues sur la Pénitence" (Paris, 1836)—these two works are often published together; "Esquisse de Rome Chrétienne" (Paris, 1843), previously mentioned. In the two former books Gerbet views the dogmas of the Eucharist and Penance as admirably fitted to develop the affections—*nourrir le cœur de sentiments*—just as he uses the *réalités visibles* of Rome as symbols of her *essence spirituelle*. Sainte-Beuve (*Causeries de lundi*, VI, 316) says that certain passages of Gerbet's writings "are among the most beautiful and suave pages that ever honoured religious literature". Gerbet's "Mandements et instructions pastorales" were published at Paris in 1876.

DE LADOUÈ, Gerbet, *sa vie, ses œuvres et l'école mennaisienne* (Paris, 1870); RICARD, Gerbet, *sa vie, ses œuvres* (Paris, 1881); BRÉMOND, Gerbet (Paris, 1907); LONGHAYE, Gerbet in *Esquisses littéraires* (Paris, 1908). See also MARÉCHAL, *Essai d'un système de philosophie catholique par Lamennais* (Paris, 1908); and CRAVEN, *Récit d'une sœur*.

J. F. SOLLIER.

**Gerbillon, JEAN-FRANÇOIS**, French missionary; b. at Verdun, 4 June, 1654; d. at Peking, China, 27 March, 1707. He entered the Society of Jesus 5 Oct., 1670, and after completing the usual course of study taught grammar and the humanities for seven years. His long-cherished desire to labour in the missions of the East was gratified in 1685, when he joined the band of Jesuits who had been chosen to found the French mission in China. Upon their arrival in Peking they were received by the Emperor Kang-Hi, who was favourably impressed by them and retained Gerbillon and Bouvet at the Court. This famous monarch realized the value of the services which the fathers could render to him owing to their scientific attainments, and they on their part were glad in this way to win his favour and gain prestige in order to further the interests of the infant mission. As soon as they had learned the language of the country, Gerbillon with Pereyra, one of his companions, was sent as interpreter to Nipchou with the ambassadors commissioned to treat with the Russians regarding the boundaries of the two empires. This was but the beginning of his travels, during which he was often attached to the suite of the emperor. He made eight different journeys into Tataria. On one of these he was an eyewitness of the campaign in which Kang-Hi defeated the Eleuths. On his last journey he accompanied the three commissioners who regulated public affairs and established new laws among the Tatar-Kalkas, who had yielded allegiance to the emperor. He availed himself of this opportunity to determine the latitude and longitude of a number of places in Tataria. Gerbillon was for a time in charge of the French college in Peking, and afterwards became superior-general of the mission. He enjoyed the special friendship and esteem of the emperor, who had a high opinion of his ability and frequently availed himself of his scientific and diplomatic services. He was withal a zealous missionary, and in 1692 obtained an edict granting the free exercise of the Christian religion. After the emperor's recovery from a fever, during which he was attended by Gerbillon and Bouvet, he showed his gratitude by bestowing on them a site for a chapel and residence. Gerbillon was a skilled linguist. He was the author of several works on mathematics, and wrote an account of his travels in Tataria. These relations are valuable for their accurate account of the topography of the country, the customs of the people, and also for the details of the life of the missionaries at the Court.

Among his works are "Eléments de Géométrie" (1689), "Géométrie pratique et théorique" (1690), "Eléments de philosophie", "Relations de huit Voyages dans la Grande Tartarie". A work entitled "Elementa Linguae Tartaricae" is also attributed to him.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Biblioth. de la C. de J.*, III; EYRIES in *Biographie Universelle*, s. v.

HENRY M. BROCK.

**Gerdil, HYACINTHE SIGISMOND**, cardinal and theologian; b. at Samoëns in Savoy, 20 June, 1718; d. at Rome, 12 August, 1802. When fifteen years old, he joined the Barnabites at Ancey, and was sent to Bologna to pursue his theological studies; there he devoted his mind to the various branches of knowledge with great success, and attracted the attention of Archbishop Lambertini of that city, later Pope Benedict XIV. After his studies, he taught philosophy at Macerata, philosophy and moral theology at Turin, and became provincial of his order. At the suggestion of Benedict XIV, he was chosen preceptor of the Prince of Piedmont, afterwards Charles Emmanuel IV. Designated cardinal *in petto*, in 1773, by Clement XIV, he was promoted to that dignity by Pius VI, in 1777, who called him to Rome and named him Bishop of Dibbon, consultant of the Holy Office, corrector of the oriental books, and prefect of the Propaganda. After the invasion of Rome in 1798, he left the city and returned to his Abbey Della Chiusa. On the death of Pius VI he would probably have been elected pope at the consistory of Venice, in 1800, had not his election been vetoed by Cardinal Herzan in the name of the Emperor of Germany. He accompanied the new pope (Pius VII) to Rome, where he died in 1802.

His numerous works written in Latin, Italian, and French on divers subjects—dogmatic and moral theology, canon law, philosophy, pedagogy, history, physical and natural sciences, etc.—form twenty volumes in quarto (ed. Rome, 1806–1821). Among the most important may be mentioned: "L'Immortalité de l'âme démontrée contre Locke et défense du P. Malebranche contre ce philosophe" (Turin, 1747–48), 2 vols.; "Réflexions sur la théorie et la pratique de l'éducation contre les principes de J.-J. Rousseau" (Turin, 1765), reprinted in a new edition under the title "Anti-Emile"; "Exposition des caractères de la vraie religion", written in Italian (translated into French, Paris, 1770), etc. His works were written especially for the defence of spiritual philosophy against materialism, of supernatural religion against Deism, of the supreme authority of the pope against Febronianism and the Synod of Pistoia. A scholar of very extensive knowledge, a deep thinker, though some of his philosophical opinions, especially those concerning our knowledge of God, are not those generally accepted, a theologian of firm principles, he was also known as a man of great moderation in his counsels and of great charity in controversy.

PIANTONI, *Vita del Card. G. S. Gerdil ed analisi delle sue opere* (Rome, 1831); HERGENROTHER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; FELLER-HENRIEN, *Dictionnaire historique ou Biographie Universelle*, s. v.

G. M. SAUVAGE.

**Gereon, SAINT.** See THEBAN LEGION.

**Gerhard of Zutphen (ZEBOLT OF ZÜTPEHN)**; b. at Zutphen, 1367; d. at Windesheim, 1398; a mystical writer and one of the first of the Brothers of the Common Life, founded by Gerhard Groote and Florentius Radewyn at Deventer, in the Netherlands. Even in that community of "plain living and high thinking" Gerhard was remarkable for his absorption in the sacred sciences and his utter oblivion of all matters of merely earthly interest. He held the office of librarian, and his deep learning in moral theology and canon law did the brothers good service, in helping them to meet the prejudice and opposition which their manner of life at first aroused. His best known works are

entitled "Homo quidam" and "Beatus vir"; the two are almost identical (de la Bigne, *Bibliotheca Patrum*, XXVI). Two other treatises on prayer in the mother-tongue and on reading the Scripture in the mother-tongue are attributed to him (Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*; and Hirsche in *Herzog's Realencyklopädie*, 2nd ed.). Ullmann and other controversialists have used Gerhard of Zutphen's zeal for propagating the vernacular Scriptures as proof to connect the Brothers of the Common Life with the German Reformers; but an examination of Gerhard's arguments, as quoted by them, reveals with how little foundation.

ARTHUR, *The Spiritual Ascent*, a translation of GERHARD, *Beatus vir* (London, 1908); ARTHUR, *The Founders of the New Devotion* (London, 1903); CRUISE, *Thomas a Kempis* (London, 1887); GEM, *Hidden Saints* (London, 1907); KETTLEWELL, *Thomas a Kempis and the Brothers of the Common Life* (London, 1882); SCULLY, *Life of the Ven. Thomas a Kempis* (London, 1901); A KEMPIS, *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp, 1607. Heiler is issuing a new critical edition); ULLMANN, *Reformatoren* (Gotha, 1866).

VINCENT SCULLY.

**Gerhoh of Reichersberg**, provost of that place and Austin canon, one of the most distinguished theologians of Germany in the twelfth century, b. at Polling, Bavaria, 1093; d. at Reichersberg, 27 June, 1169. He studied at Freising, Mosburg, and Hildesheim. In 1119, Bishop Hermann of Augsburg called him as "scholasticus" to the cathedral school of that city; shortly afterwards, though still a deacon, he made him a canon of the cathedral. Gradually Gerhoh adopted a stricter ecclesiastical attitude, and eventually withdrew (1121) from the simoniacal Bishop Hermann, and took refuge in the monastery of Raitenbuch in the Diocese of Freising. After the Concordat of Worms (1122) Bishop Hermann was reconciled with the legitimate pope, Callistus II, whereupon Gerhoh accompanied the bishop to the Lateran Council of 1123. On his return from Rome Gerhoh resigned his canonicate, and with his father and two half-brothers joined the Austin canons at Raitenbuch (1124).

Bishop Kuno of Ratisbon ordained him a priest in 1126, and gave him the parish of Cham, which he later resigned under threats from Hohenstaufen followers whom he had offended at the Synod of Würzburg in 1127. He returned to Ratisbon, and in 1132 Archbishop Conrad I of Salzburg appointed him provost of Reichersberg, to the spiritual and material advantage of that monastery. Archbishop Conrad sent him several times on special missions to Rome; in 1143 he also accompanied, together with Arnold of Brescia, Cardinal Guido of Santa Maria in Porticu on his embassy to Bohemia and Moravia. Eugene III (1145-53) held Gerhoh in high esteem; his relations with the successors of that pope were less pleasant. On the occasion of the disputed papal election in 1159 (Alexander III and Victor IV) Gerhoh sided with Alexander III, but only after long hesitation; for this action the imperial party looked on him with hatred. For refusing to support the antipope, Archbishop Conrad was condemned to banishment in 1166, and the monastery of Reichersberg repeatedly attacked; Gerhoh himself was forced to take refuge in flight, and died soon after his return to Reichersberg. Gerhoh was a reformer in the spirit of the Gregorian ideas. He aimed particularly, perhaps with excessive zeal, at the reform of the clergy; it seemed to him that this object could not be attained unless the community life were generally adopted.

His reformatory views, and his ecclesiastical policy are set forth in the following works: "De edificio Dei seu de studio et cura disciplinæ ecclesiasticæ" (P. L., CXCIV, 1187-1336; Sackur, 136-202); "Tractatus adversus Simoniacos" (P. L., 1335-1372; Sackur, 239-272; see also Jaksch in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, VI [1885], 254-69); "Liber epistolaris ad Innocentium II. Pont. Max. de eo quid distet inter clericos sæcu-

lares et regulares" (P. L., CXCIV, 1375-1420; Sackur, 202-239); "De novitatibus hujus sæculi ad Adrianum IV Papam" (selections in Grisar and in Sackur, 288-304); furthermore, the important work written in 1162, "De investigatione Anti-Christi" libri III [selections in P. L., CXCIV, 1443-1480; see also Stulz in "Archiv für österreichische Geschichte, XXII (1858), 127-188; selections in Scheibelberger, see below; book I complete in Sackur, 304-395]; "De schismate ad cardinales" [Mühlbacher in *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, XLVII (1871), 355-382; Sackur, 399-411]; his last work is the "De quarta vigilia noctis" [Österreichische Vierteljahresschrift für kath. Theologie X (1871), 565-606; Sackur, 503-525]. His principal work he left unfinished, "Commentarius in Psalmos" (P. L., CXCIII, 619-1814; CXCIV, 1-1066); it offers much interesting material for contemporaneous history. This is particularly true of his commentary on Ps. lxiv, that appeared separately as "Liber de corrupto Ecclesiæ statu ad Eugenium III Papam" (P. L., CXCIV, 9-120; Sackur, 439-92). We are indebted to him also for a number of polemical works and letters against the Christological errors of Abelard, Gilbert de la Porrée, and Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg; others deal with the errors of Folmar, Provost of Triefenstein, on the subject of the Holy Eucharist.

The genuineness of the "Vitæ beatorum abbatum Formbacensium Berengeri et Wirtonis, O.S.B.", generally ascribed to Gerhoh, is denied by Wattenbach. The Migne edition of Gerhoh's works is faulty and incomplete. Those of his writings which are of importance for the study of the history of that period were edited by Sackur in the "Monumenta Germaniæ Historica: Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum", III (Hanover, 1897), 131-525; also by Scheibelberger, "Gerhohi Opera adhuc inedita" (Linz, 1875).

STULZ, *Historische Abhandlung über das Leben und die Werke des Propstes Gerhoh I. von Reichersberg in Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, I (1849); BACH, *Propst Gerhoh I. von Reichersberg, ein deutscher Reformator des XII Jahrhunderts in Österreichische Vierteljahresschrift für kath. Theologie*, IV (1865), 19-118; DILLOO, *De Gerhoho proposito Reichersbergensi* (Berlin, 1867); NOBBE, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg* (Leipzig, 1881); LEFFLAD in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 6th ed., II (Berlin, 1894), 308-314; IDEM in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, VIII, 783 sq.; VILDHAUT, *Handbuch der Quellenkunde zur deutschen Geschichte* (Arnsberg, 1898), 322-330; POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica mediæ ævi*, 2nd ed., I (Berlin, 1896), 502 sq.; HURTER, *Nomenclator: Kirchliches Handlexikon*, I, 1658 sq. Details are treated in BINTERIM, *Pragmatische Geschichte der deutschen National-, Provinzial und vorzüglichsten Diöcesanconcilien*, IV (Mainz, 1840), 187-212; BACH, *Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Vienna, 1875), passim; KALTNER, *Folmar von Triefenstein und der Streit Gerhohs mit Eberhard von Bamberg in Theologische Quartalschrift* (Tübingen, 1883), 523-552; RIBBECK, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg und seine Ideen über das Verhältniss zwischen Staat und Kirche in Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, XXIV (Göttingen, 1884), 1-80; see also XXV (1885), 556-561; GRISAR, *Die Investiturstreife nach ungedruckten Schriften Gerhohs von Reichersberg in Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*, IX (1885), 536-553.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

**Gerlach.** See PETERSSEN, GERLACH.

**Gerlandus.** See GARLAND, JOHN.

**Germain, SAINT**, Bishop of Auxerre, b. at Auxerre c. 380; d. at Ravenna, 31 July, 448. He was the son of Rusticus and Germanilla, and his family was one of the noblest in Gaul in the latter portion of the fourth century. He received the very best education provided by the distinguished schools of Arles and Lyons, and then went to Rome, where he studied eloquence and civil law. He practised there before the tribunal of the prefect for some years with great success. His high birth and brilliant talents brought him into contact with the court, and he married Eustachia, a lady highly esteemed in imperial circles. The emperor sent him back to Gaul, appointing him one of the six dukes, entrusted with the government of the Gallic provinces. He resided at Auxerre and gave himself up to all the enjoyments that naturally

fell to his lot. At length he incurred the displeasure of the bishop, St. Amator. It appears that Germain was accustomed to hang the trophies of the chase on a certain tree, which in earlier times had been the scene of pagan worship. Amator remonstrated with him in vain. One day when the duke was absent, the bishop had the tree cut down and the trophies burnt. Fearing the anger of the duke, who wished to kill him, he fled and appealed to the prefect Julius for permission to confer the tonsure on Germain. This being granted, Amator, who felt that his own life was drawing to a close, returned. When the duke came to the church, Amator caused the doors to be barred and gave him the tonsure against his will, telling him to live as one destined to be his successor, and forthwith made him a deacon.

A wonderful change was instantly wrought in Germain, and he accepted everything that had happened as the Divine will. He gave himself up to prayer, study, and works of charity, and, when in a short time Amator died, Germain was unanimously chosen to fill the vacant see, being consecrated 7 July, 418. His splendid education now served him in good stead in the government of the diocese, which he administered with great sagacity. He distributed his goods among the poor, and practised great austerities. He built a large monastery dedicated to Sts. Cosmas and Damian on the banks of the Yonne, whither he was wont to retire in his spare moments. In 429 the bishops of Britain sent an appeal to the continent for help against the Pelagian heretics who were corrupting the faith of the island. St. Prosper, who was in Rome in 431, tells us in his Chronicle that Pope Celestine commissioned the Church in Gaul to send help, and Germain and Lupus of Troyes were deputed to cross over to Britain. On his way Germain stopped at Nanterre, where he met a young child, Genevieve, destined to become the patroness of Paris. One of the early lives of St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland, tells us that he formed one of St. Germain's suite on this occasion. Tradition tells us that the main discussion with the representatives of Pelagianism took place at St. Alban's, and resulted in the complete discomfiture of the heretics. Germain remained in Britain for some time preaching, and established several schools for the training of the clergy. On his return he went to Arles to visit the prefect, and obtained the remission of certain taxes that were oppressing the people of Auxerre. He constructed a church in honour of St. Alban about this time in his episcopal city.

In 447 he was invited to revisit Britain, and went with Severus, Bishop of Trèves. It would seem that he did much for the Church there, if one can judge from the traditions handed down in Wales. On one occasion he is said to have aided the Britons to gain a great victory (called from the battle-cry, *Alleluia!* the *Alleluia* victory) over a marauding body of Saxons and Picts. On his return to Gaul, he proceeded to Armorica (Brittany) to intercede for the Armoricans who had been in rebellion. Their punishment was deferred at his entreaty, till he should have laid their case before the emperor. He set out for Italy, and reached Milan on 17 June, 448. Then he journeyed to Ravenna, where he interviewed the empress-mother, Galla Placidia, on their behalf. The empress and the bishop of the city, St. Peter Chrysologus, gave him a royal welcome, and the pardon he sought was granted. While there he died on 31 July, 450. His body, as he requested when dying, was brought back to Auxerre and interred in the Oratory of St. Maurice, which he had built. Later the oratory was replaced by a large church, which became a celebrated Benedictine abbey known as St. Germain's. This tribute to the memory of the saint was the gift of Queen Clotilda, wife of Clovis. Some centuries later, Charles the Bald had the shrine opened, and the body was found intact. It was embalmed and wrapped in

precious cloths, and placed in a more prominent position in the church. There it was preserved till 1567, when Auxerre was taken by the Huguenots, who desecrated the shrine and cast out the relics. It has been said that the relics were afterwards picked up and placed in the Abbey of St. Marion on the banks of the Yonne, but the authenticity of the relics in this church has never been canonically recognized. St. Germain was honoured in Cornwall and at St. Alban's in England's pre-reformation days, and has always been the patron of Auxerre.

TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, XV, 8; BRIGHT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; *Gallia Christiana*, XII, 262; GUÉPIN, *Vies des Saints* (Paris, 1880), IX, 132-45; *Acta SS.*, VII, July, 184-200; CONSTANTINUS, *Vie de S. Germain d'Auxerre*, tr. *fran.*, avec une étude (1874); and for his connexion with St. Patrick, HEALY, *Life of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1905); *Vita Tripartita* in *Rolls Series*, ed. Whitley Stokes (London, 1887), 2 vols., passim; BURY, *Life of St. Patrick* (London, 1905), passim; O'Connor, *Rerum Hibern. Script.* (1825), II, 92.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Germain, SAINT**, Bishop of Paris; b. near Autun, Saône-et-Loire, c. 496; d. at Paris, 28 May, 576. He was the son of Eleutherius and Eusebia. He studied at Avalon and also at Luzu under the guidance of his cousin Scapilion, a priest. At the age of thirty-four he was ordained by St. Agrippinus of Autun and became Abbot of Saint-Symphorien near that town. His characteristic virtue, love for the poor, manifested itself so strongly in his alms-giving, that his monks, fearing he would give away everything, rebelled. As he happened to be in Paris, in 555, when Bishop Eusebius died, Childebert kept him, and with the unanimous consent of the clergy and people he was consecrated to the vacant see. Under his influence the king, who had been very worldly was reformed and led a Christian life. In his new state the bishop continued to practise the virtues and austerities of his monastic life and laboured hard to diminish the evils caused by the incessant wars and the licence of the nobles. He attended the Third and Fourth Councils of Paris (557, 573) and also the Second Council of Tours (566). He persuaded the king to stamp out the pagan practices still existing in Gaul and to forbid the excess that accompanied the celebration of most Christian festivals. Shortly after 540 Childebert making war in Spain, besieged Saragossa. The inhabitants had placed themselves under the protection of St. Vincent, martyr. Childebert learning this, spared the city and in return the bishop presented him with the saint's stole. When he came back to Paris, the king caused a church to be erected in the suburbs in honour of the martyr to receive the relic. Childebert fell dangerously ill about this time, at his palace of Celles, but was miraculously healed by Germain, as is attested in the king's letters-patent bestowing the lands of Celles on the church of Paris, in return for the favour he had received. In 588 St. Vincent's church was completed and dedicated by Germain, 23 December, the very day Childebert died. Close by the church a monastery was erected. Its abbots had both spiritual and temporal jurisdiction over the suburbs of St. Germain till about the year 1670. The church was frequently plundered and set on fire by the Normans in the ninth century. It was rebuilt in 1014 and dedicated in 1163 by Pope Alexander III.

Childebert was succeeded by Clotaire, whose reign was short. At his death (561) the monarchy was divided among his four sons, Charibert becoming King of Paris. He was a vicious, worthless creature, and Germain was forced to excommunicate him in 568 for his immorality. Charibert died in 570. As his brothers quarrelled over his possessions the bishop encountered great difficulties. He laboured to establish peace, but with little success. Sigebert and Chilperic, instigated by their wives, Brunehaut and the infamous murderess Fredegunde, went to war, and Chilperic being defeated, Paris fell into Sigebert's



hands. Germain wrote to Brunehaut (his letter is preserved) asking her to use her influence to prevent further war. Siebert was obdurate. Despite Germain's warning he set out to attack Chilperic at Tournai, whither he had fled, but Fredegunde caused him to be assassinated on the way at Vitri in 575. Germain himself died the following year before peace was restored. His remains were interred in St. Symphorien's chapel in the vestibule of St. Vincent's church, but in 754 his relics were solemnly removed into the body of the church, in the presence of Pepin and his son, Charlemagne, then a child of seven. From that time the church became known as that of St. Germain-des-Prés. In addition to the letter mentioned above we have a treatise on the ancient Gallican liturgy, attributed to Germain, which has been published by Martene in his *"Thesauris Novus Anecdotorum"*. St. Germain's feast is kept on 28 May.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, II, 296-S; BENNETT in *Diet. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. (18); GUFRIN, *Vie des Saints* (Paris, 1880); VI, 264-71; *Acta SS.*, May, VI, 774-S; MABILLON, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* (1668-72), I, 234-45; DUPLESSY, *Histoire de St. Germain* (Paris, 1831); FRACINET, *Not. biog. sur St. Germain-des-Prés* (Agen, 1881); *Anal. Bolland.* (1883), II, 69; BOUTILLART, *Hist. de l'abbaye de St. Germain* (Paris, 1724).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Germaine Cousin**, SAINT, b. in 1579 of humble parents at Pibrac, a village about ten miles from Toulouse; d. in her native place in 1601. From her birth she seemed marked out for suffering; she came into the world with a deformed hand and the disease of scrofula, and, while yet an infant, lost her mother. Her father soon married again, but his second wife treated Germaine with much cruelty. Under pretence of saving the other children from the contagion of scrofula she persuaded the father to keep Germaine away from the homestead, and thus the child was employed almost from infancy as a shepherdess. When she returned at night, her bed was in the stable or on a litter of vine branches in a garret. In this hard school Germaine learned early to practise humility and patience. She was gifted with a marvellous sense of the presence of God and of spiritual things, so that her lonely life became to her a source of light and blessing. To poverty, bodily infirmity, the rigours of the seasons, the lack of affection from those in her own home, she added voluntary mortifications and austerities, making bread and water her daily food. Her love for Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament and for His Virgin Mother presaged the saint. She assisted daily at the Holy Sacrifice; when the bell rang, she fixed her sheep-hook or distaff in the ground, and left her flocks to the care of Providence while she heard Mass. Although the pasture was on the border of a forest infested with wolves, no harm ever came to her flocks.

She is said to have practised many austerities as a reparation for the sacrileges perpetrated by heretics in the neighbouring churches. She frequented the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist, and it was observed that her piety increased on the approach of every feast of Our Lady. The Rosary was her only book, and her devotion to the Angelus was so great that she used to fall on her knees at the first sound of the bell, even though she heard it when crossing a stream. Whenever she could do so, she assembled the children of the village around her and sought to instil into their minds the love of Jesus and Mary. The villagers were inclined at first to treat her piety with mild derision, until certain signs of God's signal favour made her an object of reverence and awe. In repairing to the village church she had to cross a stream. The ford in winter, after heavy rains or the melting of snow, was at times impassable. On several occasions the swollen waters were seen to open and afford her a passage without wetting her garments. Notwithstanding her poverty she found means to help the poor by sharing with them her allowance of bread. Her father at last came to a sense of his duty, forbade

her stepmother henceforth to treat her harshly, and wished to give her a place in the home with the other children, but she begged to be allowed to remain in the humbler position. At this point, when men were beginning to realize the beauty of her life, God called her to Himself. One morning in the early summer of 1601, her father finding that she had not risen at the usual hour went to call her; he found her dead on her pallet of vine-twigs. She was then twenty-two years of age.

Her remains were buried in the parish church of Pibrac in front of the pulpit. In 1644, when the grave was opened to receive one of her relatives, the body of Germaine was discovered fresh and perfectly preserved, and miraculously raised almost to the level of the floor of the church. It was exposed for public view near the pulpit, until a noble lady, the wife of François de Beauregard, presented as a thanks-offering a casket of lead to hold the remains. She had been cured of a malignant and incurable ulcer in the breast, and her infant son whose life was despaired of was restored to health on her seeking the intercession of Germaine. This was the first of a long series of wonderful cures wrought at her relics. The leaden casket was placed in the sacristy, and in 1661 and 1700 the remains were viewed and found fresh and intact by the vicars-general of Toulouse, who have left testamentary depositions of the fact. Expert medical evidence deposed that the body had not been embalmed, and experimental tests showed that the preservation was not due to any property inherent in the soil. In 1700 a movement was begun to procure the beatification of Germaine, but it fell through owing to accidental causes. In 1793 the casket was desecrated by a revolutionary tinsmith, named Toulza, who with three accomplices took out the remains and buried them in the sacristy, throwing quick-lime and water on them. After the Revolution, her body was found to be still intact save where the quick-lime had done its work.

The private veneration of Germaine had continued from the original finding of the body in 1644, supported and encouraged by numerous cures and miracles. The cause of beatification was resumed in 1850. The documents attested more than 400 miracles or extraordinary graces, and thirty postulatory letters from archbishops and bishops in France besought the beatification from the Holy See. The miracles attested were cures of every kind (of blindness, congenital and resulting from disease, of hip and spinal disease), besides the multiplication of food for the distressed community of the Good Shepherd at Bourges in 1845. On 7 May, 1854, Pius IX proclaimed her beatification, and on 29 June, 1867, placed her on the canon of virgin saints. Her feast is kept in the Diocese of Toulouse on 15 June. She is represented in art with a shepherd's crook or with a distaff; with a watchdog, or a sheep; or with flowers in her apron.

GUÉRIN in *Petits Bollandistes*, 15 June; VÉVILLAT, *Vie de la bienheureuse Germaine* (2d ed., Paris, 1904).

C. MULCAHY.

**German Gardiner**, BLESSED, last martyr under Henry VIII; date of birth unknown; d. at Tyburn, 7 March, 1544; secretary to, and probably a kinsman of Stephen Gardiner, and an able defender of the old Faith, as his tract against John Frith (dated 1 August, 1534) shows. During the years of fiery trial, which followed, we hear no more of him than that "he was stirred up to courage" by the examples of the martyrs, and especially by More, a layman like himself. His witness was given eight years later, under remarkable circumstances. Henry VIII was becoming more severe upon the fast-multiplying heretics. Cranmer fell under suspicion, and Gardiner was (or was thought to have been) employed in drawing up a list of that heresiarch's errors in the Faith. Then the whim of the religious despot changed again, and the Catholic was sacrificed in the heretic's place. Still he was the last victim, and Henry afterwards became even more



hostile to Protestantism. Gardiner's indictment states plainly that he was executed for endeavouring "to deprive the King of his dignity, title, and name of Supreme Head of the English and Irish Church", and his constancy is further proved by this circumstance, that Thomas Haywood, who had been condemned with him, was afterwards pardoned on recanting his opinions. His other companions at the bar were Blessed John Larke, priest, whom Blessed Thomas More had presented to the rectory of Chelsea (when he himself lived in that parish), and also the Ven. John Ireland, who had once been More's chaplain. They suffered the death of traitors at Tyburn.

CAMM, *Lives of English Martyrs* (London, 1904), i, 543-7; STRYPE, *Cranmer* (1694), 163-8; MORE, *Life of More* (1726), 278.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Germanicia**, a titular see in the province of Euphratensis and the patriarchate of Antioch; incorrectly called Germaniciana and located in Byzacene, Africa. An official document of the Propaganda, the "Catalogo dei vescovati titolari" for 1884 (no. 228, 10) expressly states that the see is *Germanicia in Euphratensis*. Lequien (*Oriens christ.*, Paris, 1740, II, 939) names five Greek bishops of this city, among them the Arian Eudoxius, future Bishop of Antioch and Constantinople. He also names (II, 1495) four Jacobite bishops, and at least eighteen others are known from the eighth to the thirteenth century (*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 1901, 200), if Germanicia be considered identical with Marash, which has not been ascertained. It is customary to consider these two cities as identical, but the texts collected by Muller, in his edition of Ptolemy's "Geographia" (965-967), are so contradictory that it is difficult to arrive at any conclusion. Muller prefers to locate Germanicia in the neighbouring ruins of Altun-Tash-Kalé. If Germanicia and Marash are one, this industrial city, whose climate is very healthy, is situated in a sanjak of the vilayet of Aleppo. It numbers 52,000 inhabitants, about 15,000 of whom are Catholics, comprising Melchites, Armenians, Chaldeans and Latins; 22,000 are Mussulmans. The remainder are either schismatic Christians or Jews.

CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie* (Paris, 1892), II, 226-239.

S. VAILLÉ.

**Germanicopolis**, a titular see in the province of Isauria, suffragan of Seleucia. The city took its name from Germanicus, grandson of Augustus. Four of its bishops are known during the Byzantine government: Tyrannus, 451; Eustathius, 787; Basil, 878 (Lequien, *Or. christ.*, II, 1027); and Bisulas in the sixth century (Brooks, *Sixth Book of the Letters of Severus*, 13, 26, 80). The crusaders sustained a great defeat near the city in 1098. It then passed into the power of the Armenian dynasty of the Rupenians, who called it Germanig, whence is derived the present name of Ermenek. The Turks took possession of it in 1228. It is situated at a height of 1362 feet, in a caza of the vilayet of Adana, and numbers 6500 inhabitants. The ruins of many Roman monuments and a stronghold are still to be seen on the mountain.

CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II, 77; ALISHAN, *Sissouan*, 338-340.

S. VAILLÉ.

**Germans in the United States**, THE.—Germans, either by birth or descent, form a very important element in the population of the United States. Their number is estimated at not less than twelve millions. Under the name *Germans* we here understand to be included all German-speaking people, whether originally from Germany proper, Austria, Switzerland, or Luxemburg.

A. GERMANS IN GENERAL. The landing, in the autumn of 1683, of Franz Daniel Pastorius and his little band of Mennonite weavers, from Crefeld, marks

the beginning of German-American history. These early immigrants founded Germantown, Pennsylvania, where they soon built themselves a church and established a school, taught by Pastorius, who wrote for it, and published, a primer, the first original school-book printed in Pennsylvania. To this place came the German settlers directly after their landing; from it went out the settlers who gradually spread over Montgomery, Lancaster, and Berks Counties, among them, the so-called Rosicrucians (settled near Germantown), a colony of German Friends, Quaker converts made by William Ames and visited by Penn (founded Cresheim, from Kreisheim near Worms), and the Dunkers (Conestoga, Ephrata). From these early Pennsylvania settlers and their descendants many Americans of note have sprung, as Bayard Taylor, James Lick, Charles Yerkes, John Fritz, John Wanamaker, Charles M. Schwab, and Henry C. Frick.

In 1707, a small band of Lutherans, from the Palatinate, embarked for America. They landed at Philadelphia and settled in what is now known as Morris County. In the spring of the following year, another company of fifty-two Palatines, joined by three Holsteiners, went to England and appealed to Queen Anne, praying for transportation to America. The majority of these men were farmers and one was a Lutheran clergyman, Kockertal; on arriving in the Colonies in the winter of 1709, they were settled in the district then known as Quassaick Creek and Thankskamir (part of the territory of the present Newburgh). Another, and far more extensive, migration took place in the same year and the following; about three thousand Palatines landed in America, by way of England. The severities of the winter of 1708-09 seem to have been the chief cause of this exodus. One company, under Christopher de Graffenried and Lewis Michell, settled at the junction of the Neuse River and the Trent (North Carolina) and in the neighbouring country. This colony included a considerable number of Swiss, and to their first settlement they gave the name, New Berne, in memory of the native city of the two Swiss partners, de Graffenried and Michell. Another company of Germans was settled about the same time, by Governor Spotswood, at Germanna in Virginia, whither, a little later, many of those who had established themselves in North Carolina are said to have removed. Some ten or fifteen years after Spotswood's retirement to Germanna, a company of Germans came into Virginia from Pennsylvania, doubtless Palatines from Berks County. They settled in the lower Shenandoah Valley and founded the town of Strasburg, just over the mountain from Germanna.

By far the largest expedition of Palatines left the shores of England towards the end of January, 1710. They were settled on the Hudson (Rhinebeck, Germantown, Newburgh, West Camp, Saugerties, etc.), whence many afterwards removed to the Schoharie Valley (Blenheim, Oberweiser Dorp, Brunnen Dorp, etc.); the Government, however, refused to recognize their title to the Schoharie lands, and some of them at last migrated in disgust to the Mohawk Valley, where their increase and the stream of German immigration that followed made the Mohawk "for thirty miles, a German river" (Mannheim, Oppenheim, Newkirk, German Flats, Herkimer, etc.). But the greater portion removed from Schoharie in 1723 to Pennsylvania, where Governor Keith, on hearing of their afflictions and unrest, offered them an asylum from all persecution. Previously to this migration from New York to Pennsylvania, thousands of Germans had sailed directly to the latter territory, and so large was the Palatine element in these and the following immigrations that the natives of all other German States, coming with them, were called by the same name. Between 1720 and 1730 the German immigration to Pennsylvania became so large as to be looked

upon by the other settlers with serious misgivings: Logan, Penn's secretary, suggested the danger of the province becoming a German colony, as the Germans "settled together, and formed a distinct people from His Majesty's subjects". As early as 1739, a German newspaper was published at Germantown, and another appeared at Philadelphia in 1743. The Germans became an important factor in the political life of Pennsylvania, usually uniting with the Quakers, and forming with them a conservative peace party. In 1734, the Schwenkfelders, followers of Casper Schofield, came to Pennsylvania and settled along the Perkiomen, in Montgomery County. About the same time a number of Germans established themselves near Frederick, Maryland, and between South Mountain and the Conococheague.

The first German settlement in South Carolina was in 1731, at Puryburg on the Savannah. In 1734 Lutherans from Salzburg founded Ebenezer, the first settlement in Georgia. Seven years later, there were about 1200 Germans in Georgia. By the middle of the eighteenth century the mountain counties of North Carolina had numerous German settlements. Meantime, the Moravians, who in 1736 had settled in Georgia, had left that colony and secured a tract of land in Pennsylvania, to which they gave the name of Bethlehem. Zinzendorf came thither in 1741. More than twenty years earlier, German settlers had established themselves on the lower Mississippi. The "German Creoles" of Louisiana are descendants of these early colonists.

During the war of the Revolution, thirty thousand German soldiers fought under the British flag. They had been sold to England by the petty princes of Germany, those "brokers of men and sellers of souls", as one of these soldiers rightly styled them. As Hesse furnished more than any other German State (twelve thousand) all these soldiers were called Hessians. Over one third of the thirty thousand never returned to Europe; some had died; many had deserted to Washington's army, "coming over in shoals", as Gates wrote in 1777; many thousands settled in the newly created States.

On the eve of the Revolution there were fully a hundred thousand Germans in Pennsylvania. Their number was little increased during the next sixty years, since the great immigration period did not begin until about the year 1840. Among those who came to the United States before 1830 was Franz Lieber, accompanied by his two friends, Professors Carl Beck and Carl Follen. For nearly half a century Lieber stood in the front rank as an authority on public questions. The year 1848 brought to our shores those thousands of political fugitives who belonged to the most educated of the German nation. To mention several, merely as typical of the rest, among these "Forty-Eighters" were Carl Schurz, Friedrich Hecker, Franz Sigel, Oswald Ottendorfer, Friedrich Kapp, Wilhelm Rapp, Gustav von Struve, and Lorenzo Brentano. Soon the number of German immigrants grew enormously, averaging over 800,000 for each of the six succeeding decades. They did not, however, settle in the Eastern States only, but the majority proceeded to the Middle West, whither many of the Germans, who had already been very numerous on the frontiers, had removed as soon as the new country was opened to colonizing. Owing to prosperity in the Fatherland, German immigration began to decline in the early nineties. During the period subsequent to 1848 the Germans settled chiefly in the following states: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania (especially the western parts), Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Minnesota, California, Louisiana, Texas, North Dakota. They were never attracted to the New England States until about the middle of the nineteenth century. Even now New Hampshire,

Vermont, and Maine have practically no German population; in Massachusetts there are very few except around Boston. According to the twelfth census, taken in 1900, there was in that year, a German-born population of 2,663,418 in the United States (about three millions from Germany and German Austria). Since 1900 about 250,000 more have come over. Add to these the descendants of the immigrants from the earliest periods down to our time, and the large number of people of German descent who can now hardly be recognized as Germans, owing to the fact that they have assumed English names, it is safe to say that there are at present (1909) fully twelve million persons of German birth or descent in the United States.

The early German settlers were mostly farmers in their old country, and it was but natural that, after their arrival in the United States, they should have chosen the same occupation. There is no need of pointing out the merits of the German farmers, since those merits have been generally admitted in Pennsylvania, the Mohawk Valley, and, later, the Middle West. In trade, industry, and commerce the Germans in the United States are second to none. Men like Spreckels, Havemeyer, A. Busch, Fred. Pabst, Henry Miller, and Henry C. Frick, stand among the pillars of American industry. Rockefeller is proud of his German descent. The Belmonts came from Alzey, the Astors from Walldorf near Heidelberg, the Iselins from Switzerland. The largest lumber-yard in the world, is owned by Fritz Weyershauser, a native of Hesse. The Roebings are still prominent in their line of industry. Prominent as bankers are those bearing German names.

But more important, though less known, is the army of skilled mechanics in all different branches, designers, lithographers, etc., who, in their spheres, have made the German name honoured and respected. The Germans are known to be a hardworking, thrifty people, and, as a result, they are generally prosperous, and pauperism is hardly known among them. Americans have learned that wherever the Germans settle, prosperity and culture are pretty sure to follow.—"What the Germans do, they do well", has become a common saying among their neighbours. Puritanism never gained a foothold among the Germans. Though they cannot be charged with extravagance, they are fond of the quiet joys and amusements of social life, witness their many societies, which combine beneficial objects with recreation and amusement. Their fondness for children and family life is well known; as a rule they have large families. The industry and carefulness of the German housewife are proverbial.

While there have not been any great political leaders among the Germans, with the exception, perhaps, of Carl Schurz, it cannot be denied that their influence on the political development of the country has been on the whole a very wholesome one. As adherents of a healthy and vigorous conservatism in politics, they are universally respected. Though anxious to preserve their language and customs, they have given ample proof of their loyalty to the land of their choice. The share taken by the Germans in the wars of the United States, was by no means limited to the War of the Revolution and the Civil War of 1861-65. From the very beginning of their settlement in this country, they always stood ready to take up arms in its defence. The early Germans of Pennsylvania and New York, responded freely to the summons to defend their new country against the French and their allies, the Indians. They gave freely of their men and means to the cause of liberty, in the War of the Revolution. The names of Generals de Kalb, F. W. A. Steuben, F. W. de Woedke, J. P. G. Muehlenberg, and George Weedon will always be mentioned with honour, among those who established the liberties of the country. Undoubtedly the ablest of them was General Steuben, the impetuous warrior who "took a

mob and hammered it into an army". Nor should we forget to cite the name of Herkimer, than whom no braver man fought in the War for Independence. He was the son of a Palatine immigrant, and in the battle of Oriskany—"of all the battles of the Revolution, the most obstinate and murderous"—those whom Herkimer led were largely Palatines. To them and their brave leader belongs largely the credit of making possible the victory of Saratoga, by which the struggle for the Hudson was ended, and the vital union of the northern Colonies secured.

The Germans also did their duty in full in the War of 1812 and in the Mexican War. What they did to keep the United States together, can be learned from an article by General Franz Sigel, which was published at St. Louis after his death. The General calls attention to the historical fact, that, three days after the surrender of Fort Sumter, when the City of Washington was in imminent peril of falling into the hands of the Confederates, this catastrophe was prevented by the arrival of a detachment of infantry and cavalry from Pennsylvania, the five companies of which were chiefly composed of Germans, both from the older and from the more recent immigrant stock. Again, when St. Louis was in extreme danger of falling into the hands of the Confederacy it was four regiments of volunteers, mainly German, and one regiment commanded by Sigel that surrounded the camp of the Confederates and made them prisoners. There were, during that war, not fewer than 176,767 Germans in the United States Army. Of the more than 5,000 officers of the German contingent, the following may here be mentioned: the exiled popular leader Friedrich Hecker, who was one of the first to form a volunteer regiment, Gustav von Struve, General Blenker, General Osterhaus, Jos. Fickler, Nepomuk Katzenmayer, General Alexander von Schimmelpfennig, General Max Weber, General Sigel, and Captain Albert Sigel, a brother of the General, August Willich, the commander of a regiment from Indiana, and especially General Carl Schurz, who commanded the eleventh corps at the battle of Gettysburg. It is deserving of mention that among the Germans, the advocates of the abolition of slavery were always prominent. The first German settlers in this country, were also signers of the first anti-slavery petition in America (1688).

Although the first German colonists themselves, for the most part, had no higher education than what was to be acquired in the German village schools of that time, they considered it their duty to establish schools for their children, and therefore, as a rule, brought teachers over with them. School attendance was always looked upon as a serious matter, almost as serious as the teaching of religion, which was combined with elementary instruction, so that German colonies thus paved the way for compulsory education. Men like Muehlenberg and Schlatter did much in the way of improving the schools. The development of German literature in America, including thousands of publications, went hand in hand with this progress. The first German Bible published in the New World appeared in 1743, forty years before an English Bible was printed in America. The "Public Academy of the City of Philadelphia", now the University of Pennsylvania, is the first American school into which German was introduced. Gradually the language was introduced into the public schools of cities with a large German population, and numerous German private schools were established in the different parts of the country. And after educated Americans had become acquainted with German educational methods, German literature, and German science, either directly by attending German schools of learning, or indirectly from France through England, they enthusiastically advocated educational reform based upon the German models. It is no exaggeration to speak of a gradual

"Germanization" of most of the greater American colleges. "Although Great Britain is generally regarded as the mother of the United States, Germany has, from an intellectual standpoint, become more and more the second mother of the American Republic. More than any other country, Germany has made the universities and colleges of America what they are to-day—a powerful force in the development of American Civilization" (Andrew D. White).

B. THE GERMAN CATHOLICS IN AMERICA. A certain proportion of the Palatines who went to England were of the Catholic Faith, but they were not allowed to proceed to the American colonies, neither was the English government willing to permit their prolonged residence in England. They were therefore returned under government passports to the Palatinate. But of those who came later and directly to America, undoubtedly, a considerable number were Catholics. In 1741 the German Province of the Society of Jesus, sent out two priests to minister to the German Catholics in Pennsylvania. These were Father William Wappeler (born 22 January, 1711, in the Diocese of Mainz), co-founder of the mission of Conewago, and Father Theodore Schneider, a Palatine (born at Geinsheim, Diocese of Speyer, 7 April, 1703), who took up his residence at Goshenhoppen, in Berks County. Other German Jesuits came later on, among them Fathers James Frambach (died 1795 at Conewago), Luke Geissler (died at Lancaster, in 1786), Lawrence Graessel, who was appointed coadjutor to Bishop Carroll, but died in Philadelphia, of yellow fever, before consecration, James Pellentz, one of Bishop Carroll's vicars-general (died at Conewago in 1800), Matthias Sittensperger (changed his name to Manners), Ferdinand Steinmayr (Farmer), who, according to Bishop Carroll, founded the first Catholic congregation in New York (died in Philadelphia, 17 August, 1787, in the odour of sanctity). Father Farmer was a member of the famous Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, and was made a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Philadelphia, when that institution was chartered in 1779. To these early missionaries may be added Father John Baptist de Ritter, who was a German, though a member of the Belgian Province. He died at Goshenhoppen, 3 February, 1787. Father Schneider was the pastor of the parish at Goshenhoppen for twenty-three years, ministering to the Catholics there and in the region for fifty miles around. Before he died, in 1764, he had the satisfaction of seeing the Church firmly established in Pennsylvania. His companion, Father Wappeler, founded the mission of the Sacred Heart at Conewago. Of him, Bishop Carroll wrote that "he was a man of much learning and unbounded zeal". Having remained about eight years in America, and converted or reclaimed many to the Faith of Christ, he was forced by bad health to return to Europe. His successor, Father Pellentz, built the church of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the first in the country under that title. It is not probable that there was any large, or indeed appreciable, number of German Catholics in any other colony at that time, with the exception of Louisiana, whose French inhabitants shared and honoured their religion, whereas most of the English colonies had severe laws against the "Papists". But gradually all were opened to Catholics.

From a letter by the Rev. Dr. Carroll to the Rev. C. Plowden, in 1785, we learn that in that year he visited Philadelphia, New York, and the upper countries of the Jerseys and Pennsylvania, "where our worthy German brethren have formed congregations". Although we do not know of any German settlement in the Far West during the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, we find during that period German priests labouring among the Indian tribes on the coast of the Pacific, and in the south-western States. The first

German priest on the Pacific coast was the Jesuit Father Eusebio Francisco Kino. His real name was Eusebius Franz Kuehn. He was a native of Trent, and entered the Society of Jesus in Bavaria, where for some time he was professor at Ingolstadt. He came from Germany in 1680 or 1681, and to Lower California in 1683. In the following year he was called to Sonora, where he laboured until his death, in 1710, meanwhile making missionary and exploring trips to the Rio Gila in Sonora. Other German Jesuits in Lower California from 1719 to 1767, were Joseph Baegert, the author of the "Nachrichten von der Kalifornischen Halbinsel" (Mannheim, 1772), Joh Bischoff, Franz Benno Ducre, Joseph Gasteiger, Eberhard Helen, Lambert Hostell, Wenzeslaus Link, Karl Neumayr, Georg Retz, Ignatz Tuersch, Franz X. Wagner. Arizona saw the indefatigable Father Eusebius Kuehn, towards the latter part of the seventeenth century, as far up as the Gila River at its junction with the Colorado. In 1731, Philip V., at the suggestion of Benedict Crespo, Bishop of Durango, ordered three central missions to be established in Arizona, at the royal expense. To the joy of the bishop, three German Jesuit Fathers were sent, Father Ignatius Xavier Keller, Father John Baptist Grashoffer, and Father Philip Segesser. Of the last two, one soon died, and the other was prostrated by sickness, but Father Ignatius Keller became the leader of the new missions in that district, taking possession of Santa Maria Soameca, 20 April, 1732. About the year 1750, we find Father Ignatius Pfefferkorn, a native of Mannheim, Germany, at Guevavi; and at the same time, Father Sedelmayr, at the instance of the Spanish Government, was evangelizing the tribes on the Gila, erecting seven or eight churches in the villages of the Papagos, among whom Father Bernard Middendorf also laboured, and Father Keller was endeavouring to reach the Moquis, who were willing to receive missionaries of any kind but Franciscans. Other prominent Jesuits from the Fatherland were Fathers Caspar Steiger, Heinrich Kurtzel, and Michael Gerstner. By the summary act of the King of Spain, in 1763, every church in Arizona was closed and the Christian Indians were deprived of their zealous German priests.

In 1808, the Diocese of Baltimore, which had, up to this time, embraced the entire United States, was divided, and the four new sees of Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Bardstown erected. There were, at that time, under the jurisdiction of the first Bishop of Philadelphia, Holy Trinity, attended by the Rev. William Elling and Father Adam Britt, the latter of whom issued a new edition of the German catechism; St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, erected in 1806, was the first institution of its kind established by Catholics in the United States. The Rev. Louis de Barth attended at Lancaster and Conewago. He was the son of Joseph de Barth, Count de Walbach, and his wife, Maria Louisa de Rohme, who was born at Munster, 1 November, 1764. When the See of Philadelphia became vacant by the death of Bishop Egan, Father de Barth became administrator of the diocese. He died 13 October, 1838. The Rev. Paul Ermtzen had begun, in 1793, his quarter-century pastorship at Goshenhoppen. Father Peter Helbron, O. Min. Cap., had reared a log chapel in Westmoreland County. After years of devoted service, he went to Philadelphia, but died at Carlisle on his homeward journey. The Rev. Demetrius A. Gallitzin was labouring in the district of which Loretto was the centre, and had come to America in 1792, with a learned and pious priest, the Rev. F. K. Brosius, who had offered his services to Dr. Carroll. He travelled under the name of Schmet, a contraction of his mother's name, but this in America soon became Smith, by which he was known for many years. He bore letters to Bishop Carroll, and when he was introduced to the priests of Saint-Sulpice, was delighted with their life and work. His father had

marked out a brilliant career for him in the military or diplomatic service in Europe, but the peace and simplicity which reigned in America contrasted so forcibly with the seething maelstrom of European revolution that, penetrated with the vanity of worldly grandeur, young Gallitzin resolved to renounce all schemes of pride and ambition, and to embrace the clerical profession for the benefit of the American mission.

In 1808 the Diocese of New York was created, and its chief organizer was the learned and able Jesuit Father, Anthony Kohlmann, as vicar-general and administrator *sede vacante*. He had come over from the old country in 1806, together with two other priests of his order. The German Catholics in New York had gradually increased, so that they organized a little congregation by themselves. Their first pastor seems to have been the Rev. John Raffener, of whom Archbishop Hughes said: "Bishops, priests, and people have reason to remember Father Raffener for many years to come". He visited his countrymen far and near, always ready to hasten to any point to give them the consolations of religion. For a time the Germans in New York assembled under his care in a disused Baptist place of worship at the corner of Delancey and Pitt Streets, and afterwards, when the lease expired, in St. Mary's church; but on 20 April, 1833, the corner-stone of a church to be dedicated to St. Nicholas, on Second Street, was laid. By the sacrifices and exertions of Father Raffener the church was completed and dedicated on Easter Sunday, 1836. Father Raffener directed the church for several years and became vicar-general for the Germans in the diocese. By the year 1836, the German Catholic element in the Boston diocese required Bishop Fenwick's care, the largest body of them being in and near Roxbury. Having no priest in his diocese who could speak German fluently, Bishop Fenwick applied to his fellow-bishop in New York, and at the close of May, 1835, the Very Rev. John Raffener, apostle of his countrymen in the East, arrived. On the last day of May, that zealous priest gathered three hundred in the chapel of St. Aloysius and addressed them with so much power and unction, that he spent the whole evening in the confessional. Quickened by his zeal, they resolved to collect means to support a priest, and in August, 1836, they obtained the Rev. Father Hoffmann as their pastor, with Father Freygang as assistant; but, led by designing men, they would not co-operate with those sent to minister to them. Fathers Hoffmann and Freygang were both forced to retire, and an ex-Benedictine, named Smolnikar, became their choice. In a short time, however, the bishop discovered in this priest unmistakable signs of insanity and, unable to obtain another clergyman, became himself the chaplain of the German congregation. In 1841, stimulated by their bishop, they purchased a lot on Suffolk Street, and prepared to erect a church, laying the corner-stone on 28 June; he had already secured a zealous priest, Rev. F. Roloff, for this congregation. The German Catholic body in New York City, was now increasing so rapidly that soon another church was needed, and in June the corner-stone of St. John Baptist's was laid by the Very Rev. Dr. Power, to be dedicated on 13 September, by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Hughes.

About 1820 Ohio was already the home of many Catholic families of German speech. It was for this reason that Bishop Flaget, of Bardstown and Louisville, urged that a see should be erected at Cincinnati, and for its first bishop recommended the Rev. Demetrius A. Gallitzin, educated in Germany, and familiar with the language and ideas of the people; but the good priest, learning of the project, peremptorily refused. In 1829, two zealous German priests began to make a list of their Catholic countrymen in the State of Ohio. They found them everywhere—at Cincin-

nati, Somerset, Lancaster—and by their untiring zeal awoke religion in the hearts of many who had for years neglected to practise it. One of these itinerant priests was the Rev. John Martin Henni, a name to be known in time as that of the founder of the first German Catholic paper, first Bishop of Wisconsin, and first Archbishop of Milwaukee. In 1832, on the death of Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati, the administration of the diocese devolved on the zealous missionary priest, Father Edward Reese, who had laboured so earnestly among his countrymen in the diocese and been instrumental in the establishment of the "Leopoldinen-Stiftung", an association for aiding missions, at Vienna, whose alms have fostered so many missions and helped substantially towards developing the Catholic school system, particularly in the Diocese of Cincinnati, and the dioceses formed from it. Dr. Reese was born at Vianenburg, near Hildesheim, in 1791 and, like Pio Nono, had been a cavalry officer before he embraced the priesthood. He was the founder of the Athenæum in Cincinnati, which later was transferred to the Jesuits, and changed into the present St. Xavier College. Holy Trinity, erected in 1834, was the first German church west of the Alleghanies. Its second pastor, the Rev. John M. Henni, whom we have already mentioned, displayed untiring energy in founding and organizing schools in Cincinnati and was actively interested in the development of Catholic educational work throughout the States; he also formed the German Catholic Orphan Society of St. Aloysius, and an asylum was soon erected. About this time, log churches arose at Glandorf, Bethlehem, and New Riegel in northern Ohio, sufficient to gather the faithful together, and afforded a place for the instruction of the young. Meanwhile, the Catholic population of the State increased steadily, and the churches and institutions were very inadequate. St. Mary's church for the Germans, in Cincinnati, was dedicated in July, 1842; another German church was erected about the same time, at Zanesville, by Rev. H. D. Juncker. As early as 1836, a German congregation was organized at Louisville, Kentucky, by the Rev. Jos. Stahlschmidt; they soon erected St. Boniface's church, which was dedicated on the feast of All Saints, 1838. This church was attended for a time from Indiana and Ohio by the Rev. Jos. Ferneling and Rev. John M. Henni. In 1842, on 30 October, Bishop Chabrat dedicated St. Mary's church, Covington, Kentucky, a fine brick structure, erected by the German Catholics of that city. When, in 1833, the Rt. Rev. Frederick Reese became Bishop of Detroit, there were labouring in his diocese, among other German priests, the Redemptorist Fathers Saenderl and Hatscher. In the following year the German church of the Holy Trinity was established. At that time Vincennes was erected into a diocese. Three years later, we find a German congregation in Jasper County, Illinois. The German Catholics around Quincy, Illinois, had erected a house for a priest, and as a temporary chapel till their church was built. Father Charles Meyer's ministrations in the little log church of St. Andrew, at Belleville, Ill., was his first step to a future bishopric. In 1841 a German Catholic church was erected at West Point, Iowa, in the present Diocese of Dubuque. At Pittsburg the German Catholics attended St. Patrick's until their increasing numbers made it expedient for them to form a separate congregation. They then worshipped in a building previously used as a factory. In 1839, at Bishop Kenrick's suggestion, a community of Redemptorists then in Ohio, came and took charge of this mission, and the factory was soon transformed into the church of St. Philomena, with a Redemptorist convent attached—the first house of that congregation in the United States. Here, before long, the Rev. John N. Neumann received the habit and began his novitiate, to become in time Bishop of Philadelphia, and die in the odour of sanc-

tity. When, on 3 December, 1843, the first Bishop of Pittsburg reached that city, he found in his district a Catholic population estimated at forty-five thousand, 12,000 being of German origin.

An attempt at Catholic colonization was made about this time at St. Mary's, Elk County, where Messrs. Mathias Benziger and J. Eschbach, of Baltimore, purchased a large tract. Settlers soon gathered from Germany, who, from the first, were attended by the Redemptorist Fathers, but, though well managed, and encouraged by the hearty approval of the bishop, the town never attained any considerable size. Important and wide-reaching in its results, not only for the Diocese of Pittsburg, but for the Catholic Church in the United States, was the arrival at Pittsburg, 30 September, 1845, of the Benedictine monk, Dom Boniface Wimmer. The Rev. Peter Lemcke, a German priest, had been labouring for several years in the mission of Pennsylvania. His life had been a strange and varied one. Born in Mecklenburg, of Lutheran parents, he grew up attached to their sect, trained piously by those who still clung to the great doctrines of Christianity. Drafted into the army, he fought under Blücher at Waterloo, and afterwards returning to his home, resolved to become a Lutheran minister. To his astonishment and dismay, he found the professors to be men who, in their classes, ridiculed every religious belief which he had been taught to prize. He was led to study, and a thorough mastery of the works of Luther convinced him that Almighty God never could have chosen such a man to work any good in his Church. He went to Bavaria, where he began to study Catholic doctrines, and was received into the Church by Bishop Sailer. Having resolved to become a priest, he went through a course of study and was ordained. Coming to America in 1834, he was sent, in time, as assistant to Father Gallitzin, and laboured in the missions of Western Pennsylvania. As early as 1835, he appealed, in the Catholic papers of Germany, to the Benedictines to come to the United States. He returned to Europe in 1844, mainly to obtain German priests for the missions of the Diocese of Pittsburg. At Munich he met Dom Boniface Wimmer, a Benedictine monk of the ancient Abbey of Metten, in Bavaria, a religious whose thoughts had already turned to the American mission. Father Lemcke offered him a farm of 400 acres which he owned at Carrolltown, Maryland. Correspondence with Bishop O'Connor followed. Dom Boniface could not secure any priests of his order, but he obtained four students and fourteen lay brothers. Their project was liberally aided by the Ludwig-Verein, the Prince-Bishop of Munich, the Bishop of Linz, and others. After conducting his colony to Carrolltown, Father Wimmer paid his respects to Bishop O'Connor. That prelate urged him to accept the estate at St. Vincent's which Father Brouwers had left to the Church in the preceding century, rather than establish his monastery at Carrolltown. Visiting St. Vincent's with the bishop, Dom Boniface found there a brick church with a two-story brick house which, though built for a pastoral residence, had been an academy of Sisters of Mercy. He decided in favour of the bishop's suggestion, and, 19 October, 1846, the first community of Benedictine monks was organized in the schoolhouse at St. Vincent's. Father Wimmer took charge of the neighbouring congregation, and was soon attending several stations. His students were gradually ordained, and in a few years St. Vincent's was declared by the Holy See an independent priory, and was duly incorporated 10 May, 1853. Prior Wimmer showed great ability and zeal, and from the outset confined his labours as much as possible to German congregations.

Already, before 1850, the Rev. John E. Paulhuber and other Jesuit Fathers from Georgetown had been in charge of St. Mary's church at Richmond, Virginia, erected for Germans, of whom there were seven or



eight hundred in the city. In the Diocese of Wheeling, erected in 1850, there was a log chapel near the German settlement of Kingwood. About that time, German settlers were gathering in Preston, Doddridge, and Marshall Counties. Soon after, the Rev. F. Mosbach began to plan the erection of a church for the Germans in Wheeling. When Bishop Hughes, in 1843, returned from Europe, one of his first episcopal acts was the dedication of the church of the Most Holy Redeemer, on Third Street, New York, which the Redemptorists had erected for the German Catholics. The Rev. John Raffener, the Apostle of the Germans, reported the labours among his countrymen, in New York State, of Fathers Schneider at Albany, Schwenninger at Utica, Inama at Salina, the Redemptorists and Franciscans of St. Peter's church at Rochester, and announced that peace prevailed in the long distracted congregation of St. Louis, Buffalo. In New York City, St. Alphonsus, the second church of the Redemptorists for the Germans, was erected in 1848. The German Catholics of Albany, though struggling with difficulties, were soon rearing a neat Gothic church on Hamilton and Philip Streets. Addressing the Leopold Society, in January, 1850, to acknowledge their generous aid, Bishop McCloskey estimated the Catholic population of his diocese at 70,000, including 10,000 Germans. He had sixty-two churches, eleven of them for Germans. At about the same time, Bishop Timon, of Buffalo, estimated his flock at 40,000 souls, half of whom were Germans, attended by five secular priests and five Redemptorists. The Diocese of Cincinnati received, in 1843, a valuable accession, a colony of seven priests of the Congregation of the Most Precious Blood (Sanguinists), led by the Rev. Francis de Sales Brunner. The difficult mission of Peru was assigned to them by the bishop, with the charge of Norwalk and scattered stations in the neighbouring counties. The labours of the Sanguinist priests were signally blessed, and the healthy growth of the Church in that part of Ohio must be ascribed mainly to these excellent missionaries. In December, 1844, Father Brunner established a convent of his congregation at New Riegel, another, next year, at Thompson, and, in 1848, one at Glandorf. Each of these became the centre of religious influence for a large district. Father Brunner was born at Mumliswil, Switzerland, 10 January, 1795, entered the Congregation of the Precious Blood in 1838, and, after taking part in the establishment of a community in Switzerland, formed the project of a mission in America.

In April, 1845, Bishop Purcell, with a large gathering of the clergy, societies, ecclesiastics, and pupils of the schools, laid the corner-stone of the German church of St. John the Baptist, Green Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, to be dedicated on 1 November of the same year, by Bishop Henni of Milwaukee, who had done so much for the German Catholics of Cincinnati. St. Mary's church, at Detroit, Michigan, was dedicated for the Germans, 29 June, 1843. In 1844 Bishop Kenrick of St. Louis estimated the Catholic population of Missouri at 50,000, one-third being of German origin. At this time, St. Louis possessed the German church of St. Aloysius. The corner-stone of St. Joseph's, another church for the Germans, under the care of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, was laid in April, 1844. A letter sent, in 1850, by Archbishop Kenrick to the Leopold Association, gives the condition of the German Catholics of the diocese at this time.—Four of the ten churches in St. Louis were exclusively German. The Germans had their own orphan asylum and an Ursuline convent, with sisters from Hungary and Bavaria. Three German congregations in Scott County were attended by a priest at Benton. Two congregations in St. Charles County had each a German priest. Those in Washington County were attended by two German

Fathers of the Society of Jesus; and three other fathers attended four congregations in Osage and Cole Counties. Jefferson City had a German congregation and priest. In Gasconade County, the German Catholics were erecting a church. The archbishop was about to send a German priest to Montgomery County. Those at Boonville were visited by priests, but had no church, while those in Pettis, with five or six small congregations, were regularly attended.

By the close of the year 1844 the Rt. Rev. William Quarter, first Bishop of Chicago, had twenty-three priests in his diocese, one at the cathedral (the Rev. C. H. Ostlangenberg) to care for the Germans, while Quincy had its German congregation and priest. With a steadily increasing German flock, he appealed, and not in vain, to the Leopold Association and made plans to give them a church of their own in Chicago, as they were estimated at one thousand. Chapels were being erected at St. Peter's and at Teutopolis. After Easter, 1850, the Rt. Rev. James Oliver van de Velde, the second Bishop of Chicago, dedicated St. Joseph's church, at Grosse Pointe, or New Trier, erected by the Rev. Henry Fortmann, and exhorted the German Catholics at Ridgeville to commence building. In 1844, the Rev. Ivo Schacht, who had a large district, embracing several counties of the State of Tennessee, laid the corner-stone of a church at Clarksville. The German Catholics in Nashville desired a church of their own, and Bishop Miles appealed in their behalf to the Leopold Association.

When, in 1846, Bishop Loras of Dubuque, visited New Vienna, he found there 250 Germans, all Catholics. There were at that time more or less Germans everywhere in that diocese, and almost all farmers. On 19 April, 1846, Bishop Henni, of Milwaukee, laid the corner-stone of St. Mary's German church in that city. Before the Mexican War had begun, German settlements were established at Couhi, New Braunsfels, and Fredericksburg, Texas. About the year 1849 the Rev. Gregory Menzel was labouring among his countrymen at the two last-named places, as well as at Bastrop and Austin, urging Catholics, for the sake of the future of their families, to gather near each other so as to enjoy the benefits of church and school. Bishop Odin of Galveston, in 1851, visited Europe and, before the end of the following year, had the consolation of bringing with him four Franciscans from Bavaria to take care of his increasing German flock.

In the Diocese of Pittsburg the community of Benedictines had grown and prospered. New lands were acquired, and suitable buildings for various purposes were erected. In 1855, Prior Wimmer visited Rome, and Pope Pius IX, on 24 August, made St. Vincent's an exempt abbey, and on 17 September appointed the Rt. Rev. Boniface Wimmer mitred abbot for a term of three years. St. Vincent's College, opened in 1849, had thriven with the growth of the community and soon had a large number of students. The course was thorough, and pupils had special advantages for acquiring a practical knowledge of German. The Redemptorists were labouring earnestly in Pittsburg, under Father Seelos and others. In 1851 they laid the foundation of St. Joseph's German Orphan Asylum. When, in 1853, the See of Erie was erected, the German Catholics had a little church in that city. Williamsburg, New York, had a German church of the Holy Trinity many years before the Diocese of Brooklyn, to which it now belongs, was erected. In Brooklyn, St. Boniface's, purchased from the Episcopalians, was dedicated for the use of the Germans in 1854, as were Holy Trinity and St. Malachy's in East New York. From the year 1849, the German Catholics at Elizabeth, Diocese of Newark, were visited by the Redemptorist Fathers till the Rev. Augustine Dantner, O. S. F., became their resident priest in 1852. Bishop Bayley endeavoured to secure the Benedictine Fathers for St. Mary's German

Church, Newark, and in 1856 the Rt. Rev. Abbot Wimmer sent Father Valentine Felder, O. S. B., to that city. Two years later, St. Michael's German church was dedicated. In 1853 the Abbot of Einsiedeln, at the request of the Bishop of Vincennes, sent a colony of Benedictine monks to Indiana. They settled in Spencer County, where they founded the Abbey of St. Meinrad. At that time, the Very Rev. Jos. Kundeck had been for twenty years vicar-general of the diocese, in which he laboured most zealously. In 1857 the sovereign pontiff established the Diocese of Fort Wayne, selecting for its first bishop, the Rev. John Henry Luers, born near Munster, Westphalia, 29 September, 1819. He soon dedicated St. Mary's German church, the pastor of which was the Rev. Joseph Wentz. In the summer of 1858 the Franciscan Fathers of the Province of the Holy Cross founded a residence at Teutopolis, Effingham County, Illinois, under the Very Rev. Damian Hennewig. The corner-stone of the college was laid in 1861, and the institution opened in the next year. A similar institution arose at Quincy. The German Catholic church at Alton was, in June, 1860, destroyed by a tornado, but the congregation courageously set to work to replace it by a more substantial edifice. In 1856, the Salesianum, the famous seminary of Milwaukee, was opened, with the Very Rev. Michael Heiss as rector and the Rev. Dr. Joseph Salzmann as leading professor. The church of the seminary was consecrated in 1861. The fine church of St. Joseph was erected at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1856, by Rev. C. Holzhauser. A community of the Capuchin Order, destined to spread to many parts of the United States and to distinguish itself by successful mission work, arose in the diocese. Two secular priests, Fathers Haas and Frey, conceived the idea of establishing a Capuchin house. After some correspondence, a father of the order came from Europe and opened a novitiate, receiving the two priests as novices in 1857. After their profession postulants came, the community grew, and God blessed their labours wonderfully. The first German priest on record in Upper California, was the Rev. Florian Schweninger, who first appears at Shasta, in 1854. He must have arrived in 1853. In 1856 the Rev. Sebastian Wolf had charge of a station at Placerville, California. He was later (1858-59) stationed at St. Patrick's church as assistant, but preached the German sermon at St. Mary's cathedral, at the nine-o'clock Mass on Sundays. He began to erect a church for the Germans early in 1860, and since then St. Boniface's congregation has formed an independent parish. He remained pastor until the archbishop called from St. Louis some Franciscans, who took charge and, in 1893, founded another German parish, St. Anthony's, in the southern part of the city. In the lower part of the State, the Diocese of Monterey, the first German name found in the parish records of San Diego is that of the Rev. J. Christ. Holbein, missionary Apostolic, who was in charge of both the former Indian mission and the city of San Diego, from July, 1849, to February, 1850. A German settlement for the first time appears in the Catholic Directory as an out-mission of Santa Anna in 1867, but it had no German priests until years after. It is St. Boniface's. The first German parish of Los Angeles, St. Joseph's, was organized in 1888; the first German church in Sacramento in 1894. German Jesuits went to work in what is now Oregon and Washington, with others of their order, in the early forties, and since then German parishes have arisen. No German priests or settlers of account reached New Mexico until within the last fifteen or twenty years.

Gradually German Catholics were to be found in nearly every part of the United States, especially in New York, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, everywhere establishing flourishing congregations

with schools and churches. The number of German Catholics in the United States can only be given approximately. Over one-third of the Germans from the German Empire, as well as the majority of the Germans from Austria, are Catholics; accordingly, almost one-half of the Germans in this country should be Catholics. Making liberal allowance for the leakage, we may safely say that at least one-fourth, i. e. over three millions, are Catholics. This is a conservative estimate. The leakage is considerable among Catholics of all nationalities. For the defection of Germans in particular, the following reasons must be assigned. Where Germans settled in small numbers, frequently there were no priests of their own tongue. Left to themselves, they were in a condition of religious isolation; they gradually neglected religious practices and finally lost their faith. Although this applies to all immigrants who do not speak English, it proved specially disastrous in the case of the Germans. As over one-half of the German settlers were Protestant, and frequently had churches and various church organizations, there was a non-Catholic atmosphere around them; mixed marriages, particularly in such places, frequently resulted in losses to the Catholic Church. Great as the contributions of the immigrants of '48 were to the intellectual advancement of the United States, it cannot be denied that, on the whole, their influence was not favourable from a religious viewpoint. The same must be said of certain German organizations, as the turnvereins, which frequently manifested an anti-Catholic, and even anti-religious, spirit. Nor can it be denied that Socialistic principles were largely spread by German immigrants and German publications. Small wonder that hundreds of thousands of Germans have been lost to the Catholic Church.

*German Churches and Religious Communities.*—No attempt is made to give exact statistics of German Catholic churches and parishes, because such are not available at the present time. A general idea, however, can be formed from the fact, that among the 15,655 priests in the Catholic Directory for the United States, about one third bear German names. Among the more distinguished German prelates, mention should be made of John Martin Henni, first Bishop, and later Archbishop, of Milwaukee; Michael Heiss, Archbishop of Milwaukee; Seb. Gebhard Messmer, Bishop of Green Bay, now Archbishop of Milwaukee; Winand S. Wigger, third Bishop of Newark, a wise ruler, a devout priest, and notable for his practical work as head of the St. Raphael Society for the protection of immigrants; and most particularly of the saintly Bishop Neumann of Philadelphia, whose beatification is the earnest hope of all American Catholics.

Of the great number of European orders and congregations of men and women labouring in the United States for man's spiritual or physical welfare, the following are of German origin and even now (1909) are recruited chiefly from Germans or their descendants:—

*Religious Orders of Men.* (1) Benedictines.—(a) American Cassinese Congregation, founded in 1846, by the Rev. Boniface Wimmer, O.S.B.—At the present time there belong to this congregation the following independent abbeys: St. Vincent's Arch-Abbey, Beatty, Pennsylvania, with 126 fathers, 5 deacons, 23 clerics, 64 lay brothers, and 4 novices; St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota, with 94 fathers, 11 clerics, 26 lay brothers, 9 novices; St. Benedict's Abbey, Atchison, Kansas, with 51 fathers, 6 clerics, 18 brothers; St. Mary's Abbey, Newark, New Jersey, with 40 fathers, 7 clerics, 14 lay brothers; Maryhelp Abbey, Belmont, North Carolina, the Rt. Rev. Leo Haid, D.D., O.S.B., abbot-bishop, 31 fathers, 1 deacon, 4 clerics, 36 lay brothers, 4 novices; St. Bernard's Abbey, Cullman Co., Alabama, with 38 fathers,

1 deacon, 3 subdeacons, 12 clerics, 16 lay brothers, 6 postulants; St. Procopius's Abbey, Chicago, Illinois, with 14 fathers, 6 clerics, 20 lay brothers, 6 novices; St. Leo's Abbey, St. Leo, Florida, with 12 fathers, 16 lay brothers, 3 novices. (b) Swiss American Congregation, founded by Pope Pius IX, 1871, and Pope Leo XIII, 1881.—To this congregation belong the following abbeys: St. Meinrad's Abbey, St. Meinrad, Indiana, founded in 1854 by two Benedictine Fathers from Einsiedeln, Switzerland; an abbey since 1871, 50 fathers, 6 clerics, 42 lay brothers, 7 novices; Conception Abbey, Conception, Missouri, founded in 1873 by Fathers Frown Conrad and Adelhelm Oidermatt from the Benedictine Abbey, Engelberg, Switzerland; an abbey since 1881, 42 fathers, 7 clerics, 26 lay brothers, 4 novices; New Subiaco Abbey, Spierville, Arkansas, with 30 fathers, 5 clerics, 23 lay brothers, 5 novices; St. Joseph's Abbey, Gessen, Louisiana, with 19 fathers, 4 clerics, 8 lay brothers, 3 novices; St. Mary's Abbey, Richardson, North Dakota, with 21 fathers, 8 clerics, 12 lay brothers, 11 novices; St. Benedict's Abbey, Mt. Angel, Oregon, with 18 fathers, 7 clerics, 28 lay brothers, 2 novices.—With these abbeys are connected 17 colleges and numerous parishes, stations, and missions. (2) Capuchins.—There are two provinces: (a) St. Joseph's, extending over the States of New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Dakota, and the Dioceses of Chicago and Fort Wayne; (b) St. Augustine's, comprising the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois (the Dioceses of Chicago and Fort Wayne excepted).—(a) St. Joseph's Province, founded in 1857 by two secular priests, Fathers Gregory Haas and John Anthony Frey, numbers 67 fathers, 19 professed clerics, 43 professed brothers, 2 novices, and 10 Brothers of the Third Order; (b) St. Augustine's Province, founded in 1874, by the Capuchin Fathers Hyacinth Epp and Matthias Hay, with 64 fathers, 18 professed clerics, 37 professed lay brothers, 5 novices, 2 Brothers of the Third Order. (3) Franciscans.—The three provinces, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, of St. John the Baptist, of the Most Holy Name, number 431 fathers, 145 clerics, 233 lay brothers, 36 Tertiary Brothers, and 10 novices. (4) Jesuits.—About 200 Jesuits from the Fatherland are labouring in the United States. Besides, there are several hundred Jesuits of German descent who were born in this country. For nearly forty years there was a distinct German division called the Buffalo mission of the German Province, with colleges at Buffalo, New York; Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio; Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin; two Indian missions in South Dakota, and other houses. In 1907, the mission numbered about 300 members; in that year the mission was separated from the mother-province, and the houses and members joined to different American provinces. (5) Redemptorists.—Although now many other nationalities are represented in the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, it still numbers a great many Germans among its members. The two provinces of Baltimore and St. Louis are composed of 325 fathers, 95 professed students, 22 choir novices, 121 professed lay brothers, 48 novice lay brothers and postulants. (6) Fathers of the Precious Blood.—This congregation, founded at Rome in 1814 is divided into four provinces, three European and one American. The American province was organized in 1844 by the Rev. Francis S. Brunner, and most of its members are Germans, either by birth or by descent. The congregation is represented in the Dioceses of Cincinnati, Fort Wayne, Cleveland, Kansas City, St. Joseph, St. Paul, Chicago, and San Antonio.—100 fathers, 6 clerics, 82 lay brothers, and 32 novices. (7) Alexian Brothers.—They conduct hospitals and asylums, in the Archdioceses of Chicago and St. Louis, the Dioceses of Green Bay and Newark.—99 professed brothers, 5 novices, 6 postulants.

(There are also numerous Germans among the Passionists, Dominicans, Lazarists and the Fathers of the Holy Cross.)

*Religious Orders of Women.* (1) Sisters of St. Benedict.—In 1852 the first colony of Benedictine Sisters came to the United States from Eichstätt, Bavaria, and settled in St. Mary's, Elk County, in the Diocese of Erie, Pennsylvania. At present they have also houses in many other dioceses. They number about 2000 sisters, 135 novices, and 115 postulants. (2) Sisters of Christian Charity.—They were established in 1874 by sisters from Paderborn, Germany. The sisters conduct establishments in 17 dioceses; they number about 731, including novices and postulants. The mother-house for the United States is at Wilkes-barre, Pennsylvania. (3) Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis.—(a) Mother-house at Peoria, Illinois, founded in 1876, by sisters from the house of Bethlehem, Herford, Westphalia, Germany. 151 sisters, 32 novices, 28 postulants. (b) Mother-house at Glen Riddle, Pennsylvania. 804 professed sisters, 54 novices, 8 postulants. (c) Mother-house at 337 Pine Street, Buffalo, New York. 256 sisters, 30 novices, 14 postulants. (d) Mother-house at Syracuse, New York; Millvale, Pennsylvania, and at Mt. Loretto, Staten Island, New York. All these houses are German foundations, though now many sisters of other nationalities belong to them. (4) Sisters of the Third Order Regular of St. Francis.—There are about 600 sisters, 48 novices, and 7 postulants, with mother-house at Oldenburg, Indiana. They were founded in the year 1851, by Mother M. Theresa of Vienna, Austria. (5) Sisters of St. Francis.—Their mother-house at 749 Washington Street, Buffalo, New York, was founded in 1874, by sisters from Nonnenwerth near Rolandseck, Rhenish Prussia. There are 268 sisters. (6) Franciscan Sisters.—Founded in 1872, by sisters from Salzkotten, Germany. Mother-house for the United States, at St. Louis, Missouri. There are 192 sisters. (7) School Sisters of St. Francis.—Their mother-house and novitiate are at Milwaukee, Wisconsin. There are 668 professed sisters, 110 novices, 54 postulants. (8) Franciscan Sisters of the Perpetual Adoration.—Founded in 1853, by Most Rev. M. Heiss, D.D. There are 364 professed sisters, 45 novices, and 42 postulants. Mother-house at St. Rose Convent, La Crosse, Wisconsin. (9) Hospital Sisters of St. Francis.—Founded in 1875, by sisters from Münster, Westphalia, Germany. Sisters 299, novices 24, postulants 6. Provincial House at St. John's Hospital, Springfield, Illinois. (10) Poor Sisters of St. Francis of the Perpetual Adoration.—Provincial house at St. Francis Convent, Lafayette, Indiana. Founded by Sisters from Olpe, Westphalia, Germany. Professed sisters 573, novices 65, postulants 24. (11) Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis.—Founded by sisters from Aachen, Germany. They conduct hospitals in eight dioceses, and number about 530. (12) The Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ.—The American Province of this sisterhood was established in August, 1863, at Fort Wayne, Indiana. The mother-house and novitiate are still united with the general mother-house at Dernbach, Germany. They number 423 professed sisters, 32 novices, 19 postulants. (13) School Sisters of Notre Dame. General mother-house, Munich, Bavaria. Principal mother-house in America, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. First convent established at Baltimore, 1847. The sisters form the largest teaching Congregation in the United States and conduct schools in nearly all the dioceses. Number of sisters and novices 3368, besides 238 candidates, with 99,009 pupils. (14) Sisters of the Most Precious Blood.—(a) Mother-house at Maria Stein, Ohio, established in 1834, by sisters from Switzerland. (b) Mother-house at Ruma, Illinois; established in 1868, at Piopolis, Illinois, by sisters from Gurtweil, Baden, Germany; transferred to Ruma, in 1876. (c)

Mother-house at O'Fallon, Missouri. About 1000 sisters belong to this congregation. (15) Sisters of Divine Providence. Mother-house at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, and Brightside, Holyoke, Massachusetts. The Pittsburg mother-house was established in 1876, by sisters from Mainz, Germany. There are now about 400 sisters in all.

Besides all these, there are several smaller German religious congregations in the United States. In other congregations also, not of German foundation, there are now many German sisters. There must be, therefore, upwards of twelve thousand sisters of German origin in this country.

*Parochial Schools.*—From the very beginning, of their settling in this country the German Catholics had at heart the establishing of parochial schools. Interesting details are given concerning the schools at Goshenhoppen and Conewago. The school at Goshenhoppen was begun by Father Schneider, S.J. (who had previously served as Rector Magnificus, or elective head, of Heidelberg University), soon after his arrival, in 1741. It was under his charge for twenty years, and under Father Ritter's during the twenty-three succeeding years. It was attended by the children of the whole neighbourhood, Protestant as well as Catholic, it being the only one in the place. About the time of the close of the French and Indian War, the school, for the first time, engaged the services of a lay teacher. Contrary to the custom which prevailed in the Colonies generally, the schoolmaster was looked upon as a person of distinction in the little world of Goshenhoppen. Three schoolmasters are mentioned in the parish registers between 1763 and 1796: Henry Fredder, Breitenbach, and John Lawrence Gubernator. The last-named was no doubt the most distinguished of the three. Born at Oppenheim, Germany, in 1735, he served as an officer in the army of the Allies in the Seven Years' War, and came to America during the Revolutionary War. Highly educated, and a devoted teacher, he rendered eminent services to the cause of Catholic education in Pennsylvania, during a period of twenty-five years. When, about 1787, the school near Conewago was so far developed as to be able to support a lay teacher, the services of this famous schoolmaster were obtained.

These schools, along with the other schools established and conducted by the Jesuits, have greatly influenced the development of the Catholic parochial school system in the United States. This early zeal for founding parochial schools is typical of the activity of the Germans during all succeeding periods. Wherever they settled in sufficient numbers the schoolhouse soon rose by the side of the parish church, and until the present day they have never ceased to be staunch and unflinching advocates of the parochial school system.

*Societies.*—The natural inclination and aptitude of the Germans for organizations issued in the formation of numerous social and religious associations. Besides parochial and local societies there is one organization which exerted a far-reaching influence, namely, the Central-Verein. The wonderful organization of the Centre Party in the Fatherland and the admirable unity shown by the German Catholics during the *Kulturkampf*, naturally stimulated the German Catholics in the United States to unite their efforts in vast organizations. "Germany is the land of fearless Catholicity, where Catholics have made themselves respected. . . . There is a vigor in German Catholicity, both political and doctrinal, that should excite our admiration, and be for us a splendid example for imitation. Who can reflect upon the work of the Centre Party, from Mallinckrodt and Windthorst to the late lamented Lieber, without a feeling of pride and satisfaction?" (Father John Conway, S.J.).—There is no doubt that the Central-Verein would never have become what it now is without the noble

example of Catholic Germany. Founded in 1855, the Central-Verein had for its object, above all, the material aid of its members. But gradually, it broadened its programme, and it became one of the objects of the organization "to stand for Catholic interests in the spirit of the Catholic Church". It has been said, and justly, that perhaps no other Catholic organization in the United States can point to a greater number of positive results, tending to promote the welfare of our fellow-men, than the Central-Verein. It has been a firm support of our youthful and flourishing Church, and has nobly contributed towards its gratifying development. For decades it has unflinchingly laboured in the interest of the parochial school and for the preservation of the German language. Chiefly under its influence were founded the Teachers' Seminary, at St. Francis, and the Leo House, an institution in New York City for Catholic immigrants by which thousands have been rescued from bodily and spiritual perdition. The German American *Katholikentage* likewise owed their origin to the activity of the men of the Central-Verein, after the model of the famous annual assemblies of the German Catholics, in the Fatherland. The influence of this splendid organization on the formation of the Federation of Catholic Societies cannot be overrated.—"The young organization breathes the spirit which animated the Central-Verein during the past fifty years; the programme of the Federation, in its essential parts, is identical with that of the Central-Verein, so that the former helps to further and complete what the vigorous and valiant Germans began."—Together with Bishop McFaul of Trenton, the German Archbishop Messmer, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is the prime mover and leading spirit of the Federation.

*The Press.*—More than twenty-five weekly papers are published in the United States for the benefit of German Catholics, besides a goodly number of monthly periodicals. The first German Catholic paper, "Der Wahrheitsfreund", was established in 1837, by the Rev. John M. Henni. After an existence of almost seventy years it ceased to appear in 1907. Another weekly which no longer exists, but which for many years rendered essential service to religion, was the "Katholische Kirchenzeitung". Maximilian Oertel, the founder of this weekly, was born at Ansbach, Bavaria, in 1811, and arrived in this country in the beginning of the year 1839, highly commended by the heads of his denomination, to attend Lutheran immigrants in the United States. On 15 March of the following year he was received into the Catholic Church, to which he remained true and faithful throughout the rest of his life, doing excellent service to the Catholic cause as one of the most brilliant editors the Germans ever produced in this country. The "Ohio Waisenfreund", founded in 1873, and edited by the indefatigable Rev. Jos. Jessing, later Monsignore, has a larger circulation than any other Catholic weekly in the country. It has been doing a great amount of good these thirty-five years, the finest monument of its missionary spirit being the "Josephinum", a seminary for the education of candidates for the priesthood. Whereas an English Catholic daily for many years has been a desideratum not yet realized, the German Catholics have two daily papers: "Amerika" (St. Louis), from 1878–1902 under the editorship of the famous Dr. Edward Preuss, and the "Buffalo Volksfreund" (Buffalo, New York). In connexion with these periodical publications, may be mentioned the "Pastoral-Blatt", for a number of years edited by the Rev. W. Färber, of St. Louis, which existed long before the able English "Ecclesiastical Review" was founded and edited by Dr. Herman J. Heuser.

It is surely deserving of notice that among Catholic publishers in this country the German names of Benziger, Herder, and Pustet stand in the front rank. Nor should it be overlooked, that the translations of



German religious works—as Deharbe's Catechism, Wilmer's "Hand-book of the Christian Religion", Schuster's Bible History, the works of Knecht, Alzog, Bruck, Spirago, Schanz, Hettinger, etc.—have been largely used, and are still being used, for the religious instruction of American Catholics. The words of Father John A. Conway, S.J. (in the preface to Fr. von Hammerstein's work, "Edgar, or from Atheism to the Full Truth") may well be quoted in this connexion: "Who can read the works that teem from the German Catholic press without feeling that the defence of Catholic truth is in brave and fearless hands? It is in Germany that the fiercest on-slauts are made upon revealed truth by rationalists, materialists, pantheists, Kantians, Hegelians, evolutionists, etc. But it is from Germany, too, that we get our best defence and our ablest expositions of Catholic doctrines." Thus we see that, although the efforts of the German Catholics, naturally, are concerned in the first place, with the religious affairs of their own people, still their activity has produced beneficial results for the Catholic body in general.

For Germans in General.—COBB, *The Story of the Palatines* (New York, 1879); VIERECK, *German Instruction in American Schools* (Washington, 1902); McMASTER, *A History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1883-1900); LOHER, *Geschichte und Zustände der Deutschen in Amerika* (Göttingen, 1855); SEIDENSTICKER, *Die erste Deutsche Einwanderung in Amerika und die Gründung von Germantown im Jahre, 1683* (Philadelphia, 1883); KÜRNER, *Das Deutsche Element in den Vereinigten Staaten, 1815-1848* (New York, 1884); KAPP, *Die Deutschen im Staate New York während des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (New York, 1884); JANNET-KAMPEFF, *Die Vereinigten Staaten Nordamerikas in der Gegenwart* (Freiburg im Br., 1893); KNORTZ, *Das Deutschtum in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Hamburg, 1897); GÜBEL, *Das Deutschtum in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika* (Munich, 1904).

The German Catholics in America.—SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886-1892); BURNS, *The Catholic School System in the United States* (New York, 1908); ENGELHARDT, *A True History of the Missions and Missionaries of California* (Watsonville, California); SCHWICKERATH, *Jesuits as Missionaries in The Review* (St. Louis, 1901); WILTIUS, *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, annual); HAMMER, *Die Katholische Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten Nordamerikas* (New York, 1897); SHAEFFER and HERBERMANN, *Records and Studies in U. S. Cath. Historical Society*, I, 110; HERBERMANN, *A Catholic German Colony in Ohio in U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine*, IV, 125.

FRANCIS M. SCHIRP.

**Germanus I**, SAINT, Patriarch of Constantinople (715-30). b. at Constantinople towards the end of the reign of Emperor Heraclius (610-41); d. there 733 or 740. The son of Justinianus, a patrician, Germanus dedicated himself to the service of the Church and became a cleric at the cathedral of the metropolis. Some time after the death of his father, who had filled various high official positions, at the hands of the nephew of Heraclius, Germanus was consecrated Bishop of Cyzicus, but the exact year of his elevation is not known. According to Theophanes and Nicephorus, he was present in this capacity at the Synod of Constantinople held in 712 at the instance of the new emperor, Philippicus, who favoured Monothelitism. The object of the council was to re-establish Monothelitism and to condemn the Acts of the Sixth General Council of 681. Even Germanus is said to have bowed to the imperial will, with the majority of the Greek bishops (Mansi, Conc. Coll., XII, 192-96). However, immediately after the dethronement of Emperor Philippicus (713) his successor, Anastasius II, restored orthodoxy, and Monothelitism was now definitively banished from the Byzantine Empire. If Germanus really yielded for a short time to the false teachings of the Monothelites, he now once more acknowledged the orthodox definition of the two wills in Christ. John, Patriarch of Constantinople, appointed by Philippicus to succeed the deposed Cyrus, sent to Pope Constantine a letter of submission and accepted the true doctrine of the Church promulgated at the Council of 681, whereupon he was recognized by the pope as Patriarch of Constantinople. On his death Germanus was raised to the patriarchal see (715), which

he held until 730. Immediately (715 or 716) he convened at Constantinople a synod of Greek bishops, who acknowledged and proclaimed anew the doctrine of the two wills and the two operations in Christ, and placed under anathema Sergius, Cyrus, and the other leaders of Monothelism (q.v.). Germanus entered into communication with the Armenian Monophysites, with a view to restoring them to unity with the Church, but without success. Soon after his elevation to the patriarchal dignity the Iconoclastic storm burst forth in the Byzantine Church, Leo III the Isaurian, who was opposed to the veneration of images having just acceded to the imperial throne (716). Bishop Constantine of Nacoleia in Phrygia, who like some other bishops of the empire condemned the veneration of the pictures and images of Christ and the saints, went to Constantinople, and entered into a discussion with Germanus on the subject. The patriarch represented the traditional use of the Church, and sought to convince Constantine of the propriety of reverencing images. Apparently he was converted to the teaching of the patriarch, but he did not deliver the letter entrusted to him by Germanus for the Metropolitan of Synnada, for which he was excommunicated. At the same time the learned patriarch wrote to Bishop Thomas of Claudiopolis, another Iconoclast, and developed in detail the sound principles underlying the reverencing of images, as against the recent innovations. Emperor Leo III, however, did not recede from his position, and everywhere encouraged the iconoclasts. In a volcanic eruption between the islands of Thera and Therasia he saw a Divine judgment for the idolatry of image-worship, and in an edict (726) explained that Christian images had taken the place of idols, and the venerators of images were idolaters, since, according to the law of God (Ex., xx, 4), no product of the hand of man may be adored. Immediately afterwards, the first Iconoclastic disturbances broke out in Constantinople. The Patriarch Germanus vigorously opposed the emperor, and sought to convert him to a truer view of things, whereupon Leo attempted to depose him. Germanus turned to Pope Gregory II (729), who in a lengthy epistle praised his zeal and steadfastness. The emperor in 730 summoned the council before which Germanus was cited to subscribe to an imperial decree prohibiting images. He resolutely refused, and was thereupon compelled to resign his patriarchal office, being succeeded by the pliant Anastasius. Germanus withdrew to the home of his family, where he died some years later at an advanced age. The Œcumenical Council of Nicæa (787) bestowed high praise on Germanus, who is venerated as a saint in both the Greek and the Latin Church. His feast is celebrated on 12 May. Several writings of Germanus have been preserved (Migne, P. G., XCVIII, 39-454), viz., "Narratio de sanctis synodis", a dialogue "De vitæ termino", a letter to the Armenians, and three letters on the reverencing of images, as well as nine discourses in the extravagant rhetorical style of the later Byzantines. Of doubtful authenticity is the "Historia ecclesiastica et mystica", also attributed to him (Migne, loc. cit., 383-454).

PARCQRE, *L'Eglise Byzantine de 527 à 847* (Paris, 1905); HURTER, *Nomenclator*; KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Literatur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897), 66 sqq.; HEFELE, *Konstanzgesch.*, 2nd ed., III, 363 sqq., 380 sq.; HERGENRÖTHER AND KIRSCH, *Kirchengeschichte*, 4th ed., II, 6, 16-17, 266.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Germany**.—From their first appearance in the history of the world the Germans represented the principle of unchecked individualism, as opposed to the Roman principle of an all-embracing authority. German history in the Middle Ages was strongly influenced by two opposing principles: universalism and individualism. After Arminius had fought for German freedom in the Teutoburg Forest the idea that the



race was entitled to be independent gradually became a powerful factor in its historical development. This conception first took form when the Germanic states grew out of the Roman Empire. Even Theodoric the Great thought of uniting the discordant barbarian countries with the aid of the *leges gentium* into a great confederation of the Mediterranean. Although in these Mediterranean countries the Roman principle finally prevailed, being that of a more advanced civilization, still the individualistic forces which contributed to found these states were not wasted. By them the world-embracing empire of Rome was overthrown and the way prepared for the national principle. It was not until after the fall of the Western Empire that a great Frankish kingdom became possible and the Franks, no longer held in check by the Roman Empire, were able to draw together the tribes of the old Teutonic stock and to lay the foundation of a German empire. Before this the Germanic tribes had been continually at variance; no tie bound them together; even the common language failed to produce unity. On the other hand, the so-called *Lautverschiebung*, or shifting of the consonants, in German, separated the North and South Germans. Nor was German mythology a source of union, for the tribal centres of worship rather increased the already existing particularism. The Germans had not even a common name. Since the eighth century most probably the designations *Franks* and *Frankish* extended beyond the boundaries of the Frankish tribe. It was not, however, until the ninth century that the expression *theodisk* (later German *Deutsch*), signifying "popular", or "belonging to people", made its appearance, and a great stretch of time divided this beginning from the use of the word as a name of the nation.

The work of uniting Germany was not begun by a tribe living in the interior but by one on the outskirts of the country. The people called Franks suddenly appear in history in the third century. They represented no single tribe, but consisted of a combination of Low and High German tribes. Under the leadership of Clovis (Chlodwig) the Franks overthrew the remains of the Roman power in Gaul and built up the Frankish State on a Germano-Romanic foundation. The German tribes were conquered one after another and colonized in the Roman manner. Large extents of territory were marked out as belonging to the king, and on these military colonies were founded. The commanders of these military colonies gradually became administrative functionaries, and the colonies themselves grew into peaceful agricultural village communities. For a long time political expressions, such as *Hundreds*, recalled the original military character of the people. From that time the Frankish ruler became the German overlord, but the centrifugal tendency of the Germanic tribes reacted against this sovereignty as soon as the Merovingian Dynasty began slowly to decline, owing to internal feuds. In each of the tribes after this the duke rose to supremacy over his fellow tribesmen. From the seventh century the tribal duke became an almost independent sovereign. These ducal states originated in the supreme command of large bodies of troops, and then in the administration of large territories by dukes. At the same time the disintegration was aided by the bad administration of the counts, the officials in charge of the territorial districts (*Gau*), who were no longer supervised by the central authority. But what was most disastrous was that an unruly aristocracy sought to control all the economical interests and to exercise arbitrary powers over politics. These sovereign nobles had become powerful through the feudal system, a form of government which gave to medieval Germany its peculiar character. Caesar in his day found that it was customary among the Gauls for a freeman, the "client", voluntarily to enter into a relation of dependence on a "senior". This surrender (*commendatio*) took place in

order to obtain the protection of the lord or to gain the usufruct of land. From this Gallic system of clientship there developed, in Frankish times, the conception of the "lord's man" (*homagium* or *hominium*), who by an oath swore fealty to his suzerain and became a *vassus*, or *gasindus*, or *homo*. The result of the growth of this idea was that finally there appeared, throughout the kingdom, along with royalty, powerful territorial lords with their *vassi* or *vassalli*, as their followers were called from the eighth century. The vassals received as *fief* (*beneficium*) a piece of land of which they enjoyed the use for life. The struggle of the Franks with the Arabs quickened the development of the feudal system, for the necessity of creating an army of horsemen then became evident. Moreover the poorer freemen, depressed in condition by the frequent wars, could not be required to do service as horsemen, a duty that could only be demanded from the vassals of the great landowners. In order to force these territorial lords to do military service fiefs were granted from the already existing public domain, and in their turn the great lords granted part of these fiefs to their retainers. Thus the Frankish king was gradually transformed from a lord of the land and people to a feudal lord over the beneficiaries directly and indirectly dependent upon him by feudal tenure. By the end of the ninth century the feudal system had bound together the greater part of the population.

While in this way the secular aristocracy grew into a power, at the same time the Church was equally strengthened by feudalism. The Christian Church during this era—a fact of the greatest importance—was the guardian of the remains of classical culture. With this culture the Church was to endow the Germans. Moreover it was to bring them a great fund of new moral conceptions and principles, much increase in knowledge, and skill in art and handicrafts. The well-knit organization of the Church, the convincing logic of dogma, the grandeur of the doctrine of salvation, the sweet poetry of the liturgy, all these captured the understanding of the simple-minded but fine-natured primitive German. It was the Church, in fact, that first brought the exaggerated individualism of the race under control and developed in it gradually, by means of asceticism, those social virtues essential to the State. The country was converted to Christianity very slowly, for the Church had here a difficult problem to solve, namely, to replace the natural conception of life by an entirely different one that appeared strange to the people. The acceptance of the Christian name and ideas was at first a purely mechanical one, but it became an inner conviction. No people has shown a more logical or deeper comprehension of the organization and saving aims of the Christian Church. None has exhibited a like devotion to the idea of the Church, nor did any people contribute more in the Middle Ages to the greatness of the Church than the German. In the conversion of Germany much credit is due the Irish and Scotch, but the real founders of Christianity in Germany are the Anglo-Saxons, above all St. Boniface. Among the early missionaries were: St. Columbanus, the first to come to the Continent (about 583), who laboured in Swabia; Fridolin, the founder of Säkingen; Pirminius, who established the monastery of Reichenau in 724; and Gallus (d. 645), the founder of St. Gall. The cause of Christianity was furthered in Bavaria by Rupert of Worms (beginning of the seventh century), Corbinian (d. 730), and Emmeram (d. 715). The great organizer of the Church of Bavaria was St. Boniface. The chief herald of the Faith among the Franks was the Scotchman, St. Kilian (end of the seventh century); the Frisians received Christianity through Willibrord (d. 739). The real Apostle of Germany was St. Boniface, whose chief work was in Central Germany and Bavaria. Acting in conjunction with Rome he organized the German Church,

and finally in 755 met the death of a martyr at the hands of the Frisians. After the Church had thus obtained a good foothold it soon reached a position of much importance in the eyes of the youthful German peoples. By grants of land the princes gave it an economic power which was greatly increased when many freemen voluntarily became dependents of these new spiritual lords; thus, besides the secular territorial aristocracy, there developed a second power, that of the ecclesiastical princes. Antagonism between these two elements was perceptible at an early date. Pepin sought to remove the difficulty by strengthening the Frankish Church and placing between the secular and spiritual lords the new Carolingian king, who, by the assumption of the title *Dei gratia*, obtained a somewhat religious character.

The Augustinian conception of the Kingdom of God early influenced the Frankish State; political and religious theories unconsciously blended. The union of Church and State seemed the ideal which was to be realized. Each needed the other; the State needed the Church as the only source of real order and true education; the Church needed for its activities the protection of the secular authority. In return for the training in morals and learning that the Church gave, the State granted it large privileges, such as: the *privilegium fori* or freedom from the jurisdiction of the State; immunity, that is exemption from taxes and services to the State, from which gradually grew the right to receive the taxes of the tenants residing on the exempt lands and the right to administer justice among them; further, release from military service; and, finally, the granting of great fiefs that formed the basis of the later ecclesiastical sovereignties. The reverse of this picture soon became apparent; the ecclesiastics to whom had been given lands and offices in fief became dependent on secular lords. Thus the State at an early date had a share in the making of ecclesiastical laws, exercised the right of patronage, appointed to dioceses, and soon undertook, especially in the time of Charles Martel, the secularization of church lands. Consequently the question of the relation of Church and State soon claimed attention; it was the most important question in the history of the German Middle Ages. Under the first German emperor this problem seemed to find its solution.

Real German history begins with Charlemagne (768-814). The war with the Saxons was the most important one he carried on, and the result of this struggle, of fundamental importance for German history, was that the Saxons were brought into connexion with the other Germanic tribes and did not fall under Scandinavian influence. The lasting union of the Franks, Saxons, Frisians, Thuringians, Hessians, Alamanni, and Bavarians, that Charlemagne effected, formed the basis of a national combination which gradually lost sight of the fact that it was the product of compulsion. From the time of Charlemagne the above-named German tribes lived under Frankish constitution retaining their own old laws, the *leges barbarorum*, which Charlemagne codified. Another point of importance for German development was that Charlemagne fixed the boundary between his domain and the Slavs, including the Wends, on the farther side of the Elbe and Saale Rivers. It is true that Charlemagne did not do all this according to a deliberate plan, but mainly in the endeavour to win these related Germanic peoples over to Christianity. Charlemagne's German policy, therefore, was not a mere brute conquest, but a union which was to be strengthened by the ties of morality and culture to be created by the Christian religion. The amalgamation of the ecclesiastical with the secular elements that had begun in the reign of Pepin reached its completion under Charlemagne. The fact that Pepin obtained papal approval of his kingdom strengthened the bond between the Church and the Frankish kingdom. The

consciousness of being the champion of Christianity against the Arabs, moreover, gave to the King of the Franks the religious character of the predestined protectors of the Church; thus he attained a position of great importance in the Kingdom of God. Charlemagne was filled with these ideas; like St. Augustine he hated the supremacy of the heathen empire. The type of God's Kingdom to Charlemagne and his councillors was not the Roman Empire but the Jewish theocracy. This type was kept in view when Charlemagne undertook to give reality to the Kingdom of God. The Frankish king desired like Solomon to be a great ecclesiastical and secular potentate, a royal priest. He was conscious that his conception of his position as the head of the Kingdom of God, according to the German ideas, was opposed to the essence of Roman Caesarism, and for this reason he objected to being crowned emperor by the pope on Christmas Day, 800. On this day the Germanic idea of the Kingdom of God, of which Charlemagne was the representative, bowed to the Roman idea, which regards Rome as its centre, Rome the seat of the old empire and the most sacred place of the Christian world. Charlemagne when emperor still regarded himself as the real leader of the Church. Although in 774 he confirmed the gift of his father to the Roman *res publica*, nevertheless he saw to it that Rome remained connected with the Frankish State; in return it had a claim to Frankish protection. He even interfered in dogmatic questions.

Charlemagne looked upon the revived Roman Empire from the ancient point of view, inasmuch as he greatly desired recognition by the Eastern Empire. He regarded his possession of the empire as resulting solely from his own power, consequently he himself crowned his son Louis. Yet on the other hand he looked upon his empire only as a Christian one, whose most noble calling it was to train up the various races within its borders to the service of God and thus to unify them. The empire rapidly declined under his weak and nerveless son, Louis the Pious (814-40). The decay was hastened by the prevailing idea that the State was the personal property of the sovereign, a view that contained the germ of constant quarrels and necessitated the division of the empire when there were several sons. Louis sought to prevent the dangers of such division by the law of hereditary succession published in 817, by which the sovereign power and the imperial crown were to be passed to the oldest son. This law was probably enacted through the influence of the Church, which maintained positively this unity of the supreme power and the Crown, as being in harmony with the idea of the Kingdom of God, and as besides required by the hierarchical economy of the church organization. When Louis had a fourth son, by his second wife, Judith, he immediately set aside the law of partition of 817 for the benefit of the new heir. An odious struggle broke out between father and sons, and among the sons themselves. In 833 the emperor was captured by his sons at the battle of Lügenfeld (field of lies) near Colmar. Pope Gregory IV was at the time in the camp of the sons. The demeanour of the pope, and the humiliating ecclesiastical penance that Louis was compelled to undergo at Soissons made apparent the change that had come about since Charlemagne in the theory of the relations of Church and State. Gregory's view that the Church was under the rule of the representative of Christ, and that it was a higher authority, not only spiritually but also substantially, and therefore politically, had before this found learned defenders in France. In opposition to the oldest son Lothair, Louis and Pepin, sons of Louis the Pious, restored the father to his throne (834), but new rebellions followed when the sons once more grew dissatisfied.

In 840 the emperor died near Ingelheim. The quarrels of the sons went on after the death of the father, and in 841 Lothair was completely defeated

near Fontenay (Fontanetum) by Louis the German and Charles the Bald. The empire now fell apart, not from the force of national hatreds, but in consequence of the partition now made and known as the Treaty of Verdun (August, 843), which divided the territory between the sons of Louis the Pious: Lothair, Louis the German (843-76), and Charles the Bald, and which finally resulted in the complete overthrow of the Carolingian monarchy.

As the imperial power grew weaker, the Church gradually raised itself above the State. The scandalous behaviour of Lothair II, who divorced himself from his lawful wife in order to marry his concubine, brought deep disgrace on his kingdom. The Church however, now an imposing and well-organized power, sat in judgment on the adulterous king. When Lothair II died, his uncles divided his possessions between them; by the Treaty of Ribemont (Mersen), Lorraine, which lay between the East Frankish Kingdom of Louis the German and the West Frankish Kingdom of Charles the Bald, was assigned to the East Frankish Kingdom. In this way a long-enduring boundary was definitely drawn between the growing powers of Germany and France. By a curious chance this boundary coincided almost exactly with the linguistic dividing line. Charles the Fat (876-87), the last son of Louis the German, united once more the entire empire. But according to old Germanic ideas the weak emperor forfeited his sovereignty by his cowardice when the dreaded Northmen appeared before Paris on one of their frequent incursions into France, and by his incapacity as a ruler. Consequently the Eastern Franks made his nephew Arnulf (887-99) king. This change was brought about by a revolt of the laity against the bishops in alliance with the emperor. The danger of Norman invasion Arnulf ended once and for all by his victory in 891 at Louvain on the Dyle. In the East also he was victorious after the death (894) of Swatopluk, the great King of Moravia. The conduct of some of the great nobles forced him to turn for aid to the bishops; supported by the Church, he was crowned emperor at Rome in 896. Theoretically his rule extended over the West Frankish Kingdom, but the sway of his son, Louis the Child (899-911), the last descendant of the male line of the German Carolingians, was limited entirely to the East Frankish Kingdom. Both in the East and West Frankish Kingdoms, in this era of confusion, the nobility grew steadily stronger, and freemen in increasing numbers became vassals in order to escape the burdens that the State laid on them; the illusion of the imperial title could no longer give strength to the empire. Vassal princes like Guido and Lamberto of Spoleto, and Berengar of Friuli, were permitted to wear the diadem of the Cæsars.

As the idea of political unity declined, that of the unity of the Church increased in power. The Kingdom of God, which the royal priest, Charlemagne, by his overshadowing personality had, in his own opinion, made a fact, proved to be an impossibility. Church and State, which for a short time were united in Charlemagne, had, as early as the reign of Louis the Pious, become separated. The Kingdom of God was now identified with the Church. Pope Nicholas I asserted that the head of the one and indivisible Church could not be subordinate to any secular power, that only the pope could rule the Church, that it was obligatory on princes to obey the pope in spiritual things, and finally that the Carolingians had received their right to rule from the pope. This grand idea of unity, this all-controlling sentiment of a common bond, could not be annihilated, even in these troubled times when the papacy was humiliated by petty Italian rulers. The idea of her unity gave the Church the strength to raise herself rapidly to a position higher than that of the State. From the age of St. Boniface the Church in the East Frankish Kingdom had had

direct relations with Rome, while numerous new churches and monasteries gave her a firm hold in this region. At an early date the Church here controlled the entire religious life and, as the depositary of all culture, the entire intellectual life. She had also gained frequently decisive influence over German economic life, for she disseminated much of the skill and many of the crafts of antiquity. Moreover the Church itself had grown into an economic power in the East Frankish Kingdom. Piety led many to place themselves and their lands under the control of the Church.

There was also in this period a change in social life that was followed by important social consequences. The old militia composed of every freeman capable of bearing arms went to pieces, because the freemen constantly decreased in number. In its stead there arose a higher order in the State, which alone was called on for military service. In this chaotic era the German people made no important advance in civilization. Nevertheless the union that had been formed between Roman and German elements and Christianity prepared the way for a development of the East Frankish Kingdom in civilization from which great results might be expected. At the close of the Carolingian period the external position of the kingdom was a very precarious one. The piratic Northmen boldly advanced far into the empire; Danes and Slavs continually crossed its borders; but the most dangerous incursions were those of the Magyars, who in 907 brought terrible suffering upon Bavaria; in their marauding expeditions they also ravaged Saxony, Thuringia, and Swabia. It was then that salvation came from the empire itself. The weak authority of the last of the Carolingians, Louis the Child, an infant in years, fell to pieces altogether, and the old ducal form of government revived in the several tribes. This was in accordance with the desires of the people. In these critical times the dukes sought to save the country; still they saw clearly that only a union of all the duchies could successfully ward off the danger from without; the royal power was to find its entire support in the laity. Once more, it is true, the attempt was made by King Conrad I (911-18) to make the Church the basis of the royal power, but the centralizing clerical policy of the king was successfully resisted by the subordinate powers. Henry I (919-36) was the free choice of the lay powers at Fritzlar. On the day he was elected the old theory of the State as the personal estate of the sovereign was finally done away with, and the Frankish realm was transformed into a German one. The manner of his election made plain to Henry the course to be pursued. It was necessary to yield to the wish of the several tribes to have their separate existence with a measure of self-government under the imperial power recognized. Thus the duchies were strengthened at the expense of the Crown. The fame of Henry I was assured by his victory over the Magyars near Merseburg (933). By regaining Lorraine, that had been lost during the reign of Conrad, he secured a bulwark on the side towards France that permitted the uninterrupted consolidation of his realm. The same result was attained on other frontiers by his successful campaigns against the Wends and Bohemians. Henry's kingdom was made up of a confederation of tribes, for the idea of a "King of the Germans" did not yet exist. It was only as the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation" that Germany could develop from a union of German tribes to a compact nation. As supporters of the supreme power, as vassals of the emperor, the Germans were united.

This imperial policy was continued by Otto I, the Great (936-73). During his long reign Otto sought to found a strong central power in Germany, an effort at once opposed by the particularistic powers of Germany, who took advantage of disputes in the royal

family. Otto proved the necessity of a strong government by his victory over the Magyars near Augsburg (955), one result of which was the re-establishment of the East Mark. After this he was called to Rome by John XII, who had been threatened by Berengarius II of Italy, and by making a treaty that secured to the imperial dignity a share in the election of the pope, he attained the imperial crown, 2 February, 962. It was necessary for Otto to obtain imperial power in order to carry out his politico-ecclesiastical policy. His intention was to make the Church an organic feature of the German constitution. This he could only do if the Church was absolutely under his control, and this could not be attained unless the papacy and Italy were included within the sphere of his power. The emperor's aim was to found his royal power among the Germans, who were strongly inclined to particularism, upon a close union of Church and State. The Germans had now revived the empire and had freed the papacy from its unfortunate entanglement with the nobility of the city of Rome. The papacy rapidly regained strength and quickly renewed the policy of Nicholas I. By safeguarding the unity of the Church of Western Europe the Germans protected both the peaceful development of civilization, which was dependent upon religion, and the progress of culture which the Church spread. Thus the Germans, in union with the Church, founded the civilization of Western Europe. For Germany itself the heroic age of the medieval emperors was a period of progress in learning. The renaissance of antiquity during the era of the Ottos was hardly more than superficial. Nevertheless it denoted a development in learning, throughout ecclesiastical in character, in marked contrast to the tendencies in the same age of the grammarians Wilgard at Ravenna, who sought to revive not only the literature of ancient times, but also the ideas of antiquity, even when they opposed Christian ideas. Germany now boldly assumed the leadership of Western Europe and thus prevented any other power from claiming the supremacy. Moreover the new empire sought to assert its universal character in France, as well as in Burgundy and Italy. Otto also fixed his eyes on Lower Italy, which was in the hands of the Greeks, but he preferred a peaceful policy with Byzantium. He therefore married his son Otto II, in 972, to the Greek Princess Theophano.

Otto II (973-83) and his son Otto III (983-1002) firmly upheld the union with the Church inaugurated by Otto I. Otto II aimed at a great development of his power along the Mediterranean; these plans naturally turned his mind from a national German policy. His campaign against the Saracens, however, came to a disastrous end in Calabria in 982, and he did not long survive the calamity. His romantic son sought to bring about a complete revival of the ancient empire, the centre of which was to be Rome, as in ancient times. There, in union with the pope, he wished to establish the true Kingdom of God. The pope and the emperor were to be the wielders of a power one and indivisible. This idealistic policy, full of vague abstractions, led to severe German losses in the east, for the Poles and Hungarians once more gained their independence. In Italy Arduin of Ivrea founded a new kingdom; naturally enough the Apennine Peninsula revolted against the German imperial policy. Without possession of Italy, however, the empire was impossible, and the blessings of the Ottonian theory of government were now manifest. The Church became the champion of the unity and legitimacy of the empire.

After the death of Otto III and the collapse of imperialism the Church raised Henry II (1002-24) to the throne. Henry, reviving the policy of Otto I which had been abandoned by Otto III, made Germany and the German Church the basis of his imperial system;

he intended to rule the Church as Otto I had done. In 1014 he defeated Arduin and thus attained the imperial crown. The sickly ruler, whose nervousness caused him to take up projects of which he quickly tired, did his best to repair the losses of the empire on its eastern frontier. He was not able, however, to defeat the Polish King Boleslaw II; all he could do was to strengthen the position of the Germans on the Elbe River by an alliance with the Lusici, a Slavonic tribe. Towards the end of his reign a bitter dispute broke out between the emperor and the bishops. At the Synod of Seligenstadt, in 1023, Archbishop Aribio of Mainz, who was an opponent of the Reform of Cluny, forbade an appeal to the pope without the permission of the bishop. This ecclesiastical policy of Aribio's would have led in the end to the founding of a national German Church independent of Rome. The greater part of the clergy supported Aribio, but the emperor held to the party of reform. Henry, however, did not live to see the quarrel settled.

With Conrad II (1024-39) began the sway of the Franconian (Salian) emperors. The sovereigns of this line were vigorous, vehement, and autocratic rulers. Conrad had natural political ability and his reign is the most flourishing era of medieval imperialism. The international position of the empire was excellent. In Italy Conrad strengthened the German power, and his relations with King Canute of Denmark were friendly. Internal disputes kept the Kingdom of Poland from becoming dangerous; moreover, by regaining Lusatia the Germans recovered the old preponderance against the Poles. Important gains were also made in Burgundy, whereby the old Romanic states, France and Italy, were for a long time separated and the great passes of the Alps controlled by the Germans. The close connexion with the empire enabled the German population of north-western Burgundy to preserve its nationality. Conrad had also kept up the close union of the State with the Church and had maintained his authority over the latter. He claimed for himself the same right of ruling the Church that his predecessors had exercised, and like them appointed bishops and abbots; he also reserved to himself the entire control of the property of the Church. Conrad's ecclesiastical policy, however, lacked definiteness; he failed to understand the most important interests of the Church, nor did he grasp the necessity of reform. Neither did he do anything to raise the papacy, discredited by John XIX and Benedict IX, from its dependence on the civil rulers of Rome. The aim of his financial policy was economic emancipation from the Church; royal financial officials took their place alongside of the *ministeriales*, or financial agents, of the bishops and monasteries. Conrad sought to rest his kingdom in Germany on these royal officials and on the petty vassals. In this way the laity was to be the guarantee of the emperor's independence of the episcopate. As he pursued the same methods in Italy, he was able to maintain an independent position between the bishops and the petty Italian despots who were at strife with one another. Thus the ecclesiastical influence in Conrad's theory of government becomes less prominent.


This statesmanlike sovereign was followed by his son, the youthful Henry III (1039-56). Unlike his father Henry had had a good education; he had also been trained from an early age in State affairs. He was a born ruler and allowed himself to be influenced by no one; to force of character and courage he added a strong sense of duty. His foreign policy was at first successful. He established the suzerainty of the empire over Hungary, without, however, being always able to maintain it; Bohemia also remained a dependent state. The empire gained a dominant position in Western Europe, and a sense of national pride was awakened in the Germans that opened the way for a national spirit. But the aim of these national aspirations, the hegemony in Western Europe, was a mere

phantom. Each time an emperor went to Italy to be crowned that country had to be reconquered. Even at this very time the imperial supremacy was in great danger from the threatened conflict between the imperial and the sacerdotal power, between Church and State. The Church, the only guide on earth to salvation, had attained dominion over mankind, whom it strove to wean from the earthly and to lead to the spiritual. The glaring contrast between the ideal and the reality awoke in thousands the desire to leave the world. A spirit of asceticism, which first appeared in France, took possession of many hearts. As early as the era of the first Saxon emperors the attempt was made to introduce the reform movement of Cluny into Germany, and in the reign of Henry III this reform had become powerful. Henry himself laid much more stress than his predecessors on the ecclesiastical side of his royal position. His religious views led him to side with the men of Cluny. The great mistake of his ecclesiastical policy was the belief that it was possible to promote this reform of the Church by laying stress on his suzerain authority. He repeatedly called and presided over synods and issued many decisions in Church affairs. His fundamental mistake, the thought that he could transform the Church in the manner desired by the party of reform and at the same time maintain his dominion over it, was also evident in his relations with the papacy. He sought to put an end to the disorder at Rome, caused by the unfortunate schism, by the energetic measure of deposing the three contending popes and raising Clement II to the Apostolic See. Clement crowned him emperor and made him Patrician of Rome. Thus Henry seemed to have regained the same control over the Church that Otto had exercised. But the papacy, purified by the elevated conceptions of the party of reform and freed by Henry from the influence of the degenerate Roman

aristocracy, strove to be absolutely independent. The Church was now to be released from all human bonds. The chief aims of the papal policy were the celibacy of the clergy, the presentation of ecclesiastical offices by the Church alone, and the attainment by these means of as great a centralization as possible. Henry had acted with absolute honesty in raising the papacy, but he did not intend that it should outgrow his control. Sincerely pious, he was convinced of the possibility and necessity of complete accord between empire and papacy. His fanciful policy became an impractical idealism. Consequently the monarchical power began rapidly to decline in strength. Hungary regained freedom, the southern part of Italy was held by the Normans, and the Duchy of Lorraine, already long a source of trouble, maintained its hostility to the king. By the close of the reign of Henry III discontent was universal in the empire, thus permitting a growth of the particularistic powers, especially of the dukes.

When Henry III died Germany had reached a turning-point in its history. His wife Agnes assumed the regency for their four-year-old son, Henry IV (1056-1106), and at once showed her incompetence for the position by granting the great duchies to opponents of the crown. She also sought the support of the lesser nobility and thus excited the hatred of the great princes. A conspiracy of the more powerful nobles, led by Archbishop Anno (Hanno) of Cologne, obtained possession of the royal child by a stratagem at Kaiserswert and took control of the imperial power. Henry IV, however, preferred the guidance of Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, who was able for the moment to give the governmental policy a more national character. Thus in 1063 he restored German influence over Hungary, and the aim of his internal policy was to strengthen the central power. At the Diet of Tribur, 1066, however, he was overthrown by the particularists, but the king by now was able to assume control for himself. In the meantime the papacy had been rapidly advancing towards absolute independence. The Curia now extended the meaning of simony to the granting of an ecclesiastical office by a layman and thus demanded an entire change in the conditions of the empire and placed itself in opposition to the imperial power. The ordinances passed in 1059 for the regulation of the papal elections excluded all imperial rights in the same. Conditions in Italy grew continually more unfavourable for the empire. The chief supporters of the papal policy were the Normans, over whom the pope claimed feudal suzerainty. The German bishops also yielded more and more to the authority of Rome; the Ottonian theory of government was already undermined. The question was now raised: In the Kingdom of God on earth who is to rule, the emperor or the pope? In Rome this question had long been settled. The powerful opponent of Henry, Gregory VII, claimed that the princes should acknowl-

edge the supremacy of the Kingdom of God, and that the laws of God should be everywhere obeyed and carried out. The struggle which now broke out was in principle a conflict concerning the respective rights of the empire and the papacy. But the conflict soon shifted from the spiritual to the secular domain; at last it became a conflict for the possession of Italy, and during the struggle the spiritual and the secular were often confounded. Henry was not a match for the genius of Gregory. He was courageous and intelligent and, though of a passionate nature, fought with dogged obstinacy for the rights of his monarchical power. But Gregory as the representative of the reform movement in the Church, demanding complete liberty for the Church, was too powerful for him. Aided by the inferior nobility, Henry sought to make himself absolute. The particularistic powers, however, insisted upon the maintenance of the constitutional limits of the monarchy. The revolt of the Saxons against the royal authority was led both by spiritual and secular



CASTLE OF RHEINSTEIN

edge the supremacy of the Kingdom of God, and that the laws of God should be everywhere obeyed and carried out. The struggle which now broke out was in principle a conflict concerning the respective rights of the empire and the papacy. But the conflict soon shifted from the spiritual to the secular domain; at last it became a conflict for the possession of Italy, and during the struggle the spiritual and the secular were often confounded. Henry was not a match for the genius of Gregory. He was courageous and intelligent and, though of a passionate nature, fought with dogged obstinacy for the rights of his monarchical power. But Gregory as the representative of the reform movement in the Church, demanding complete liberty for the Church, was too powerful for him. Aided by the inferior nobility, Henry sought to make himself absolute. The particularistic powers, however, insisted upon the maintenance of the constitutional limits of the monarchy. The revolt of the Saxons against the royal authority was led both by spiritual and secular



princes, and it was not until after many humiliations that Henry was able to conquer them in the battle on the Unstrut (1075). Directly after this began his conflict with the papacy. The occasion was the appointment of an Archbishop of Milan by the emperor without regard to the election already held by the ecclesiastical party. Gregory VII at once sent a threatening letter to Henry. Angry at this, Henry had the deposition of the pope declared at the Synod of Worms, 24 January, 1076. Gregory now felt himself released from all restraint and excommunicated the emperor. On 16 October, 1076, the German princes decided that the pope should pronounce judgment on the king and that unless Henry were released from excommunication within a year and a day he should lose his crown. Henry now sought to break the alliance between the particularists and the pope by a clever stroke. The German princes he could not win back to his cause, but he might gain over the pope. By a penitential pilgrimage he forced the pope to grant him absolution. Henry appealed to the priest, and Gregory showed his greatness. He released the king from the ban, although by so doing he injured his own interests, which required that he should keep his agreement to act in union with the German princes.

Thus the day of Canossa (2 and 3 February, 1077) was a victory for Henry. It did not, however, mean the coming of peace, for the German confederates of the pope did not recognize the reconciliation at Canossa and elected Duke Rudolf of Swabia as king at Forchheim, 13 March, 1077. A civil war now broke out in Germany. After long hesitation Gregory finally took the side of Rudolf and once more excommunicated Henry. Soon after this, however, Rudolf lost both throne and life in the battle of Hohenmolsen not far from Merseburg. Henry now abandoned his policy of absolutism, recognizing its impracticability. He returned to the Ottonian theory of government, and the German episcopate, which was embittered by the severity of the ecclesiastical administration of Rome, now came over to the side of the king. Relying upon this strife within the Church, Henry caused Gregory to be deposed by a synod held at Brixen and Guilbert of Ravenna to be elected pope as Clement III. Accompanied by this pope, he went to Rome and was crowned emperor there in 1084. Love for the rights of the Church drove the great Gregory into exile where he soon after died. After the death of his mighty opponent Henry was more powerful than the particularists who had elected a new rival king, Herman of Luxemburg. In 1090 Henry went again to Italy to defend his rights against the two powerful allies of the papacy, the Normans in the south and the Countess Matilda of Tuscany in the north. While he was in Italy his own son Conrad declared himself king in opposition to him. Overwhelmed by this blow, Henry remained inactive in Italy, and it was not until 1097 that he returned to Germany. No reconciliation had been effected between him and Pope Urban II. In Germany Henry sought to restore internal peace, and this popular policy intensified the particularism of the princes. In union with these the king's son, young Henry, rebelled against his father. The pope supported the revolt, and the emperor was unable to cope with so many opponents. In 1105 he abdicated. After this he once more asserted his rights, but death soon closed (1106) this troubled life filled with so many thrilling and tragic events. To Henry should be ascribed the credit of saving the monarchy from the threatened collapse. He has been called the most brilliant representative of the German laity in the early Middle Ages. During his reign began the development, so fruitful in results, of the German cities.

Henry V (1106-25) also adopted the policy of the Ottos. In the numerous discussions of the right of investiture men of sober judgment insisted, as did the emperor, that the latter could not give up the right of

the investiture of his vassal bishops with the regalia, that a distinction must be made between the spiritual and secular power of the bishops. The pope now made the strange proposal that the emperor should give up the investiture and the pope the regalia. This proposal to strip the Church of secular power would have led to a revolution in Germany. Not only would the bishops have been unwilling to give up their position as ruling princes, but many nobles as well, as vassals of the Church, would have rebelled. The storm of dissatisfaction which in 1111 broke out in Rome obliged the pope to annul the prohibition of investiture. It was soon seen to be impossible to carry out the permission so granted, and the conflict regarding investitures began again. The ecclesiastical party was again joined by the German princes antagonistic to the emperor, and the imperial forces soon suffered defeats on the Rhine and in Saxony. Consequently the papal party gained ground again in Germany, and the majority of the bishops fell away from Henry. Notwithstanding this he went, in 1116, to Italy to claim the imperial feudal estates of the Countess Matilda, who had died, and to confiscate her freehold property. This action naturally made more difficult the relations between pope and emperor, and in spite of the universal weariness the conflict began anew. The influence of the German secular princes had now to be reckoned with, for at this time certain families of the secular nobility commenced to claim hereditary power and appeared as hereditary dynasties with distinct family names and residences. It was in the age of the Franconian emperors that the dynastic families of the German principalities were founded. These princes acted as an independent power in settling the disagreement between emperor and pope. Callistus II was ready for peace; in 1122 an agreement was reached and the concordat was proclaimed at the Synod of Worms. In this the pope agreed that in Germany the election of bishops should take place according to canonical procedure in the presence of the king or his representative, and that the bishop-elect should then be invested by the king with the sceptre as a symbol of the regalia. In Germany this investiture was to precede the ecclesiastical consecration, in Italy and Burgundy it was to follow it. The emperor therefore retained all his influence in the appointment to vacant dioceses, and as secular princes the bishops were responsible to him. Notwithstanding this the Concordat of Worms was a defeat for the imperial claims, for the papacy that had been hitherto a subordinate power had now become a power of at least equal rank. It was now entirely free from the control of the German Crown and held an independent position, deriving its dignity wholly from God. The emperor, on the contrary, received his dignity from the papacy. The talented, but intriguing and deceitful, king had greatly strengthened the anti-imperial tendency in all Western Europe. During the great investiture conflict the other kings had freed themselves completely from the suzerainty of the emperor. The pope was the guarantee of their independence, and he had become the representative of the whole of Christendom, while the imperial dignity had lost the attribute of universality. The way was now open to the pope to become the umpire over kings and nations. There was now a truce in the conflict between pope and emperor. Only a minor question had been settled, but the conflict had awakened the intellects of men, and on both sides a voluminous controversial literature appeared. The assertion was now made that the Christian conception of the papacy was not realized by existing conditions. There were also other manifestations of independent thought. The Crusades opened a new world of ideas; historical writing made rapid progress, and art ventured upon new forms in architecture. Commerce and travel increased through the active intercourse with Italy, a state of affairs bene-

ficial to the growth of the cities. Germany grew in civilization although it did not reach the same level of culture which Italy and France had then attained.

Henry V died childless, and his nephew, Duke Frederick of Swabia, the representative of the most powerful ruling family in the empire, hoped to be his successor. The clergy, led by Archbishop Adalbert of Mainz, however, feared that Frederick would continue the ecclesiastical policy of the Franconian emperors, and they succeeded in defeating him as a candidate. At Mainz the majority of the princes voted for Lothair of Supplinburg (1125-37); thus the electors disregarded any hereditary right to the throne. The Hohenstaufen brothers, Frederick and Conrad, did not yield the crown to Lothair without a struggle. The Hohenstaufen family was in possession of the crownlands belonging to the inheritance of the Franconian emperors, and a long struggle ensued over these territories. Lothair's suzerainty was for a while in a very critical position; the Hohenstaufen power increased to such an extent that in 1127 its abettors ventured to proclaim Conrad king. In the end, however, Lothair conquered. A courageous man, but one somewhat inclined to hasty action, he was able to maintain the claims of the empire against Bohemia, Poland, and Denmark. As a statesman, however, Conrad was less aggressive. He allowed the schism of 1130, when Innocent II and Anacletus II contended for the Holy See, to pass by without turning the temporal weakness of the papacy to the benefit of the empire. After a delay Lothair finally recognized Innocent as pope and brought him to Rome. Here Lothair was crowned emperor in 1133; but the Curia did not agree to his demand for the restoration of the old right of investiture. However, he received the domains of the Countess Matilda as a fief from the pope and thus laid the foundation of the strong position of the house of Welf (Guelph) in Central Europe. In the meantime the two Hohenstaufen brothers were defeated, and Lothair was now able (1136), without fear of an uprising in Germany, to go to Rome for a second time. The object of this further campaign in Italy was to defeat King Roger of Sicily, the protector of the antipope, but the success of the imperial army was only temporary. Differences of opinion as to imperial and papal rights in lower Italy and Sicily endangered at times the good understanding between the two great powers. The emperor grew ill and died on the way home, and after his death the vigorous Roger united all lower Italy, with the exception of Benevento, into a kingdom that held an unrivalled position in Europe for its brilliant and strangely mixed culture. In the struggle between the papacy and the empire this Sicilian kingdom was before long to take an important part.

The political policy of the Church was directed by its distrust of the aims of the Saxon dynasty in lower Italy; consequently by a bold stroke it brought about the election of Conrad III (1138-52), the Hohenstaufen Duke of Franconia, passing over Duke Henry the Proud, ruler of Saxony and Bavaria, and a descendant of Duke Welf (Guelph). The new king demanded from Henry the surrender of the Saxon duchy. Although after a long struggle the double Duchy of Bavaria-Saxony was dissolved, yet the Saxon duchy that was given by the treaty of 1142 to young Henry the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, continued a menace to the Hohenstaufen rule. Conrad was not able to put an end to the disorders in his realm, and the respect felt for the empire on the eastern frontier declined; neither was he able to assert his power in Italy. Yet all these troubles did not prevent his yielding to the fiery eloquence of St. Bernard of Clairvaux and joining the Second Crusade. This crusade, the success of which had been promised by St. Bernard and the pope, failed completely. When Conrad returned home, broken in spirit, he was confronted by the danger of a

formidable rising of the Welfs. In 1152 he died. During his reign the intellectual results of the Crusades began to show themselves. Men's imaginations had been stimulated and led them away from traditional medieval sentiment. The world was seized by a romantic impulse and the conception of the Crusades, developed first among the Romanic nations, gave a Romanic colouring to the civilization and morals of the age. For a long time German knighthood, in particular, was characterized by Romanic ideas and manners.

When the new king, Frederick I Barbarossa (1152-90), ascended the throne his German kingdom seemed on the verge of disintegration, and he sought to strengthen his power by a journey through all parts of his realms. Contrary to the policy pursued by his predecessor, he exerted himself to settle the strife between the Welf (Guelph) and Hohenstaufen parties. He wanted to strengthen the Welf power to such extent as to make it evident that this party's interests coincided with those of the Crown. Besides Saxony, Henry the Lion received also the Duchy of Bavaria which had been taken from his father Henry the Proud. As secular protector of the Church, Frederick came to an agreement with the pope in regard to the latter's adversaries, the citizens of Rome and King Roger of Sicily. The imperial policy of Frederick was one of vast schemes which he could only carry out when he had a firm footing in Italy. But in Italy the city republics had arisen, and these had entirely cast off his suzerainty. Not realizing the power of resistance of the free communities, Frederick wanted to force the cities to recognize the supremacy of the empire. In case the pope should interfere in the dispute, Frederick was resolved not to permit his intervention in secular affairs. Frederick was filled with an ideal conception of his position as emperor. He believed that the Germans were destined in the history of the world to exercise universal rule. It was this idea, however, that exasperated the Italians and aroused their hatred. Frederick could only carry out this universal policy if Italy were his, and the question of its possession led to renewed struggles between Church and State. When Frederick went to Rome to be crowned emperor in 1155, most of the Italian cities paid their homage to him. On his return home Bavaria was restored in fief to Henry the Lion, the East Mark (later Austria) being first detached from the duchy. This led in the course of time to a development of the mark that proved of great importance for the future history of the empire. Frederick's policy was, in the main, not to interfere with the rights of the German princes as long as they obeyed the laws of the empire. The spiritual princes he attached closely to himself. The most powerful bishops of this period, Rainald of Cologne, Christian of Mainz, and Wichmann of Magdeburg, supported the imperial party. The majority of the bishops looked upon Frederick as a protection against the encroachments of Rome and of the secular rulers. The emperor sought, by strengthening his dynastic power, to make himself independent of both the ecclesiastical and temporal princes; to carry out this policy he depended on his inferior civil officials (*Ministerialen*), who were still serfs, and from whom was hereafter to come the important military nobility. Thus Frederick prepared the way for the flourishing period of chivalry, which was to give its signature to the time now at hand. A romantic, knightly culture arose; poetry flourished; yet the love lyrics of the age often expounded unhealthy views of morals and marriage. Nevertheless, the movement did not penetrate very deep, and the common people remained uncorrupted. Moreover, poetry was not wasted on artificial love songs; Wolfram von Eschenbach had the courage to attempt great problems; Walther von der Vogelweide was the herald of German imperialism. Art undertook to solve great questions, and began to draw

its themes from life. Scientific learning, however, had not made equal progress; the time of apprenticeship was not yet passed, while in France and Italy Scholasticism had already shown itself creative. In 1158 Frederick made a second campaign in Italy that closed with the sack of Milan, the subjugation of Italy, and the flight of Pope Alexander III to France. When, however, the rest of Europe sided with the lawful pope, the defeat of the emperor was assured, for the papacy, when supported by all other countries, could not be coerced by Frederick. The emperor's third campaign in Italy (1162-64) ended in the failure of his lower Italian policy, and the outbreak of the plague destroyed the more promising prospects of the fourth expedition. In the fifth campaign (1174) occurred the memorable defeat near Legnano which opened the eyes of the emperor to the necessity of a treaty of peace. In 1177 he made peace with the pope at Venice, and recognized Alexander III, whom he had so obstinately opposed. The papacy had victoriously defended its equality with the empire. In Germany Frederick was obliged to take steps against the violent proceedings of Henry the Lion. The insubordinate Guelph was deposed and his fiefs divided, Bavaria being given to Otto of Wittelsbach. By the repeated allotment of these lands Frederick in reality helped to break up the empire, and when in 1184 he betrothed his son Henry to Constance, the heiress of the Norman kingdom, he prepared the way for new complications. Frederick took part in the Third Crusade in order that the highest power of Christendom might actively fight against the infidel. He was drowned in Asia Minor, 10 June, 1190; and was, at his death, a popular hero. He had greatly strengthened the feeling of the Germans that they were one great people, though a really national empire was at the time quite out of the question; the achievement of unity was prevented by the international character of intellectual, and partly of social, life.



Frederick's son, Henry VI (1190-97), meant to establish a world power along the Mediterranean. His schemes were opposed by a Saxon-Guelphic combination headed by Richard the Lion-Hearted of England, and also by the German princes, who strove to hinder the increase of the royal power aimed at by Henry. The capture of Richard in 1192 dissolved the league of princes and led to peace with the House of Guelph. In 1194 Henry succeeded in conquering Sicily, and it now seemed as though his imperialistic schemes would gain the day; nevertheless they failed owing to the opposition of the German princes and the pope. When Henry died in 1197 the countries of Western Europe had already taken a stand against the all-embracing schemes of the German emperor. Germany was threatened by the horrors of a civil war. All the anti-national forces were active.

Instead of the crown going to Frederick, son of Henry, who was at Naples, Archbishop Adolph of Cologne sought, by means of the electoral rights of the princes, to obtain it for the son of Henry the Lion, Otto IV (1198-1215). But the Hohenstaufen party anticipated this scheme by securing the election of the popular Duke Philip of Swabia (1198-1208). For the first time the question now arose, which of the princes have the right to vote? The number of electors had not, so far, been defined, yet as early as the election of Lothair and Conrad only the princes had voted, and the right of the Archbishops of Mainz to preside at the election was clearly admitted. Not much later the opinion prevailed that only six ruling princes were entitled to act as electors: the three Rhenish Archbishops, the Rhenish Palgrave, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg; to these was added in the course of time the King of Bohemia. The "Sachsenspiegel" (compilation of Saxon law, c. 1230) caused this view to prevail. At the time of the double election of Otto and Philip the policy pursued by the


German princes was a purely selfish one. The energetic Innocent III, who was then pope, claimed the right of deciding the dispute and adjudged the crown to Otto. Thus the latter for a time gained the advantage over Philip. In this conflict the German princes changed sides whenever it seemed to their interest. Archbishop Adolph of Cologne, who had carried the election of Otto, finally fell away from him. Philip gained in authority, and after the successful battle near Wassenberg in 1206 he would have overcome Otto and his ally the papacy, had he not been murdered at Bamberg in 1208 by Otto of Wittelsbach.

Otto IV was now universally acknowledged king. He had promised the pope to give up his claim to the domains of the Countess Matilda of Tuscany and to grant the free election of bishops. But when at Rome he refused to carry out these promises. However, the pope, though displeased, crowned him emperor in 1209. But when Otto after this wished to revive the imperial claims to Naples, the pope excommunicated him (1210).

In the meantime the supreme position of the empire had become so important a matter that foreign princes meddled in German politics. The great conflict between Philip II Augustus of France and John of England was reflected in the contest between the Guelphs and the Hohenstaufens in Germany. Protected by the French and the pope, Frederick II (1212-50) came to Germany and was crowned at Mainz. The coalition of the English and the Guelphs was broken by the French at the battle of Bouvines (1214), yet Otto kept up the struggle for his rights until his death in 1218. The long conflict had greatly impaired the strength of the Hohenstaufen line; both the imperial and the Hohenstaufen domains had been squandered, and the German princes had become conscious of their power. Like his father, Frederick II made Italy the centre of his policy; but at the same time he intended to keep the control of Germany in his own hands, as the imperial power was connected with this country and he must draw the soldiers needed for his Italian projects from Germany. In order to maintain peace in Germany and to secure the aid of the German princes for his Italian policy Frederick made great concessions to the ecclesiastical princes in the "Confoederatio cum principibus ecclesiasticis" (1220) and to the secular princes in the "Statutum in favorem principum" (1232). These two laws became the basis of an aristocratic constitution for the German Empire. They both contained a large number of separate ordinances, which taken together might serve as a secure basis for the future sovereignty of the local princes. In these statutes the expression *landesherr* (lord of the land) occurs for the first time. In this era Germany was cut up into a large number of territorial sovereignties, consisting of the ecclesiastical territories, the duchies, which, however, were no longer tribal duchies, the margravates, among which the North Mark ruled by Albert the Bear was one of the most important, the palatinates, the countships, and the independent domains of those who had risen from landed proprietors to landed sovereigns. In addition to these were the districts ruled directly by the king through imperial wardens. What Frederick sought to get by favouring the princes he obtained. He had no real interest in Germany, which was at first ruled by the energetic Engelbert, Archbishop of Cologne; after 1220 he visited it only once. It was to him an appendage of Sicily. Frederick's Italian policy threatened the papacy, and he strove by concessions to avert a conflict with the pope. The highly talented, almost learned, emperor was far in advance of his age; an autocratic ruler, he created in lower Italy the first modern state; but by his care for Italy he overstrained the resources of the empire. This brought advantages to the neighbouring Kingdoms of France and England, now long independent powers, as well as



CHURCH OF ST. HEDWIG, BERLIN  
HEIDELBERG CASTLE



CHURCH AT MARIA-LAACH  
MAGDEBURG CATHEDRAL





to Hungary, Poland, and the Scandinavian countries. The conflict between the sacerdotal power and the empire had aided the independent development of the states of Western Europe. The possession of Italy and the vow to go on a crusade regulated Frederick's relations with the Curia. In 1212 he was crowned emperor. Repeatedly urged to undertake the promised crusade, and finally excommunicated because he failed to do so, the emperor obtained successes in the East in 1227-29, contrary to the wishes of the pope. The silent acknowledgment of these successes by the Curia was a victory for Frederick. A rebellion headed by his son Henry was quickly crushed, but the confederates of Henry, the Lombards, assumed a threatening attitude. The emperor was able to bring order out of the confusion in Germany by the policy of yielding to the princes. About the same time began Frederick's struggle with the Lombards and Pope Gregory IX (1227-41). The German princes loyally upheld the emperor, consequently, upon the pope's death, the victory seemed to belong to the imperial party. Innocent IV (1243-54), however, renewed the struggle and from Lyons excommunicated the emperor, whose position now became a serious one. In Germany his son Conrad was obliged to contend with the pretenders, Heinrich Raspe of Thuringia and William of Holland. In Italy, though, conditions seemed favourable, but just at this juncture Frederick died (13 December, 1250), and with his death ended the struggle for the world sovereignty.

The year 1250 marks an era of extraordinary change in Germany. The romance of chivalry passed away, and new forces directed the life of the nation. On account of the extraordinary economic changes the population rapidly increased; the majority of the people were peasants, and this class was rising, but compared with nobles and ecclesiastics the peasants had no weight politically. The important factor of the new era was the municipality, and its development was the beginning of a purely German policy. The glamour of the imperial idea had vanished, men now took their stand on facts and realities. Education found its way among laymen, and it developed with trade. New markets were opened for commerce. The new commercial settlements received "city charters" under the royal cross. The merchants in these settlements needed craftsmen, and these latter from the twelfth century formed themselves into guilds, thus making a new political unit. Councils elected by the cities strove to set aside the former lords of the cities, especially the bishops on the Rhine. In vain the Hohenstaufen rulers supported the bishops against the independence of the towns, but the self-government in the cities could no longer be put down. In order to protect their rights some of the cities formed alliances, such as the confederation of the Rhenish towns, that was formed as early as the period of the Great Interregnum, in order to guard the public peace. These confederations promised to become dangerous opponents of the territorial lords, but such alliances did not become general and, divided among themselves, without mutual support, the smaller confederations of towns succumbed to the united princely power. The growth of the towns brought about the ruin of the system of trade by barter or in kind; the rise of the capitalistic system of commerce at once affected German views of life. Up to this time almost wholly absorbed in the supernatural, henceforth the Germans took more interest in worldly things. Unconditional renunciation of the world came to an end, and men grew more matter-of-fact and practical. This change in the German way of thinking was aided by the opposition that sprang up in the towns between the citizens and the former lords of the territory, often the bishops and their clergy. Here and there the influence of the city on the views of the clergy manifested itself. The Dominicans and Franciscans, at

least, taught their doctrines in language quite intelligible to the people. The rise of the cities was also of importance in the social life of the day, for the principle, "City air gives freedom" (*Stadluft macht frei*), created an entirely new class of freemen.

Under the last of the Hohenstaufens the beginnings of a national culture began to appear. Latin had fallen into disuse, and German had become the prevailing written language. For the first time Germany felt that she was a nation. This soon brought many Germans into opposition to the Church. In the conflict between the papacy and the empire the former often seemed the opponent of nationalism, and bitterness was felt, not against the idea of the Church, but against its representative. The Germans still remained deeply religious, as was made evident by the German mystics.

The most valuable result of this strengthening of the national feeling was the conquest of what is now the eastern part of the present German Empire. Henry I had sought to attain this end, but it was not until the thirteenth century that it was accomplished, largely by the energy of the Teutonic Order. The Marks of Brandenburg, Pomerania, Prussia, and Silesia were colonized by Germans in a manner that challenges admiration, and German influence advanced as far as the Gulf of Finland. The centres of German civilization in these districts were the Premonstratensian and Cistercian monasteries. This extraordinary success was won by Germans in an era when the imperial government seemed ready to go to pieces. It was the period of the Great Interregnum (1256-73). We find traces of internal chaos as early as the reign of Frederick's son, Conrad IV (1250-54), and the confusion grew worse in the reign of William of Holland, and after him during the nominal reigns of Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile. At the same time Bohemia rapidly advanced in power under Ottocar II and became a dangerous element for the domestic and foreign policy of Germany. It was Pope Gregory X who restored order in Germany. To carry out his projects in the Holy Land peace must be secured in Western Europe. He therefore commissioned the electoral princes, who now appear for the first time, to elect a new king. In 1273 the princes chose Rudolf of Hapsburg (1273-91), a man of no great family resources. Meantime the imperial power had fallen into decay; the imperial estates had been squandered; there were no imperial taxes; and the old method of obtaining soldiers for the service of the empire had broken down. Rudolf saw how necessary the possession of crown-lands was for the imperial authority, his aim being to create a dynastic force. Ottocar II, King of Bohemia, sought to induce the Curia to object to the election of Rudolf, but the Curia had quickly come to terms with Rudolf concerning conditions in Italy. After his election he demanded from Ottocar the return of the imperial fiefs, and the refusal of the latter led to a war (1276) in which, on the plain called the Marchfeld, Ottocar lost both life and crown. This victory gave Rudolf secure possession of the Austrian provinces. As the German king was not permitted to retain vacant fiefs, he evaded this law by granting Austria, Styria, Carniola, and Lusatia in fief to his sons Albert and Rudolf; in this way the power of the family was greatly increased. Not even Rudolf thought of strengthening the kingly power by constitutional means. He decided to protect the public peace but did not entirely succeed in this. His policy was always influenced by the circumstances of the moment; at one time he favoured the princes, at another the cities; consequently he was never more than half successful. His only great achievement was that he secured for his family a position in Eastern Europe that was destined to give it importance in the future. Rudolf's successor was Adolf of Nassau (1292-98), not his son Albert, as he had desired. The policy of

the new sovereign was to weaken Austria, his natural opponent. Like Rudolf he recognized the necessity of obtaining possessions for his family, for which he tried to lay a foundation in Thuringia. Adolf's success against Frederick the Degenerate of Thuringia caused the electoral princes to incline to Albert. In a battle near Goldheim, fought between Albert and Adolf, Albert, aided by Adolf's numerous enemies, defeated the king, who was killed.

Albert I of Austria, a very able but morose man (1298-1308), was filled with a boundless ambition for power. Without regard for the rights of others, he enforced the recognition of his own rights in his duchy. He desired to preserve the public peace in Germany and opposed the cruel persecution of the Jews customary at this time. He also wished to reorganize the imperial lands, which were to be regained in such a way as to provide a connecting link between the territories of the Hapsburgs in the east and those in the west. If his lands were thus united he would be a match for the strongest of the territorial princes; but the latter opposed this scheme. Albert also roused the anger of the ecclesiastical electors by combining with King Philip IV of France against Boniface VIII, who had not recognized Albert. Boniface now declared his intention of summoning Albert before his tribunal for the murder of Adolf. Supported by the cities, Albert contended successfully with the Rhinish electors, but after a while, in order to carry out his plans for the aggrandizement of his family, he came to terms with the pope, and this put an end to the opposition of these electors. The only opponent of his dynastic schemes now to be dreaded was Wenceslaus II of Bohemia; but the Przemyśl line soon died out, and Albert at once claimed their lands and gave them to his son Rudolf as a fief. Before he could carry out his designs on Thuringia he was murdered by John of Swabia, called Johannes Parricida. According to legend the tyranny of his rule in Switzerland led to a great struggle for freedom on the part of the confederated Swiss. The aim pursued by Albert was always the same: by making Austria powerful to force the other sovereign princes to acknowledge his suzerainty and thus to make the crown hereditary in his family. It is, therefore, not a matter of surprise that after his death the electors decided to select a less mighty prince.

Archbishop Baldwin of Trier managed the matter so skilfully that his brother Henry of Luxemburg (Lützelburg) was chosen (1308-13). A man of gentle, amiable character, Henry was full of visionary enthusiasm, but withal he was a man of energy; consequently he was soon very popular. By birth he was in sympathy with the French. German interests concerned him less. Italy had a great fascination for him; he was ambitious to receive the imperial crown, to be the first after a long interregnum. Clement V had recognized him. The Ghibelline party in Italy greeted him with joy. At first he sought to hold a neutral position in the quarrels of the Italian parties, but this proved to be impossible. The Guelphs, led by King Robert of Naples, began to oppose him. When Henry thereupon wished to attack Naples, the old conflict with the Church again broke out, but death suddenly ended his imperial dreams. Henry's only successful act was the marriage of his son John with the heiress of Bohemia, Elizabeth, the sister of Wenceslaus III; for Germany his reign proved of no advantage. The election of his son John to succeed him was impossible, and the Luxemburg party chose Louis the Bavarian (1314-47) in opposition to Frederick the Fair (1314-30). There was a double election, each of the candidates being elected by one party, and a civil war broke out, confined, however, mainly to the partisans of the two Houses of Wittelsbach and Hapsburg. The struggle was ended by the capture of Frederick at the battle of Mühldorf (1322); after this Louis was universally recognized.

While this conflict was going on the old strife between Church and State again broke out. At the time of the double election John XXII claimed the rights of an administrator of the country. He asserted that no king chosen by the electors could exercise authority before the pope had given his approval. This over-straining of the papal claims roused a dissatisfaction which continually grew and to which were already added complaints of the worldliness of the Church. The Minorites placed at the disposal of the king eloquent preachers to denounce the worldliness of the papacy, which had rejected as heretical the Franciscan teaching concerning the poverty of Christ and the Apostles. In 1324 Louis was excommunicated because he had not obeyed the papal command to lay down his authority. To this Louis made a sharp reply in the proclamation of Sachsenhausen, in which he denied the claims of the pope and at the same time defended the teaching concerning poverty upheld by the Franciscans. In the conflict with the pope, who supported the candidature of Charles IV of France for the imperial throne, the German cities and the German episcopate, the latter led by Baldwin of Trier, were virtually a unit on the side of Louis. Even the death of Frederick the Fair did not produce a reconciliation with the Curia. It was at this juncture that the writings of the Franciscans, Michael of Cesena and William of Occam began to exert their influence. The spirit of revolution in the Church is shown by the "Defensor Pacis" of Marsilius of Padua, a professor of Paris who went to the Court of Louis the Bavarian. In this the medieval papal ecclesiastical system is attacked. The intellectual ferment enabled Louis to undertake an expedition to Rome. He had been invited to enter Italy by the magnates of northern Italy, especially by the Visconti of Milan and the Scala of Verona. The city of Rome received him with joy, and he was the first German king to receive the imperial crown from the Roman commonwealth, which had always regarded itself as the source of all sovereignty. But the fickle populace soon drove him away; the means at his command were too small to carry out the old imperial policy. Again Italy was lost. Notwithstanding the lack of success in Italy, Germany in the main held to Louis, who had been excommunicated again. It was now evident that papal interdicts had largely lost their terrors; the civil communities frequently paid no attention to them, and in some places ecclesiastics were forced, notwithstanding the prohibition, to say Mass. The growth of a worldly spirit in the Church began to undermine respect for it, and Germany was the first country to turn against the ideals of the Middle Ages. Sects opposed to sacerdotalism appeared; mysticism tended to make the soul independent in its progress towards God, without, however, rejecting the sacraments, as was done by some in this era. Yet, unintentionally, mysticism strengthened the tendency to deny the absolute necessity of the intercessory office of the Church. Moreover, mysticism gave a national cast to German religious life, for the intellectual leaders of mysticism, Ekkehard, Suso, and Tauler, wrote and preached in German. The chief strength of this religious movement was among the citizens of the towns. In the conflict between Church and State the cities sided with the emperor, but they were not yet strong enough without assistance to maintain the authority of a German emperor. Consequently the position taken by the German princes was decisive for Louis. As he meant to carry on a dynastic policy, as his predecessors had done, he soon came into conflict with these princes, and, in order to be stronger than his opponents, he sought to establish friendly relations with the pope. But although Louis could resolve on vigorous action, yet he lacked the necessary persistence. He was not an able man, nor one of much intellectual power. He tried to make a good impression on every

one; as a consequence, he failed with all parties. He opened negotiations with the Curia, but the intrigues of Philip VI of France kept the two parties from concluding peace. This led Louis to take the side of Edward III of England at the beginning of the war between the French and English for the succession to the French throne. This stand won more general sympathy for Louis in Germany. The electors were also influenced by public opinion when they declared at Rense in 1338 that a legitimate German emperor could be created only by their votes; a king so chosen needed no papal recognition, and the pope, by crowning the German king, only gave him the imperial title. Louis was also declared to be entirely without blame in the dispute with the Curia. When Edward III appeared before Louis at Coblenz and the latter appointed him imperial vicar for the territories beyond the Rhine, the emperor had reached the zenith of his power. Nevertheless the fickle Louis, because he hoped, through the mediation of the King of France, to be reconciled with the Curia and to secure the support of the latter for his schemes to aggrandize his family, allied himself with the French in 1341. Instead of peace a worse estrangement with the papal court was the result.

With the consent of the emperor, Margaret Maultasch of Tyrol, who had married John of Luxemburg (Lützelburg), had divorced herself without awaiting the papal decision and married the emperor's son, Louis of Brandenburg. The Luxemburg party at once had recourse to Clement VI. Louis was excommunicated in 1346, and Charles IV of Moravia (1347-78) was, with the help of the pope, chosen German king by five of the electors under humiliating conditions. At first Louis had strong support from the German cities, but his unexpected death secured universal recognition for Charles. Henceforth for nearly a hundred years the Luxemburg-Bohemian dynasty held the throne. The king set up by the Wittelsbach party, Günther of Schwarzburg, could make no headway against the adroit policy of Charles IV. In 1347 Germany was ravaged by the Black Death; the Jews were immediately accused of poisoning the wells, and a frightful persecution followed. In the midst of the confusion the country was traversed by bands of flagellants, and these "penitents" were often full of hostility to the Church. While in Italy Petrarch and Cola di Rienzi revived the dream of the universal dominion of the Eternal City, Charles IV regarded Italian affairs with the eyes of a political realist. The Italians said that he went to Rome (1355) to secure the imperial crown like a merchant going to a fair. In Germany Charles sought to settle the election to the crown at the Diets of Nuremberg and Metz in 1356, and he issued the Golden Bull, which was the first attempt to put into writing the more important stipulations of the imperial constitution. Above all, the Bull was intended to regulate the election of the king, and defined what princes should have the electoral vote. The electoral college was to consist of the three Archbishops of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne; the Count Palatine of the Rhine; the Duke of Saxony (Sachsen-Wittenberg), and the Margrave of Brandenburg; to this number was added later the King of Bohemia. The electors were granted special privileges; besides the royal rights (*regalia*) and those of taxation and coinage, they received the *privilegium de non evocando*, that is, their subjects could not be summoned before the court of another jurisdiction, not even before an imperial one. The royal authority was to find in the electors who were scattered throughout the empire a support against the many petty princes. Other articles of the Golden Bull were to guard the rights of the local princes against their vassals and subjects, especially against the cities. Nothing is said of the share of the pope in the election of the king; the one chosen by the majority of the electors was to be the

king. Only the coronation as emperor was left to the pope. The Golden Bull remained the most important part of the fundamental law of the Holy Roman Empire.

Learning flourished under the rule of Charles, who was a scholar among his contemporaries. He was surrounded by highly educated men, one of whom was John of Neumarkt, the head of his chancery. His interest being almost entirely in Bohemia, he showed his care for the advancement of learning chiefly in this country and founded there, 7 April, 1348, the University of Prague. Charles held steadfastly to Catholicism and Christian Scholasticism. But this did not prevent him from carrying on policies independent of the pope. In reorganizing the imperial chancery he encouraged the use of German in the imperial documents and thus assured the victory of the national tongue over Latin. By this action he gave German learning an independent standing.

Charles also furthered the interests of the empire in various other directions. He did not, indeed, overthrow the power of the princes, which had grown strong during the several hundred years of its existence, but he sought by the maintenance of internal peace to preserve his supreme power. To promote the foreign interests of Germany he desired to liberate the papacy from its connexion with France and to persuade the pope to return from Avignon to Rome. Gregory XI went back to Rome, but the Babylonian Captivity was to be followed by the Great Schism. In the meantime Charles had largely increased the territorial possession of his family; the Marks of Brandenburg, Lusatia, and Silesia came into his hands. By marriage he hoped to obtain for his son, and thus for his dynasty, both Hungary and Poland. Thus for a time the House of Luxemburg threatened to crush out the Hapsburgs. In two directions only Charles's adroit agreements and diplomatic skill failed of success. The Swiss Confederation seceded more and more completely from the empire, and the cities by their leagues established for themselves an independent position in the empire. Towards the end of his life he secured the election of his son Wenceslaus as German king.

Wenceslaus (1378-1400) reigned without the confirmation of the defenceless pope of that time. The German crown was no longer dependent on the papacy. Other questions far more important than this were now brought into the foreground by the Great Schism. There was a continually growing clamour, which could not be suppressed, for the reform of the Church in its head and members. The demand for reform had infused new life into the whole conception of the Church, and the leaders of this movement still held to Catholic dogmas. The most difficult task of the new king, and one he did not shirk, was to put an end to the schism. He sided with Rome and supported Urban VI while France, at the head of the Romanic countries, upheld Clement VII. Wenceslaus, however, took no energetic action in ecclesiastical affairs; the internal disorder in Germany did not permit it, for here the confederations of princes, knights, and the cities, struggled with one another. In 1381 the confederation of the Rhenish cities formed a coalition with the league of the Swabian cities and sought with considerable success to obtain the adherence of other Swabian towns and of those of North Germany. Thus strengthened, the cities wished to share in the government of the empire; this desire was opposed by the princes who in military force were superior to the cities. The attempts of the rulers of Austria to overthrow the Swiss confederates failed, but in Germany the army of the Swabian League suffered a crushing defeat in 1388 near Döfingen. After this Wenceslaus changed his policy and sided with the princes. Confederations of the cities were forbidden. Owing to their lack of union the cities succumbed in this contest for political independ-

ence and the territorial princes were the conquerors. The quick-tempered, irascible king sought to strengthen his hold on his hereditary provinces by protecting himself against the other ruling princes, but in this he was not successful. A government by favoritism of the worst kind began which excited the anger of the nobility and the clergy. A dispute with the Archbishop of Prague led to the murder, by the king's command, of the archbishop's vicar-general, John of Pomuk, and this caused open rebellion. In 1344 the nobles with Jost, Margrave of Moravia, as their leader, took the king prisoner; he was soon set free at the instance of the German princes, but his release did not do away with the rule of the nobility in Bohemia. In this era of confusion no attempt was made to oppose the repeated incursions (1388) of Charles VI of France into Germany. Wenceslaus looked on inactively when the French king undertook to carry out a scheme for putting an end to the schism by securing the success of the Avignon pope by a bold stroke; but in 1392 Charles VI became insane, and his plans were brought to nought. The waning influence of the German Empire was everywhere perceptible and called forth universal indignation. The king's lack of capacity for government led the majority of the electors to form a league for the protection of the interests of the country.

Soon after this the three episcopal electors chose Ruprecht, Count Palatine of the Rhine, as King of Germany (1400-10). As only a part of the electors joined in this choice Ruprecht was never more than a pretender, and although he was an ambitious and capable man he never succeeded in uniting the empire. Ruprecht hoped to gain popularity by restoring German influence in northern Italy, and by securing the imperial crown to prove himself the legal sovereign. As Ruprecht had no money, his expedition to Italy was inglorious, and its failure had a bad effect on his position in Germany. Even his final recognition by the pope, who had for a long time held to the Luxemburg dynasty, his faithful supporters, did little to aid Ruprecht's cause, and his throne began to totter. In 1405 Archbishop Johann of Mainz combined the princes against Ruprecht in the League of Marbach which, however, accomplished next to nothing. In the question of the schism Ruprecht supported Boniface IX. As King of the Germans Ruprecht was a failure. During the laxity of government that followed his death the German conquests in the eastern part of the empire were in danger of being lost. A new factor had appeared in history, the Kingdom of Poland.

All this time the confusion in the affairs of the Church had continued to grow worse, and it was now proposed to put an end to the schism by means of a council. The cardinals of the two rival popes called a council at Pisa which deposed Popes Gregory XII and Benedict XIII and elected Alexander V, but Gregory and Benedict could still count on some supporters, and the world thus saw three popes. The greater part of Germany held to the new pope, Alexander V, but the party of the Count Palatine and of the Bishop of Trier held to Gregory. A period of utter confusion and great distress of conscience followed; all the relations of life suffered, the political by no means the least. In Germany the troubles led to a double election; Sigismund of Luxemburg, King of Hungary, the brother of Wenceslaus was elected (1410-37), as was also Jost, Margrave of Moravia. Jost withdrew, and Wenceslaus resigned the government to Sigismund, who in 1411 was generally recognized as emperor. The impotence of the last reign convinced the electors, who had chosen Margrave Jost for reasons of Church politics, that a king who had not large territorial power could accomplish nothing. Consequently they dropped their opposition to Sigismund. The latter's life before his election had been a very eventful one.

He had married the daughter and heiress of Louis the Great of Hungary, and had been crowned king of that country in 1387. In the war between Hungary and the Turks he had been completely defeated by Sultan Bajazet; after this he had had to contend with a dangerous rebellion in Hungary. Sigismund was talented, eloquent, witty, and exceedingly ambitious; he was inclined to visionary schemes, but he honestly desired to relieve the woeful troubles of his time. In his hereditary dominions, to which Hungary was now added, there was great disorder. Yet notwithstanding this he succeeded in bringing together the great Councils of Constance and Basle. Ambition led him to attempt to settle the difficulties in which the Church was involved, but he was also impelled by political considerations. He hoped that a council would aid him in suppressing the religious troubles kindled in his hereditary kingdom of Bohemia by John Hus. It was not zeal for the Church, however, which inspired his interest in the council, as is evident from the general bent of his mind. For with all his interest in literature and learning, Sigismund scrupulously avoided involving himself in theological difficulties; moreover he took pleasure in denouncing the faults of the clergy. Nevertheless it was Sigismund's energy that held together the great council at Constance. It was certainly not his fault that many were not satisfied with the result of this and the following council. The forcible interference of the Council of Constance in the religious difficulties of Bohemia and the burning of John Hus were injurious to Sigismund's dynastic interests, and not in accordance with his political schemes. In Bohemia and Moravia the Hussites at once strove to prevent the king from taking possession of these countries; and the result, especially in Bohemia, was a violent religious and national outbreak. The king was held directly responsible for the burning of the national hero and saint. Fanatical hordes led by Ziska repeatedly overthrew Sigismund's army in his crusade against the Hussites, and the storm spread over the adjacent provinces of the empire. Bavaria, Franconia, Saxony, and Silesia were terribly devastated. The imperial government broke down completely. The selfishness of the cities prevented the reform of the German military system, even after its necessity had been proved by further successes of the Hussites. In 1427 an imperial law for the levying of a war-tax was laid before the Diet at Frankfurt, but it was never carried out.

In addition to the troubles in Bohemia, Sigismund's already insecure position was made more precarious by a fresh invasion of Hungary by the Turks. The only help he received was from Duke Albert V of Austria, his son-in-law and the prospective heir of the great inheritance of the Luxemburg possessions. The jealousy among the German states prevented common action against both foes. Sigismund's chief ambition, after the reunion and reformation of the Church, to unite all the nations of Western Europe in a war against the Turks, became more and more hopeless. The defeat of the Hussites appeared equally impossible, and negotiations were opened with them, peace being finally arranged at Basle. Sigismund induced the pope to weaken in his attitude towards the conciliar theory, and especially to the Council of Basle which was to deal with the Hussite difficulties. To gain his point he had gone to Rome, where he was crowned emperor in 1433. Even in Bohemia where the existing anarchy had been increased by a new religious quarrel, where the moderate Calixtines had obtained a decisive victory over the Taborites under Procopius the Great in 1434, the need of peace grew more and more intense. The year previous to this, 1433, a commission of the Council of Basle had made a number of concessions to the Hussites in the Compact of Basle or of Prague; among these was the granting of the Cup to the laity. On the basis of the




Compact a peace was agreed to, which was followed by the recognition (1436) of Sigismund as king in Bohemia. When this was attained Sigismund seemed to lose all concern for the reform of the Church and empire in which before he had shown so keen and active an interest. He can hardly be blamed; for the bound-

less selfishness and jealousy of the princes repeatedly wrecked the work of reform; and the whole responsibility for the scanty gains for the empire achieved during his reign should not be laid on his shoulders. Only two of his measures were to have permanent existence; the transfer of the Mark of Brandenburg to the Hohenzollerns, and the granting of electoral Saxony to the House of Wettin. The great councils passed without bringing the fervently desired reform. Great changes were witnessed in these assemblies. At Basle the pope was regarded simply as a representative of the Church, and the superiority of the council over the pope was openly declared. In 1433 Procopius had been allowed to enter Basle at the head of his heretical followers and to set forth his opinions before the assembled members of the council without molestation. At Basle opinions which were signs of a revolutionary movement in the Church repeatedly appeared. In character this council differed entirely from all earlier ones; the excitement was so great that tumults and brawls occurred. Contrary to the wishes of Rome the council remained at Basle; the fear was that if it were transferred to Italian soil the work of reform would be forgotten. Yet the honest intentions of the majority of the members cannot be doubted. In the end the pope was victorious, and the council was transferred to Ferrara. Some of the members remained at Basle and the spectacle of a conciliar schism was offered to the world.

In this troubled era Albert II (1438-39), Duke of Austria, was chosen emperor. The electors recognized the fact that the centre of gravity of the empire now lay towards the east. Albert, member of the Hapsburg family, had not put himself forward as a candidate, and the electors probably selected him through fear that the important and necessary eastern territories might fall away from the empire. Before he could come to Western Germany Albert, a rough soldier, died during a campaign against the Turks.

The election now went to the head of the Hapsburg family, the inert and indolent Frederick III, who, as King of the Romans, was Frederick IV (1440-93). During his reign the work of reform in the empire fell completely into abeyance. He too was obliged to face the difficulties in the Church. The electors had decided to remain neutral in the dispute between the pope and the Council of Basle, but this neutrality had been broken, inasmuch as the Diet of Mainz in 1439 accepted the reform decrees of Basle, with exception of the assertion of the superiority of the council over the pope. Henceforth bishops and abbots were to be

elected canonically, but the king had the right to secure the election of suitable persons by negotiation. Papal reservations and annates were abolished. The Council of Basle, however, held firmly to its exaggerated conception of the powers of a council, and its members wished




MAIN PORTAL, ERFURT CATHEDRAL

to establish the dogma of conciliar superiority by deposing Pope Eugene IV. In this dispute the electors remained neutral. The reform of the Church was more and more lost sight of by the Council of Basle in its struggle with the pope. Frederick, who was appealed to by both Rome and Basle, at first remained neutral; then he proposed the calling of a new council to reunite divided Christianity. Western Europe gradually turned again to the rightful pope, and the pope elected at Basle, Felix V, received but slight recognition. For a time the German attitude of neutrality was maintained, but after a while Frederick gave the impulse to the universal recognition of Pope Eugene. This was brought about by Æneas Sylvius, later Pius II, an adroit diplomat who was able to influence the king and the leading princes. An agreement was made with Rome in the Concordat of Vienna (1448) in which the Curia made but trifling concessions, while the question of reform received scant consideration. From now on the

Synod of Basle, transferred to Lausanne, had only a shadowy existence. The Curia, although sorely pressed, had once more conquered. The general anxiety to avoid a new schism in the Church had far more to do with the settlement of these ecclesiastical troubles than the interference of Frederick. Moreover Frederick showed his lack of skill in other ways. In 1444 the Swiss at the battle of St. Jakob on the Birs, not far from Basle, by their extraordinary courage defeated his French mercenaries, called Armagnacs, and thus frustrated his schemes for restoring the control of the Hapsburgs over the Swiss League. In

spite of the constant disorders in the empire and the frequent wars, Frederick never wavered in his belief in the future greatness of the Hapsburg dynasty. It was this confidence that in 1452 led him to Rome, where he was crowned emperor by the pope, the last German king to be crowned at Rome. Directly afterwards came the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, which obliged the emperor to take up arms for the defence of the eastern frontier of his realm. Yet he could neither main-



CATHEDRAL (XIV CENTURY) AND CHURCH OF ST. SEVERUS (XIII-XIV CENTURY), FRIEDRICH WILHELMS PLATZ, ERFURT

tain peace within the empire nor its most important rights. Luxembourg and the possessions of the Wittelsbach family in the Netherlands fell into the hands of Burgundy, the Poles annexed West Prussia, and the remnant of the Teutonic Order in East Prussia was obliged to recognize the suzerainty of the Polish king. Thus the Germanizing influences that had been at work for centuries in what is now the eastern part of the German Empire were destroyed.

The complete breakdown of the power of the empire



called forth the demand that the emperor should be either deposed or have a coadjutor, but the lack of harmony among the electors prevented any change. The clamour for internal reform grew louder, but nothing was done except to enact laws for the maintenance of the public peace. During this confusion Frederick's position in his hereditary possessions became very precarious. The Czechs had held the preponderating power in Bohemia ever since the time of the Hussite troubles and now elected George of Podiebrad as king. The Hungarians also chose a ruler for themselves, electing the hero of the wars with the Turks, Matthias I Corvinus. Matthias soon overthrew the Bohemian king, and in 1487 apparently intended to form a great kingdom by uniting the eastern German provinces with the Bohemian, Moravian, and Hungarian territories. Important changes also occurred in the northern part of Germany. The Counts of Holstein, who had carried the German nationality into the northern territory of what is now Germany, had received Schleswig as early as 1386 in fief from Denmark; the two provinces, Holstein and Schleswig, soon grew together. After the death of the last Count of Holstein, King Christian of Denmark was in 1460 elected duke by Schleswig and Holstein. In this way he became a prince of the empire, a point of importance in the near future. This was afterwards to influence the position of the Baltic countries and the German interests there. For centuries the centre of the empire had been in the south, and Germany had had no maritime interests. In this case also, as in the Germanization of the east, self-help was the means of attaining the desired end. The Hanseatic League, a union of German mercantile guilds, rapidly extended from Cologne to Reval on the Gulf of Finland. From the middle of the thirteenth century the chief towns of the League were Lubeck and Hamburg. German commerce flourished on all waters, for the members of the League carried the fame of their country across all the seas surrounding the Europe of that day. It is in fact a striking phenomenon that the national feeling was invigorated, while the strength of the empire was weakened by the division into so many petty sovereignties. The Hanseatic League maintained its ascendancy in the Baltic as late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

At the same time a great power threatened to spring up in the west. By peaceful agreement Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy (1467-77), attempted to secure Frederick's consent to his election as King of the Romans and to the elevation of his possessions to the rank of an independent kingdom. But all these ambitious plans came to an end upon the death of Charles at the battle of Nancy in 1477. The duke's possessions fell to Louis XI of France, while Maximilian, son of the Emperor Frederick and son-in-law of Charles the Bold, hastened to the Netherlands, which he secured for himself (1479) by the brilliant battle at Guinegate. He was not, however, able to make himself master of Burgundy and Artois. Moreover, Flanders was not willing to submit to the new regime and it was not until 1489 that it was completely subdued. Somewhat later, on the death of Matthias Corvinus in 1490, Maximilian's energetic action gained for his dynasty the future possession of Hungary and Bohemia, while at the same time he reunited the Tyrol with Austria. Consequently when the old emperor died, all looked to the knightly hero Maximilian for the restoration of the empire.

Thus the outlook was by no means unfavourable at the time Maximilian I (1493-1519) ascended the throne. There were even indications of a healthier condition of internal affairs. The Swabian League, made up of the free cities and of the knights, sought, especially in 1486, to effect an adjustment of those interests of the different estates which most threatened the existence of the empire. Another favourable sign

was the rapid development in civilization and culture of the several principalities. No less promising was the decision of the electors, now that the imperial authority had shown its entire impotence to check further decentralization. Turbulent agitation for reform in the cities was another important indication in the same direction. Maximilian tried by vigorous reforms to win the good will of the cities, the aid of which would be essential to him in the expected war with France, but the obstacles to be overcome before reforms could be introduced seemed steadily to increase. The most serious difficulty was and remained the antagonism between the interests of the empire and those of the princes. Maximilian, with his dynastic resources, which were made up of very heterogeneous elements, was not able to overcome these opposing forces. Thus the Diet of Worms in 1495 could not do much to promote reform on account of the opposing interests of the ruling princes, the free knights of the empire, and the imperial cities. At this diet the "Universal Pacification of the Empire" was proclaimed. All private wars were forbidden. An Imperial Chamber was established as a perpetual supreme court for the maintenance of the public peace, and the appointments to it were made by the emperor and the Estates of the empire. So many matters, however, were turned over to this court that it was condemned to inactivity from the outset. Nor was the Imperial Chamber able to promote the public peace, as it lacked all power of enforcing its decrees. Order in the empire could not be attained until the subordinate rulers became strong enough to exercise a vigorous police power in their territories. Maximilian had only agreed to the establishment of this court on condition that a general imperial tax, "the common penny", and military help against France and the Turks should be promised him. Concessions of a very different character had also been demanded by the ruling princes from the king. The powerful Archbishop of Mainz, Berthold of Henneberg, was the first to express the opinion that the administration of the empire should be placed in the hands of the electors, without, however, doing away with the monarchy. This proposition of the Diet of Worms was rejected by Maximilian. Five years later, however, when the promised financial and military aid was not forthcoming, he consented to the appointment of a permanent Imperial Council at Nuremberg. If this council had maintained an active existence for any length of time the king would have become a mere puppet. But after two years the royal power proved strong enough to break down the unnatural limitations imposed on it by the Estates.

During these constitutional struggles within the empire the hostile feeling between France and Germany continued to grow. France, now greatly increased in power, wished to gain a firm foothold in the Italian peninsula, and put forward claims to Naples and Milan. Thus began the long struggle of the Hapsburg dynasty with France for the possession of Italy. Maximilian was unable to checkmate the Italian schemes of the French king. In the end Maximilian even changed his policy, for, in order to gain assistance against Venice, he allied himself with France. Yet even now he reaped no laurels in Italy. In the Swabian war also, which the Swiss confederated cantons carried on against the Swabian League, his intervention was unsuccessful. As a matter of fact Maximilian was obliged, in the Treaty of Basle (1501), to acknowledge the independence of the Swiss Confederation. In the course of these wars the Swiss had become enthusiastic soldiers, and after this Switzerland could furnish or refuse entire armies of mercenaries, in this way attaining European importance in the great struggle of the Hapsburgs with France. The work of reform in the empire, however, came to a complete standstill on account of these unsuccessful for-

eign undertakings. The only permanent result of all these efforts was the Imperial Chamber. The course of history could not be reversed: the territorial development of the separate states had been too logical to allow its reversal. A strengthening of the central administration, the preliminary condition for a reform of the empire, was no longer possible. In 1508 Maximilian had assumed the title of "Elected Roman Emperor", thus proclaiming that the imperial dignity was independent of papal confirmation. Restlessly active, he staked everything on the success of those foreign policies that would strengthen his royal power. It was for this reason that he finally returned to his earlier course of action and joined the Holy League against France. The brilliant success of Francis I over the Swiss at Marignano (1515) forced Maximilian to agree to a peace by which the French received Milan, and Venice obtained Verona. In the meantime various imperial diets again took up the question of reform, but the whole reform movement failed entirely, and the separate states gained a complete victory over the central administration. At Maximilian's death practically nothing had been accomplished for the constitution of the empire.

Political and cultural life followed the course of development we have described, the foci being in the several states. Among these states the most prominent were the electoral principalities, which had been granted special honours and privileges by the Golden Bull. The three Rhenish electors were the most important political personages. Saxony was much increased in size by the addition of Meissen. It would have become the leading state of northern Germany had not its territories been divided in 1485 between the Albertine and Ernestine branches of the ruling family. The Electoral Mark of Brandenburg, acquired in 1417 by the Hohenzollerns, was still in the beginnings of its growth. The Hussite wars had almost entirely estranged Bohemia from the empire. The Palatinate of the Rhine, always a home of culture, was still one of its centres. The Duchies of Brunswick-Lüneburg and Bavaria were also prominent. In 1495 the able Counts of Württemberg (Württemberg) received Countship of Swabia, which was raised to a duchy. Baden grew into a principality more slowly. More rapid was the development of Hesse, whose sovereigns under the title of Landgraves, were soon to come into prominence. The future of the empire depended on these minor states. The empire lacked imperial civil officials, imperial taxes, an imperial army, a general and systematized administration of imperial justice, while in these subordinate states there arose a defined government, a centralization of the civil officials, a systematic administration of law. This is also true of Maximilian's hereditary possessions, the Austrian provinces. The leaders of progress in this respect also were the imperial cities, in which intellectual life began to flourish. In art they produced an Albrecht Dürer and the two Holbeins. A darker side, however, was not lacking to this brilliant city life. Bloody outbreaks were often caused by a restless proletariat. Dissatisfaction was also rife among the free knights of the empire who had lost their former importance in consequence of the change in the military system, which had again made infantry the decisive element in battle. Moreover discontent was at work among the peasantry. The knights became robber-knights and highwaymen. Though banned by the empire, Franz von Sickingen, without authority, carried on war with the city of Worms. The economic changes had even more ruinous consequences for the peasantry. The age of discovery, of the growth of commerce, and of great inventions, is also the age in which capital made its appearance as the great power of the world. There was a change in the value of money which brought severe suffering upon the peasantry which was despised and politically without rights, especially in the

thickly populated southern part of Germany. Communistic writings appeared, which discussed the position of the peasants. The unrest increased in Franconia, Swabia, and on the upper Rhine, and revolts occurred. It was proposed to found a communistic kingdom of God and all hopes were placed on a strong emperor. Mixed with these desires was the expectation of a thorough reform of ecclesiastical affairs concerning which dissatisfaction was loudly expressed.

The social-religious restlessness continually increased. The period of political confusion had not passed by without leaving its impress on the German character. The brilliant exterior of life covered but thinly the brutality within. There was widespread evidence of the lack of morality in domestic life, of barbarity in the administration of justice, and of inhumanity in war. Loyalty to the Church continually decreased, although a rich and voluminous religious literature had been disseminated by the art of printing. Great preachers, like Geiler von Kaysersberg at Strasburg, also appeared at this time. The Brethren of the Common Life took for their ideal the abnegation of the world. But all this failed to prevent the decline of the authoritative influence of the Church on the life of the people. The Great Schism had severely shaken the position of the papacy. The common people were estranged from the Church. A craving for religious self-help arose, and religious movements antagonistic to the Church won large followings. German learning loosened the bond that up to then had united it to theology. A new intellectual movement disputed the dominance of Scholasticism at the universities. Nicholas of Cusa, Æneas Sylvius, and Gregor von Heimburg prepared the way for Humanism. The medieval ideals having apparently lost their attraction, men turned to others, which advocated the world and its pleasures in opposition to self-abnegation, and instead of medieval universalism preached the freedom of the individual.

In the second half of the fifteenth century Italian Humanism entered Germany in order to break down here as it had done in Italy the absolute domination of the ecclesiastical conception of the world. But Humanism in Germany assumed an entirely different form. In Germany the end sought was not beauty of form in learning, art, and life; here it manifested, rather, a practical, pedagogical, and, finally, religious tendency. Aided by the art of printing, humanism, by its delight in experiment and induction, roused other sciences to fresh life, such as the science of history and especially the natural sciences. Individualism, moreover, strengthened the national sentiment and was a powerful force in overthrowing medieval universalism, and in putting an end to the ideal of the medieval world, the universality of the Kingdom of God. At the close of Maximilian's reign the signs of the times were undoubtedly very threatening, yet closer investigation shows that the Christian idea was still powerful. Notwithstanding the turning away of many from the Church, there were still men in Germany who were filled with this idea. These men did not conceal from themselves the necessity of genuine moral reform. The same power and intensity of Christian feeling that had built the great cathedrals in the later Middle Ages was still alive in the more serious minded part of the nation. Only the elect few carried these feelings over into the succeeding age, and with them the certain expectation of the reform of the Church from within.

POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica mediæ ævi* (2nd ed., 1896); DAHLMANN AND WAITZ, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte*, 7th ed., edited by BRANDENBURG (1905-); WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter bis zur Mitte des XIII. Jahrh.*: Vol. I in 7th ed., edited by DÜMLER AND TRAUBE (1904); Vol. II in 6th ed. (1894); LORENZ, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter seit der Mitte des XIII. Jahrh.* (3rd ed., 1886-87); VILDBAULT, *Handbuch der Quellenkunde zur deutschen Geschichte*: Vol. I, to the fall of the Hohenstaufens (1898; 2nd ed., 1906); Vol. II, from the fall of the Ho-

henstaufen- to the rise of Humanism (1900); *Mon. Germ. Hist.* (Hanover and Berlin, 1823)—, *Script. rerum Germanicarum* (in a *unischolarum*) or *Mon. Germ. Hist. rerum* (Hanover, 1840, contains revised texts; *Die Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit in deutscher Bearbeitung* (Berlin, 1849—); 2nd complete ed., edited by WALTENBACH (Leipzig, 1884—); JAFFE, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum* 6 vols., Berlin, 1864-73, mainly letters of the Carolingian age, BOHMER, *Fontes rerum Germanicarum, Geschichtsquellen Deutschlands* (Stuttgart, 1843-68); IDEM, *Regesta imperii*, a collection, from Bohmer's various works, of imperial records from the time of the Carolingians up into the fourteenth century, revised and continued to 1410, some parts already published, *Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte vom XIV bis ins XVI Jahrh.* (Leipzig, 1862—), I-XXVIII; ALTMANN AND BERNHEIM, *Ausgewählte Urkunden zur Erläuterung der Verfassungsgeschichte Deutschlands im Mittelalter* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1895); VON BELOW AND KEUTGEN, *Ausgewählte Urkunden zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte*, Vol. I. *Urkunden zur städtischen Verfassung* (Berlin, 1899); ZEUMER, *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte der deutschen Reichsverfassung im Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 1904); VON GIESEBRECHT, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* (5th ed., Leipzig, 1881-90), I-III; (2nd ed., 1877), IV; (Leipzig, 1895), VI; VON ZWIEDINECK-SIEDENHORST, ed., *Bibliothek deutscher Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1876—); NITZSCH, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden*, ed. MATTHAI from the literary remains and lectures of NITZSCH (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1892), III; GEBHARD ed., *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* (2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1902), II; LAMPRECHT, *Deutsche Geschichte* (Berlin, 1891-96), VI; Vols. I-II in 3rd ed. (1902); Vols. III-V, Pt. I in 2nd ed. (1895-96); LINDNER, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* (Stuttgart, 1891), II; LOSERTH, *Geschichte des späteren Mittelalters 1197-1429* (Munich, 1903); in VON BELOW AND MEYERKE eds., *Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte* (Munich, 1903—), in publication; HENSE AM RHEIN, *Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Volkes* (3rd ed., Berlin, 1898); STEINHAGEN, *Geschichte der deutschen Kultur* (Leipzig, 1904); GRUPP, *Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Paderborn, 1908), II, vol. III not yet published; WAITZ, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* (Kiel and Berlin, 1844—), VIII; SCHRÖDER, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (4th ed., Leipzig, 1902); VON INAMA-STERNEGG, *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1879-1901), IV, LAMPRECHT, *Deutsches Wirtschaftsleben im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1886), IV; SOMMERLAD, *Die wirtschaftliche Tätigkeit der Kirche in Deutschland*, Vol. I, *In der naturwissenschaftlichen Zeit bis auf Karl den Grossen* (Leipzig, 1900); HALCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Protestant), Vols. I-IV (Leipzig, 1887-1903); Vols. I and III (4th ed., 1904); Vol. II (2nd ed., 1898).

FRANZ KAMPERS.

FROM 1556 TO 1618.—After the death of Maximilian I the two great competitors for the imperial crown were Francis I of France and Charles, Maximilian's grandson. Notwithstanding the opposition of Leo X and the alienation of French sympathies, the choice of the electors fell on Charles (28 June, 1519), who was crowned as Charles V (q. v.) at Aachen, on 23 October, 1520, and by Clement VII at Bologna, on 23 February, 1530. In January, 1521, he opened the Diet of Worms and his administration of the Holy Roman Empire lasted until his abdication. In 1556 Charles V resigned the imperial throne. This act implied a serious break in the continuity of the political and religious history of the German people. Charles's reign had lasted for more than a generation, but only an insignificant part of it had been devoted to Germany. His attention had been mainly given to the Netherlands, to Spain, and to the wars with France and the Turks. Consequently from 1520 the defection from the Church had made more and more rapid headway, in spite of the emperor's prohibitory edicts issued at the Diet of Worms (1521) and at the Diet of Augsburg (1530), and shortly after 1540 this apostasy threatened to affect the whole of Germany. At the same time the separatist tendencies of the ruling princes increased in strength. It was not until towards the end of his reign that Charles took measures to check the princes of the empire. By the war in Gelderland (1543), the deposition of the Archbishop of Cologne (1547), and the Smalkaldic War (1546-47), he succeeded in bringing the triumphant career of Protestantism to a standstill, thus saving the greater part of western and southern Germany to Catholicism. Driven from these territories Protestantism overran, during the following decades, the Bavarian and Bohemian-Austrian provinces in the south-east. But even there it was not able to maintain itself. On the other hand, Charles did not succeed in forcing the princes to return to their proper position in the empire and to

subordination to the emperor. The most important of the princes were the rulers of the northern states; these were in no wise affected by Charles's military successes, as he did not push his operations as far as northern Germany. The Dukes of Saxony and Bavaria also, who were friendly to Charles and took part in his campaigns, suffered no curtailment of their power. The partial failure of Charles determined the future development of the empire, the basis of which was laid down in the recess of the Imperial Diet of 1555. By it, in the so-called Religious Peace of Augsburg, Germany was divided between the Catholics and the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, and the territorial princes were practically made the political arbiters of the empire. The principle, *cujus regio, ejus religio*, was recognized. The Imperial Chamber (*Reichskammergericht*) was subjected to the influence of the Estates of the empire. In the newly instituted system of administration by "circles" also, the control of the emperor was no longer permitted. Further, the permanent council of administration (*Reichsdeputationstag*), an organ of centralization developed in 1558 from the system of "circles", was summoned and presided over by the Elector of Mainz as chancellor of the empire and not by the emperor. Economical and judicial legislation devolved on the separate states. At the Diet of Speyer (1570) the princes annulled the supreme authority of the emperor in military matters.

These events implied not only a change in the government of the empire, so that it was controlled by the electors and not by the emperor, but the empire itself became almost a shadow incapable of great administrative actions. Its constitutional powers waned; diets were seldom convoked (only ten up to 1618), the decisions of the Imperial Chamber were not carried out, the administration by "circles" did not take root. The empire failed just as signally, as a European power, in maintaining its interests during the great wars of the reign of Philip II in Western Europe, an exception being the Pacification of Cologne (1579), which sought to restore order in the Netherlands, but to which little heed was paid. Not even the boundaries of the empire were maintained. From about 1580 the Spaniards and Dutch established themselves in the Rhine provinces and Emden, and Spain sought in addition to obtain Alsace. France entangled as many of the south-western sections of the empire as possible in its intrigues, especially the city of Strasbourg. James I of England married his daughter to the Elector Palatine. On the Baltic coast the Swedes, Russians, and Poles despoiled the Germans of the more distant territories colonized by them, while the Danes settled in the south-west corner of the Baltic. At the same time the Dutch overthrew the economic supremacy of the Hanseatic League in the Baltic Sea and German Ocean. On the Danube the Hapsburgs were compelled to buy an armistice with the Turks by the payment of tribute. The blame for the helpless condition of the empire rested principally on the reigning princes. They took no interest in its affairs, not because they were lacking in German sentiment, but because the horizon of their ideas was still too restricted, and because either they gave little thought to politics or their attention was absorbed by the details of administration within their own dominions. The governmental organization of their principalities was still very imperfect. The conservation and gradual development of their territories engrossed the energies of the princes, especially of the most powerful among them, the Elector Augustus of Saxony (1553-86) and Duke Albert V of Bavaria (1550-89). They, therefore, avoided war above all things. The only alliance among them that had any stability at that time, the "Landsberg League" of southern Germany (1556-90), had, for its sole object, the maintenance of peace.

The emperors of this period, Ferdinand I (1556-64),

Maximilian II (1564-76), Rudolf II (1576-1612), and Matthias (1612-19), not only failed to arouse the princes to a more intelligent treatment of the affairs of the empire, but by their own policy they encouraged the princes to pursue purely personal ends. For, unlike Charles V who had ruled a world-empire, his successors governed territories, the political importance of which barely exceeded that of the majority of German states, and which only surpassed these latter in extent. Accordingly, as none of them were men of pre-eminent ability, their political aims were narrow, their need of peace urgent, and their credit inadequate, while the credit of the western powers had largely developed since the time of Charles V. Moreover they had harder conditions to face in their own dominions than the other princes. Most of their territories were in the eastern part of Europe where, from the end of the fifteenth century, the landed petty nobles, who formed a large class, opposed with ever-increasing success the progress of the commonalty and the introduction of orderly administration under the control of the sovereign. With this inferior nobility in the dominions of the German Hapsburgs, the Protestants, who attracted to themselves all the opposing elements, made common cause. Thus the emperors were by degrees so harassed in their family possessions that, towards the end of Rudolf's reign, the power fell into the hands of the nobility, and Matthias, though advised by his able minister Cardinal Klesl, was hardly able to maintain his authority.

In the period from 1556 to 1618 the only general movement in the inner politics of the empire, and one that caused important changes in the relative influence of the German rulers, namely, the endeavour to place the ecclesiastical principalities in the hands of the younger sons of reigning princes, was entirely due to the desire of these princes to increase their territories. The ecclesiastical domains in the eastern provinces of Germany were few and insignificant, whereas in the north-west as well as throughout the west and south they were numerous, some being large in extent and of great importance. With exception of the territorially large and powerful Diocese of Munster and the small Diocese of Hildesheim those in the east and north came under the control of Protestant princes as "administrators" to the aggrandizement of the Houses of Wettin, Hohenzollern, and Guelph. In this way these territories were made ripe for secularization. Bavarian princes became Bishops of Cologne and Hildesheim, which were, thereby, saved from the fate that befell the others. These measures quickened the process of consolidation by which the territories of a few dynastic houses in northern Germany steadily grew in extent, the result being of considerable importance in the future political development of Germany. On the other hand, the attempts of the princes to annex the spiritual principalities of southern Germany failed. Protestantism entered these territories at a later date and with less force than it had in those of northern Germany. Consequently the ecclesiastical lands in the south had more power of resistance than those in the north, while the princes were weaker, because their number was large and their possessions all small, excepting what belonged to the Austrian Hapsburgs on the Upper Rhine and perhaps also the territory belonging to Wurtemberg. In these circumstances the Ecclesiastical Reservation (*Reservatum Ecclesiasticum*), adopted at the instance of the Catholics in the Recess of the Imperial Diet of 1555, proved an effective precautionary measure in southern Germany. It provided that any bishop or abbot who turned Protestant could not take advantage of the rule *cujus regio, ejus religio*, but must resign.

The chief opponents of the ecclesiastical principalities in southern Germany were the representatives of the House of Wittelsbach, rulers of the Palatinates and of Bavaria. Prominent because of their noble

descent, the Elector Palatine being in fact the ranking temporal elector, they were all poor in land. The branch that ruled the Palatinate of Neuburg acquired a heritage on the Lower Rhine by marrying into the ducal House of Cleves-Julich, which was becoming extinct. The other branches sought to extend their domains at the expense of their neighbours. What decided the predominance of the Catholics in the south was the result of two movements which settled the question whether the Protestants, in spite of the successes in 1543-47 of Charles V, were finally to seize Cologne and the whole country of the Lower Rhine and from these centres crush the Catholics of southern Germany. In the first of these contests, the "Cologne War" (1582-84), which arose from the apostasy of Archbishop Gebhard Truchsess, the last Archbishop of Cologne who was not a Bavarian, the Catholics were successful. In the second, the contest over the Cleves-Julich succession on the extinction of the native ducal family, the inheritance, it is true, passed to Protestant rulers, the Palatines of Neuburg and the Hohenzollerns; but of these the Neuburg line became Catholic in 1612, so that the danger was dispelled once more. As a consequence the Catholic Church gained sufficient time, after the Council of Trent, to accomplish gradually the reconversion of the greater part of southern and western Germany, especially since Bavaria in the south, and Munster as well as Cologne in the west, remained faithful to it. The political consequence of the Catholic victory in the south-west was that this part of the empire, in contrast to the northern sections, continued to be split up into many principalities. This caused a constant state of unrest among the reigning princes and the nobles of the empire in south-western Germany. The electors palatine, especially, were dissatisfied with their fortunes. They pursued within the empire a policy of hostility to the Catholics and to the imperial house that became more and more reckless with each succeeding decade. Moreover they were in league with France and other foreign countries. In accordance with this policy they turned from the Lutheran to the Calvinistic faith and put themselves at the head of all the discontented elements in the empire. Up to 1591 their aim was to bring about a union of all the German Protestant princes, including the Lutheran, for the purpose of enforcing the claims of Protestantism in south-western Germany. Even Saxony eventually took part in these negotiations. At the same time Calvinism also penetrated surreptitiously into central Germany (the so-called Crypto-Calvinism). But in 1592 a complete revulsion took place in Saxony. After that the only remaining adherents of the palatine princes in central Germany were a few petty reigning princes and counts of that section. One of them, Christian of Anhalt, appears actually to have guided the policies of the electoral palatinate from 1592-1620. After sixteen years more of persistent urging, a few princes of south-western Germany joined the palatine princes in 1608 to form the "Protestant Union". Their value as allies, however, was in inverse ratio to their historical fame. The hopes of foreign succour that the palatine princes had entertained also proved vain; in 1609 the Netherlands concluded an armistice with Spain; in 1610 Henry IV of France was assassinated. In their disappointment the Calvinists brought the entire machinery of the empire to a standstill by breaking up the Imperial Diet in 1613. In their freebooting temper the party was ready to snatch at whatsoever spoil presented itself.

The Calvinistic party was, nevertheless, too weak to inflict any serious harm. The Lutherans, under the leadership of Saxony, drew back more and more. The Catholics, led by Bavaria, maintained a purely defensive attitude. The revival of religious life among them made but slow progress, despite the strenuous exertions of the Bavarian rulers, of the Hapsburgs,

and of individual bishops, of whom the Bishop of Würzburg, Julius Echter of Mespelbrunn, was the most prominent, and of the Jesuits. The situation was in no wise altered by the fact that in 1598 Maximilian I succeeded to the sovereignty of Bavaria. He surpassed all the German princes of that period in ability and energy, and in the course of a few years he made Bavaria the most powerful of the German states. But he was prudent, peaceable, and above all intent on the internal improvement of his principality. Only on one occasion did he offer a decided opposition to the Calvinistic party; in 1607 he seized Donauwörth, which had persecuted its Catholic inhabitants. The Catholic League, which he organized in 1609 to offset the Protestant Union, was of a purely defensive nature.

Thus, in spite of unrest, the peace of the empire was apparently not in immediate danger at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Its impotence, however, was most clearly manifested in its economic and intellectual life. Under Charles V the German mercantile instinct had made the mistake of giving itself largely to the profitable business of money transactions with governments. This was no longer lucrative, but the self-control necessary for the more arduous gains of industrial enterprises now hardly existed. Moreover, political conditions made commerce timid. The free cities of the empire, the centres of mercantile life, had lost the support of the imperial power. The princes were either hostile to them or still biased by their economic views of land and agriculture. Furthermore, the extent of the several principalities was too small to form the basis of commercial undertakings while customs duties closed their frontiers. Foreign competition was already proving a superior force; commerce and manufacture, with the prosperity of which the growth of great states seems universally bound up, were at the point of collapse in Germany. Intellectual life was in an equally discouraging state. Almost without knowing it the nation had been divided by the Reformation into two religious camps, and a large part of it had accepted a wholly different faith. The thoughts of the people were being concentrated more and more on this one fact. They were encouraged in this by the princes who had derived from the schism great advantages in position and possessions, and also by the clergy on either side. The still insurmountable prejudice of the Lutherans of northern Germany against Catholics can be traced to the sermons of their preachers in the sixteenth century. From an entirely different point of view the Jesuits exhorted the Catholics to have as little as possible to do with Protestants. Sectarian strife controlled all minds. Thereby the common consciousness of nationality was just as obscured in the people as it was dulled in the princes by political selfishness.

From 1618 to 1713.—(1) *1618 to 1648*.—The political life of the German nation was quickened into fresh activity by the strong character of several princes who in their respective states took up almost simultaneously the fight against the preponderating power of the petty landed nobility. Those among these princes who made their mark on German history were Ferdinand II of Austria, Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, and, a generation later, Frederick William of Brandenburg, called the Great Elector. In 1617 Frederick II was chosen by his family, on account of the vigour he had shown as ruler of Styria, to be the associate and successor of Matthias. No sooner had the nobles felt Ferdinand's strong hand than they revolted in Bohemia, where they were most rebellious (1618). As Ferdinand did not have at his disposal the means to suppress it vigorously, the rebellion spread to the Danubian provinces, where it was supported by the rulers of Transylvania. When Matthias died (1619) the insurgents, through the mediation of Christian of Anhalt, went to the extreme of raising the head of the Union, Frederick V of Palatinate, to the

throne of Bohemia (August, 1619), in order to obtain the help of the German Protestants. At the same time, however, Ferdinand was chosen emperor by the electors, whereupon Maximilian of Bavaria and the Elector of Saxony promised to fight on his side. The issue at stake was the existence of the Hapsburg dynasty. The struggle was carried on chiefly by the troops of the two Wittelsbach lines and the Elector Palatine was defeated by the Duke of Bavaria on 8 November, 1620, at the battle of the White Mountain (Weissenberg) before the gates of Prague. Ferdinand II followed up his victory vigorously and from 1621 to 1628 established a new basis of political administration in his dominions. The multiplicity of heterogeneous Hapsburg territories, bound together almost solely by dynastic unity, was to be replaced by a compact Austrian state. This was to be founded on a system of government based on one official language, the German, on uniformity of administrative principles, on the profession of the Catholic faith by the entire population, and on the steady support of the reigning house by a body of great landed proprietors whose estates were made up of the confiscated lands of the landed petty nobility. These great landowners, established in the various dominions of the Hapsburgs and free from separatist traditions, were to represent the principle of a single state as against the peoples of the several provinces.

The consequences of this change of system were soon felt all over Europe. The scheme had in view the organization of so extensive a state that the united Austrian dominion must needs become one of the great powers of Europe. Hitherto great countries had developed only in Western Europe, namely, Spain and France. Their fields of conflict were Italy and Burgundy. Now, however, a strong power was rising on the borders of central Europe, which appeared to have unlimited room for expansion in the territories of eastern Europe. By means of its dynastic connexion with Spain it was as well a menace to France. As early as 1623 Austria and Spain supported each other in Switzerland; in 1628 Ferdinand by his power as emperor protected the interests of Spain in the War of the Mantuan Succession. As a result France became the natural enemy of Austria from the very beginning.

It was for this reason that the empire first became interested in the issue of the war in Bohemia. The greater portion of its territory lay between France and Austria. In the paralyzed condition of the empire a war between these two great countries would have to be fought out on imperial territory. It was remarkable that the clouds of war so quickly gathered. For the states of western Europe were, first of all, hampered by internal troubles and by their relations to one another, while the Hapsburgs were occupied at home. Even Maximilian of Bavaria, after the battle of the White Mountain, expected to bring the war to a speedy end by overcoming Christian of Anhalt and a few other adherents of the fugitive Elector Palatine. In order to bring the old Wittelsbach family feud to a final settlement, to seize the Upper Palatinate by way of war indemnity, and to secure the transfer of the electoral dignity from the palatine to the Bavarian line of the house Maximilian occupied the entire Palatinate. But war once kindled in the empire could not be confined within limits, and it spread slowly but steadily (see THIRTY YEARS WAR). Too much inflammable material had been accumulated by the discontent of the petty princes of the empire, by the religious animosities, by the lack of employment that resulted from the economic decline, and by the occupation of the border provinces by foreign powers. Whenever Maximilian gained a victory his enemies with very little trouble enlisted fresh hosts of mercenaries; the Netherlands furnished the money. Very soon he was obliged to send his army




into north-western Germany; thus the war continued to spread.

Two events of the years 1624-29 increased animosities and, finally, in 1630, gave the struggle an international character. (a) The historical development of the German Hapsburgs had led to so close a connexion between their dynastic power in their own dominions and the imperial authority that the recovery of the former immediately filled Ferdinand with the ambition to restore the latter. When he drove the Elector Palatine out of Bohemia he had also outlawed him as a prince of the empire. Now that the territories in the empire occupied by Maximilian of Bavaria were growing in extent and the war was becoming more general throughout Germany, Ferdinand could hardly avoid assuming its direction. He had not the necessary funds for such an undertaking, because of the persistently blundering economic administration of Austria. But he accepted Wallenstein's offer to maintain an army for him. Wallenstein was ambitious to be invested, as the head of an army, with extraordinary powers both military and diplomatic. He was a genius as an organizer and a remarkable man, but a *condottiere* rather than a statesman. Nevertheless the emperor placed him (1625) at the head of an army. Wallenstein did not act in conjunction with Maximilian's troops; moreover, he showed little respect either for the historically established relation between emperor and princes, or for the position of the latter in the empire. He quartered his troops in the territories of the princes, levied heavy contributions from their subjects and treated these sovereigns themselves with arrogance, while at the same time he was not a general who rapidly achieved decisive results. The blind jealousy that had animated the princes against Charles V was now directed against Ferdinand. Once more the complaint resounded that the emperor was placing on them "the yoke of brutal servitude", was making himself "monarch" of the empire, and an autocrat. (b) Maximilian followed up the victory of the Bavarian and imperial forces by restoring Catholicism in the Upper Palatinate. The Catholics demanded the restitution of the small territories in southern Germany of which they had been despoiled since 1550, despite the *Reservatum ecclesiasticum*. Furthermore, overestimating their success in the field, they sought to regain the dioceses in northern Germany that had passed under Protestant administration. The emperor was impelled by his political interests to enforce the claims for restitution in the south, since this would greatly weaken the Würtemberg dynasty, which was an obstacle to the extension of the Hapsburg power in Swabia. In addition he also authorized the reclamation of the bishoprics of northern Germany in the district of the Elbe and at the mouth of the Weser, in order to place them in the hands of an Austrian archduke. Accordingly he issued the Edict of Restitution of 1629. The Calvinistic party of the Palatinate had been totally defeated, and now Lutheranism was in danger of being confined to a comparatively narrow territory split up into detached districts by Catholic ecclesiastical principalities. On this account all the Protestant states of the empire were filled with distrust and resentment, although ill-prepared to take up arms in self-defence.

Cardinal Richelieu had, meanwhile, overthrown the Huguenots in France and had laid plans to strengthen the French power in Europe by the occupation of desirable positions in upper Italy as well as in Lorraine and on German soil. He saw a menace to his schemes in the growth of the imperial power in the empire and in Ferdinand's interference in the War of the Mantuan Succession. He reminded the princes that France had formerly protected their liberties, impressed them with its peace-loving character, and urged them, especially Maximilian of Bavaria, to refuse to elect the emperor's son King of the Romans and to demand the

dismissal of Wallenstein (1629-30). While he thus sought to deprive the emperor of his commander-in-chief and his main army, Richelieu also used every means to induce Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, to invade the empire. The appearance of Wallenstein on the Baltic coast and the invasion of the ecclesiastical principalities on the Elbe by the Catholics disturbed the ambitious King of Sweden. He was the ablest of all the princes who, in the first half of the seventeenth century, sustained the authority of the sovereign against the encroachments of the petty nobility in central and eastern Europe. After a speedily won success in Sweden itself, he set about the task of conquering all the territories on the Baltic in which the princes still suffered the inferior nobles to do as they pleased, thereby securing also for Sweden the control of this sea and a place as one of the great powers. If the Hapsburgs should accomplish their plans for the restoration of Catholicism the schemes of Gustavus Adolphus would be completely frustrated. For, in order to control all the lands on the Baltic and to sever permanently the German provinces of this region from the empire, he must unite them in an organic political system and civilization; this would be impossible unless all of



THE CATHEDRAL, AUGSBURG  
See article AUGSBURG

them were separated in religion from the greater part of the rest of Europe by professing Lutheranism. In the summer of 1630 the king landed in Pomerania; in August the emperor sacrificed Wallenstein to the princes.

The success of Richelieu's intrigues and of the invasion of Gustavus Adolphus appeared more alarming at first than the outcome warranted. They did not cause the dynastic power of the Hapsburgs to totter. Gustavus Adolphus was killed at Lützen (1632); his finest troops, the mainstay of his strength, were annihilated at Nördlingen (1634). Thereafter the Swedes could achieve only ephemeral successes by means of a few bold but spasmodic excursions from the coast into the interior of the empire. Years passed before Richelieu was able to replace the army of Gustavus Adolphus by French troops. During the Swedish invasion he had occupied (1630-34) the whole of Lorraine and the region between the Moselle and the Upper Rhine. After the battle of Nördlingen he openly declared war against the emperor (1635), but he did not venture far beyond the Rhine. Within the empire the first successes of the Swedes led to a reconciliation between Maximilian and the emperor, while the continued occupation of German soil by the Swedes and the French declaration of war after Richelieu's assurances of peace influenced most of the other princes to ally themselves again with the emperor, Saxony leading the way. There was a burst of patriotic indignation, such as had not been known for a long time; men were again ready to sacrifice their interests to those of the empire. In the Peace of Prague (1635) emperor and princes

agreed upon the future organization of the empire. This treaty made allowances both for the historical development of the empire and its necessities: the enforcement of the Edict of Restitution was suspended, the autonomy of the Austrian dominions, of Bavaria, and of the great states of northern Germany was recognized, and the exercise of the imperial authority, in so far as it extended to internal affairs, was confined to the smaller territories of the west and south. On the other hand, the administration by "circles" was to be revived and perfected. Against foreign foes all pledged themselves to act in common, no one desired any further separate leagues. In case of war a consolidated imperial army was to enter the field. As early as 1635 the offensive was taken against France and the Swedes. In 1636 Ferdinand III was elected King of the Romans; he was emperor 1637-57.

Thus the political unity of the German nation, sorely as it had suffered from the weakness of the imperial authority, the excessive growth of separatism, and the religious schism, stood the test in the hour of danger. However, its resources, seriously weakened after a struggle of twenty years, were not adequate to carry out the compact made at Prague and to relieve the distress of the empire at one stroke; Austria, in particular was not equal to its task. It was found impossible to drive the enemy by force out of the empire and to move all the estates to unite with the emperor. For the protection of the frontiers had been neglected and the individual states allowed to cultivate relations with foreign countries too long to permit the attainment of these ends. In western Germany the Landgraviate of Hesse became a supporter of the French, while the young Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg, who had succeeded to his electorate in the latter part of 1640, concluded an armistice with the Swedes. From 1640 on Richelieu was finally able to send French armies into Germany. The inadequacy of the services that Austria rendered the empire and the support it gave the Spaniards, who were hated throughout Germany, reawakened distrust in the emperor. Moreover economic conditions in the German states, after nearly a century of gradual decline, and the ravages since 1621 of the soldiery, became each year more pitiful. The need for rest excluded every other consideration. Even the antagonistic religious parties began to long for peace. The smaller estates of the empire felt no interest in the war and demanded peace at any price with the foreign enemies; even the greater ones, becoming gradually exhausted, declared themselves neutral. In conjunction with the emperor, and even without him, they negotiated for peace at Munster and Osnabrück with France and Sweden, whose influence thereby naturally became much more powerful. But the consciousness that they were parts of the empire did not again die out. A dim perception that Austria in its development as a great power partly belonged largely to eastern Europe had deepened the conviction, which was encouraged by France, that the interests of the empire and Austria were not absolutely identical, that the policy of the one need not of necessity be the policy of the other, and that the empire had needs of its own which should be safeguarded by the estates. In order to meet these exigencies the estates claimed, on behalf of the empire, the right to seek the protection of other great powers as well as of the emperor, so as to find support in all emergencies either on one side or the other. Some declared that these needs were, above all, the restoration and maintenance of peace, and the preservation of the independence of the different estates of the empire, and of the varied forms of German governmental administration as opposed to the centralization of other countries. The Bishop of Würzburg, John Philip of Schönborn, the most active representative of the inferior estates, was strongly imbued with these principles.

These views were officially recognized by the Peace of Westphalia (1648). To procure the evacuation of Germany by the foreign armies France was indemnified by that part of Alsace that belonged to Austria, and Sweden by the territories at the mouths of the Oder and the Weser. The great possessions gained by Austria in Bohemia and in the countries on the Danube were not touched, but it agreed to cease supporting Spain. Within the empire everyone was restored to his own possessions and his own rights. At the same time, however, the possessions of the German princes having military resources were enlarged in such manner that the balance of power was maintained among them. To do this the lands of decadent principalities, especially the lands of the bishoprics of northern Germany which were ready for secularization, were allotted to them. The consolidation of northern Germany into an ever decreasing number of states thus made another great advance, as was evidenced by the fact that towards the end of the war even the much divided possessions of the Guelphs in the north-west were combined to a large extent, like those of the other north German dynasties, under a single government. An attempt was made to assure the mutual recognition of the new territorial boundaries by establishing complete equality between Protestants and Catholics. The Catholics were satisfied with a slight enlargement of their possessions over those they held in the year 1618, the year taken as the standard being 1624, and the Calvinistic Confession was recognized. The new order of things was protected, as regards the emperor, by proclaiming the sovereignty of the princes of the empire, by restoring to them the right to make alliances, and by making France and Sweden the guarantors of the execution of the treaty. As against these two powers, however, it was most inadequately secured; the disturbances in the south-west, it is true, were suppressed, but the division of that region into small states was maintained, and its development thereby impeded. The result was that the frontier bordering on France was ill-protected, while the occupation of the lands at the mouths of the Oder and Weser by the Swedes was a perennial danger to northern Germany.

(2) 1648 to 1763.—Frightful as had been the devastation of property and loss of life, the conclusion of peace did not find a ruined people. Both in political affairs and in the advance of civilization the war had brought about the renewal of national vigour. In most of the states the governments gave themselves to arduous work. Some commercial centres gradually revived, and by untiring energy the agriculture of northern Germany recovered its working power. Intellectual life also reawakened and grew apace. In jurisprudence, political science, education, the perfecting of the German language, and poetry, a succession of scholars, by a constantly increasing mastery of form and matter, produced a series of great works. The study of these works during the next two decades matured the all-embracing genius of Leibniz (1646-1716). France, which reached the height of its literary culture in the following generation, was the teacher of Germany, and Catholicism derived especial advantage from the influence of France. The reputation of Catholicism rapidly increased, and it soon exerted a powerful force of attraction over many high-minded Protestants in Germany which eventually led them into the Church. Around Schönborn especially, who in 1647 had become Archbishop of Mainz and chancellor of the empire, was gathered a circle of Catholics, converts, and well-intentioned Protestants, among the latter Leibniz. From Schönborn emanated an influence that permeated the entire intellectual life of Germany. In the domain of politics Catholic hopes were founded on the military successes of Austria and Bavaria, which had shown themselves the strongest of the German states, on the efforts of Schönborn to in-

fuse life into the administration by "circles", and on his attempt to form alliances among the princes with the ultimate aim of bringing about a general confederation of the estates. Schonborn desired, by means of such a general confederation, to make Germany under his own leadership independent of the favour of the great powers. Although this confederation was to be peaceful in character and could consequently only become a second grade power, he even hoped to make of it a means of establishing a balance of power in Europe between France and Austria, such as some Italians had sought to make of their country in the preceding century. Schonborn's policy was most successful in 1657-58, when Ferdinand III died without leaving an heir who had attained his majority and had been elected King of the Romans, thus giving France an opportunity to attempt to dictate the succession to the imperial crown. Schonborn, however, secured its bestowal upon another Hapsburg, Leopold I (1658-1705); at the same time he united a large number of princes in the Confederation of the Rhine (*Rheinbund*), which looked for support to France.

Still more powerful but not more advantageous for Germany was the influence exercised on the course of events by another reigning prince, Frederick William of Brandenburg, the Great Elector. His contemporaries looked upon him only as the most turbulent of the rulers in the empire. His chief object was the aggrandizement of Brandenburg to the eastward of the Elbe, but in the Peace of Westphalia he had been compensated by new territories in western Germany. Dissatisfied with this arrangement he openly avowed that as the greater part of his dominion bordered on eastern Europe, he, like Austria and even more unscrupulously, did not consider the interests of Germany as identical with those of Brandenburg. When Sweden declared war on Poland in 1655 he took part on the side of the former country with all his resources. In 1658 the new emperor joined forces with him to drive Sweden out of Germany. In order to be more certain of the aid of the imperial troops Frederick William, at the election of the emperor, brought it about that Austria was required to renew its pledges not to support Spain, at which France was preparing to strike the final blow. This threatened Germany once more with serious danger, for France, after forcing Spain into concluding the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659, in 1660 dictated peace on the Baltic at Oliva and Copenhagen on such terms that Sweden was protected against any diminution of its territories. Then when the Turks, after a long truce, renewed their advance on Vienna in 1662 France forced auxiliaries on Austria as soon as the latter began to offer a sturdy defence. Consequently, after the first victories, Leopold preferred to come to a secret understanding with the Turks at Vasvár (1664). France interfered in every quarrel among the states of the empire.

Aided by the personal charm of its young king Louis XIV, who had assumed the government in 1661, France appeared to have obtained a dominant influence in Germany such as Charles V had formerly held in Italy. What it had vainly striven to gain by war France now acquired during ten years of peace. Apparently in all parts of the empire, including Austria, there was a continually growing need of peace. The subsidies that Louis poured into the exchequers of the impecunious princes, who were just beginning to devise a rational system of taxation, were intended to fetter them. The upper classes in Germany surrendered themselves completely to the influence of French culture and customs. Moreover, French statecraft, economic policy, and military system, which presented to the princes an example of effective administrative organization, all promised to place Germany more and more under the spell of its western neighbour. The Houses of Guelph and Wittelsbach and the rulers of Saxony allowed themselves to be won over by France.

In 1667-68 Louis was able to place a check upon the Elector of Brandenburg, and also upon Austria, the dynastic line of which was now reduced to one person, and threatened to become extinct like that of Spain. Although the Peace of Westphalia led the Germans to take France as a model, yet in many unseen ways it prepared the emancipation of Germany. The national consciousness became quickened in proportion as intellectual life reawakened, and the national spirit once more found a voice. The princes gradually drew back from France, and its friendship was only seriously sought by the House of Wittelsbach. When de Lionne, Louis's adviser in foreign affairs, warned him not to carry out his purpose of attacking the Netherlands until he was sure of the sympathy of the more important German princes, all the efforts of the able French diplomats did not avail to obtain this assurance. Louis, nevertheless, advanced against the Dutch, and a storm of popular indignation broke out in Germany which carried along with it the German princes, with the exception of the Wittelsbach line. In 1674 the empire declared war against France.

(3) 1674-1713.—This was the signal for a war of forty years duration, which was divided into three periods. In the first the advantages of efficient generals, well-trained troops, and abundant means were all on the side of France. The contingents of the German princes formed a motley body; in 1675 the Elector of Brandenburg withdrew, and marched into Pomerania against the Swedes. In addition, the allies of the emperor, the Netherlands and Spain, proved inefficient. Only a few isolated exploits, such as the battle of Fehrbellin (1675), revived the fame of German military prowess. In 1679 peace was made between the empire and France at Nimwegen. Louis, however, overestimated his success. On the one hand he calculated on detaching the Elector of Brandenburg permanently from the German cause by compelling him, as in 1660, to restore all the territory won from the Swedes and then to enter into an alliance with France that would reduce him almost to feudatory dependence. On the other hand, after peace had been signed, France seized various strips of territory on the western frontier of Germany (called the "Reunions"), this unwarranted procedure culminating in the occupation of Strasburg (1781). Such conduct, however, only stimulated the patriotic indignation of the small western states (Alliance of Laxenburg, 1682), while at the same time the rising generation in the larger principalities, including the territories of the Wittelsbach line, was rallying enthusiastically around the emperor for the Turkish war. The repulse of the Turks at the siege of Vienna (1683), followed by the glorious recovery of Hungary, gave a new impulse to Austria's political power. With the increase of French interference in German affairs (succession to the Palatinate, 1685; election of the Bishop of Cologne, 1688), German resistance to Louis, in which Brandenburg joined, became unanimous. Louis retorted by renewing war. Although Austria was still engaged in the struggle with the Turks, the military forces of the two sides were almost even. The Margrave Louis William of Baden organized the troops of the small south-western states of Germany in an efficient manner. Austria found in Eugene of Savoy a general and statesman who, in a position similar to Wallenstein's, far surpassed the latter in genius and character. Moreover, the emperor found in England a far more efficient ally than the Netherlands had been. Both sides brought larger and larger armies into the field, until each of them maintained 400,000 men. By the Peace of Ryswick (1697) Louis restored part of the territory of which he had robbed the empire. Austria, by the brilliant victory of Zenta (1697), drove the Turks completely out of Hungary and Transylvania (Treaty of Carlowitz, 1699). The death of the last Spanish Hapsburg (1700) caused a fresh outbreak of

the war as early as 1701. This time Austria was able to employ most of its forces against France, England being again the ally of the empire. The allied powers won brilliant victories, some jointly, some separately (Blenheim, 1704, Ramillies and Turin, 1706, Oudenarde, 1708, Malplaquet, 1709). By straining its powers to the utmost France bettered its position after 1709. During the course of the war Austria changed rulers twice, Joseph I reigning 1705-11, Charles VI, 1711-40. After Charles VI ascended the throne England deserted Austria. By the Treaties of Rastatt and Baden in 1713-14 France retained only Alsace out of all its conquests on the German frontier. Meanwhile Austria, which had once more become embroiled with the Turks, again defeated the latter, and imposed terms at the Peace of Passarowitz in 1718 that were extremely favourable to Austrian trade in the Levant. At the same time a war was raging between Russia and Sweden, and the princes of northern Germany took advantage of it to drive Sweden completely out of Germany (treaty of Stockholm between Sweden and Hanover in 1719; between Sweden and Prussia in 1720).

By the victories over the Turks and by its opposition to Louis XIV the Austrian monarchy became in the fullest sense a great power, while France effected no substantial extension of its frontiers. In this way the plans of Ferdinand II were realized and secured for a long period. But at the same time Ferdinand's successors allowed the imperial power and the reorganization of the empire to decline. In the reign of Leopold I the Diet had, indeed, become a permanent body at Ratisbon from 1663, and the empire took part as a whole in all three periods of the war. The contemporary sovereign princes, however, were interested chiefly in the political development of the separate states. Their policies were based on the centralizing and absolutist principles of the government of Louis XIV. These principles were susceptible of application to the individual principalities, but not to the empire, which, by its very nature, was federal and parliamentary. The empire could never have the same bureaucratic form of administration that the separate principalities had now received, nor could it be organized on a fiscal basis similar to theirs. Consequently Austria, Prussia, which had become a kingdom in 1701, and the other larger German states detached themselves more and more from the empire. Some ruling houses, dissatisfied with the smallness of their territories, which did not admit of extension, were disposed, at the beginning of the new century, to seek new countries. The Elector of Saxony, belonging to the Wettin line, accepted the crown of Poland (1697), while the main branch of the Guelphs ascended the throne of England (1714). The branch of the House of Wittelsbach that ruled Bavaria aspired to the crown of Spain, or at least to the sovereignty of the Spanish Netherlands. When foiled in this they made an alliance with France in 1701; this doomed them to an unfruitful, separatist policy in their territories. Even among the people the conception of imperial unity no longer obtained. It is true that the nation made steady progress towards intellectual unity, as the development of its written language proved. Moreover between 1660 and 1690 the patriotic sentiment of the nation showed itself plainly, but it grew weak again at the very moment that was decisive for a constitutional policy. For the people took but little interest in the aims of the last period of war, the struggle over the Spanish succession, while at the same time the entire organic life of the nation was undergoing a vital crisis. Economically the country made but little progress because its resources were too much exhausted and the constant wars permitted no recuperation. Consequently the social organization of the nation, in particular, lost its elasticity; the nobility became arrogant, the middle class decayed,

the bureaucracy grew overweening and excluded all others from participation in state affairs. During this period the Germans made no effort to secure national unity. Under these circumstances, notwithstanding the German victories, foreign countries affected in large measure German politics. France continued to be the guaranteeing power. Two other great powers, England and Russia, had considerable influence, the former on Hanover, with which it was connected by a common dynasty, the other on all the German states on the Baltic, especially Prussia.

Catholicism lost its preponderance once more owing both to the renewed decay of political and national life in Germany and to the decline of France. At the beginning of the eighteenth century its progress lay in the field of art, especially in that of architecture. In Vienna and the capitals of the spiritual and temporal lords of southern Germany many architecturally striking buildings were erected; among the great architects and fresco painters of this period were Hildebrand, Prandauer, Fischer of Erlach, Neumann, and the brothers Asam. Protestantism, however, led in learning, as was exemplified by the professors of the University of Halle, Thomasius, Christian Wolff, Francke. Moreover, the close relations of England to Germany now began to make themselves felt, and German Protestantism found in England a powerful and progressive intellectual aid that Sweden had not been able to afford.


FROM 1713 TO 1848.—(1) 1713 to 1763.—Many petty differences were still left unsettled in 1713, many an ambition was as yet unrealized. In Germany as well as in the rest of Europe questions remained to be settled by diplomatic negotiations, but swords were sheathed. The people had an intense desire for peace. The industrial classes longed to emerge from the miserable hand-to-mouth existence which had been theirs for so many years, to rise again to the profitable exercise of trades and commerce, and to accumulate capital for larger undertakings. For several decades to come they were obliged to work without visible results. But the strenuous effort produced the will and the strength necessary to achieve the phenomenal economic progress of the German people in the nineteenth century. The prevailing tendency among the princes and nobility was towards the voluptuous enjoyment of the social and artistic pleasures of life, which they gratified by the erection of magnificent buildings and by gorgeous court ceremonials; examples of the indulgence of such tastes were the rulers of Saxony Augustus II (1694-1733) and Augustus III (1733-63), the latter being also King of Poland; Maximilian II Emanuel of Bavaria (1679-1726); Eberhard Louis (1677-1733) and Charles Eugene (1737-93) of Wurtemberg. Men of higher aims were Maximilian III Joseph of Bavaria (1745-77), and, among the bishops, especially those of the Schönborn family. In the interior development of the states the princes sought to complete the reorganization of their territories according to the French absolutist and bureaucratic model, as: the introduction of state officials into local government, the collection of taxes in coin and a money basis for trade, the augmentation of the standing armies, repression of the privileges of the nobility, and the extinction of parliamentary and corporative rights. To perfect such a system both persistent and steady effort was needed; the majority of states fell short in this respect. In Hanover the nobles gradually recovered control of the government; in Austria a perilous state of political inertia set in under Charles VI. Frederick William I of Prussia (1713-40) was the only sovereign who carried out the work of economic reconstruction with energy. The ideal state which the statesmen of the age of Louis XIV sought to attain, an ideal impracticable in larger countries, was to a great extent realized in Prussia. Small as was Prussia's territory and backward as it was in civiliza-

tion, it grew, nevertheless, into a power influential out of all proportion to the size of its population and area, thanks to the high efficiency of the administration, to the utilization of all resources for the benefit of the state, and to the unflagging energy of the king himself. Shortly after 1740 Prussia was able to maintain a standing army of more than 100,000 men ready for war, and with this army it could turn the scale in a conflict between the equally balanced forces of the great countries.

In 1740 Frederick II, the Great, succeeded to the throne of Prussia. In the period just passed Austria and France had exhausted themselves in a war begun in 1733 over issues that had not been settled in 1713, namely, the Polish Succession, and the right of France to Lorraine. By the Peace of Vienna in 1738 France obtained Lorraine; Austria, moreover, in 1739 lost Belgrad to the Turks. Soon after Frederick's accession in Prussia, the Emperor Charles VI died, leaving a daughter, Maria Theresa (1740-80). France and Bavaria took up arms to prevent her coming to the throne of Austria; this was in direct violation of the promises made to Charles when these countries recognized the Pragmatic Sanction. At the instigation of France the electors chose Charles Albert of Bavaria emperor under the title of Charles VII (1742-45). Frederick the Great took full advantage of Maria Theresa's difficulties; he occupied Silesia and, upon her refusal to surrender it, concluded an alliance with France and Bavaria; the wars that followed upon this were the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-48), the First Silesian War (1740-42), and the Second Silesian War (1744-45). Impaired in strength during the weak government of Charles VI, Austria seemed ready to fall to pieces under the force of the shock. But the hesitation of Frederick the Great, the aid of England, Austria's ally after 1742, and above all Maria Theresa's political energy and inspiring personality helped Austria to withstand the shock. Silesia, it is true, was not recovered, but Maria Theresa kept all the other provinces and in 1745 her husband, Francis I, was elected emperor. She found in Kaunitz a most valuable guide in matters of foreign policy and a wise assistant in the direction of home affairs. The internal administration was steadily perfected in imitation of Prussia, the army was reorganized by Daun, Laudon, and Lacy. Further, by the new alliance between the three great European powers, Austria, France and Russia, Austria was once more established in a commanding position in Europe. However, Frederick, with the aid of England as ally, prevented the consequences of these measures from becoming immediately apparent. In 1756 he made a fresh attack on Austria while England simultaneously went to war with France for the purpose of acquiring the latter's colonies. The ensuing struggle was the Seven Years War, which exposed the weak points of the schemes of Kaunitz and especially the decline in the military strength of France before their excellences could be turned to use. Moreover Maria Theresa, by summoning as empress the French to enter the country, stifled in the princes all feeling of obligation to the empire, while Frederick by his victory over the French at Rossbach (1757) became a national hero despite the unpopularity of Prussia. In addition, the sturdy resistance that the Prussian king offered to the three powers, even though he failed of victory, made an impression on the political world in Prussia's favour no less great in results than were the consequences in northern Germany of his alliance with England.

(2) 1763 to 1815.—After the Treaty of Hubertusburg (1763) Prussia was not only an independent state, it had as well an independent policy. From this time on the rest of northern Germany also became alienated from Austria and southern Germany. These states now received an impulse from England such as they had never had from the empire and Central

Europe, for England in this period was rapidly advancing in commerce, industries, and intellectual life, and exhibited an energetic and far-seeing political policy. The mining of the coal and ore deposits in the Rhenish-Westphalian district and in Silesia was undertaken on a large scale, the number of factories increased, the Hanseatic towns took advantage of the American Declaration of Independence to establish transoceanic trade relations that were pregnant with rich results for the future of German commerce, while agriculture east of the Elbe adopted larger methods involving the use of capital in order to develop export trade in grain with England. In addition to Halle other universities in northern Germany became noted as centres of intellectual life; among these were Göttingen, founded in 1737, which had the historians and writers on political science, Schölzer and Spittler, as professors, and Königsberg, where Kant and Kraus taught. Most of the precursors of the classical age of German poetry, as Klopstock and Lessing, were North Germans, so were many of the writers of the Storm and Stress (*Sturm und Drang*) period. And although Goethe and Schiller, the great poets of the classic era, were South Germans, yet they made their homes in the



THE CATHEDRAL, BAMBERG  
See article BAMBERG

north, the centre from which their influence was exerted by the Court of Weimar. Herder and the two Humboldts were Prussians. The Romantic School also under the leadership of North Germans, the Schlegels, Hardenberg, Tieck, Schleiermacher, developed around two northern cities, Berlin and Jena. It was through the intellectual ascendancy exerted by northern Germany that Denmark and Holland were brought almost completely within the sphere of German culture. From north-western Germany proceeded the chief influences that in a periodical press created German public opinion (Schölzer's criticisms on contemporary politics in his "Staatsanzeigen", the political writings of Gentz), and encouraged the sense of nationality (Möser, Count Stolberg). It was in this part of Germany that Freiherr vom Stein received his early education and his training in official life. The relatively large area of the states of northern Germany, the result of the last two hundred and fifty years of political evolution, encouraged intellectual progress and was in turn promoted thereby. For the first time northern Germany undertook to outstrip southern Germany in development; along with this, however, the Protestant states once more took the lead of the Catholic states.

It is true that southern Germany immediately strove to compete with northern Germany, but the division of the former section into so many small principalities paralyzed commerce and retarded intellectual progress and the development of industries. Joseph II (q.v.), joint-ruler with Maria Theresa from 1760 and sole ruler of Austria from 1780 to 1790, desired to remedy this disintegration by annexing Bavaria to



Austria and by extending the Austrian power in Swabia and on the Upper Rhine. The latter result he desired to attain by making the city of Constance a great emporium of trade between Italy and Germany. In Austria he set on foot far-reaching projects of reform. On the non-material side he and other rulers strove to infuse new strength into the intellectual and civilizing influence of Catholicity as opposed to Protestantism. Catholicity in southern Germany, which remained closely in touch with French intellectual life, suffered from the paralyzing influence of French rationalism and its destructive critical tendencies. The champions of the Church, foremost among them being the Prince-Abbot Martin Gerbert of St. Blasien, gave it a more national basis again and infused into it a more positive spirit. But they failed, almost without exception, to renounce in principle the rationalistic movement; this failure led many men, as Joseph II, and Wessenberg, into grievous errors. Progress in southern Germany depended ultimately upon progress in Austria. Not only, however, did all the political plans for Germany of Joseph II break down before the opposition of Frederick the Great, as shown in the War of the Bavarian Succession (1778-79) and in the league of princes formed by Frederick against Joseph (1785), but towards the end of Joseph's reign serious revolutionary movements sprang up against him even in his own dominions. A complete reversal of the relative strength of northern and southern Germany seemed imminent.

Nevertheless northern Germany did not fully utilize the pre-eminence it had obtained in intellectual progress. In spirit Frederick the Great was not in sympathy with recent developments. The English political system rested on principles differing widely from French absolutism, the methods and aims of which Frederick, following in his father's footsteps, clung to tenaciously. He even carried these somewhat further, especially in regard to economic administration. Taken altogether his political achievements were the greatest and most effective development of the French system. After 1763 by the annexation of West Prussia, obtained through the First Partition of Poland in 1722, he extended his dominions in the district of the Oder and Weichsel Rivers, and by adopting the policy of Catherine II of Russia he secured for his kingdom a strong position among the states of Eastern Europe. Moreover he declared his intention to give special weight to the eastern or Prussian part of his monarchy by making its nobility, the *Junker*, his principal instruments both in the military and civil administration. From the time of their arrival in these districts these nobles had been trained to fight and to colonize. The impulse towards a united northern Germany could in this era only come from Frederick the Great, the middle class of north-western Germany had not as yet made itself felt. In 1786 Frederick died, whereupon Prussia's prestige declined once more. Bereft of a strong political stimulus the intellectual life of Germany, both north and south, took on a cosmopolitan and purely humanitarian character.

Even the outbreak of the French Revolution at first produced in Germany not progress but a shock. The ideas of 1789 were greeted with approval, but when the Revolution became radical in 1792 and involved Germany in war, the people, craving peaceful development, without exception rejected it. Austria, reorganized by Leopold II (1790-92), took up again under Thugut, prime-minister of Francis II, who was Francis I of Austria (1792-1835), the policy of expansion initiated by Joseph II. Thugut, however, preferred to make conquests in Italy rather than in southern Germany, and Napoleon's victories in 1796 compelled him to desist even from these (Treaty of Campo-Formio, 1797). The princes of southern Germany, being left to themselves, now turned to the French government

and by humble supplication obtained from it the aggrandizement of their territories at the expense of the ecclesiastical rulers whose dominions were to be secularized. At the Congress of Rastatt (1797-99) France was willing to grant their petitions, but Russia, England, and Austria brought the congress to a premature end by renewing the war with France. Previous to this, in 1792, Prussia had joined Austria in taking up arms against the French Revolution. At the Treaty of Basle (1795), however, it had deserted Austria and, influenced by French diplomacy, disclosed for the first time its ambition to become the ruling power of northern Germany, to annex Hanover, and to carry out the secularization of ecclesiastical lands. But Frederick the Great's successors, Frederick William II (1786-97) and Frederick William III (1797-1840), were men of little energy. Moreover at the Second (1793) and Third (1795) Partitions of Poland Prussia had assumed more Polish territory than it could assimilate; its administrative resources, unable to bear the strain put upon them, were paralyzed. Thus the end of the eighteenth century left Germany in complete disorder.

South-western Germany, brought into constant contact with France by active commercial relations, now manifested a desire for comprehensive and efficient political organization. For, by the impetuosity with which the French Revolution preached the principle of nationality and the rights of the individual in the State, the German mind had again become accessible to national ideas and strong political convictions. From the beginning of the nineteenth century the Romantic School extolled the glories of German nationality and the empire, and the younger generation of officials in the several states, especially in Prussia, promoted drastic measures of reform. Napoleon, as the instrument of the times, contributed to the realization of these ideals. Defeating Austria again, both in 1800 (Treaty of Lunéville, 1801), and in 1805 (Treaty of Presburg), Napoleon proceeded to make a new distribution of German territory. By the Treaty of Lunéville he annexed the left bank of the Rhine to France. By the partition compacts with Prussia and Bavaria in 1802 and by the Imperial Delegates Enactment of 1803, he secularized such ecclesiastical states as still existed, and in 1805-06 he abolished the rest of the decadent petty principalities in the south, including the domains of the free knights of the empire and of the free cities. He wished to retain only three territorial divisions in southern Germany: Bavaria, Württemberg, and Baden. These his creative genius built up into secondary states, similar to those of northern Germany both in area and in their capacity for internal development. The South Germans had at last a clear course for renewed progress. Napoleon hoped thereby to put them under lasting obligation to France; in 1806 he bound them, as well as the central German states, more strongly to himself by the Confederation of the Rhine (*Rheinbund*). In the abolition of the small principalities he gave the death-blow to the Holy Roman Empire, which ceased to exist 6 August, 1806. The administration and economic condition of the secondary states now rapidly improved, but, contrary to Napoleon's expectations, the sympathies of their inhabitants did not turn to France. Napoleon then overthrew Prussia at the battles of Jena and Auerstädt (1806) and by the Treaty of Tilsit (1807) left to Prussia only its original provinces between the Elbe and the Russian frontier. After this, by means of far-reaching, liberal reforms instituted under the enlightened guidance of Freiherr vom Stein aided by Gneisenau and Scharnhorst, both state and army in Prussia became stronger and more progressive than ever before. In all the German lands on the right bank of the Rhine the educated classes were full of fervid patriotism, and in Austria and Prussia as well the people bore the foreign yoke with

impatience. In 1809 a national war against Napoleon broke out in Austria. The Tyrolese under Hofer made an heroic struggle, and Archduke Charles won a victory over the French at Aspern. It is true that Napoleon, notwithstanding all this, finally maintained his ascendancy (Treaty of Schönbrunn, also called of Vienna, 1809), and Austria, thereafter, by the advice of Metternich, who was prime-minister from 1809 to 1848, adopted a policy of inaction. Pursuing an opposite course, the Prussian people rose in a body in 1813 after Napoleon's disastrous campaign in Russia. This revolt Napoleon did not succeed in crushing; on the contrary, he himself was now defeated in the Wars of Liberation by the coalition of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and England.

The interior of Germany, the true home of Teutonic national life, had been forced almost completely into the background during the eighteenth century by Austria and Prussia. During the Napoleonic era it advanced materially in influence as a result of the formation of the secondary states and the growth of national political opinions. Nevertheless Austria and Prussia re-established their military ascendancy over the interior during the Wars of Liberation. In the Treaties of Paris (1814) and at the Congress of Vienna (1814-15) efforts were made to do justice to both of these circumstances. Under Metternich's guidance Austria reached the climax of its power at the Congress of Vienna. It became the leading state in Europe, but at the same time it made the Danube and the territory east of the Alps the centres of its power and withdrew completely from southern Germany. Prussia, now likewise recognized as a great power and a leading state of Germany, received, on condition of surrendering a part of its Polish possessions, a strong position in the extreme north-west, but it did not attain the hegemony of northern Germany. The Napoleonic system of secondary states was ratified and amplified, as in the four kingdoms of Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Hanover, and Saxony, etc. It was hoped that this settlement would be permanent since it was founded on the joint liability of all the European states, a principle recognized by the Vienna Congress and the maintenance of which was guaranteed both by Prussia and Austria. Moreover the political rivalry between the different faiths was supposed to have been overcome, since of the great powers Austria was Catholic and Prussia Protestant and both were now on friendly terms. By the award of many Catholic districts to Protestant sovereigns Catholicity had, it is true, sustained great losses in central Germany, Wurtemberg being one-third, Baden two-thirds, and Prussia almost one-half Catholic. It was thought, however, that none of these states, not even Prussia, could be able thereafter to retain an entirely Protestant character. Moreover Catholicity gained greater influence over the minds of men owing to the Romantic movement and the spread of anti-revolutionary ideas. Metternich, continuing the policy decided upon in 1548 and 1635, committed himself to the following programme: to give a new guarantee to the reawakened national feeling by establishing a German Confederation; that each German state must belong to the Confederation, though without prejudice to its autonomy; that the primary object of the Confederation was to be the defence of the independence and stability of Germany against external foes as well as against revolutionary agitation; but it was also to be allowed to develop into a confederated state by gradually enlarging its authority over the internal affairs of the individual states, such as commerce, economic administration, civil and constitutional law. The organ of this confederation was to be a permanent assembly composed of plenipotentiaries appointed by the reigning princes, as in the Imperial Diet prior to 1806. This body was authorized to enact fundamental laws for the confederation and to organize its administrative

machinery (Federal Acts of the Congress of Vienna, 9 June, 1815).

(3) *1815 to 1848*.—The Federal Diet was in session from 1816 to 1848 and again from 1850 to 1866 without, however, enacting any fundamental laws or creating any administrative machinery. The only result of the deliberations was a fuller and more detailed but not a more definite statement of the problems to be solved by the confederation (Final Federal Act of Vienna, 1820), and this in spite of Metternich's pressure for the working out of these problems. Prussia and the secondary states opposed all progress in the work of the Diet. Even Metternich was no longer really in earnest about it. In the autumn of 1815 he had concluded the Holy Alliance with the Czar and the King of Prussia and had thereby bound himself to a common policy with the great powers of Eastern Europe, the three countries Russia, Austria, and Prussia being then called the eastern powers. This policy, in view of the possibility of revolutionary agitation, opposed the national and constitutional current of the times. Moreover, as Premier of Austria, Metternich's course had to be directed by the fact that, after the troubles of the reign of Joseph II and the losses sustained in war during the last twenty-five years, the country stood in need of absolute rest. Austria kept its people from all foreign commercial competition and in politics avoided contact with foreign nations. Consequently its policy within the confederation was restricted substantially to the safeguarding of its own interests.

Between 1815 and 1848 Prussia and the secondary states also devoted themselves exclusively to the solution of problems within their own boundaries. Up to 1848 Germany witnessed the most complete autonomy of the individual states in its entire history. The need of national unity was once more entirely ignored. In most of the secondary states much was done to improve the administration and the economic policy. Prussia, the self-reliance of which had been still further intensified by the Wars of Independence waged against Napoleon, completed the reforms that had been started in the period before 1815, although not in the German national spirit of their authors but rather in accordance with antiquated Prussian ideas. Even the new western provinces were as far as possible subjected to the old Prussian law as well as the old Prussian ecclesiastical policy and methods of government. At the University of Berlin, founded in 1809 by William von Humboldt, Hegel raised the Prussian conception of the state, filled with the spirit of Protestantism and rooted in absolutism, to the dignity of a philosophical system. He gave this position to the state as the highest and all-controlling form of society. Nevertheless the individual German states had clearly passed the limit of their capacity for organization. Routine dominated state administration. A well-trained but arrogant bureaucracy seized control of the government in Prussia as well in the secondary states, and while it carried to excess the traditional political principles, yet it did not enforce them with the firm hand of the rulers of an earlier era. This was especially the case in the conflict concerning mixed marriages in the fourth decade of the century when the Prussian government arrested Archbishop Droste-Vischering of Cologne as an "insubordinate servant of the state" (1837). Its weakness was also plainly shown when the people of western and southern Germany objected to the interfering supervision of the government officials.

The middle class was indebted to Metternich for more than thirty years of uninterrupted peace, during which he protected it from all disturbances both at home and abroad, and they owed to Prussia laws more favourable to commerce than had ever before existed. These were the moderately protective Prussian customs law of 1818 and the founding (1833) of the cus-

toms-union (*Zollverein*), which made a commercial unit of Prussia, central and southern Germany. Now for the first time the exertions of the commercial classes during the eighteenth century brought forth ample fruit, and Germany regained the financial ability to undertake large commercial enterprises. Important industries flourished and traffic was increased many-fold, while the middle class gained a clearer perception of the influence of foreign and domestic policies on economic conditions. The leaders (Hansemann, Mevissen, and von der Heydt) in the manufacturing district of the Lower Rhine, the most promising region in Germany from an economic point of view, were ready as early as 1840 to guide the fortunes of Prussia, provided they could obtain political rights. Holding radical views in politics and religion, they adopted also the political demands of their intellectual kinsmen in France, the Liberals: the creation of a constitutional parliament and the remodelling of the body politic in accordance with their social and economic principles. As Prussia like Austria had not granted its subjects a constitution, the struggle of these men for influence was conducted under difficulties. Their efforts, however, were aided by the existence of constitutional government in some of the smaller states since 1819, whereby a number of men, mostly university professors, were enabled in the several Diets to attack the bureaucratic administrations. These men were also Liberals, but their primary demand was the substitution of popular government for that of the bureaucracy; the leaders were Rotteck and Welcker of Baden, and of the moderates, Dahlmann. As early as 1837 matters came to a crisis in Hanover, while in Baden the contest lasted from 1837 to 1844. In answer to the opposition they called forth the Liberals raised the battle-cry of national unity, claiming that union would be the strongest guarantee of civic liberty. Their programme, as well as the appeal to the moral feeling of the people made by many of their leaders, aroused universal sympathy. As champions both of the principle of national unity and of economic and social progress, they hoped soon to be able to lead the entire people in a struggle against the reactionary administrations of the individual states. The latter, blinded by their particularistic prejudices, did not rally their forces to meet the threatening attack. As early as the forties differences on politico-economic questions weakened the customs-union between Prussia and the states of southern Germany. Metternich had repeatedly urged that Austria become a member of the customs-union. But it now appeared that the social and economic differences, always existing between Austria and the rest of Germany, had been so accentuated by the selfish policy pursued by Austria since 1815 that a strong opposition to its entering the customs-union came from within Austria itself.

The position of the Catholic Church also became critical. The expectations of the Congress of Vienna had not been realized. Catholicity, it is true, owing to the splendid abilities of a number of men, partly the sons of the Church and partly converts, exercised a leading influence in the field of political sciences (Haller, Adam Müller, Frederick von Schlegel, Görres, Jarcke, Radowitz), in history (Buchholtz, Hurter), in art (Cornelius, Overbeck, Veit), and in theology (Mohler, Döllinger, Kuhn, Hefele). But in actual political life and in connexion with the life of the masses it fared ill. The bureaucratic state administration so fettered the Catholic Church that it was hardly able to stir, while Liberalism, for the most part anti-Catholic, threatened to place a gulf between the Church and the people. The deep piety of the people, however, was manifested both in 1844, on the occasion of the pilgrimage to Trier, and in the rejection of German Catholicism (1844-46). The attempt, however, to build up a Christian and anti-revolutionary party in

conjunction with a few conservative Protestants (the two von Gerlachs, and the periodical "*Politisches Wochenblatt*" in Berlin; Gorres and his circle of friends in Munich), on the basis of Haller's political teaching, was unpopular and altogether out of sympathy with the actual politico-social and politico-economic development of the nation. Nevertheless a few courageous politicians attacked at the same time the bureaucratic administration and Liberalism; thus Görres published his "*Athanasius*" in 1837, and founded with friends the periodical "*Historisch-politische Blätter*" in 1838; others were Andlaw and Buss in Baden, Kuhn and Hefele in Wurtemberg, Moritz Lieber in Nassau. In Bavaria the Catholics were represented by the Abel ministry (1837-47). In Austria Metternich favoured them.

FROM 1848 TO 1871.—The wide-spread political agitation in Western Europe, which from 1846 had been undermining the foundations of the system of government established by the Congress of Vienna, culminated in Germany in March, 1848. The reigning princes, unprepared for the emergency, turned the governments over to the Liberals and ordered elections for a German Parliament on the basis of universal suffrage. Austria and Prussia, in addition, now granted constitutions to their peoples and, besides the national, summoned local parliaments. On 18 May the German National Parliament was opened at Frankfort, Heinrich von Gagern presiding. Archduke Johann of Austria was elected provisional imperial administrator. The success of Liberalism was apparently complete, the individual existence of the separate states practically annulled, and the establishment of a constitutional German national State, as opposed to the development as a confederation, seemed assured. The only difficult question was, apparently, how Prussia was to be "merged" into Germany. However, as Frederick William IV of Prussia (1840-61) had expressed his sympathy with German unity, while the Liberals were prepared to make it as easy as possible for Prussia, as the head of the customs-union and the leading Protestant power in Germany, to surrender its individuality as a state, and were ready to offer to Prussia the hereditary imperial crown, the Parliament made light of this obstacle. Austria, rent by grievous national dissensions, seemed ready to step aside of its own accord.

In the autumn of 1848, however, the situation became complicated. The draft of a new constitution made by the Liberals awakened the distrust of the Catholics by its provisions regarding the Church and the schools. At the suggestion of the Pius Association (*Piusverein*) of Mainz, the Catholics flooded the Parliament with petitions, while in October the Catholic societies assembled at Mainz and the German bishops at Würzburg. The Liberals gave way but conditions remained strained. The great mass of Catholics repudiated the proposed settlement of the German question in the "*Little German*" (*Klein-deutsche*) sense, which advocated the exclusion of Austria from Germany and the conferring of the imperial dignity upon Prussia; they demanded that Austria should remain part of Germany and should be its leader. This was called the "*Great German*" (*Gross-deutsche*) view. Simultaneously a radical reaction broke out against the Liberals. Liberalism stood for ethical and political progress only, not for social progress; nevertheless it had received the support of the labouring classes, who were impoverished by the recent industrial development but not ready to become a political organization, because of the Liberal opposition to the existing state of things. Now that the Parliament did nothing to better their condition they flocked to the standards of radical agitators. Before the spring of 1849 repeated disturbances resulted, especially in Southern Germany; furthermore Radicalism obtained a majority in the constitutional assembly

of Berlin. The Liberals were not able to make any headway against this movement. Prussian troops had to re-establish the authority of the state, and in the interim the reigning princes had also regained confidence. Austria, now under the leadership of Schwarzenberg (Francis Joseph having been emperor since November, 1848), declared in December, 1848, that it would not suffer itself to be forced out of Germany. The Catholic agitation as well as the politico-economic movements were in Austria's favour. The industrial classes of Southern Germany, inspired by the fear that Prussia would adopt free-trade, desired to secure a politico-economic alliance with Austria, while the great merchants of the Hanseatic cities preferred for the field of their commercial operations Germany with Austria included, an area extending from the Baltic Sea to the Levant, to the lesser Germany alone. Having imposed a constitution on his kingdom in December, 1848, the King of Prussia refused to accept the imperial crown at the hands of the Frankfurt Parliament (April, 1849). Maximilian II of Bavaria (1848-64), by a strange recourse to the ideas of the seventeenth century, advocated a union of the secondary states, which in conjunction with Prussia but not in subjection to it, should control the policy of Germany (the "Triad").

In May, 1848, the Frankfurt Parliament came to an inglorious end. An attempt was made immediately afterwards by Prussia with the aid of the Liberals and the secondary states to agree on a German constitution maintaining the federal principle (The Union, Diet of Erfurt, 1850), and to form merely an offensive and defensive alliance with Austria; this was foiled by Austria. But although Austria forced Prussia to yield in the negotiations at Olmütz in December, 1850, it failed to effect either the renewal of the German Confederation under conditions that would strengthen itself or to gain admission to the customs-union. The German Diet, still unreformed, resumed its deliberations in 1851, while by the treaty of February, 1853 (*Februarvertrag*) the negotiations for Austria's entrance into the customs-union were postponed for six years. Austria and Prussia neutralized each other's influence and nothing was done, either in the customs-union or in the Diet. Consequently the central states, Saxony and Bavaria, von Beust being prime-minister in Saxony and von der Pfordten of Bavaria, regarded themselves as the balance of power. Maximilian II summoned to Catholic Munich Liberal and Protestant professors, nicknamed the "Northern Lights", in order to win the public opinion of all Germany for his "Triad" project. Both of the great powers strove to secure the support of the German press. The failure to secure German unity once more gave the bureaucracy of the individual states the control. It was, however, no longer able to check the growth of democratic ideas among the people, and the masses were more and more influenced by the political and social movement of the times. In 1849-50 Liberalism underwent defeat; it then changed its programme and pursued chiefly economic aims. These were attained partly by founding countless politico-economic associations, such as consumers' leagues, unions of dealers in raw products, and loan associations (*Schulze-De-litzsch*); partly, and more largely, by controlling the use of capital on a large scale. During the fifties the representatives of great capital were able, by founding large joint-stock banks, principally for the purpose of building railroads and of financing mining enterprises, to attain a leading position in German economic life. The large landed proprietors of the Prussian provinces east of the Elbe had also in 1848 formed an economic, the Conservative, party. They watched over agrarian interests and also aimed at restoring the old Prussian-Protestant character of the Prussian monarchy and the absolute sovereignty of the king. For a time incompetent leadership hindered their growth. On the

other hand the Catholic movement soon spread among the people, though it did not constitute as yet an organized political party. The Catholics, undeceived at last as to the true character of Liberalism, but without entering into relations with the Conservatives, devoted themselves chiefly to the interests of the suffering masses whose social and economic needs had interested Radicalism merely as a pretext for agitation, and who had been neglected by the other parties. Thus arose the organization of journeymen's unions (*Gesellenvereine*) by Kolping, of farmers' associations by Schorlermer-Alst, and the attempts to solve the labour question, which was taken up especially by Ketteler and Jörg. At the same time the Catholics fought against the restoration of Protestant supremacy in Prussia ("Catholic Fraction", 1852, Mallinckrodt, the Reichenspergers), and in the South-West against the unwarranted control of the Church by the bureaucracy. The beginnings of Socialism resembled those of the Catholic movement. The feeling of a community of interests awoke in the labouring classes; but it was not until about 1864 that Lassalle utilized this sentiment for political purposes. Throughout the fifties and sixties the Liberals retained the lead. As early as 1859 they deemed the time propitious for seeking to attain again to political power, without, however, any such revolutionary disturbances as in 1848. The decline of Austria's influence since Schwarzenberg's death (1852) encouraged them. In the Crimean War the temporizing policy of Austria, which offended Russia and did not satisfy the western powers, brought upon that country a serious diplomatic defeat, while in the Italian war it suffered military disaster. In both cases Austria had opposed Napoleon III who by these wars laid the foundation of his prestige in Europe.

The growth of large commercial enterprises in Germany widened the breach between it and Austria so that in 1859 the latter was obliged to consent to a further postponement of its admission into the customs-union. In ecclesiastical politics Austria sought to satisfy the "Great German" aspirations of the Catholics of southern and western Germany by signing the Concordat (1855). Wurtemberg and Baden also negotiated with Rome on the subject of a Concordat; but when, in 1859, Austria was defeated they relinquished the project. Austria's discomfiture in 1859 and its failure to form an alliance with Prussia against Napoleon, greatly excited public opinion in Germany, for the impression prevailed that Germany was menaced by France. The Liberals took advantage of this to renew their agitation for the union of Germany into a single constitutional state. In 1860 the Grand Duke Frederick of Baden (1852-1907), whose land was exposed to the attacks of France, entrusted the Liberals with the ministry of Baden. In 1861 the Liberals undertook to force parliamentary government upon Prussia so as to obviate all further opposition on the part of the king to the creation of a consolidated German state. They encountered, indeed, an obstinate resistance from King William I (1861-88), but the prevailing antagonism between the bureaucracy and the people caused the sympathies of almost the entire German nation to be enlisted on the side of the Liberals. The smaller states, becoming anxious, proposed reforms, leading to greater unity, in the constitution of the German Confederation. Austria, where since 1860 von Schmerling had been prime minister, also made advances to the Liberals in order to strengthen its position in Germany (Austrian Constitution, 1861; congress of the princes at Frankfurt, 1863). However, the appointment of Bismarck to the presidency of the Prussian ministry in the autumn of 1862, and the political organization in 1864 of Socialism by Lassalle, again checked the rising tide of Liberalism as early as 1863-64. This was followed by Bismarck's determination to settle once and for all

with the sword the antagonism existing since 1848 in German affairs between Prussia and Austria. As Prussian envoy to the Federal Diet in the fifties Bismarck had observed the instability of the lesser German states and the decline of Austria's strength, as well as the methods of Napoleon, especially the use the latter made of the principle of nationalities; but he was also able to see that since 1860 Napoleon's star was on the wane. To a certain extent he appropriated Napoleon's views in order that Prussia might reap the fruits of what the French emperor had sown in Europe. At the same time he preserved an independent judgment so as to fit his measures to German conditions and proved that his genius contained greater qualities and more elements of success. In the Danish War (1864), fought to settle whether Schleswig and Holstein belonged to Denmark or Germany, he forced the Austrian minister of foreign affairs, Rechberg, to adopt his policy. He then manoeuvred Austria into a position of diplomatic isolation in Europe and, after forming an alliance with Italy, made a furious attack upon Austria in 1866. After two weeks of war Austria was completely defeated at Königgrätz (3 July), and by the middle of July Prussia had occupied all Germany. In the meanwhile Napoleon had intervened. Bismarck put him off with unmeaning, verbal concessions, and in like manner pacified the German Liberals whose continued opposition might hinder the carrying out of his solution of the question of German unity. He then concluded with Austria the Treaty of Prague (23 August, 1866) which partook of the nature of a compromise. Austria separated itself entirely from Germany, the South German states were declared internationally independent, Prussia was recognized as the leader of North Germany, while Hanover, Hesse-Cassel (Electoral Hesse), Hesse-Nassau, Schleswig-Holstein, and Frankfurt were directly annexed to Prussia, and preliminaries were arranged for the adoption of a federal constitution by the still-existing North German states. The constitution of the North-German Confederation, established 1 July, 1867, was framed by Bismarck so that the federal development of German constitutional law should be guarded, thus the constitution was adopted by treaties with the several sovereign princes, the autonomy of the individual states was assured, and a federal council (*Bundesrat*) was to be the representative of the various governments. The necessary unity of the government was guaranteed (1) by endowing Prussia with large authority in administration, giving it especially the command of the army and direction of diplomatic relations; (2) by assigning foreign affairs, formation of the army, economic interests, traffic and means of communication to the authority of the confederation, the competence of which was to be gradually enlarged (the model here taken being the Federal Acts of the Congress of Vienna of 1815); (3) by creating the Reichstag (Parliament), elected by universal, direct and equal suffrage, as the exponent of the national desire for unity. In the years immediately following the Reichstag passed laws regulating the administration of justice.

Bismarck considered the absence from the confederation of the South German states to be merely temporary. As early as August, 1866, he had secretly made sure of their co-operation in case of war. In 1867 he re-established the customs-union with them; politico-economic questions of common interest were, in future, to be laid before the Reichstag of the North German Confederation which, for this purpose, was to be complemented by delegates from Southern Germany so as to constitute a customs parliament. In all other respects he left diplomatic relations with the states of South Germany *in statu quo*. Attempts on their part to found a southern confederation failed. In like manner Bismarck postponed as long as possi-

ble the accounting with France in regard to the unification of Germany, although he foresaw that such an accounting was unavoidable. At a conference held in London, in 1867, he secured the neutralization of Luxemburg. In 1868 he desired to secure a resolution in favour of national unity from the customs parliament. To attain this he relied on the economic progress which, in consequence of the gradual unification of Germany, continually grew more marked and caused a complete change in a Liberal direction in the legislation on social and economic questions, and in that on the administration of law, both in the North German Confederation and Bavaria. Illustrations of these more liberal changes are: the organization of the postal system by Henry Stephan; introduction of freedom of trade and the right to reside in any part of Germany; enactment of the penal code, 1870. Notwithstanding these results of the efforts towards union, the opposition, led by Ludwig Windthorst, succeeded in obtaining a majority against him.

On 19 July, 1870, war broke out with France, the cause being the candidature of Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern for the Spanish throne. Napoleon had not been able to secure the help of Austria and Italy; furthermore, his army was not prepared for war. Bismarck, on the contrary, fanned to white heat the national enthusiasm of Germany. The German armies quickly crossed the Rhine, and gained a firm footing on the other side by a rapid succession of victories at Weissenburg, Wörth, and the Heights of Spicheren. The main French army under Bazaine was defeated at Metz and shut up inside the city, 14-18 August. The army of relief under MacMahon was defeated at Sedan, 1-2 September. The war became a series of sieges; Strasburg fell, 28 September; Metz, 27 October, and Paris, not until 28 January. Meanwhile Gambetta had organized a national militia, 600,000 strong, which, in conjunction with the remains of the standing army, harassed and obstructed the Germans on the Loire and in the North-West from October to January. On 10 May, 1871, by the Peace of Frankfurt, Alsace-Lorraine was restored to Germany as an imperial territory (*Reichsland*). The southern states had already joined the Confederation, which had become the German Empire (with an area of 208,748 sq. miles). The Constitution of the North German Confederation was adopted, with the reservation of certain privileges in favour of Bavaria and Württemberg. The Constitution was proclaimed 16-20 April, 1871, Prussia being entitled to 17 of the 58 votes in the Bundesrat or Federal Council, and to 236 of the 397 deputies in the Reichstag or Imperial Parliament. William I assumed the title of "German Emperor" at Versailles, 18 January, 1871; the office was made hereditary.

THE NEW GERMAN EMPIRE.—(1) 1871-1888.—A development that had been in progress for many centuries and had been attended by many complications had practically reached its culmination; the political union of the Germans in a single body politic, without any relinquishment of the federal principle, so far as the relations among the ruling houses were concerned, had been accomplished, advantage being taken of the popular movement towards the unification of the several States into one organic whole. Austria had been excluded from Germany, the political consolidation of Northern Germany was almost complete, and Prussia's economic superiority over the south had been established beyond question. For while Southern and Central Germany (with the exception of Saxony and Nassau), as well as Hanover, experienced an increase in population of only about 22 to 36 per cent between 1830 and 1880, that of Prussia grew about 60 per cent; and nearly all the coal and ore deposits of Germany were located within the borders of the latter kingdom. Withal, during the ensuing years the united people did not devote themselves



exclusively to peaceful pursuits. It is true these received great attention; German commercial and economic interests throughout the world were developed; uniformity was established in weights and measures (1872), coinage (1875), the administration of justice (1879), the laws of the empire were codified; and after a short time close attention was also given to social problems. On the other hand, military preparations (September, 1874), in case France should renew the war, were pushed forward with increasing zeal. Furthermore, the old internal feuds among the religious creeds and parties were resumed with greater passion than ever in consequence of the proclamation of the dogma of Infallibility and of the organization of the Centre party. In all this Bismarck was the leader, while the Liberals constituted the government party (see KULTURKAMPF).

It was not until 1875 that there was any degree of tranquillity and stability. Bismarck recognized that he was lessening the extraordinary esteem in which he was held by the whole world, by his excessive intimidation of France. Moreover, the defeat in France of the Royalists and Catholics by the Radicals and Protestants freed him from apprehension of danger from that quarter. Russia having been estranged from the empire by his anti-French policy, Bismarck sought the friendship of Austria-Hungary. In 1879 he brought about an alliance with Austria, which, when joined by Italy in 1883, became the Triple Alliance, which still subsists—the league of the great powers of Central Europe. He re-established better relations with Russia by means of the secret treaty with that country in 1887. The election of Leo XIII, the “pope of peace” (1878), disposed Bismarck to come to an understanding with the Catholic Church. But as a preliminary condition he demanded either that the Centre party be dissolved or that it become a government party. At the same time he contemplated sweeping changes in internal politics. The Liberal ascendancy, beginning in 1871, had been responsible for the inauguration of an excessive number of economic undertakings, resulting in the financial depression of 1873; in political finance it had brought about an almost complete stagnation in the development of the systems of taxation both of the empire and the component states; in social politics it had led to a rapid increase in the ranks of the Social Democrats, who after Lassalle's death had become under Bebel and Liebknecht an international party, in which numerous anarchistic elements were blended. In 1875 there had been a fusion of the Lassalle and Bebel factions; the Gotha programme was drawn up; at the elections of 1877 they scored their first important success. Liberalism had also failed completely in its opposition to the Centre; the latter party had so grown that it controlled more than a quarter of the votes in the Reichstag. Bismarck determined to restrict once more the influence of the Liberals in domestic politics. The transformation of the Conservative faction from an old-Prussian party of landed proprietors into a German Agrarian party (1876) made it capable of further development and useful as a support for Bismarck. He purposed forming a majority by combining this Conservative party with the moderate National Liberals (under Bennigsen and Miquel), while at the same time, the Centre party having refused to disband, there was the possibility of forming a majority of the Conservatives and the Centre.

Between 1876 and 1879 to organize the administration of the empire, the Reichstag created, subordinate to the chancellor, who under the Constitution was the only responsible official, the following imperial authorities or secretariats of State: Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Imperial Home Office, Imperial Ministry of Justice, Imperial Treasury, Administration of Imperial Railways, Imperial Post Office, Imperial Admiralty, Secretariat for the Colonies (1907). A number

of non-political departments were also established, in part under the various secretaries of State, the chief of which was the Imperial Insurance Department; military affairs were placed under the Prussian Minister of War. In 1879 the imperial territory of Alsace-Lorraine was granted autonomy, though this was of a limited character. In 1878, after the attempts made by Hôdel and Nobiling on the life of William I, Bismarck carried out temporary measures for the suppression of Social Democratic agitation, e. g., the Socialist Law forbidding all Social Democratic organizations and newspapers. In the following year, encouraged by the increase in the sense of national unity due above all to the growth of German commerce and industry, he effected the financial and economic-political reform, his battle cry being: “Protection for German Labour!” Small protective duties were imposed upon agricultural and industrial imports, and a tariff for revenue only on colonial wares. The proceeds of both duties were to constitute the chief revenue of the empire, but of these only 130 million marks were to go to the imperial treasury, the rest being divided among the federal states, in return for which the latter, by means of federal contributions (*Matrükularbeiträge*), were to make good the contingent deficits of the empire. During the eighties the duties on agricultural products were gradually raised (especially in 1887), besides which several profitable indirect taxes, e. g., on brandy, tobacco, and stamps, were sanctioned, in order to meet the growing expenditures of the empire. In 1881 an imperial message to the Reichstag announced the inauguration of a policy of social reform in favour of the working classes. Between 1881 and 1889 the compulsory insurance of working-men against sickness, accident, disability, and old age was provided for by legislation. This was Bismarck's greatest achievement in domestic politics. The empire was now for the first time made the centre of the civil interests of the Germans, who up to this time had been occupied chiefly with the doings of their respective states, the management of Church and school having been retained by these. Bismarck, now at the zenith of the second creative period of his life, conceived the idea of organizing labour insurance on the basis of the community of interests of those engaged in the same work. By this means he proposed to establish in the empire self-government in social politics, which would equal in importance the local self-government of communities subordinated to the individual states, and which would complement the establishment of universal suffrage by educating the people for the administration of public affairs.

Bismarck also gave his support to the great German commercial interests which insisted upon the acquisition of colonies; in 1884 South-West Africa, Kamerun, and Togo were acquired; in 1885-86 German East Africa, German New Guinea, and the Bismarck Archipelago. He even went so far as to risk being embroiled with England, although it was an inviolable fundamental principle of his policy not to encroach on that country's privileges. It appeared as if Bismarck, though he had grown up under wholly different conditions and had been schooled in wholly different ideas, entered into the spirit of the democratic Germany of the future, with its world-wide commerce and its world-wide economic interests. But the first step taken, he retreated. He did not carry out his scheme of co-operative organization. It was in the fight against the growth of the German democratic tendencies within the empire that he exhausted his strength in the eighties. Domestic peace was promoted in Germany by the final though belated close of the *Kulturkampf* (1886-87); the beneficial effects of this were greatly lessened by the severity and violence of the measures with which Bismarck had begun (1885-86) to break up the national movement of the Prussian Poles, which was the conse-

quence of their constantly increasing prosperity and of the rise of a middle class among them. Exile, efforts to suppress the Polish language, the expenditure of State funds to colonize Poland with German peasants were the means used. Incapable of respecting political parties and working in harmony with them, he became involved in incessant parliamentary contests with them. Particularly the demands of the Government for an increase in the strength of the army, which was levied by general conscription, brought him into conflict with the Centre and the Left, because of his insistence that the appropriation for army purposes should be made for a period of seven years, instead of for one year, according to the Constitution, or for the term of a parliament. Bitter quarrels also marked the debates on social questions, because Bismarck refused to agree to state protection of workmen, though he had conceded state insurance.


The political parties, all of which had been organized before the creation of the empire, now began to adapt themselves to new conditions, to cast aside issues resulting from the division of Germany into separate states, and to alter their positions to conform to new points of view; but their development was seriously hampered by these conflicts. In 1879 the Liberals had resigned the presidency of the Reichstag in consequence of the adoption of financial and tariff reform. The president was now chosen from the Conservatives, marking the Conservative era of the empire, which down to the present time has been uninterrupted with the exception of the supremacy of the Centre from 1895 to 1906. After their fall from power, the Liberals repeatedly split into factions according to their differences of opinion on commercial policy. The most important section, the National Liberal party, was reorganized in 1884 by Miquel. It became reconciled with Bismarck and regained some seats in the Reichstag, but not its former power. The Conservatives energetically took up the demands for the protection of the working classes. Eventually the Agrarian element among them got the upper hand. They failed, however, to attract into their ranks the smaller middle class, i. e. the small retail traders who had combined to resist the great industrial interests; nor did they win over the officials of the civil service, nor the Christian Socialists among their Evangelical constituents. Consequently, small parties sprang up in the west and south of Germany that were fundamentally Conservative in character but had no connexion with the great Conservative party. The attempt that von Kleist-Retzow made to found a Protestant party of the Centre in the hope of winning over the heir to the throne, Prince William, to its cause, was frustrated by Bismarck's intrigues, by which the prince was alienated from the Conservatives. The Centre maintained its strength and directed its attention to social politics in the empire and to the school question in the individual states. It became the leading party in the Reichstag, represented by Hitze and von Hertling. In 1890 the "People's Union for Catholic Germany" (*Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland*) was founded. The Social Democrats, prevented by the Socialist Law from agitating their cause publicly, kept up their strength by secret recruitment. By dissolving the Reichstag in 1887, Bismarck secured the most favourable electoral results that had ever fallen to his lot, inasmuch as an overwhelming majority of Conservatives and National Liberals (so-called Kartell-Reichstag) was returned. But he was unable to work harmoniously even with this majority.

(2) From 1888 to 1909.—In 1888 William I died. Frederick III, the hope of the Liberals, followed him to the grave in ninety-nine days, and the reign of William II began. The youthful and able ruler wished to make Germany as speedily as possible a sharer in the world's commerce. He realized that, to

attain this end, internal tranquillity was as necessary as external peace. He dismissed Bismarck in March 1890 and replaced him by Caprivi (1890-94). Then he saw to it that the all but unanimous desire of the Reichstag to complete the compulsory insurance legislation by comprehensive factory legislation was satisfied. An international conference for the protection of working men was held March, 1890, and a supplementary law (*Gewerbsordnungs-Novelle*) was passed 1 June, 1891. He moderated the repressive measures against the Poles. He intended to give the Catholics a guarantee that the national schools would continue to be Christian by the proposed National School Law in 1892, but withdrew the bill when the Liberals assumed a hostile attitude, and his pacific aims were thwarted. In foreign affairs he came to an understanding with England in regard to the difficulties that had arisen from the colonial expansion of Germany, e.g. the exchange of Zanzibar for Heligoland in 1890. In the interests of peace likewise he succeeded in concluding commercial treaties with Austria, Italy, Russia, and several smaller states, by lowering the agricultural duties which had become very high. With France he sought to establish relations that were at least free from bitterness. Because of its sovereignty over the Balkans and the East, he devoted special attention to Germany's political relations to Turkey. For he saw that these countries were the best markets for German trade. But trouble soon began. The emperor's autocratic proclivities and his sudden changes of opinion aroused bitter criticism among the people. The new Army Bill of 1893, which proposed to reduce the period of military service to two years, was well-meant on his part, but was so badly managed that it brought him into collision with the Centre (Dissolution of the Reichstag, 1893). On the other hand, the commercial treaties, which were opposed by the agricultural party, got the emperor into difficulties with the Conservatives. In 1895 the Reichstag turned a deaf ear to his demands for renewal of sharp repressive measures against agitations that were "hostile to the state" (the so-called "Umsturzvorlage"). His views subsequently became liberalized, his following being recruited mainly from the commercial, industrial, and intellectual classes (Krupp, Ballin, Harnack).

The success of the emperor's policy during the next few years dispelled the clouds of opposition, especially as Caprivi's successor, Chlodwig Hohenlohe (1894-1901), was a man of astute and conciliatory nature, while in Count Posadowsky, Secretary of State for Home Affairs, the emperor had the support of an extremely competent and energetic man. Germany became Turkey's chief counsellor. The maintenance of friendly relations with the rapidly developing United States of America, despite the opposition of their economical interests and isolated instances of friction between officers, strengthened public confidence in the international situation. By the occupation of Kiaochau in 1898, Germany secured a footing in Eastern Asia, while the partition of the Samoan Islands and the acquisition of the Carolines (1898-9) gave her a much-desired increase of stations in the Pacific. The German transatlantic merchant marine held for a long period the record for the race across the Atlantic, and, even in Africa and Asia, Germany promised to become a very serious rival of England. The last decade of the nineteenth century was a period of exceptional prosperity throughout the country. From forty-one millions in 1871, the population increased to sixty millions in 1905. The increased national well-being will be realized from the fact that at present the gross value of the agricultural produce amounts to some \$3,525,000,000, and of the industrial output to about \$8,460,000,000. In 1871, two-thirds of the population still lived in the country, whereas in 1900 54.3 per cent lived in towns of more than 2000





- Seal of Archbishopric
- Seal of Bishopric
- United Diocese
- Seal of Archbishopric or Bishopric transferred or vacated
- Capitals of Countries
- Capitals of States of the German Empire
- Capitals of Provinces of Prussia
- Seal of Vicariate Apostolic
- Seal of Prefecture Apostolic
- Abbey

Scales  
English Statute Miles  
Kilometers

# GERMANY

SHOWING THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES, DIOCESES, VICARIATES, AND PREFECTURES APOSTOLIC

I  
Dioceses under the Direct Jurisdiction of the Holy See.

- 1 Diocese of Breslau with the Apostolic Delegation of Brandenburg.
- 2 Diocese of Ermland. (Seat at Frauenburg.)
- 3 Diocese of Hildesheim.
- 4 Diocese of Osnabrück.
- 5 Diocese of Metz.
- 6 Diocese of Strasburg.

II  
Ecclesiastical Province of Bamberg.

- 1 Archdiocese of Bamberg.
- 2 Diocese of Eichstätt.
- 3 Diocese of Würzburg.
- 4 Diocese of Speyer.

III  
Ecclesiastical Province of Munich-Freising.

- 1 Archdiocese of Munich-Freising.
- 2 Diocese of Augsburg.
- 3 Diocese of Ratisbon.
- 4 Diocese of Passau.

IV  
Ecclesiastical Province of Freiburg or of the Upper Rhine.

- 1 Archdiocese of Freiburg.
- 2 Diocese of Fribourg.
- 3 Diocese of Limburg.
- 4 Diocese of Mainz.
- 5 Diocese of Rottenburg.

V  
Ecclesiastical Province of Gnesen-Posen.

- 1 Archdiocese of Gnesen-Posen.
- 2 Diocese of Culm. (Seat at Pelplin.)

VI  
Ecclesiastical Province of Cologne.

- 1 Archdiocese of Cologne.
- 2 Diocese of Münster.
- 3 Diocese of Trier.
- 4 Diocese of Paderborn.

VII  
Vicariates Apostolic.

- 1 Vicariate Apostolic of Anhalt.
- 2 Vicariate Apostolic of North Germany.
- 3 Vicariate Apostolic of Saxony. (Res. at Dresden.)

VIII  
Prefectures Apostolic.

- 1 Prefecture Apostolic of Lusatia (Bautzen-Meißen). (Res. at Dresden.)
- 2 Prefecture Apostolic of Schleswig-Holstein.





inhabitants, and in 1905 19 per cent lived in cities of more than 100,000 inhabitants. In the agricultural districts, however, conditions continued to be healthy—31 per cent being cultivated by peasants, 24 per cent being held in large estates, and the remainder in lots of less than 20 hectares (roughly 50 acres). The woodland area still includes one-fourth of the total area.

During this period the national standard of living became more luxurious; revolutionary and anarchistic tendencies began appreciably to disappear. The whole nation was seized by a burning tendency towards the formation of new associations, a spirit to which we owe the foundation of the Catholic People's Union (*der Volksverein*: members in 1908, 600,000), the Farmers' League (1908: 300,000 members), the free (Socialistic) guilds (1908: over 750,000 members), the Christian Endeavour guilds (1908: over 200,000 members), etc. In Parliament the great political parties (Conservatives, National Liberals, and the Centre) drew closer together; the presidency devolved on the Centre in consequence of its numerical preponderance and the ability of its leaders. In 1899, the constantly recurring conflict between the Crown and the Reichstag on the subject of appropriations for military expenditure was settled by an agreement on the part of the legislative assembly to vote supplies henceforth for the parliamentary period, which had been increased from three to five years in 1888. Among the important measures passed were the completion of the unified legal codes (1896) and the Naval Acts (1898, 1901), which had in view the raising of Germany to a maritime power of the first rank. In 1902 the resolution to restore the high protective duties on agricultural products was passed in the face of the bitter opposition maintained by the Social Democrats for many months (Tariff Bills, on the basis of which the commercial treaties were renewed in 1905). Prussia's project of constructing a canal through her own territory from the Oder to the Rhine met with obstinate resistance, not indeed in the Reichstag, but in the Prussian diet (rejected in 1899, approved in 1903). In the midst of this era of prosperity Bismarck died (1898).

In foreign politics, however, there came a change for the worse after England's subjugation of the Boers. Under Edward VII, Great Britain forced Germany back from almost all the positions which she had recently occupied. Meanwhile, William II devoted himself to a line of policy calculated to win temporary favour (journey to Jerusalem, 1898; intervention in the Chinese complications, 1900; landing in Tangier, 1905). Prince Bulow, who replaced Hohenlohe in 1900, was unable to stem the ebbing tide. In the Moroccan controversy between Germany and France, Germany, who appealed to an international conference (at Algeiras, 1906), suffered a severe rebuff. By his efforts to separate Austria and Italy from the Triple Alliance and by his ententes with the other Powers of Europe, Edward VII isolated his rival (1907, Triple-Entente between England, Russia, and France). Bulow's Polish policy, which was more drastic even than Bismarck's (cf. the Expropriation Act of 1908), resulted only in disappointments without effectually checking the Polish disturbances. In 1907, owing in part to the financial crisis in America, Germany's commercial prosperity markedly declined. Favoured by the customs tariff, agriculture alone continued to flourish. The revenue of the empire decreased with the commercial profits. At the same time the rising of the Herreros in South-Western Africa in 1904 called for large unforeseen expenditures, while the troubled aspect of the foreign situation necessitated a tremendous increase in the outlay on armaments (cf. Naval statutes of 1908. The "ordinary" expenditure in 1907 was 2329 millions of marks; National debt in 1873: 1800 millions, and in

1908 4400 millions of marks.) One attempt after another was made at fiscal reform [1904, relaxation of the Franckenstein clause; 1906, 150 million marks (\$35,250,000) yearly taxes were voted; in 1908-09, 500 millions were demanded by the government], but the government is still carried on with a deficit. Thorough recovery has been prevented by the renewed violent dissensions in the nation by party spirit (since 1892) and the clash of opposing ideals.

The coalition, which had formed the majority during the nineties, broke up in 1903. Its most important factor was the Centre, the number of whose seats in the Reichstag and supporters in the constituencies remained stationary even during the period of its parliamentary ascendancy. Therein lay its weakness, since meanwhile its allies, the official Liberal and Conservative parties, gained ground. The Liberals gained in consequence of a movement towards concentration among the Liberals of the Left soon after the beginning of the century (Fusion of the Liberals of the Left, 1906), and of a reconciliation between the National Liberals and the Liberals of the Left by means of a "Young Liberal" movement in their ranks. The Conservatives, who had been growing as a party almost uninterruptedly since 1876, especially after the founding of the "Farmers' League" in 1893, gained by gradually invading the agrarian territory in the west and south-west.

Up to 1906, the Protestant League, founded in 1886, maintained a fanatical agitation amongst the populace to frustrate the endeavours of the Catholics, directed through the Centre, to secure recognition of their equal rights as citizens in the public life of the nation. Yielding to this agitation, first the National Liberals then the Conservatives dissociated themselves from the Centre. Despite its utmost efforts, the Centre failed in 1906 to secure the repeal of the remainder of the *Kulturkampf* Laws, except to the extent of the two paragraphs of the Jesuit law (i. e. the expulsion clauses). Furthermore, the so-called "toleration bills", in which the Centre strove by imperial legislation to fix the minimum of rights to be conceded to Catholics in the separate states, although repeatedly presented to the Reichstag after 1900, always met with defeat. When, in 1906, the Christian character of the national schools was finally established by statute in Prussia after an interval of 13 years, the Government drafted the bill in accordance with the wishes of the Conservatives and the National Liberals, and left to the Centre only the right of voting for it.

Another important factor in bringing about the cleavage between the parties was the spread among the wealthier classes, both Liberal and Conservative, of a strong feeling of opposition to further social legislation. This feeling found an outlet in the formation of influential syndicates, and was most bitterly directed against the Centre, as the principal promoter of social remedial measures. An open breach between the parties took place on the question of a relatively insignificant colonial budget. The Government immediately disowned the Centre, and dissolved the Reichstag (13 December, 1906). Since then the situation has been very complicated. As a result of the elections the Centre retained its former voting strength, but was isolated. The Government formed a new coalition, called "the Block", consisting of the Conservatives and the united Liberal party—the Liberals of the Left had hitherto been in opposition. In this it relied on the feelings of hostility towards the Centre which animated the Protestants and the propertied classes. When the administration, however, made concessions to Liberal principles (extension of the right of association, partial repeal of the stock exchange legislation, promise to introduce popular suffrage into Prussia), the Conservatives, after some hesitation, decided to oppose the Government and again sought an alliance with the Centre. They are

stronger than the Liberals, but the sympathies of the Government and of the anti-Catholic portion of the population will help the Liberals in their contests with the Conservatives. The quarrel amongst the civil parties prevents the further loss of parliamentary seats by the Social Democrats, whose voting power has been steadily increasing since 1890 (in 1907 they cast 3,259,000 votes, 29 per cent of the total, although they won only forty-three seats in the Reichstag as compared with eighty-one in 1903). It also prevents the reconstruction of the programme of the Socialists, many of whom—especially in South Germany—favour a peaceful transformation of society. The difference of opinions existing among the Socialist party was clearly evidenced by the violent quarrel between the opposing sections at the Dresden Convention in 1903.

The position of the Government in view of its relations with the parties is at present (Jan., 1909) not very favourable. The administrative organization of the empire hardly suffices. Besides, the shock given to the power of the emperor in November, 1908, in consequence of the popular resentment of his personal interference in politics as revealed in the "Daily Telegraph" interview, has not served to strengthen the Government. On the other hand, its prestige was greatly enhanced by the re-establishment of German influence in international politics, owing to its firm support of Austria-Hungary in the Balkan crisis (1908-9). It has put an end to the isolation of Germany, strengthened the bonds of the Triple Alliance, and promises to result in a rapprochement with Russia.

In dealing with the present situation of German Catholicism, relations between Church and State must be separated from the question of the civic rights of the German Catholics. The authorities of the Church and State work together in a spirit of mutual benevolence, the chief credit for which is due to Cardinal Kopp, since 1886 Prince-Bishop of Breslau. Ecclesiastically speaking, Germany is divided into 5 archbishoprics, 14 suffragan and 6 exempt bishoprics, 3 Apostolic vicariates, and 2 Apostolic prefectures. The clergy are trained for the most part by 15 theological university or lyceum faculties (the most recently established being at Strasburg, 1902), a smaller number in seminaries. Ecclesiastical affairs are not regulated by the empire but by the individual state. In Prussia they rest on the Bull "De Salute Animarum" and the explanatory brief "Quod de Fidelium" of 1821 (although the promise of land endowment for the bishoprics has not been kept), on the constitution of 1850, and on the laws of 1886-87 regulating ecclesiastical polity. In Wurtemberg, they rest on the Statute of 1862, in Baden on the Statutes of 1860, in Bavaria on the Concordat of 1817, which has not actually been enforced and which consequently creates a state of legal uncertainty. In these divisions of the empire, the Church has the rights of a privileged corporation. In the Kingdom of Saxony and in Saxe-Weimar, all ecclesiastical ordinances and appointments, even those issued from Rome, as well as the erection of new churches, etc., are subject to the approval of the Government. Appeal to Rome is forbidden. In the other small Thuringian states, and in Brunswick and Mecklenburg, the Catholics even recently had to submit their parochial affairs to the authority of the Protestant pastors, and in part Catholics even now pay tithes to the Protestant pastors for this unsought-for service. The building of churches and establishment of schools are also subject to galling restrictions.

The bishops are elected by the cathedral chapters, except in Bavaria (where they are chosen by agreement between the Government and Rome); in the Upper Rhenish church province, in Osnabrück, and in Hildesheim, the Irish method of election obtains; elsewhere exists the customary submission of a list of candidates to the Government. The establishment of convents is everywhere subject to the approval of the

State. In Wurtemberg and Baden only female orders are allowed; in Saxony and the smaller Protestant States only nursing sisterhoods. Jesuit institutions are not permitted anywhere. The primary schools are mostly denominational, but are neutral in Baden, in part of Bavaria, and in two provinces of Prussia. They are founded by the State and by the communities, but the local pastors supervise the religious instruction and are generally the local school inspectors. The system of intermediate and higher schools for boys is undenominational almost without exception, and is under either state or municipal control; the schools for girls are mostly under private and denominational management, being largely conducted by nuns. The civil marriage ceremony takes precedence of the religious by an imperial law of 1875; divorce is regulated by the civil code. For Catholic couples separation *a mensâ et thoro* may be granted. Charitable relief work is admirably regulated and carefully stimulated by the focusing of charitable impulses in the *Charitasverband* (Charity Organization Society), founded at Freiburg in 1897. It is working more and more in harmony with social relief work. There is a large number of religious societies; the throngs who assist at all religious festivals are impressive, and the numbers who receive the sacraments are gratifying. Pilgrimages are numerous attended, the most famous place of pilgrimage in Prussia being Kvelaer, in Bavaria Altötting. Considerable anxiety is inspired by the prevalence of Social Democracy in certain districts, and by the irreligious indifference of the rising generation of the propertied classes.

The civil status of Catholics is not so good. Of the 60,641,272 inhabitants of Germany in 1905, about 36.00 per cent were Catholic (in 1900 only 36.1 per cent as compared with 36.2 per cent in 1871). At present, as formerly, unity infuses vigorous life into the Catholic Church. The Catholics are splendidly organized (for politics by the Centre and in sociological respect by the Christian guilds and by *Volksvereine*). They are making persistent efforts to secure equal recognition in public life (cf. the agitation afoot in Prussia since 1890 in favour of equal rights for Catholics; the so-called "Self-examination Movement" throughout the empire, that is to say, the general investigation into the injustices suffered by Catholics in the educational and economical life of the country). Recently, the number of Catholic pupils in the intermediate and higher schools has increased, but only on the humanistic side. Their representation in the polytechnic schools as well as in the student bodies at the universities continues to be weak, out of all proportion to those of the other communions. Only in isolated instances are the leading positions in the states and communities filled by Catholics. No Prussian state minister, and only one state secretary is Catholic. Their share in the public wealth does not at all correspond with their numerical strength.

JANSEN, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, IV-VIII; RITTER, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation und des 30-jährigen Krieges*, III; ERDMANNSDORFFER, *Deutsche Geschichte vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zur Regierungsantritt Friedrichs des Grossen*, II; IMMICH, *Geschichte des europäischen Staatensystems von 1660 bis 1789*; KOSER, *Friedrich der Grosse* (1903-04), II; ARNETH, *Geschichte der Maria Theresia* (1863-79), X; HEIGEL, *Deutsche Geschichte vom Tod Friedrichs d. Gr. bis zur Auflösung des Reichs* (1899), I; TREITSCHKE, *Deutsche Geschichte im XIX. Jahrhundert* (1879-94), V, goes to 1848; SYBEL, *Begründung des Deutschen Reichs durch Kaiser Wilhelm I.* (1889-94), VII; FRIEDTUNG, *Geschichte Oesterreichs von 1848 bis 1859* (1908), I; IDEM, *Der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Deutschland 1859-1866* (1908), II; LORENZ, *Wilhelm I. und die Begründung des Deutschen Reichs* (1902), I; MARCKES, *Wilhelm I.* (1905); LENZ, *Bismarck*; BISMARCK, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen* (1898), II; *Denkwürdigkeiten des Fürsten Chlodwig zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst* (1906), II; EGBELHAFF, *Deutsche Geschichte seit dem Frankfurter Frieden* (1908), I; LABORD, *Das Staatsrecht des Deutschen Reichs* (1901), IV; *Publications of the Bureau of Imperial Statistics* (Kaiserl. Statistisches Amt.); BRÜCK-KITPLING, *Geschichte der kath. Kirche im Deutschland im XIX. Jahrh.* (1887-1908), IV.

MARTIN SPAHN.

GERMAN LITERATURE.—I. FROM OLDEST PRE-CHRISTIAN PERIOD TO 800 A. D.—There are no written monuments before the eighth century. The earliest written record in any Germanic language, the Gothic translation of the Bible by Bishop Ulfilas, in the fourth century, does not belong to German literature. It is known from Tacitus that the ancient Germans had an unwritten poetry, which among them supplanted the place of history. It consisted of hymns in honour of gods, or songs commemorative of the deeds of heroes. Such hymns were sung in chorus on solemn occasions, and were accompanied by dancing; their verse form was alliteration. There were also songs, not choric, but sung by minstrels before kings or nobles, songs of praise, besides charms and riddles. During the great period of the migrations poetic activity received a fresh impulse. New heroes, like Attila (Étzel), Theodoric (Dietrich), and Ermanric (Ermanrich), came upon the scene; their exploits were confused by tradition with those of older heroes, like Siegfried. Mythic and historic elements were strangely mingled, and so arose the great saga cycles, which later on formed the basis of the national epics. Of all these the Nibelungen saga became the most famous, and spread to all Germanic tribes. Here the most primitive legend of

ance. The conversion of Germany, vigorously carried on since the eighth century by Irish and Anglo-Saxon missionaries, notably by St. Boniface (d. 755), was completed when Charlemagne (d. 814) forced the heathen Saxons to submit to his rule and to be baptized, and united all the German tribes under his sway. Under him and his successors Christianity was firmly established. The clergy became the representatives of learning; the newly established monasteries and their schools, above all those of Fulda and St. Gall, were the centres of culture. The language of the Church was Latin, but preaching and instruction had to be carried on in the vernacular. The prose literature that arose to serve this purpose is only of linguistic interest. The poetry that developed during this period was wholly Christian in character. Examples are the "Wessobrunner Gebet" and the "Muspilli", the latter an alliterative poem on the destruction of the world; both date from the ninth century. The Church, naturally, opposed the old heathen songs and strove to supplant them by Christian poems. Thus arose the Old Saxon epic, the "Heliand", which was composed between 822 and 840 by an unknown poet, at the suggestion of King Louis the Pious. It is written in Low German and is the last great poem in alliterative verse. The

Vur scūlun thiū uuōst ahton. thar hārto ouh zūdrahton  
 ioh scūlumesiu irfāllen. mēmihlomo uuāllen  
 Thaz hār selēric. thest zūns nūgikēric  
 nīmūgun uur thar uuēnken. uurscūlun iz bithēnken  
 Souuermānno so sih būazit. ioh sūnta sino rūuzit.  
 thaz thanne uuārlichodūat. gihōufot ermo mānag guat

OTFRIED'S "EVANGELIENBUCH"  
 Section of a page, IX-Century MS., Court Library, Vienna

Siegfried's death was combined with the historical destruction of the Burgundians by the Huns in 435, and affords a typical instance of saga-formation.

Of all this pagan poetry hardly anything has survived. The collection that Charlemagne caused to be made of the old heroic lays has perished. All that is known are the "Merseburger Zaubersprüche", two songs of enchantment preserved in a manuscript of the tenth century, and the famous "Hildebrandslied", an epic fragment narrating an episode of the Dietrich saga, the tragic combat between father and son. It was written down after 800 by two monks of Fulda, on the covers of a theological manuscript. The evidence afforded by these fragments, as well as such literature as the "Beowulf" and the "Edda", seems to indicate that the oldest German poetry was of considerable extent and of no mean order of merit.

II. THE OLD HIGH GERMAN PERIOD (c. 800-1050). CHRISTIANITY AND ITS INFLUENCE.—Between the years 500 and 700 occurred the High German sound-shifting, which divided the dialects of the South, High German, from those of the North, Low German. The history of German literature is henceforth mainly concerned with High German monuments. In fact, until the close of the Middle Ages Southern Germany occupies the leading place in literary production.

The Goths, the first Germanic tribe to be converted, embraced Christianity in the form of Arianism. But they soon gave way to the Franks, who became the dominant people, and the conversion of their king, Clovis, to Christianity, in 496, was of decisive import-

ance. The conversion of Germany, vigorously carried on since the eighth century by Irish and Anglo-Saxon missionaries, notably by St. Boniface (d. 755), was completed when Charlemagne (d. 814) forced the heathen Saxons to submit to his rule and to be baptized, and united all the German tribes under his sway. Under him and his successors Christianity was firmly established. The clergy became the representatives of learning; the newly established monasteries and their schools, above all those of Fulda and St. Gall, were the centres of culture. The language of the Church was Latin, but preaching and instruction had to be carried on in the vernacular. The prose literature that arose to serve this purpose is only of linguistic interest. The poetry that developed during this period was wholly Christian in character. Examples are the "Wessobrunner Gebet" and the "Muspilli", the latter an alliterative poem on the destruction of the world; both date from the ninth century. The Church, naturally, opposed the old heathen songs and strove to supplant them by Christian poems. Thus arose the Old Saxon epic, the "Heliand", which was composed between 822 and 840 by an unknown poet, at the suggestion of King Louis the Pious. It is written in Low German and is the last great poem in alliterative verse. The

story of the Redeemer is here told from a thoroughly German point of view, Christ being conceived as a mild but powerful chief, and His disciples as vassals or thanes. The same subject is treated in the "Evangelienbuch" of Otfried, a monk of Weissenburg, the first German poet known by name. It was completed about 868 and dedicated to Louis the German. While not possessing the literary merit of the "Heliand", it is of the greatest importance because it definitely introduces into German poetry the principle of rhyme, already familiar from the Latin church hymns. Rhyme was also used by the unknown author of the "Ludwigslied" to celebrate the victory of Louis III over the Northmen at Saucourt (881). This is the only song of the period not purely religious in character, though its author was probably a cleric.

During the ninth and tenth centuries German poetry fell into neglect; at the courts of the Saxon (919-1024) and Franconian emperors (1024-1125) and in the monasteries the Latin language was almost exclusively cultivated, and thus a body of Latin poetry arose, of which the tenth-century "Waltharius", (Waltharilied) of Ekkehard (q. v.), a monk of St. Gall (d. 973), the "Ruodlieb" (1030), and the "Ecclasis Captivi" (c. 940) are the most noteworthy examples. The "Waltharilied" relates an old Burgundian saga and is thoroughly German in spirit, while the "Ecclasis" is the oldest medieval beast epic that we possess. The Latin dramas of the nun Roswitha (Hrotsvitha) hardly belong to German literature.

The great master of German prose in this period was

Notker III, surnamed Labeo (about 952-1022), the head of the convent-school of St. Gall. His translations from Boethius, Aristotle, Marcellianus Capella, and especially of the Psalter, are the best examples of German prose until the fourteenth century.

III. THE PERIOD OF CHIVALRY AND THE CRUSADES (1050-1300). MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN POETRY.—In the eleventh century, under the influence of the reform movement that emanated from the Burgundian monastery of Cluny, a spirit of stern asceticism begins to dominate in literature. The Church in its struggle with the emperors turned again to the people, to carry through the reforms of Gregory VII, and although the poets of the beginning of this period were almost exclusively clerics, they at least wrote in German. The literature which they produced consists mainly of rhymed versions of Biblical stories and other sacred themes, and is represented by Ezzo's "Lay of the Miracles of Christ", Williram's paraphrase of the Cantic of Canticles (both c. 1060), and the poems of Frau Ava. Some of the best poetry of this time was inspired by devotion to the Blessed Virgin, as for instance the "Driu Liet von der Maget" by a Bavarian priest named Wernher (c. 1170). In these songs the characteristic German trend towards mysticism is unmistakable. A most noteworthy product of the age is the half legendary "Annolied", a poem in praise of Archbishop Anno II of Cologne (d. 1075). The "Kaiserchronik" (c. 1150), a bulky poem narrating the history of the world, presents a strange medley of legendary and historic lore. The bitter hostility of the ascetic spirit to the worldly life finds expression in the scathing satire of Heinrich von Melk (c. 1160). But asceticism was losing ground; under the influence of the Crusades the prestige of the knightly caste was steadily rising. A compromise with the secular spirit became imperative, and the clerical poets, to keep their audiences and meet the competition of the gleemen, now had recourse to worldly subjects. For their models they turned to France.

A priest named Lamprecht composed the "Alexandrieliid" (c. 1130), while a priest of Ratisbon, named Konrad, wrote the "Rolandslied" (c. 1135). In both cases the authors drew from French originals. The minstrels began once more to come to the front, and a number of popular epics date from this period. Among these "König Rother" (c. 1160) is conspicuous. Its subject is an old Germanic saga, and the rôle which the Orient, Constantinople in this case, plays therein shows the influence of the Crusades. Still more noticeable is this fondness for the Orient in "Herzog Ernst" (c. 1180), where the historical hero, Duke Ernest II of Swabia (d. 1030), is represented as a pilgrim to the Holy Land and the subject of marvellous adventures in the Far East. From this period dates also the first German beast epic, "Reinhart Fuchs", by Heinrich der Glîchesære (c. 1170).

The rule of the Hohenstaufens (1138-1254) marks the first great classic era of German literature. Many causes contributed to bring about a great literary revival. The Crusades instilled new fervour into religious life. Many thousands of German knights followed King Conrad III in the crusade of 1145-47. They were brought into contact on the one hand with the Orient and its wealth of stories and marvels, and on the other with their more cultured French neighbours, whose polished customs and manners they adopted with avidity. Chivalry, an institution essentially Romance in origin and spirit, was thus raised to pre-dominance in the social life of the age. The cultivation of poetry passed chiefly into its hands; the clergy ceased to be the sole purveyors of learning and culture.

The poets of this period are, as a rule, of knightly rank. Many of the poorer knights depended on the generosity of princely patrons, such as the landgraves of Thuringia or the dukes of Austria. The only kinds of poetry cultivated in this epoch were the epic and

the lyric, and the former was either courtly or popular. Form received the most careful attention; versification was regulated by the strictest rules; the language, the classic Middle High German, is extremely elegant. This classic poetry was essentially a poetry of caste and conformed absolutely to the ideals of French courtly society. Brilliant as it was, it was mainly a poetry of translation and adaptation.

The courtly epic deals almost exclusively with foreign subjects; its models were derived mostly from France. The subject most in favour was the *matière de Bretagne*, the legends clustering around King Arthur and the Round Table, with which that of the Holy Grail had been combined. This subject was made especially popular by the versions of the French trouvère, Chrestien de Troyes, who exerted great influence on the German courtly epic. Chivalry and the cult of woman are the leading *motifs* of this poetry. The court epic was introduced into Germany by Heinrich von Veldeke, a knight of the Lower Rhineland, whose "Eneit" (c. 1175-86), based on a French model, treats the story of Æneas in thoroughly medieval and chivalric spirit. The court epic was transplanted to Upper Germany by the Swabian, Hartmann von Aue (d. about 1215). In his "Erec" he introduced the Arthurian romance into German literature; his "Iwein" is from the same cycle; his "Gregorius" is an ascetic version of the Oedipus story. His best-known work is "Der arme Heinrich", which, as a purely German story of womanly devotion, occupies a unique position among the creations of the courtly poets. The greatest of these poets is Wolfram von Eschenbach (d. about 1220), whose chief work is his "Parzival", the story of the simpleton who overcomes doubt and temptation and ultimately becomes King of the Holy Grail. As in Goethe's "Faust", we have here the story of a human soul. To the cycle of Grail-romances belong also the so-called "Titurel" fragments, while Wolfram's last work, "Willehalm", is an historical legend which, however, remained incomplete. Opposed to Wolfram in spirit is his great rival, Gottfried von Strassburg, whose "Tristan" (c. 1210) is a glorification of sensual love and of somewhat dubious morality. With Gottfried the court epic reached its highest development; with him excessive artificiality begins to appear, and soon this species of poetry declines rapidly. The succeeding poets, in trying to imitate the great masters just mentioned, fall into tedious diffuseness, and their epics too often become a meaningless string of adventures. Rudolf of Ems (d. 1254) and Konrad von Würzburg (d. 1287) are the most gifted among these epigones. The former is the author of narrative poems like "Der gute Gerhard" and "Barlaam und Josaphat", an old Buddhist legend in Christian form. The latter wrote a bulky epic on the Trojan War, for which he used the French romance of Benoît de Sainte-More as a model. Far more meritorious are his shorter romances, like "Herzemäre" and "Engelhard". His "Goldene Schmiede" is a poem in honour of the Blessed Virgin. Thoroughly independent of courtly influence is the powerful and realistic poem "Meier Helmbrecht", a tragic village story written by a Bavarian priest named Wernher der Gärtner (c. 1250).

By the side of the courtly romances developed the popular epic. On the basis of old songs still current among the people, arose about 1200 in Austria the great German epic, the "Nibelungenlied", telling of Siegfried's death at the hands of Hagen and Kriemhild's fearful vengeance. The author is unknown, though he was probably of knightly rank. The poem is in strophic form, and, though the subject is primitively Germanic, the influence of chivalry and Christianity is throughout apparent. In Austria arose also, but little later, the "Gudrunlied", a story of the North Sea, telling of Gudrun's loyal devotion to her betrothed lover, King Herwig of Seeland. Of far less

interest are the other popular epics, which also date from the beginning of the thirteenth century; they are mostly related to the saga-cycle concerning Dietrich von Bern. The most notable are the "Rosengarten", "Alpharts Tod", "Laurin", "Eckenlied", and "Rabenschlacht". Three other epics, "Ortnit", "Hugdietrich", and "Wolfdietrich", take their subjects from the Langobardic saga-cycle; in them the influence of the Crusades is very noticeable.

Lyric poetry also flourished brilliantly in this period. Lyric poetry of a popular kind seems to have existed in Austrian territory long before the Romance influence came in from the North-west; but it was under this Romance influence that the lyric attained its characteristic form. *Minne*, i. e. the conventional

cult of woman, is the leading *motif*, but other themes, religious or political, are not wanting, and the *Spruch*, a poem of gnomic or sententious character, was also in great favour. Most of the minnesingers were of knightly rank. Tradition mentions Heinrich von Veldeke as the pioneer of minnesong. He was followed by Friedrich von Hausen, Heinrich von Morungen, and Reinmar von Hagenau. A disciple of the last-named, the Austrian, Walther von der Vogelweide (c. 1165-1230), is the greatest and most versatile lyric poet of medieval Germany. He is equally great in the *Minnelied* and in the *Spruch*. He was a staunch partisan of the emperors in their fight against the papacy, and many of his poems are bitter invectives against pope and clergy. But he never attacked the doctrines of the Church; his religious fervour is attested by such poems as that in honour of the Trinity. With his successors the *Minnesang* enters on its decline. Ulrich von Lichtenstein's life, as revealed in his autobiography, "Frauendienst" (1255), shows to what absurdities the worship of woman could go. Neidhart von Reuenthal (d. about 1245) holds up to ridicule the rude life of the peasants and so introduces an element of coarseness into the aristocratic art. Lastly, Reinmar von Zweter (d. about 1260) must be mentioned as a distinguished gnomic poet.

The didactic spirit, which now becomes prominent, is exhibited in longer poems, like "Der wälsche Gast" (1215) of an Italian priest Thomasin of Zirclære, and especially in Freidank's "Bescheidenheit" (c. 1215-30), i. e. wisdom born of experience, a collection of rhymed sayings. Though these works are strictly pious in tone, outspoken criticism of papal and ecclesiastical matters is frequently indulged in.

Prose was very backward in this period. Latin was the language for history and law. About 1230 appeared the "Sachsenspiegel", a code of Saxon law written in Low German by Eike von Repgowe, and this example produced in Upper Germany the "Schwabenspiegel" (before 1280). The first chronicle

in German prose, the "Sachsenchronik", was written by a Saxon cleric (before 1250).

A great impetus was given to German prose by the preaching of the mendicant friars, who were rising into prominence early in the thirteenth century. They reached the hearts of the people, on whom the aristocratic literature of chivalry had no influence. The sermons of David of Augsburg (d. 1272) are not preserved. His disciple, Berthold of Ratisbon (d. 1272), was immensely popular as a preacher. His dramatic, passionate eloquence, born of the sincerity of conviction, turned thousands of his hearers to repentance and a better life.

#### IV. DECLINE OF POETRY AT THE END OF THE MIDDLE AGES. RISE OF BOURGEOIS LITERATURE (1300-1500).

The decline of the knightly caste brought with it a decline of the literature of which this caste had been the chief support. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were not favourable to the development of an artistic literature. The Empire was losing its power and drifting into anarchy, the emperors were bent chiefly on increasing their dynastic power, while the princes strove to make themselves independent of imperial authority. They were no longer patrons of poetry. The clergy also, in great part, followed worldly pursuits and undermined the reverence in which they had been held. The rise of the cities and their commerce was fatal to the prestige of knight-hood and its ideals; life became more practical, more utilitarian, less æsthetic, and as a consequence the didactic tone becomes more and more prominent in literature.

The universities which sprang up in Germany during this period—the first being founded at Prague (1348)—widened

the gap between the learned classes and the people and prepared the way for Humanism, which towards the end of the fifteenth century begins to be a force in German letters. The influence of Humanism was not wholly beneficial. It was a foreign institution and fostered Latin as the language of scholarship at the expense of the native idiom. Gradually the Humanists turned against the dominant Scholastic philosophy, and soon a spirit of revolt manifested itself against the Church and its authority. The schisms within the Church and the worldliness of many of its dignitaries stimulated this spirit, which took a violent form, notably in the Hussite movement. The way was thus prepared for the great Lutheran revolt.

The romance of chivalry degenerated into allegory and tedious description, of which a typical instance is the "Theuerdank" (1517), an allegorical description of Emperor Maximilian's courtship of Mary of Burgundy, written at the suggestion of the emperor himself. The heroic epic fared no better; its tone became coarse and vulgar. Rhymed chronicles still supplied the place of histories, the most noteworthy being the

ernstlich und hart, die gotmalte wolge  
brant, dunt bediet die chur, die keiser



liehen berichet die er künich aller künig ge  
ben, der got wolge mæze dar. frant blut  
wird, dan er zaget er dch. der er got w  
war, der al die werlt beuot. dr drut  
nirren dar bot, dunt ir künich er d w  
ber, der er staudin cruce lat. iawar do an genon  
bett, der man rouch nirten befuert, der ir  
dhem fule wichte der opfer sat bezichenlich.

WERNHER, LIFE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN, ENTITLED "DRU  
LIET VON DER MAGET"  
Facsimile of page of the MS., XII Century, Royal  
Library, Berlin



chronicle of the Teutonic Order translated from the Latin of Peter von Dusburg by Nikolaus von Jeroschin (c. 1340). Of higher poetic value are the legends, fables, and anecdotes that enjoyed such popularity in this period. The best-known collection of fables was "Der Edelstein", containing a hundred fables translated from the Latin by Ulrich Boner, a Dominican monk of Berne (c. 1340). Of the many didactic poems of this period, by far the most famous was the "Narnschiff" (Ship of Fools) of the learned humanist Sebastian Brant (d. 1521), which appeared in 1494 and achieved a European reputation. This is a satire of all the vices and follies of the age, of which no less than one hundred and ten kinds are enumerated. A satiric tendency pervades also the "Reinke de Vos", a Low German version from a Dutch original of the famous story of Reynard the Fox (1498). The allusions in this poem to the vices of men high in Church and State are unmistakable.

As for lyric poetry, the *Minnesang* dies out, Hugo, Count of Montfort (d. 1423), and Oswald von Wolkenstein (d. 1445) being its last representatives. The cultivation of the lyric is now taken up by the burghers; the *Meistersang* displaces the *Minnesang*. Poetry in the hands of this class became a mere matter of technic, a trade that was taught in schools established for that purpose. The guild system was applied to art, and the candidate passed through different grades, from apprentice to master. Tradition names Mainz as the seat of the oldest school, and Heinrich von Meissen (d. 1318) as its founder. Of the many cities where schools flourished, none gained such a reputation as Nuremberg, the home of Hans Sachs.

Very little of the poetry of these *meistersingers* has literary merit. The best lyric poetry of this period and the following is found in the *Volkslied*, a song generally of unknown authorship, expressive of the joys and sorrows of people in all stations and ranks of life. Contemporary events often furnished the inspiration, as in Halbsuter's song of the battle of Sempach (1386). Other songs deal with legendary subjects, as for instance the song of Tannhäuser, the minstrel knight who wandered into the Mountain of Venus and then journeyed to Rome to gain absolution. The religious lyric of this period is largely devoted to the praise of the Blessed Virgin; in this connexion Heinrich von Laufenberg, a priest of Freiburg im Breisgau, later a monk at Strasburg (d. 1460), is specially noteworthy.

Another literary *genre* that now rose into prominence was the drama, the origin of which here as elsewhere is to be sought in the religious plays with which the great Christian festivals, especially Easter, were celebrated. These plays had a distinct purpose; they were to instruct as well as to edify. But gradually they assumed a more secular character, they were no longer performed in the church, but in the marketplace or some public square. Laymen also began to participate, and in the fourteenth century German takes the place of Latin. Besides the Passion, Biblical stories and legends were dramatized. One of the oldest and most striking of such plays is the Tegernsee play "Antichrist" (twelfth century). A famous drama of which the text is preserved is that of the wise and foolish virgins, performed at Eisenach in 1322.

The origin of the secular drama is not wholly clear. In the fifteenth century this *genre* is chiefly represented by the Shrovetide play, which undoubtedly traces its origin to the mummeries and the coarse fun-making indulged in on special occasions, notably on Shrove-Tuesday. No doubt the religious drama exerted its influence on the development of the secular drama. As a rule the latter was extremely crude in form and also incredibly coarse in language and content. The chief place for these plays was Nuremberg, and Hans Folz and Hans Rosenblut are the best-known authors in this line. In their plays appears the tendency that was to make of this literary *genre* an effective vehicle for satire.

In this period of utilitarianism prose comes to occupy a leading position. The romances of chivalry were turned into prose, foreign romances were translated, and thus arose the *Volksbücher*, of which the most noteworthy is that of Till Eulenspiegel, a notorious wag, around whom gathered all kinds of anecdotes. The original Low German book of 1483 is lost, the oldest High German version dating from 1515. In connexion with translated literature the names of the earliest German humanists, Heinrich Steinhöwel,

Niklas van Wyl, and Albrecht von Eyb should be mentioned.

History was now written in German prose. Of prose chronicles we possess a number, as that of Strasburg (to 1362), of Limburg (to 1398), and the Thuringian chronicle of Johannes Rothe, a monk of Eisenach (1421).

But the best German prose of this period is found in the writings of the mystics. The founder of this school was Master

Eckhart (d. 1327), a Dominican monk, and the Dominican Order became its chief exponent. Eckhart was accused of pantheism, but repudiated any such interpretation of his utterances. His disciple, Heinrich Seuse (Suso), also a Dominican (d. 1366), was less philosophical and more poetical. The third great mystic, Johannes Tauler (d. 1361), a Dominican of Strasburg, gave the teachings of his predecessors a more practical turn. The service which the mystics rendered to the German language in making it the medium for their speculations can hardly be overestimated.

The greatest preacher of the period was Geiler von Kaysersberg of Strasburg (d. 1510), whose series of sermons based on Brant's "Ship of Fools" was especially famous.

V. THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION (1500-1624).—The effects of Humanism in Germany began to be felt in the attention given by such men as Erasmus and Reuchlin to the study of the Bible in the original languages. For German literature the Reformation was a calamity. The fierce theological strife absorbed the best intellectual energy of the nation. Literature as an art suffered by being pressed into the service of religious controversy; it became polemic or didactic, and its prevailing form was prose.

Martin Luther (1483-1546) is the most important figure of this period and his most important work is his translation of the Bible (printed complete at Wittenberg, 1534; final edition, 1543-45). The German translations before his time had been made from the Vulgate and were deficient in literary quality. Luther's version is from the original, and although not

ganu pabanc got quad in liliham pefurt skibor  
ih pällora sumaro ara pinto schtic ar lance dar  
man mih eo scora in folc scoteno soman mirar  
burc engeru banun nigistate Nu scil mih tuasac  
chind. suetun hau pan breton in scinu billu eddo  
ihimo tabanin pordan. doh mih duna aod libho  
ibudir din ellen tae. In iur hainoman brufte gr  
pinnan rauba bibrahane. ibalu dar enic rehta  
ber den doh nu argotto quad hlabanc ofar luno  
der durnu figer piane nadh eo pellaustic.

THE "HILDEBRANDSLIED"  
Facsimile of passage, Earliest (Fulda) MS., IX Century.  
Provincial Library, Kassel

free from errors it is of wonderful clearness and thoroughly idiomatic. Its effect on the German language was enormous; the dialect in which it is written, a Middle German dialect used in the chancery of Upper Saxony, became gradually the norm for both Protestant and Catholic writers, and is thus the basis of the modern literary German. Luther's pamphlets have only historical interest; his catechism and sermons belong to theological literature. His "Tischreden" (Table-Talk) shows the personality of the man. Force and strength of will mark his character and writings. But his firmness often savours of obstinacy, and in dogmatism he yields no little to his opponents, while the bluntness, or still better the vulgarity, of his language, gave offence even in an age accustomed to abuse. As a poet he appears in his religious songs, among which "Ein feste Burg" is famous as the battle-hymn of the Reformers. Other writers of

directed against the Jesuits, notably his "Vierhörniges Jesuiterhütlein" (1580). His most ambitious work is the "Geschichtklitterung", a free version of Rabelais's "Gargantua" (1575). Fischart is not an original writer, and his extravagance of language and love for punning make his work thoroughly unpalatable to a modern reader.

Narrative prose is very prominent in the literature of this period. Collections of anecdotes, such as Jörg Wickram's "Rollwagenbuchlein" (1555) and especially "Schimpf und Ernst" (1522) of Johannes Pauli, a Franciscan monk, were very popular. Translations of French and Spanish romances like the "Amadis of Gaul" were also much in favour. Then there were the "Volksbücher", with their popular stories, among which those connected with Faust and the Wandering Jew have become especially famous. Didactic prose was represented by the historical work of Ægidius

wir myren an die vart. er walder goter sinne. d' sich alle itze bewart. **N**  
 lar weh vnbiden. sp'ch do Hagene niht. mine rede darvmbet. sine hant ir  
 geschilt. ich sit wanden truwen. weiz ir weh wol bewarn. so solt ir zú  
 den Hvnen. vil gewerliche varn. **S**u ir niht weiz erwinden. so besen  
 det ir man. die besten die ir vunden. oð in d' muget han. so wel ich ir in al  
 len. wifent rútgút. sine chan vns niht gewerren. d' argen Schriemh mirt  
**D**el wil ich gerne volgen. sprach d' kunic rehan. do hiez er boten ruten. wi  
 ten in sin lant. do brach man d' helde. driv wifent vñ met. si wanden niht  
 erwerben also gremelich vñ fer. **S**in ir willechliche. in vñthens lant.  
 man hiez in gebn allen. wolle vñ ouch gewant. die mit in varn wolden.  
 zú den Hvnen dan. d' kunic in goten willen. d' vil manigen gewan. **D**  
 hiez von Tronege Hagene. Danckwart den bróv sin. ir bad' techen sehrich.

#### THE "NIBELUNGENLIED"

Section of page, Earliest (Hohenems-Lassberg) MS., XIII Century, Court Library, Donaueschingen

Protestant church hymns were Paulus Speratus (d. 1551), Nikolaus Decius (d. 1541), Nikolaus Herman (d. 1561), and Philipp Nicolai (d. 1608).

As a rule, the German Humanists were indifferent to the Reformation, but Ulrich von Hutten (d. 1523) was a zealous partisan of the movement; his writings are mostly in Latin. One of the bitterest enemies of Luther was Thomas Murner, a Franciscan monk (1475-1537), who in his earlier satires castigated the follies of the age. At first he showed sympathy for the reform movement, but when Catholic doctrine was assailed, he turned, and in a coarse but witty satire "Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren" (1522), he unsparingly attacked the Reformation and its author.

The best poet of the sixteenth century was the Nuremberg shoemaker, Hans Sachs (1494-1576) who, although a follower of Luther, was not primarily a controversialist. He displayed amazing productivity in many fields, mastersong, *Spruch*, anecdote, fable, and drama. His Shrovetide plays display a genial humour that even to-day is effective. The spirit of the worthy master's verse is thoroughly didactic, and artistic form is altogether lacking.

Towards the middle of the sixteenth century, the Counter-Reformation set in, and regained much of the ground lost to Protestantism, which had now spent itself as a vital force and was divided by the dissensions between Lutherans and Calvinists. The most prominent polemical writer on the Protestant side was Johann Fischart (d. 1590), much of whose satire is

Tschudi (d. 1572), Sebastian Frank (d. 1542), and Johannes Thurmayr (known as Aventinus; d. 1534); the collections of proverbs and sayings made by Frank and Johann Agricola (d. 1566) are also to be mentioned in this connexion. In theology Bishop Berthold of Chiemsee represents the Catholic side, with his "Tewtsche Theology" (1528); the Franciscan, Johann Nas (d. 1590), a Catholic convert, in his "Sechs Centurien Euangelischer Wahrheiten" also champions the old Church. The chief Protestant writer was Johann Arndt (d. 1621), author of the "Vier Bücher vom waren Christenthum", one of the most widely read books of the time. Contemporary with Arndt was the famous shoemaker, Jakob Böhme (d. 1624), a mystical philosopher in whose writings profound thoughts and confused notions are strangely blended.

In the dramatic field there was also much activity. Luther, though opposed to the passion play, had favoured the drama on educational grounds. Nikolaus Manuel, a Swiss (d. 1530), used the dramatic form for satirizing the pope and the Catholic Church. The Biblical drama was in favour, and many of the learned writers of school comedies chose their subjects from the Bible, as for instance, Paul Rebhun (d. 1546) and Sixt Birek (d. 1554). The most prolific dramatist of the period was Hans Sachs, who wrote no less than 208 plays, which in spite of their lack of all higher literary quality, make a promising beginning. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, English strolling players

appeared in Germany, and through their superior histrionic art gained the favour of the public. Jakob Ayer (d. 1605), the leading dramatist of that age, shows their influence; still more so Heinrich Julius, Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (d. 1613), the first to write German dramas in prose instead of verse.

VI. THE AGE OF RELIGIOUS WARS (1624-1748). THE POETRY OF SCHOLARSHIP AND IMITATION.—The religious strife inaugurated by the Reformation culminated in the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), which practically destroyed Germany as a nation. National feeling almost died out. The Catholic League looked for support to Spain and Austria, while the Protestant princes betrayed the national interests to Sweden and France. A servile spirit of imitation was abroad. The German language was neglected and despised in

aristocratic circles and was corrupted by the influx of foreign words. Literature was devoid of originality and substance; the formal side absorbed the chief attention of the writers.

The literary leader of this period was Martin Opitz (1597-1639), whose treatise "Von der deutschen Poeterey" (1624) enjoyed undisputed authority as an *ars poetica* for more than a century. Intelligibility and regularity rather than imagination and feeling were to

be looked for in poetry. The theory of Opitz was drawn from the practice of French and Dutch Renaissance poets and left no room for originality. The book had a salutary effect, however, in that it put an end to the mechanical counting of syllables and made rhythm dependent on stress. Its protest against the senseless use of foreign words was also laudable. Opitz is the author of a number of poems, moralizing, didactic, religious, or descriptive in character, but of little real merit. His best-known work is "Trostgedicht in Widerwartigkeit des Kriegs" (1633). The poets who followed the leadership of Opitz are known as the First Silesian School, though not all were Silesians by birth, and included some of real talent like Friedrich von Logau (d. 1655), the witty epigrammatist, and Paul Fleming (d. 1640), the lyricist. The poets of the so-called Königsberg Circle were also followers of Opitz. Among them, Simon Dach (d. 1659) is pre-eminent. In this connexion may be mentioned also, Andreas Gryphius (1616-64), the chief dramatist of the period. His tragedies, based mostly on Dutch models, are marred by their stilted rhetoric and predilection for the horrible; his comedies are far better, though they did not meet with the same favour. It was chiefly diction and versification that benefited by the poets of this school. Literature in their hands was a mere product of scholarship, entirely out of touch with the people. The linguistic societies that sprang up at this time, the most famous of which was *Die fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* (1617), did not change this condition. The language, not the literature, improved through their efforts.



HANS SACHS IN HIS EIGHTY-FIRST YEAR  
After painting by Andreas Herneysen  
(1575); engraved by Jost Amman

As a reaction against the cold formalism and utili-

tarianism of the Opitzians, the writers of the Second Silesian School, Christian Hofmann von Hofmannswaldau (1617-79) and Daniel Kaspar von Lohenstein (1635-83) fell into the opposite extremes of bombast and exaggeration. Their style was modelled on that of the Italian Marini. The lyric poems of the former and the dramas and novels of the latter are written in an unnatural and inflated style, overloaded with metaphors. In their style, as well as in their immorality, these writings reflect the taste of contemporary courtly society. In opposition to this fashionable tendency, Christian Weise (d. 1708) in his school dramas and satiric novels strove for simplicity, which in his work and that of his followers degenerated frequently into triviality and inanity. The best poetry that the seventeenth century produced was the religious lyrics, especially the hymns. The tone of these poems is no longer one of combat, but rather of pious resignation. The greatest of Protestant writers in this line was Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676). Others deserving of mention are Joachim Neander, Georg Neumark, Johann Franck, and Philipp Jakob Spener. Among Catholic writers the most prominent were the Jesuit, Friedrich Spe (1591-1635), the intrepid defender of the victims of the witchcraft tribunals, author of the lyric collection "Trutznachtigall", and Johann Scheffler, better known as Angelus Silesius (d. 1677), a convert and later a priest, in whose poetic collections "Heilige Seelenlust" and "Der cherubinische Wandersmann" mysticism again finds a noble expression. Another Jesuit poet, Jacob Balde (1604-68), did his best work in Latin, though his German poems are not without merit.

The novel began to flourish in the seventeenth century. The heroic and gallant romance, of which Lohenstein was the chief exponent, was high in favour with aristocratic society, but of small literary value. The romances of roguery, coming in under Spanish influence, were far better. The prose classic of the century is the "Simplicissimus" of Christoph von Grimmelshausen (d. 1676), a convert to Catholicism. In the form of an autobiography it unfolds a vivid and realistic picture of the period of the Thirty Years War. Defoe's "Robinson Crusoe" brought forth a flood of imitations, of which Schnabel's "Die Insel Felsenburg" was the best. Satire is represented by Christian Reuter's "Schellmuffskys Reisebeschreibung" (1696) and the writings of Johann Balthasar Schupp, a Lutheran pastor of Hamburg (d. 1661), as well as those of Ulrich Megerle, known as Abraham a Sancta Clara (1644-1709), who as court preacher at Vienna was noted for his wit and drollery. German prose began now to be used for philosophy and science. The pioneers in this line were Christian Thomas and Christian Wolff, who inaugurated the Rationalistic movement in Germany.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century German literature was still in a low state. The drama especially was in a bad plight, coarse farces with the clown in the leading rôle being most in favour. A reform was attempted by the Leipzig professor, Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-66). His intentions were praiseworthy, but unfortunately he was anything but a poet. Poetry for him was a matter of the intellect; its aims were to be practical. For the mysterious and the wonderful he had no use. Good taste was to be cultivated by imitating the French classic drama, which was supposed to be the best exponent of the practice of the ancients. Gottsched's literary dictatorship was undisputed until he became involved in a controversy with the Swiss critics, Bodmer and Breitinger, who insisted on the rights of imagination and feeling and held up the English poets as better models than the French. Gottsched was defeated and in consequence lost all authority.

Slowly poetry began to improve. This improvement is distinctly noticeable in the descriptive poem

"Die Alpen" of Albrecht von Haller (d. 1777) and the graceful verse of Friedrich von Hagedorn (d. 1754). The most popular author of the day was Christian Furchtegott Gellert (1715-69), whose fables were familiar to every German household. He also wrote stories, moralizing comedies, and hymns. But neither these writers nor those of the Halle circle, Johann Wilhelm Ludwig Gleim, Ewald Christian von Kleist, and Johann Peter Uz, were in any sense great writers.

VII. THE CLASSIC PERIOD OF GERMAN LITERATURE (1748-1805).—Many causes contributed to the rise of a great national literature in the eighteenth century. The victories of the Prussian King Frederick the Great quickened national sentiment in all German lands. This quickening of patriotism is discernible in Klopstock's poems; it encouraged Lessing to begin his campaign against the rule of French classicism. Religious movements also exerted a powerful influence. Pietism came as a reaction against the narrow Lutheran orthodoxy then prevailing, and though it ultimately added but one more petty sect to those already existing, the deepening of religious sentiment that followed it was beneficial to poetry. With the appearance in 1748 of the three opening cantos of "Der Messias" a new era opened for German literature. The author, Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724-1803), was hailed at once as a poet born not made. Poetry again had a noble content: love, patriotism, and religion. The theme of the "Messias" is the Redemption. In spite of its high seriousness and lofty purpose, the poem is a failure as an epos. Klopstock's gift was lyric; he is at his best in his odes. Impatient of the pedantic rules of versification followed by poets since the days of Opitz, he discarded rhyme altogether and chose for his odes antique metres and free rhythms. This, as well as their involved diction, has stood in the way of their popularity. Another defect that mars all of Klopstock's work is its excessive sentimentalism, a defect that is disagreeably noticeable in most of the literature of that time. The poet's patriotism found vent in odes as well as in patriotic prose dramas, the so-called *Bardiete*, in which an attempt was made to revive Germanic antiquity and to excite enthusiasm for Arminius, the liberator of ancient Germany from Roman subjugation. As dramas these productions are utter failures, though their lyric passages are often beautiful; their chief effect was to stimulate the "bardic" movement represented by von Gerstenberg, Kretschmann, and the Viennese Jesuit Denis. Klopstock's Biblical dramas like "Der Tod Adams" (1757) are now wholly forgotten.

Of far greater influence on literature than pietism was rationalism, whose watchword was "Enlightenment". Reason was to be the sole guide in all things; tradition and faith were to conform to it. For dogma of any kind there was no room in such a system, which frequently tended towards undisguised atheism, as with the English Deists and especially the French Encyclopedists. Frederick the Great was an adherent of their views and made them dominant in Church and State as far as Prussia was concerned. In Germany, however, rationalism did not go to the length of atheism; as a rule a compromise between reason and revealed religion was attempted. The broad humanitarianism of the great writers of this period, Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, shows the influence of the Enlightenment. Certain it is that all these writers were out of sympathy with any of the orthodox forms of Christianity. Often, however, the Enlightenment degenerated into a shallow, prosy rationalism, destitute of all finer sentiment, as in the case of the notorious Nicolai (d. 1811). As a reaction against the one-sided sway of rationalism, came a passionate revolt against the existing order. This revolt was inaugurated by Rousseau and manifested itself in German literature in the *Sturm-und Drang-Periode* (Storm and Stress period). The final product of the whole rati-

onistic movement was the epoch-making "Critique of Pure Reason" of Immanuel Kant.

The representative of the Enlightenment in its best aspect is Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-81), one of the greatest critics of the century. In the "Litteraturbriefe", a series of essays on contemporary literature, his wonderful critical ability was first shown. Here Shakespeare is held up as a model and the supremacy of the French drama is challenged. In 1766 appeared the "Laokoon", in which the spheres of poetry and the plastic arts are clearly defined, and their fundamental differences pointed out. The attempt to establish a national theatre at Hamburg resulted in the "Hamburgische Dramaturgie" (1767-69), wherein Lessing investigates the nature of the drama, and refutes the claim of the French that their classic drama is the true exponent of the practice of the ancients. The rules of Aristotle are accepted as final, but it is shown that the French have misunder-



SEBASTIAN BRANT

stood them, and their German imitators are therefore doubly in error. With all its one-sidedness, the polemic was fruitful, for it put an end to pseudo-classicism and made a national German drama possible. Lessing led the way. His "Miss Sara Sampson" (1755) is the first bourgeois tragedy of the German stage. It was followed by "Minna von Barnhelm" (1767), the first German national drama, on a subject of contemporaneous interest with the Seven Years War for a background, and by "Emilia Galotti", the first classic German tragedy (1772) an adaptation to modern conditions of the story of Appius and Virginia. Lessing's last drama "Nathan der Weise" (1779) was the outcome of the theological controversy in which he had been involved, through the publication of the Wolfenbüttel fragments. These had been written by Reimarus and contained a bold attack on Christianity and the Bible. A bitter feud between Lessing and Goeze, the champion of Lutheran orthodoxy, was the result, in the course of which Lessing wrote a number of polemics in which he asserted that Christianity could exist without, and did exist before, the Bible. When a decree of the Duke of Brunswick forbade further discussion, he had recourse to the stage and wrote his "Nathan". In this he uses Boccaccio's famous parable of the three rings to enforce the thesis that there is no absolutely true religion. Not faith, but virtuous action is the essence of religion, and all religious systems are equally good. For a dogmatic religion there is, of course, no room in this view, which is a frank expression of Lessing's deistic rationalism. His last prose works, notably "Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts" (1780), are philosophical in character and treat of ideas related to those expressed in "Nathan".

A contrast to Klopstock's "seraphic" sentimentalism is offered in the sensualism of Christopher Martin Wieland (1733-1813). He began as a fervid pietist and admirer of Klopstock, and under the influence of rationalism passed to the opposite extreme of sensualism tinged with frivolity before he found his level. His "Agathon" is the first German *Bildungsroman*, presenting a modern content in ancient garb, a method

also followed in the "Abderiten" (1780), in which the provincialism of the small town is satirized. His masterpiece is the romantic heroic epic "Oberon" (1780), for which he drew his inspiration from the old French romance "Huon de Bordeaux". His last work, "Aristipp", is a novel in epistolary form, like the "Agathon" Greek in dress, but otherwise modern. Wieland was not a great poet, but the smooth graceful style of his writings and their pleasant wit did much to win the sympathy of the upper classes for German literature.

While Wieland's influence on German literature has been small, that of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) was decisive and far-reaching, less through his own writings than through the new ideas he proclaimed and the influence of his personality on others, notably Goethe. Rousseau's summons to return to nature was applied by Herder to poetry. Not imitation, but native power makes the poet. Poetry

was to be judged as the product of historic and national environment. Natural and popular poetry like the folk-song was preferred to artistic poetry. These views were developed in a series of essays "Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Litteratur" (1767) and "Kritische Walder" (1769) and were still further elaborated in essays on Ossian and Shakespeare



FRIEDRICH LEOPOLD GRAF ZU STOLBERG

in "Von deutscher Art und Kunst einige fliegende Blätter" (1773). Then followed "Stimmen der Völker in Liedern" (1778), a collection of 182 folk-songs from every age, clime, and nationality. Herder's skill as translator or adapter is exhibited here, as also in "Der Cid", a free version from the Spanish through the medium of the French. His original poems, mostly parables and fables, are of little importance. Herder, the founder of the historical method, could not but be hostile to rationalism with its unhistoric methods and one-sided worship of reason. In "Vom Geiste der hebräischen Poesie" (1783) he showed what a wealth of poetry the Bible contained. In his last work, "Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit" (1784-91), the history of the human race is regarded under the aspect of evolution; humanitarianism is the ultimate goal of religious development. This work pointed out the way for the philosophical study of history.

The effect of the work of Klopstock, Herder, and Lessing was immediate. The national movement was taken up by the "Göttinger Hain" poets, of whom the best-known are Johann Heinrich Voss (d. 1826), the translator of Homer, Ludwig Heinrich Christoph Hölty (d. 1776), the elegiac singer, and the two brothers Stolberg. Connected with them, though not members of the circle, were Matthias Claudius (d. 1815) and the gifted but dissolute Gottfried August Bürger (d. 1794), the ballad writer, whose "Lenore" (1773) has become widely known.

The protest voiced by Rousseau against the existing social order produced in German letters the so-called *Sturm und Drang* (Storm and Stress) movement, which dominated the decade (1770-80). It was a passionate revolt against conventional traditions and standards and manifested itself in the wild dramatic

products of such men as von Klinger, Friedrich Müller or Maler Müller, and Lenz, and the lyric effusions of Schubart (d. 1791). But the movement found its best expression in the early work of Germany's greatest poets, Goethe and Schiller.

Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749-1832) while a student at Strasburg had come under Herder's influence and caught the revolutionary spirit. In his "Gotz von Berlichingen" (1773), the first great historical German drama, the poet gave vent to his dissatisfaction with the social and political conditions of his time. In spite of its irregular form, due to a misguided enthusiasm for Shakespeare, the national content of the drama and the forceful diction carried the public by storm. Its popularity was exceeded by "Die Leiden des jungen Werthers" (1774), a novel in letter form, reflecting the morbid sentimentalism of the age; the hero kills himself under the spell of a hopeless passion for the affianced of his friend. The years from 1775 to 1786 were not so fruitful; political and social activity interfered with literary production. The spirit of storm and stress gradually subsided and gave way to the classicism which, especially after his return from Italy (1788), left its stamp on all of Goethe's subsequent work. The apostle of this neo-Hellenism was Johann Joachim Winckelmann (d. 1768), the founder of the historical study of art. He postulated the canons of ancient Greek art as absolute. The classicism that he inaugurated was directly opposed in spirit to the national tendency championed by Herder. Lessing's work had shown the influence of this neo-Hellenism. Now Goethe became its pronounced follower. The works that he wrote under its influence exhibit perfection of form, notably the dramas "Egmont" (1788), "Iphigenie auf Tauris" (1787), and "Torquato Tasso" (1790). Goethe's literary productions during this period, before 1794, are not numerous; they include the "Römische Elegien" and the epic "Reineke Fuchs" (1794), a free version in hexameters from the Old Low German. The dramas that arose under the influence of the French Revolution are not very important. In fact Goethe's chief interests at this time were scientific rather than literary. After 1794, however, under the inspiration of Schiller's friendship, the poetic impulse came with new strength. The period of Goethe's and Schiller's friendship (1794-1805) marks the climax of the poetic activity of these two great men. The satiric epigrams known as "Xenien" were the fruit of their joint activity. Then followed a number of their finest ballads. In 1796 Goethe completed "Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre", a novel of culture, discursive and didactic, with the stage for its principal theme. The exquisite idyllic epic, "Hermann und Dorothea" (1797), though written in hexameters, is thoroughly German in spirit and subject-matter. After Schiller's death (1805) Goethe's poetic productivity decreased. Some fine lyrics produced in this period are in the "Westöstliche Divan" (1819), a collection of poems in Oriental garb. Most of the poet's work now was in prose. "Die Wahlverwandtschaften" (1809), a psychological novel, depicts the tragic conflict between passion and duty and upholds the sanctity of the marriage tie. In the autobiographical romance "Dichtung und Wahrheit" (1811-33) the poet tells with poetic licence the story of his life. A number of stories were loosely strung together in "Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre" (1821), a long didactic novel given over largely to the discussion of ethical and sociological problems. The greatest work of Goethe and of German literature is "Faust", a dramatic poem, the composition of which occupied the poet's entire life. The idea was conceived while Goethe was still a young man at Frankfurt; a fragment containing the Gretchen episode appeared in 1790. Under the stimulus of Schiller's sympathy the first part was completed and published in 1806. The second part was not finished until eight months before



the poet's death. It is a colossal drama with humanity for its hero. Weak human nature may fall, under temptation, but its innate nobility will assert itself triumphantly in the end. Faust atones for his errors by a life devoted to altruistic effort, and so his soul after all is saved. The Catholic atmosphere of the closing scene, where the penitent Gretchen intercedes with the Virgin for her lover, betrays the influence of the Romantic School.

If Goethe is the man of universal gifts, Johann Christoph Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805) is pre-eminently a dramatist. He too received his first impulse from the Storm and Stress movement. His first three dramas, "Die Räuber" (1781), "Fiesco" (1783), and "Kabale und Liebe" (1784), breathe a spirit of passionate revolt. With all their youthful exaggeration, they reveal unmistakable dramatic power. In "Don Carlos" a calmer spirit reigns and a greater mastery of form is evident. Freedom of thought is the burden of its message. The composition of this work had turned Schiller's attention to history, and for a time the study of history and philosophy got the better of poetic production. The historical works that are the outcome of these studies are valuable rather for their style than as original contributions. Goethe's study of Kant's philosophy was responsible for a number of works of an æsthetic character, notably "Ueber naive und sentimentalische Dichtung", where *naive* and *sentimental* are taken as typical of ancient and modern respectively. His friendship with Goethe (1794-1805) won Schiller back to poetry and now followed in rapid succession his dramatic masterpieces: "Wallenstein", a trilogy, the first historic German tragedy in the grand style (1796-99), "Maria Stuart" (1800), and "Die Jungfrau von Orléans" (1801), a noble defence of the Maid of Orléans against the slanders of Voltaire. "Die Braut von Messina" (1803) is a not altogether successful attempt to combine modern spirit with antique form. The poet's last great drama, "Wilhelm Tell" (1804), is, perhaps, the most popular German play. Here he reverts again to the idea of freedom which he championed so passionately in his youthful dramas, and which here found its most convincing expression. The grandly conceived tragedy "Demetrius" remained a fragment, owing to the author's untimely death (1805). As a lyric poet Schiller is far below Goethe. His lyrics lack spontaneity; they are rather the product of reflection and are mostly philosophic in character. His masterpiece in this line is "Das Lied von der Glocke" (1800). He also excels in epigram and gnomic verse, and as a writer of ballads he has few equals.

The great classic drama by no means immediately won its way. Besides the opera, the bourgeois drama ruled the stage and its most popular representatives were Iffland and Kotzebue. The plays of these writers were thoroughly conventional in tone; those of Kotzebue had a distinctly immoral tendency, but they were theatrically effective and immensely popular.

Of prose writers contemporary with Goethe we may mention the historians, Justus Moser (d. 1794) and Johannes von Müller (d. 1809). In philosophy the commanding figure is Immanuel Kant, whose work has exerted a tremendous influence on modern thought. Alexander von Humboldt's (1769-1859) "Kosmos" is a classic of natural science.

In the field of the novel, Jean Paul Friedrich Richter (1763-1825) achieved distinction. His writings, "Quintus Fixlein", "Hesperus", "Titan", and others were enormously popular in their day, but owing to their bizarre style and absolute formlessness, joined to an unbearable discursiveness, they have lost all charm for modern readers. The unfortunate Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843) combined the classic with the romantic spirit in unique fashion. His passionate longing for the lost beauty of ancient Greece was

expressed in his novel "Hyperion", as well as in some noble lyrics.

VIII. ROMANTICISM AND THE ERA OF REVOLUTION (1805-1848).—With the beginning of the nineteenth century the revolt against the *Aufklärung* (Enlightenment), started by Herder, reasserted itself. There was also a marked revival of religious sentiment. The Romantic School rose into prominence. Art was to be rescued from the sway of rationalism; imagination and emotion were to be set free. Taking as a basis Fichte's philosophy, which proclaimed the *ego* as the supreme reality, the romanticists proceeded to free creative genius from the barriers of convention and tradition. But the result was often an extreme subjectivism that broke through the restraints of artistic form and lost itself in fantastic visions and vague mysticism. The leaders of the movement turned away from a sordid present to far-away Oriental regions, or to a remote past like the Middle Ages. This predilection for medievalism coming together with the religious revival gave to the romantic movement a pronounced Catholic tendency. Some of the leading romanticists, Brentano, Gorres, Eichendorff, were Catholics; others, like Friedrich Schlegel, became Catholics. Sympathy for Catholicism is noticeable in the work of all the members of the school.



ZACHARIAS WERNER

The Romantic movement was also a salutary reaction against the excessive classicism of Goethe and Schiller. The national element was again emphasized. The Middle Ages, depreciated and misrepresented ever since the Reformation, were now shown in a fairer light by historians like von Raumer, Wilken, Voigt, and others. The great medieval literature was rediscovered by scholars like Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm and Lachmann. In fact, the science of Germanic philology owes its origin to the Romantic School. The enthusiasm for foreign literature also bore rich fruit in masterly translations and reproductions. Here lies the main significance of much of the work of the brothers Schlegel, the critical leaders of the Older Romantic School. August Wilhelm von Schlegel (1767-1845) is famous as a translator. His translations of Shakespeare have become German classics, while his renderings from the Spanish (Calderon, Lope de Vega), Italian, and Sanskrit are hardly less meritorious. His brother, Friedrich von Schlegel (1772-1829), who became a convert to Catholicism, enunciated the romantic doctrines in his aphorisms. Through his treatise, "Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier" (1808) he became the pioneer of Sanskrit studies in Germany. The work of the Schlegels in criticism and literary history was epoch-making; they taught critics not merely to criticize, but to understand, to interpret, to "characterize". The school found no really great poet to put its theories into practice. Still the poetry of Friedrich von Hardenberg (1772-1801), better known as Novalis, is pervaded by deep feeling. His fragmentary novel "Heinrich von Ofterdingen" is an attempt to show the development of a true romantic poet. Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853) revived the old folk-books, satirized the Enlightenment in his comedies, wrote roman-

tic dramas of no great value, like "Genoveva", and a novel of culture "Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen", which had much influence on German painting. After 1821 he turned to the short story, which he was the first to cultivate with success. A second group of romantic writers, the Younger Romantic School, gathered chiefly at Heidelberg. With them the national tendency is more pronounced. Their work shows great talent, but is often spoiled by a lack of artistic restraint. Especially is this the case with Klemens Maria Brentano (1778-1842), a highly poetic but very eccentric character, who together with Achim von Arnim collected and edited an important book of folk-songs, "Des Knaben Wunderhorn" (1805-8). Their friend Joseph von Görres (1776-1848), during his period of ardent patriotism edited old German songs and folk-books; his later activity was largely devoted to the service of the Catholic Church, which found in him a zealous champion. The patriotic tendency is



ANASTASIUS GRÜN (ANTON ALEXANDER  
GRAF VON AUERSPERG)

much in evidence in the work of Friedrich de la Motte Fouqué (1777-1843), whose fantastic chivalric romances are forgotten, while his fairy-tale "Undine" still lives. The only dramatic poet of a high order connected with the Romantic School is Heinrich von Kleist (1777-1811), among whose dramas "Der Prinz von Homburg" (1810) is regarded as his masterpiece. His novels, of which "Michael Kohlhaas" is the best known, show a graphic power. Zacharias Werner (1768-1823), who ultimately became a Catholic, is chiefly known as the originator of the so-called "fate-tragedies", a gruesome species of drama in which blind chance is the dominating factor. Characteristic of decaying romanticism are the weirdly fantastic stories of E. T. A. Hoffmann (1776-1822). The influence of the romantic movement continued for some time after the movement had spent itself as a living force. Almost all the poets of the first half of the nineteenth century were more or less affected by it. The national tendency fostered by romanticism was transformed by the Wars of Liberation into patriotic fervour which found expression in the stirring lyrics of Max von Schenkendorf, Theodor Körner, and Moritz Arndt.

The poets of the Swabian School, who were romantic only in so far as they leaned towards medieval or religious subjects, excelled particularly in the ballad. Their leader was Ludwig Uhland (1787-1862), distinguished as poet and scholar. Besides him there were Justinus Kerner and Gustav Schwab. Some of Kerner's and Uhland's lyrics have become veritable *Volkslieder*.

Romanticism cast its spell over the lyric, which occupies a large space in the literature of this period. Prominent in this field were Adelbert von Chamisso, Wilhelm Müller, and Joseph von Eichendorff, a Catholic nobleman of Silesia, the most gifted lyricist of the group. Friedrich Rückert (1788-1866) was a voluminous but unequal writer of verse; his fame rests largely on his translations and imitations of Oriental poetry, the difficult forms of which he reproduced with amazing skill. In this he was followed by Count

August von Platen (1796-1835), in whose verses form reached perfection, often to the detriment of feeling. The greatest lyric poet, and the most striking literary figure of the day, was Heinrich Heine (1797-1856), a Jewish convert to Protestantism. Unfortunately, his great gifts are marred by the insincerity and immorality of his character; his finest poetic efforts are often impaired or destroyed by a wanton, mocking irony. His prose works, for the most part fragmentary and journalistic in character, are written in a graceful, easy style, and with brilliant wit. The miserable political conditions of Germany were the object of Heine's bitterest satire; but unfortunately religion and morality also became a target for his mockery and cynical wit. Great as his influence was on literature, on the whole it was pernicious. His poems appeared in different collections under the titles of "Buch der Lieder", "Neue Gedichte", and "Romanzero". Of his prose writings the "Reisebilder" (1826) are the best. Another romantic lyricist of the highest order was the Austrian, Nikolaus Lenau (Niembach von Strehlenau), the poet of melancholy. A strong individuality, uninfluenced by the literary currents of the day, reveals itself in the work of a noble Catholic lady, Annette Elisabeth von Droste-Hulshoff (1797-1848), whose writings throughout show a deeply religious spirit. Her collection entitled "Das geistliche Jahr", poems appropriate for the Sundays and Holy Days of the Catholic year, contains some of the finest religious poetry in the German language. Another genius who stood apart from the currents of the day was Franz Grillparzer (1791-1872), Austria's greatest dramatist. In his work classic and romantic elements were united. Of his many dramatic masterpieces we only mention "Die Ahnfrau", "Sappho", "Das goldene Vlies", "Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen", and "Der Traum ein Leben". His compatriot, Ferdinand Raimund, is the author of plays deservedly popular. The dramatic productions of Christian Grabbe were too extravagant and erratic to be performed. The most popular playwright of that day, Ernst Raupach, is now forgotten.

The historical novel rose into favour during this period, largely through the influence of Sir Walter Scott. Von Arnim and Tieck had tried their hand at this genre, to be followed by Wilhelm Hauff, the author of "Lichtenstein" (1826) and Willibald Alexis (pseudonym for Wilhelm Häring). The latter took his subjects from Prussian history and gave the novel a patriotic tendency. A significant change is marked by the novels of Karl Immermann (1796-1840), who in "Die Epigonen" and "Münchhausen" (1838) treated contemporary conditions in a satiric vein. The episode of the "Oberhof" in the latter work introduced the village and peasant story into German literature. In this field, Jeremias Gotthelf (Albert Bitzius) and Berthold Auerbach won success. Charles Sealsfield (Karl Postl) is known as a writer of novels of travel and adventure.

The hopes that patriots in 1815 had cherished of a united Germany had been rudely dispelled. Freedom of thought and speech had been suppressed by the political reaction typified by the Metternich regime. The smouldering discontent broke forth violently at the news of the Paris Revolution (1830) and found its literary expression in the movement known as "Young Germany". The relentless war that was carried on against the existing political order was also directed against religion and morality. The "emancipation of the flesh" was openly proclaimed. Heine had led the attack, and the members of the coterie followed with essays, novels, and dramas, which for the most part, owing to their political and social character, were short-lived. Karl Gutzkow (1811-78) is the leading figure of the coterie. His novels, with their anti-religious and immoral tendencies, have to-day only historical interest, while his dramas, of which the best known is

"Uriel Acosta" (1847), are theatrically effective. Next to Gutzkow in prominence was Heinrich Laube (1806-84), whose best work, however, was done as a dramatist and not as a partisan of Young Germany. Women also took part in the movement. Of these the most notable are the Jewess, Fanny Lewald, whose writings display a decided anti-Christian spirit, and Countess Ida von Hahn-Hahn, who began her literary career with novels of high life in which matrimony is treated with levity, and ended by becoming a devout Catholic.

The spirit of revolution inaugurated by Young Germany soon assumed a definite political character and dominated the literary activity from 1840 to the outbreak of 1848. It found its most eloquent expression in the political lyric. In Austria Anastasius Grün (pseudonym for Count Anton Alexander von Auersperg), Karl Beck, Moritz Hartmann, and Lenau were most prominent in this line; in Germany Herwegh, Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Franz von Dingelstedt, Ferdinand Freiligrath (1810-76), and Gottfried Kinkel were the political leaders of the malcontents. Much of this poetry was necessarily ephemeral; in fact Kinkel, Fallersleben, and Freiligrath owe their fame to their verses not political in character. In the poetry of Count Moritz von Strachwitz and Karl Simrock, the excellent translator of Old German literature, a reaction against the political tendency in literature and in favour of romanticism is evident. The short stories of Adalbert Stifter and the dramas of Friedrich Halm (Freiherr von Munch-Bellinghausen) also show the romantic tinge. The greatest lyricist of the age, Eduard Mörike (1804-75), a Swabian, went his way wholly unconcerned with the questions of the day.

IX. MODERN GERMAN LITERATURE (since 1848). NEW AIMS. POETIC REALISM. NATURALISM.—The year 1848 marks a great change in the political and literary history of Germany. The great question of German unification now loomed in the foreground, and though a reaction had set in after the revolutionary outbreak, liberal ideas were strong, and interest in political questions was keen. Literature sought to get more in touch with life, and became less exclusively æsthetic. The materialistic tendencies of the age were reflected in and conditioned by the great progress of science and the rise of journalism. The lyric and epic lost ground to the drama and the novel. The classic-romantic tradition still found many followers. In fact, after the turbulence of the Revolution came a return to a more formal and æsthetic art, which, however, kept more or less in touch with the life of the age. An enormous array of names confronts the student of the literature of this period, but only a relatively small number call for notice.

The most prominent lyric poet now was Emanuel Geibel (1815-84), whose poems are distinguished by beauty of form and dignified, patriotic sentiment. He was the leader of the Munich group, which numbered among others Count Adolf von Schack, the art connoisseur and distinguished translator of Firdausi, Hermann von Lingg and Julius Grosse, the epic poets, Friedrich von Bodenstedt, whose enormously popular "Mirza Schaffy" songs continued the Oriental fashion inaugurated by Goethe's "Divan". The work of one of this group, Paul Heyse, a masterly writer of short stories, is characterized by extreme elegance of form and diction. In his novel "Kinder der Welt" (1873), however, these fine qualities cannot conceal atheistic and immoral tendencies. Among the writers of this period none achieved such popularity as Joseph Victor von Scheffel, with his romantic epic, "Der Trompeter von Säckingen" (1854) and his historic novel "Ekkehard" (1855). The lyric-epic poem "Amaranth" (1849) of the Catholic Baron Oskar von Redwitz owed its success more to its religious feeling than to any real

merit. The neo-romantic productions of other Catholic poets like Behringer, Wilhelm Molitor, and Maria Lenzen failed to make a lasting impression. A Catholic poet of this period who won a permanent place was the Westphalian, Friedrich Wilhelm Weber (1813-94), author of the epic "Dreizehnlinden". A pessimistic atmosphere pervades the Austrian Robert Hamerling's epic, "Ahasver in Rom" (1866). "Die Nibelungen" of Wilhelm Jordan is a noteworthy attempt to revive the great medieval saga in modern alliterative form. This was accomplished with brilliant success by Richard Wagner (1813-83), whose music dramas are among the greatest achievements of modern German art.

A result of the more serious view of life was the new realism that strove to present life truthfully, stripped of the conventional phrasological idealism that had been the vogue since Schiller. This realism manifested itself chiefly in the drama and novel. In the former field its most eminent representative is Friedrich Hebbel (1813-63) with his powerful tragedies "Maria Magdalena", "Herodes und Mariamne", "Gyges und sein Ring", and "Die Nibelungen". Otto Ludwig (1813-65) followed with "Der Erbförster" and "Die Makka-baer", as well as the masterly romance "Zwischen Himmel und Erde". These dramas found little favour at the time of their appearance; the realistic novel fared better. Gustav Freytag (1816-95) won great success with "Soll und Haben" (1855), a novel of bourgeois life. Fritz Reuter (1810-74) used his native Low German dialect for his popular humorous novels, the most important of which are included in "Olle Kamellen" (1860-64). Great originality marks the work of the Swiss, Gottfried Keller (1819-90), regarded by many as the master-novelist of the period. His best production is the series of novels from Swiss life entitled "Die Leute von Seldwyla" (1856). The literary value of the work of Friedrich Spielhagen (b. 1829), a novelist of undoubted talent, is impaired by its undue treatment of social and political questions, while the great favour accorded to the antiquarian novels of Georg Ebers and Felix Dahn cannot hide their literary defects. Midway between romanticism and realism stands Theodor Storm (1817-88), whose great poetic talent is shown no less in his heartfelt lyrics than in his stories, such as "Aquis Submersus". Fiction began to occupy a larger place in literature especially after 1870. We mention only the Swiss, C. F. Meyer, who excels in the historical novel, and Theodor Fontane, whose later works were thoroughly modern and realistic. Peter Rosegger, a Styrian, has won fame with his village stories. Of the numerous women-writers of fiction, the most gifted are Luise von François and Marie, Baroness von Ebner-Eschenbach. The chief activity of the last-mentioned writers belongs to the period after 1870.



JOSEPH VICTOR VON SCHEFFEL

The Franco-German War of 1870 and the establishment of the new empire had comparatively little effect on literature. Poetry continued to move largely in the old classic-romantic grooves. The graceful but trivial lyrics and epics of Rudolf Baumbach, Julius Wolff, and other imitators of Scheffel's manner best

suited popular taste. The passionate lyrics of Prince Emil zu Schonau-Carolath deserved their success. The poetry, however, of Martin Greif Eduard von Paulus, Christian Wagner, and Heinrich Vierordt was slow to win recognition. The decade following the great victories of 1870 was not favourable to literary activity. For the moment political, social, and religious questions (as in *Kulturkampf*) were dominant. A spirit of agitation and unrest was abroad. Much of the literature of the time was partisan and polemic, or else catered to the materialistic taste that prevailed and merely aimed to entertain. Of this kind were the dramas of Paul Lindau, cut according to French patterns, and presenting pictures from decadent Parisian life. The more serious drama, favouring historical subjects and affecting the conventional manner of Schiller, is best represented by Ernst von Wildenbruch. By far the most original dramatist was the Austrian, Ludwig Anzengruber (1839-89), whose dramas, "Der Pfarrer von Kirchfeld", "Das vierte Gebot", etc. received almost no recognition until after 1880. The only factors that helped to counteract the materialism and commercialism that ruled the stage were the model performances of the Meiningen troupe and the uncompromising seriousness of Richard Wagner's artistic activity, as demonstrated in the festival performances of Bayreuth.

The mediocrity into which literature had fallen by 1880, its empty formalism, and conventional character, produced another literary revolt, a "Youngest Germany". Poetry was to become more modern. The questions of the day were to be its concern, the faithful reproduction of reality its aim. Instead of harking back to the realism of a Hebbel or Ludwig, the leaders of this movement looked to foreign models for inspiration, to the works of Ibsen, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and Zola. The realism there found was copied and exaggerated, and the result was a crude naturalism which unduly emphasized the mean, the ugly, and the vulgar. The pessimistic philosophy of Schopenhauer and especially the revolutionary doctrines of Nietzsche added their unwholesome influence and tended towards a perversion of ethical and moral standards. The activity of the movement was at first mainly negative and polemical. Its literary creations have already lost interest. Real literature was not produced until the extreme views were modified. As a reaction against naturalism, "symbolism" made its appearance; but the art which it inspired is apt to be so intangible and hyper-aesthetic as to be limited for appreciation to a narrow and exclusive circle.

In the dramatic field Hermann Sudermann (b. 1857), whose novels "Frau Sorge" (1887) and "Der Katzensteg" (1889), had already attracted attention, won great success. His plays "Die Ehre", "Heimat", "Es lebe das Leben", and others, are very effective, but marred by sensationalism. Sudermann is not a representative naturalist; his technic is a compromise between the older practice and the new theories. A thoroughgoing naturalist is Gerhart Hauptmann (b. 1863) in his first dramas "Vor Sonnenaufgang" (1889) and "Die Weber" (1892). Here the *milieu* is more important than character or action. In his comedies "Kollege Crampton" and "Der Biberpelz" he showed that naturalism did not preclude humour. His most famous play, the fairy-drama "Die versunkene Glocke" (1896), like "Hanneles Himmelfahrt" before, and "Der arme Heinrich" afterwards, marks a significant turning towards symbolism and neo-romanticism. So far "Fuhrmann Henschel" (1898) is the dramatic masterpiece of naturalism. Of other dramatists of this school mention may be made of Max Halbe (b. 1865), author of "Jugend" (1893) and Otto Erich Hartleben, whose "Rosenmontag" (1900) shows Sudermann's influence. A popular dramatist, though of no particular school, is Ludwig Fulda; his plays, of which "Der Talisman"

(1892) is the best known, are pleasing but shallow. The new romanticism, which is exemplified by the dreamy poetry of Maeterlinck, was even less able than naturalism to produce a vital drama. The productions of Hugo von Hofmannsthal (b. 1874) are wholly undramatic, revelling in emotion and devoid of action. His proper field is the lyric, where his talents as well as those of Stefan George (b. 1868) find scope. Symbolism has found its most characteristic expression in the rapturous and vague lyric effusions of Richard Dehmel (b. 1863). After all the best lyric poets of the present, are those who do not affect any particular fashion. Such are Detlev von Liliencron, a realist of great power, regarded by many as the foremost German lyricist of to-day, Gustav Falke, Ferdinand Avenarius, Karl Busse, Otto Julius Bierbaum and Anna Ritter. Freiherr Borries von Munchhausen has written masterly ballads.

The novelistic literature has grown to enormous proportions, and shows a host of names. Naturalism asserted itself in the novels "Meister Timpe" (1888) and "Das Gesicht Christi" (1897) of Max Kretzer, as well as in the earlier work of Wilhelm von Polenz (1861-1903). With Polenz, however, naturalism has developed into artistic realism, as evidenced by his last novels "Thekla Ludekind" (1899) and "Wurzel-locker" (1902). In addition mention may be made of Gustav Frenssen, whose "Jorn Uhl" (1901) gained an enormous success, Adolf Wilbrandt, Thomas Mann, Wilhelm Speck, Georg von Olmpeda and Walter Siegfried. Prominent among women writers of fiction are Isolde Kurz (b. 1853), Helene Bohlau, Marie Eugénie delle Grazie, Carmen Sylva (Queen Elizabeth of Rumania) and above all Ricarda Huch (b. 1867), whose great novel "Erinnerungen von Ludolf Ursleu" (1893) stands in the front rank of modern fiction.

For bibliography the standard work is GODEKE, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung* (2nd ed., Goetze, Dresden, 1884-). Useful also are BARTELS, *Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1909); BREUL, *Handy Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the German Language and Literature* (London, 1895). For modern German literature NOLLEN, *A Chronology and Practical Bibliography of Modern German Literature* (Chicago, 1903) will be found helpful. Of general histories the best are: KOBERSTEIN, *Grundriss der Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur* (6th ed., 5 vols., ed. Bartsch, Leipzig, 1884-); GERVINUS, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung* (5th ed., 5 vols., ed. Bartsch, Leipzig, 1871-74); WACKERNAGEL, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, ed. and continued MARTIN (2 vols., Basle, 1879-94); SCHERER, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (10th ed., Berlin, 1905); tr. Mrs. CONYBEARE (2 vols., Oxford, 1885); VOGT and KOCH, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* with excellent bibliography and illustrations (2nd ed., 2 vols., Leipzig, 1904). For a presentation from the Catholic point of view consult LINDEMANN, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (7th ed., Salzer, Freiburg, 1897), and SALZER, *Illustrierte Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Munich, 1908-). Of works written in English the best are: ROBERTSON, *A History of German Literature* (London and New York, 1902); FRANCKE, *History of German Literature as Determined by Social Forces* (4th ed., New York, 1901); THOMAS, *History of German Literature* (New York, 1909), with excellent bibliography. For special topics and periods some of the most important works are HERFORD, *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the 18th century* (Cambridge, 1886); HETTNER, *Literaturgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts*: Part III: *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert* (4th ed., Harnack, Brunswick, 1893-94). For Lessing consult SCHMIDT, *Lessing* (2nd ed., 2 vols., Berlin, 1899); for his religious views BAUMGARTNER, *Lessings religiöser Entwicklungsgang in Stämmen aus Maria-Laach* (Freiburg im Br., 1877). On Goethe see BIELSCHOWSKY (Munich, 1896-1904); tr. COOPER (New York, 1905-08); HEHN, *Gedanken über Goethe* (5th ed., Berlin, 1902); the best known English biography, though somewhat antiquated, is that of LEWES (4th ed., London, 1890). For an estimate from a strictly Catholic point of view see BAUMGARTNER, *Goethe, sein Leben und seine Werke* (2nd ed., Freiburg im Br., 1885). On Schiller consult the biography by WYCHGRAM (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1898). Of English biographies that of CARLYLE is well known; the best is that of THOMAS (New York, 1901). On the Romantic School consult HAYM, *Die romantische Schule* (Berlin, 1870); VAUGHAN, *The Romantic Revolt* (Edinburgh, 1907). For the nineteenth century consult BARTELS, *Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart* (7th ed., Leipzig, 1907), written from a strictly national point of view and not without bias; also MEYER, *Die deutsche Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1900).

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

**Germany, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF NORTHERN** (VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF THE NORTHERN MISSIONS).—Its jurisdiction covers the Grand Duchies of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz, the Principality of Schaumburg-Lippe, the free Hanse towns, Hamburg, Lübeck, and Bremen, the Principality of Lübeck (capital Eutin), belonging to the Grand Duchy of Oldenburg, and the Island of Helgoland. The Northern Missions, viewed in a wider sense, include also the Prefecture Apostolic of Schleswig-Holstein, coinciding with the Prussian province of that name, which was placed under a separate prelate in 1868. Both vicariate and prefecture are under the permanent jurisdiction of the Bishop of Osnabrück as administrator Apostolic. In the vicariate Catholics number about 79,400 (with 1,925,000 members of other congregations), under 47 secular priests having care of 17 parishes and 17 mission stations. The following religious congregations have houses in the vicariate: Sisters of Mercy of St. Charles Borromeo, 1; Sisters of St. Elizabeth (Grey Nuns), 5; Franciscan Sisters, 2; Ursulines, 2. The Prefecture Apostolic of Schleswig-Holstein contains (1909) 11 parishes, 31 mission stations, 34 secular priests, 35,900 Catholics, and 550,000 of other beliefs; 4 communities of Sisters of St. Elizabeth, and 3 of Franciscan nuns. In summer the Catholic population of the vicariate and prefecture is increased by 17,000 to 20,000 labourers (chiefly Poles) from other parts of Germany, who return to their homes at the beginning of the winter. The spiritual interests of the faithful are inadequately attended to owing to the extent of the parishes, the lack of priests, the poverty of the majority of the Catholics, and, in many places, owing to the intolerance of the Protestant state or municipal governments. A more encouraging picture is presented by the numerous Catholic societies, and by the maintenance of private Catholic schools, despite the fact that the Catholics are often obliged to contribute also to the support of the state and parish schools. A very fruitful activity has been developed in these missions by the Boniface Association.

The Reformation in the sixteenth century caused the loss of almost all Northern Germany to the Church. In 1582 the stray Catholics of Northern Germany, as well as of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, were placed under the jurisdiction of a papal nuncio in Cologne. The Congregation de propaganda fide, on its establishment in 1622, took charge of the vast missionary field, which at its third session it divided among the nuncio of Brussels (Denmark and Norway), the nuncio of Cologne (North Germany), and the nuncio of Poland (Sweden). The scattered Catholics were chiefly confided to the Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans. Catholics in many places had at their disposal only the chapels established in the houses of the diplomatic representatives of the emperor, and of the Catholic Powers, France and Spain. Sometimes admission even to these chapels was rendered difficult, or entirely prohibited to native Catholics.

In some districts the conversion of the princes, e. g. Duke Johann Friedrich of Brunswick-Lüneburg (1651) and Duke Christian of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (1663), brought Catholics some measure of freedom. The number of Catholics having increased in 1667, chiefly through the above-mentioned Duke of Brunswick, a vicariate Apostolic was established for Northern Germany. The first vicar was Valerio Maccioni, titular Bishop of Morocco, who resided at Hanover. He died in 1676, and was succeeded by the celebrated Danish convert, Nicolaus Steno, who in 1680 was obliged to leave Hanover, was made Auxiliary Bishop of Münster, and in 1683 returned to the Northern Missions. He died at Schwerin in 1686, and was followed in the vicariate successively by Friedrich von Hörde, Auxiliary Bishop of Hildesheim and titular Bishop of Joppe (1686-96), Jobst Edmund von Brabeck, Bishop

of Hildesheim (1697-1702), and Otto von Bronckhorst, Auxiliary Bishop of Osnabrück. Owing to its vast extent, the old vicariate Apostolic was divided by Pope Clement XI into two vicariates (1709): the Vicariate Apostolic of Hanover (or Upper and Lower Saxony), embracing the portions of the old vicariate situated in the Palatinate and Electorates of Brandenburg and Brunswick, which was placed in charge of Agostino Steffani, Bishop of Spiga and minister of the Elector Palatine, as vicar Apostolic; the rest of the original vicariate (Denmark, Sweden, Lübeck, Hamburg, Altona, and Schwerin), which retained the title of Vicariate of the North and was placed under the Auxiliary Bishop of Osnabrück. This division lasted until 1775, when Friedrich Wilhelm von Westfalen, Bishop of Hildesheim, reunited under his administration the vicariates except Norway and Sweden.

The French Revolution and the Napoleonic regime brought great relief to Catholics in many cities and states; but the equality granted them by law in some countries was often merely theoretical. At the reorganization of Catholic affairs in Germany after the Napoleonic era, the greater part of the Northern Missions was added to adjacent bishoprics. The only districts remaining mission territory were the Kingdom of Saxony, the Principality of Anhalt, constituted separate vicariates Apostolic in 1816 and 1825 respectively (see ANHALT and SAXONY), and the North, which in 1826 was placed temporarily under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Paderborn. In 1839 Pope Gregory XVI wished to entrust the vicariate to a bishop with his see at Hamburg. Johann Theodor Laurent was appointed vicar and consecrated bishop. Protestant opposition prevented the realization of the plan and Laurent was unable to reach Hamburg. The pope thereupon gave the administration of the vicariate to the Auxiliary Bishop of Osnabrück, Karl Anton Lüppe (d. 1856). The Bishop of Osnabrück has since then been the regular Vicar Apostolic of the Northern Missions, and administrator of the Prefecture Apostolic of Schleswig-Holstein, separated from the vicariate in 1868. In 1869 Denmark was erected into a prefecture, and in 1892 into a vicariate.

KLINCKHARDT, *Historische Nachrichten von zwei apostolischen Vicariaten in Archiv des historischen Vereins von Niedersachsen* (1836); MEIER, *Die Propaganda, ihre Provinzen und ihr Recht*, II (Göttingen, 1853); DREVES, *Geschichte der katholischen Gemeinden zu Hamburg und Altona* (2nd ed., Schaffhausen, 1866); WOKER, *Geschichte der Norddeutschen, französischen, Missionen der Sächsischen Ordens-Provinz vom hl. Kreuz* (Freiburg im Br., 1880); *Historisch-Politische Blätter*, XC (Munich, 1882); WOKER, *Aus Norddeutschen Missionen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne, 1884); IDEM, *Aus den Papieren des kurpfälzischen Ministers Agostino Steffani, Bischofs von Spiga* (Cologne, 1885); IDEM, *Agostino Steffani, Bischof von Spiga t. p. i., apostolischer Vicar von Norddeutschland 1709-1728* (Cologne, 1886); PIEPER, *Die Propaganda-Congregation und die nordischen Missionen im 17. Jhd.* (Cologne, 1886); GOYAU, *L'Allemagne religieuse: le protestantisme* (Paris, 1902), tr. (Einsiedeln, 1905).

JOSEPH LINS.

**Germia**, a titular see of Galatia Secunda, a suffragan of Pessinus; mentioned by Hierocles in the sixth century (Synec., 698, 4). About 650 it was already an autocephalous archdiocese directly dependent on Constantinople (Ecthesis pseudo-Epiphani, ed. Gelzer, n. 51). Its condition was the same in the ninth century (Georgii Cyprii Descriptio, ed. Gelzer, n. 51), under Emperor Leo the Wise (901-07) (ibid., n. 61); under Constantine Porphyrogenitus (ed. Gelzer, n. 59); and under Alexius I Comnenus after 1084 (ed. Parthey, n. 87). In the time of Michael Palaeologus, about 1260, Germia must have been an autocephalous metropolitan see, such as it was still under Andronicus II, about 1300, and under Andronicus III, about 1330 (ed. Gelzer, n. 80, 89). But the see was soon to disappear. Lequien (*Oriens christ.*, I, 495) knows of four titular Bishops of Germia. From the time of Justinian I (527-565) the city was entitled Myriangeloi, on account of a church dedicated to St. Michael and the Holy Angels. Justinian went there to take the baths in 556 (Theo-



phanes, Chronographia, A. M. 6056). To-day Germa is called Germa. It is a small village in the vilayet and caza of Angora, twenty-one miles south-east of Sivri-Hissar and twelve miles east of the ruins of Pessinus. The ancient baths and the ruins of the inn built by Justinian are still to be seen. Germa must not be confused with Germa, a suffragan see of Cyzicus in the province of the Hellespont, and later an autocephalous archdiocese.

GELZER, *Ecthesis pseudo-Epiphanií*, n. 135; IDEM, *Georgii Cypru descriptio orbis Romani* (Leipzig, 1890), n. 149, p. 60; HIEROCLES, *Synecdemus*, ed. PARTHEY, n. 111; LEQUEN, *Oriens Christ.* (Paris, 1740), I, 767; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie* (Paris, 1892), I, 288; TEXIER, *L'Asie Mineure*, 470 sqq.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Gerona**, DIOCESE OF (GERUNDENSIS), in Catalonia, Spain, suffragan of Tarragona, is bounded on the north by the Pyrenees, on the south and east by the Mediterranean, and on the west by the dioceses of Barcelona and Vich. The district is mountainous, with forests of pine, oak, and chestnut, and numerous mineral springs. Several of the towns are manufacturing centres, and the main railway from France to Barcelona runs through the province, which possesses considerable commercial importance. Its coal mines are a source of wealth, but agriculture is not in a flourishing condition. The episcopal city of Gerona is the chief town of the province of the same name, and is situated at the confluence of the Ter and the Oña. The ancient portion of the city with its once-formidable fortifications stands on the steep hill of the Capuchins, while the more modern section is in the plain and stretches beyond the river. The bastions of the walls which have withstood so many sieges are still to be seen.

Gerona is the ancient *Gerunda*, a city of the Ausetani. It is said that Sts. Paul and James, on their arrival in Spain, first preached Christianity there, and tradition also has it that St. Maximus, a disciple of St. James, was the first bishop of the district. It is generally held that the see was erected in 247. On 18 June, 517, a synod was convened here, and attended by the Archbishop of Tarragona and six bishops. Canons were promulgated dealing with the recitation of the Divine Office, infant baptism, and the celibacy of the clergy. The city has undergone twenty-five sieges and been captured seven times. In the time of Charlemagne it was wrested temporarily from the Moors, who were driven out finally in 1015. It was besieged by the French under Marshal Hocquicourt in 1653, under Marshal Bellefonds in 1684, and twice in 1694 under de Noailles. In May, 1809, it was besieged by 35,000 French troops under Vergier, Augereau, and St. Cyr, and held out obstinately under the leadership of Alvarez until disease and famine compelled it to capitulate, 12 December.

The ancient cathedral, which stood on the site of the present one, was used by the Moors as a mosque, and after their final expulsion was either entirely remodelled or rebuilt. The present edifice is one of the noblest monuments of the school of the Majorcan architect, Jayme Fabre, and one of the finest specimens of Gothic architecture in Spain. It is approached by eighty-six steps. An aisle and chapels surround the choir, which opens by three arches into the nave, of which the pointed stone vault is the widest in Christendom (73 feet). Among its interior decorations is a retablo which is the work of the Valencian silversmith Peter Bernec. It is divided into three tiers of statuettes and reliefs, framed in canopied niches of cast and hammered silver. A gold and silver altar-frontal was carried off by the French in 1809. The cathedral contains the tombs of Raymond Berenger and his wife. The Collegiate Church of San Felu is also architecturally noteworthy. Its style is fourteenth-century Gothic, the façade dating from the eighteenth, and it is one of the few Spanish churches

which possesses a genuine spire. It contains, besides the sepulchre of its patron and the tomb of the valiant Alvarez, a chapel dedicated to St. Narcissus, who according to tradition was one of the early bishops of the see. The Benedictine church of San Pedro de los Gallos is in Romanesque style of an early date. The present bishop Francisco Pol y Baralt was born at Arenys de Mar in the Diocese of Gerona, 9 June, 1854. The diocese contains 373 parishes, 780 priests, 325,000 Catholics. The Capuchins have a monastery at Olot, and among the cloisters for women in the diocese are those of the Franciscan, the Augustinian, and the Capuchin nuns.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

**Gerrha**, a titular see in the province of Augustamnica Prima, suffragan of Pelusium in the Patriarchate of Alexandria. The city is mentioned by Pliny (Hist. Nat., VI, 29). Erastosthenes (46, 10) asserts that the district was formerly under water. Strabo (XVI, 2, 33) places Gerrha between Pelusium and Mt. Cassius. Finally, in the sixth century the geographer Hierocles (Synecdemus, n. 698) speaks of it as being in Augustamnica. Lequien (Oriens christ., II, 551) makes known the names of four bishops of the see: Eudæmon, Pirosus, and Nilanmon, at the end of the fourth century, and at the beginning of the fifth; Stephen, who in 451 assisted at the Council of Chalcedon. Marshes have encroached upon the land in modern times; the abandoned city is found north of Pelusium on the road to El-Arish.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Gersen**, GIOVANNI. See THOMAS À KEMPIS.

**Gerson**, JEAN LE CHARLIER DE, the surname being the name of his native place, b. in the hamlet of Gerson 14 December, 1363; d. at Lyons, 12 July, 1429. The hamlet of Gerson has disappeared, but it was then a dependency of the village of Barby not far from Rethel, in the Diocese of Reims, and now included in the department of Ardennes. His father, Arnauld, and his mother, Elizabeth La Chardenière, were noted for their integrity and piety. They had twelve children, of whom Jean was the eldest. He attended the schools of Rethel and Reims and at the age of fourteen entered the famous Collège de Navarre at Paris, where he formed a life-long friendship with the rector, the illustrious Pierre d'Ailly of Compiègne. In 1381 Gerson obtained the degree of licentiate of arts under Maître Jean Loutrier; in 1388 he received that of *Baccalarius Biblicus*; in 1390 he lectured on the "Sententiæ", and in 1392 became a licentiate of theology. He was raised to the doctorate of theology in 1394, being then thirty-one years of age (cf. Denifle, Chartul. Univers. Paris, III). Before receiving the doctorate he had written several works. In 1387 he preached before Pope Clement VII of Avignon with a view to calling forth the condemnation of Jean de Monteson, a Dominican, who had denied the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and shortly afterwards he delivered a panegyric on St. Louis, King of France, thus making his debut in the oratorical career that was destined to become so brilliant.

Although Gerson had won the doctorate only a year before his former teacher, Pierre d'Ailly, was named Bishop of Puy (1395), Benedict XIII chose him to succeed d'Ailly in the important position of Chancellor of Notre-Dame and of the university (13 April). Thenceforth he was actively interested in the extirpation of the schism which, for seventeen years, had divided the Church into two hostile parties that were numerically almost equal. The friend of peace and union, he always expressed a sober and moderate opinion in regard to both the Pope of Rome and the Pope of Avignon, and on all occasions showed a strong repugnance to the violent proceedings extolled by certain members of the university (Noël Valois,

III, 71, 180). Appointed dean of the church of Saint Donatien at Bruges, Gerson remained there four years (1397-1401). It was at this period that he wrote the treatise, strongly theological and sober in tone, entitled: "Sententia de modo se habendi tempore schismatis" (Schwab, Johannes Gerson, Professor der Theologie und Kanzler der Universität Paris, 97, 152). He had not voted to withdraw obedience from the Pope of Avignon, for whom, in the beginning, France had declared herself (1398). He was one of the first to show that Benedict should be considered neither a heretic nor a schismatic, and that it was in no wise proper to introduce, on this plea, an action against him (Opp. Gersonii, II, ed. 1706, *passim*). Accordingly, he energetically demanded the restoration of obedience, that is to say, the cessation of that abnormal state that constituted a schism within a schism, but this conciliatory attitude, so conformable to his character, incurred much hatred. On 18 November, 1403, he was made curé of Saint-Jean-en-Grève at Paris, accepting the charge in addition to the office of chancellor; this favour was granted by Pope Benedict in recognition of Gerson's fidelity to him during his four years of enforced sojourn in his fortress at Avignon. The chancellor freely and openly rejoiced at the pontiff's release and the university selected him to congratulate Benedict at Marseilles. But this harmony was not to last. The university, again dissatisfied with Benedict, wished to renew the withdrawal of obedience that had so poorly succeeded the first time. D'Ailly and Gerson tried to oppose the movement both before and during the Council of Paris in 1406, and strove to urge upon their colleagues the necessity of more moderate proceedings. After long and animated discussions, they partially succeeded in obtaining that the withdrawal of obedience adopted by the members of the assembly was brought within certain limits (cf. L. Salembier, "Le grand schisme d'Occident", 221).

D'Ailly and Gerson also formed a part of the solemn embassy sent to Benedict in 1407 and tried to prevail upon the pope to resign the papacy by a formal Bull; but the pontiff refused. Thereupon some of the delegates wished openly to break with him, but here again D'Ailly and Gerson caused more peaceable sentiments to triumph and laboured to retard the total rupture (L. Salembier, op. cit., 229). During the following year Gerson attended the Council of Reims and delivered the opening discourse. That same year, because of his efforts at reconciliation, D'Ailly aroused the indignation of the members of the university incensed against Benedict. The king espoused their quarrel and wished to have the Bishop of Cambrai arrested; at this juncture Clémanges and Gerson, his ever-faithful pupils, wrote him touching letters of condolence [L. Salembier, "Petrus de Alliaco" (1886), 75; Opp. Gersonii, III, 429]. Gerson himself was soon to become acquainted with human vicissitudes and to be persecuted for another reason. On 23 November, 1407, the Duke of Orleans was assassinated in one of the streets of Paris by the cowardly hirelings of the Duke of Burgundy. With singular audacity, the Duke of Burgundy, John the Fearless (Jean sans Peur), assumed the responsibility of the deed, pleaded his own cause before King Charles VI and chose as his defending counsel, Jean Petit (8 March, 1408) who dared openly to profess the immoral theory of tyrannicide. The chancellor deemed it his duty to bring this doctrine before the Bishop of Paris and the professors of theology. The doctors first condemned seven, then nine of Jean Petit's propositions as erroneous and scandalous and these were thrown into the fire. Later, in the Council of Constance, Gerson again denounced the articles incriminated (June, 1415), and repeated the denunciation seven times within fifteen days. The Fathers passed sentence on this point (6 July), by condemning tyrannicide in a general way without, however, mentioning the name of the powerful Duke of Burgundy; this half-measure satisfied neither Gerson nor the Armagnacs who were at the council. The chancellor addressed the assemblage in the name of the King of France, 5 May, 1416, and eloquently protested against the too moderate and indefinite sentence aimed at John the Fearless ("Opp. Gersonii", II, 328; V, 353. 355, 362 sq.; Labbe and Mansi, XXVII, 728 sqq., Schwab, op. cit., 609). Gerson had attended neither the Council of Pisa (1409), nor the Council of Rome (1412-13), but he had highly approved of both. His part in the Council of Constance was, however, an important one. He arrived at Constance, 21 February, 1415, with a delegation from the University of Paris. It is not necessary to enter here into the details of the trial of John Hus (Schwab, op. cit., 540-609), of the condemnation of the Flagellants ("Opp. Gersonii", II, 658, 660), of Gerson's differences with the English, nor of his doctrinal strife (1418) with Matthew Grabon, that great enemy of new religious orders (Opp. Gersonii, I, 467). Mention will be made later of his attitude towards the three popes who then disputed the tiara, and of the theories that he set forth in the council in order to bring about the suppression of the schism.

It was above all his struggles against John the Fearless that brought Gerson into unmerited disgrace. In Paris the Duke of Burgundy had before this provoked a riotous disturbance against him; his house had been plundered and he had only escaped assassination by taking refuge for two months up under the vaulted roofs of Notre-Dame. After the Council of Constance, whilst the pope, the emperor, and the fathers were returning with all due pomp to their respective countries (1418), Gerson learned that John the Fearless had sworn his destruction and that the "nation of Picardy" in the university had demanded that he be disclaimed, recalled, and punished *atrociter* ("Opp. Gersonii", V, 374; Denifle, "Chartul." etc., IV, 300; Max Lenz, "Revue historique", IX, 470). To prevent his persecutor from having an opportunity to destroy him, he left Constance, 15 May, 1418, and with André and Ciresio, who had acted as his secretaries at the council, he took the road to exile. He retired to the Benedictine Abbey of Melk (Mölk) in Germany, the abbot of which he had known at Constance. The Archduke Frederick wished to gain him for the University of Vienna, and Gerson repaired thither but did not remain. Finally in November, 1419, the chancellor learned of the death of his sworn enemy, John the Fearless, who, by order of the Dauphin, had been slain on the bridge of the town of Montreau. Gerson at once set out for France but did not return to Paris, which was torn by factions and was still in the hands of the Burgundians. He directed his steps towards Lyons, called thither by his brother who was prior of the Celestines and by the archbishop, Amédée de Talaru (Schwab, op. cit., 767 sqq.). Here he spent his last years in exercises of devotion and in performing his priestly functions. He also while at Lyons wrote various works, some of edification, some on mystical or pastoral theology, one especially being his well-known treatise, "De parvulis ad Christum trahendis". Combining example with precept, he loved to surround himself with little children in the church of Saint-Paul and delighted to teach them the elements of Christian doctrine. These ten years were the sweetest of his militant life, and the regrets of all good men followed him to the grave. Miracles were attributed to him and at least five martyrologies give him the title of Blessed. Over fifty particular councils and many ecclesiastical writers recommend to pastors "this great, pious and learned doctor, this ardent lover of souls, this incomparable director, this model of ministers of the Gospel". Statues have been raised to his memory at Paris and Lyons; in the

church of the Sorbonne his picture is the companion to that of Bossuet.

*Views as to the Constitution of the Church: Council of Constance.*—It is well known that what the theologians of the early part of the fourteenth century lacked most, was a fixed doctrine on what theologians to-day call the *Traite de l'Eglise*. Gallicanism was born of the false principles, or rather of the temporary expedients believed to be a necessity amid the unfortunate events of the Great Schism. Extenuating circumstances can be pleaded in Gerson's favour. He had been instructed by men who were none too stable, and had made a close study of William of Occam, the most evil genius of the fourteenth century. As we have seen, Gerson was generally more sensible and moderate in practice than in theory. Besides, it is now proved that several treatises, sometimes made the basis of an attack on his theological doctrine, were not his at all ("De modis uniendi; octo conclusiones quarum dogmatizatio utilis videtur ad exterminationem moderni schismatis; Sermo factus in die Ascensionis", 1409, etc.). In fact his Protestant or Gallican editors, von der Hardt, Richer, and Ellies-Dupin, have done his memory poor service by exaggerating or envenoming some of his propositions. It is but too true that in regard to the pope and the council, the chancellor maintained erroneous theories which were censurable and later condemned. In his opinion the sovereign pontiff is not the universal bishop possessing immediate power over all the faithful; his power is only subjective and executive ("Opp. Gersonii", II, 259, 279). Far from being infallible, he can even sometimes fall into heresy, in which event, if he still remain pope, the faithful are empowered to bind him, imprison him and even throw him into the sea (Ibid., 221; Noël Valois, IV, 84). Gerson's doctrine concerning the general council is no sounder. He admits the superiority of the Church and the oecumenical council over the pope, as he sees no other means of emerging from schism and returning to unity. With him temporary expedients become principles. It is what might be called ecclesiastical opportunism. Gerson is exclusively rational and practical, and the object of all his argumentation is the justification of the most extraordinary methods of procedure in order to attain the final result desired by him and by all Christendom. Hence, according to him, the sovereign pontiff is amenable to the council which may correct and even depose him ("Opp. Gersonii", II, 201).

Regarding the convocation and composition of this assembly he declares, with d'Ailly, that the first four oecumenical councils were not convened by the authority of the pope and that not only cardinals, but princes, and in fact any Christian, can convoke a council for the election of a single and universally acknowledged pope ("De auferibilitate papæ", in Opp. Gersonii, II, 209 sqq.). He also maintains that pastors may be summoned to such an assembly and may have a deliberate voice as well as bishops ("De potestate ecclesiastica", in ibid., II, 249). None of the faithful should be excluded (ibid., II, 205). In all of these propositions is seen, as it were, a reflection of the extreme theses of the revolutionary Franciscan, William of Occam. Moreover, Gerson's attitude in the Council of Constance was in conformity with his principles. With the delegates from the University of Paris, he demanded that all three popes immediately tender their resignation (Feb., 1415). A convinced partisan of the superiority of doctors over bishops, he insisted, like d'Ailly, that the doctors of canon and even of civil law should have a voice in the deliberations of the council. This was in consequence of his democratic tendencies (cf. Salembier, *Le grand schisme*, 212, 299). He exalted to excess the omnipotence of the general council and pursued Pope John XXIII with unflagging energy (Schwab, op. cit., 507; von der Hardt, II,

265). He voted for the four famous articles of Constance (March, 1415) which are the code of Gallicanism and pave the way for all the schismatic decisions of the assembly of 1682. Besides, he boldly maintained that these revolutionary principles were dogmas and wanted them carved on the stone of all the churches (Opp. Gersonii, II, 275). However in 1416 he was obliged to admit with sadness that voices were still raised in denial of the superiority of the council over the popes. Gerson attributed this "condemnable" obstinacy to the necessity of sycophancy, calling it "a deadly poison with which the organism of the Church is impregnated to the very marrow" (Ibid., II, 247). It is because of these openly erroneous principles that Gerson, like d'Ailly, his master, passed for a precursor of the Protestant Reformation. It is also for this reason that Protestant writers, such as A. Jepp and Winklemann, in Germany, and de Bonnechose, in France, compared him to Wyclif and John Hus. What has gone before, however, proves that these comparisons do Gerson injustice.

*Gerson's Mystical Theology and Oratory.*—Gerson's mystical theology has its own peculiar and original character; it is that of an eminent and almost impeccable master. First of all he distinguishes it from scientific theology which is abstract and discursive. His mysticism in its essence is an experimental knowledge of God which, by love, one perceives in himself. If the inferior powers remain in darkness, the superior faculties, the intellect, and especially pure love, have the freer play, and therefore constitute a sublime state of transport which surpasses all theoretical learning. This theology does not require great scientific attainments, it is within the reach of the most simple. Moreover, through close union with God, it gives us perfect contentment of soul with the entire and definitive appeasement of our desires (cf. Schwab, op. cit., 325; Ellies-Dupin, "Opp. Gersonii", I, clv.). Gerson further distinguishes a practical part in his mystical theology and lays down the conditions and means (*industriæ*) preparatory to contemplation. These *industriæ* are as follows: (1) to await the call of God; (2) to know well one's own temperament; (3) to be heedful of one's vocation and one's state; (4) to aim constantly towards greater perfection; (5) to avoid as much as possible a multiplicity of occupations and, in any event, not to become absorbed in them; (6) to set aside all vain desire for learning, i. e. all idle curiosity; (7) to remain calm and practise patience; (8) to know the origin of the affections and passions; (9) to choose the necessary time and place; (10) to avoid extremes, either of abstinence or excess, in sleeping and eating; (11) to indulge in thoughts that excite pious affections; (12) to banish from one's mind all images, which is preëminently *modus simplicandi cor in meditationibus et producendi contemplationem*. Gerson's many treatises are in Vol. III of his works. He was one of the first to recognize and proclaim the supernatural vocation of Joan of Arc. He laboured diligently to promote devotion to the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph and even dedicated to this saint a poem of 4600 lines entitled "Josephina". He was not the author of the "Imitation of Jesus Christ", and the reasons for this adverse opinion advanced by Rosweyde, Amort, Malou, Funk, and Vacandard, seem convincing.

He was one of the most eminent orators of his time and preached frequently, either in French or Latin, before the university, at court, in the principal churches of the capital, or in his parish of Saint-Jean-en-Grève. It was in this parish that he preached the most of his sermons in French; these discourses, sixty-four in number, have been specially studied by the Abbé Bourret, later Bishop of Rodez and cardinal. In plan these instructions are almost the same as modern sermons, but Gerson's learning is often deficient in taste and judgment, and he makes sometimes

too pompous a display of incongruous quotations. From the point of view of doctrine he treats, for the greater part, ethical subjects, and inveighs against intemperance and the dissoluteness of morals. He labours mainly for reform within, frequently exhorts to penance, and threatens his flock with the judgments of God, but does not leave them without words of hope and consolation. His style is far from uniform and differs according to his hearers. Cold and accurate in the setting forth of dogma, he most frequently stirs the passions and resorts largely to allegory and word-painting; his language, although having all the piquancy, naïveté, and originality of the old French chronicles, is always dignified and becoming.

Gerson's works were published directly after the introduction of printing, first at Cologne in 1483 (4 vols. in fol., for details consult Schwab, *op. cit. ad finem*). Both French editions, the one by Richer (Paris, 1606, 4 vols.), the other by Ellies-Dupin (Amsterdam, 1706, 5 vols. in fol.) were prepared under the influence of Gallican ideas and with a view to religious polemics. They were hastily and confusedly compiled without any great care and contain serious defects. However, the one by Ellies-Dupin is fairly complete and the first four volumes embody over 400 of Gerson's treatises. The references to Gerson's works in this article are to this edition.

BESS, *Johannes Gerson und die kirchenpolitischen Parteien Frankreichs vor dem Konzil zu Pisa* (1890); BOILEAU in *Revue du Monde Catholique* (1881), X, 60-80, 394-416, 627-45; BOUX, *Tractatus de Papa* (1870), I; BOURRET, *Essai historique et critique sur les sermons français de Gerson* (Paris, 1855); FOUQUÈRE, *Discours à l'Académie franc.* (Paris, 1838, 1843); JADART, *Jean de Gerson, 1363-1429* (Reims, 1892); JOURDAIN, *Doctrina Johannis Gersoni de theologia mystica* (Paris, 1838) in *Dict. scient. philos.* (1875), 616-3; MASSON, *Jean Gerson, sa vie, son temps, ses œuvres* (Lyons, 1894); REYNOLDS, *Early Reprints for English Readers: John Gerson* (London, 1880); RICHERIUS, *Apologia pro Joanne Gersonis pro suprema Ecclesia et concilio generalis auctoritate* (Leyden, 1676); SALEMBIER, *Petrus de Alhaco* (Lille, 1836); IDEM, *Le grand schisme d'Occident* (Paris, 1900), tr. MITCHELL (London, 1908); SCHWAB, *Johannes Gerson, Professor der Theologie und Kanzler der Universität Paris, eine Monographie* (Würzburg, 1878); THOMASSY, *Jean Gerson et le grand schisme d'Occident* (2nd ed 1872); VALOIS, *La France et le grand schisme* (Paris, 1896, 1902), IV; WINKELMANN, *Gerson, Wiclef, Hussus, inter se et cum reformatioribus comparati* (Göttingen, 1857). LOUIS SALEMBIER.

**Gertrude of Aldenberg**, BLESSED, Abbess of the Premonstratensian convent of Aldenberg, near Wetzlar, in the Diocese of Trier; b. about 1227; d. 13 August, 1297. She was the youngest of the three daughters of Louis VI, margrave of Thuringia, and his wife St. Elizabeth of Hungary. Gertrude's father died on his way to the Holy Land shortly before she was born. She was scarcely two years old, when St. Elizabeth brought her to the convent of Aldenberg, where she afterwards became a nun. In 1248, being then only twenty-one years old, she was elected Abbess of Aldenberg, over which she ruled forty-nine years. With the inheritance which she received from her uncle, the Margrave of Meissen, she erected a church and a poorhouse. She took personal charge of the inmates of the poorhouse and led a life of extreme mortification. When Urban VI published a crusade against the Saracens, Gertrude and her nuns took the cross and obliged themselves to contribute their share to the success of the crusade by prayer and acts of mortification. In 1270 she began to observe the feast of Corpus Christi in her convent, thus becoming one of the first to introduce it into Germany. Clement VI permitted the ecclesiastical celebration of her feast to the convent of Aldenberg, and granted some indulgences to those who visit her relics at that convent.

*Thuringia Sacra* (Frankfurt, 1737), 296-300; *Acta SS.*, August, III; DUNBAR, *Dictionary of Saintly Women* (London, 1904), I, 345 sq.; KESSEL in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Gertrude of Hackeborn**, Cistercian Abbess of Helfta, near Eisleben; b. near Halberstadt in 1232; d.

towards the end of 1292. She belonged to the noble Thuringian family of Hackeborn and was a sister of St. Mechtild. At an early age she entered the Cistercian convent of Rodersdorf, of which she was elected abbess in 1251 when she was only nineteen years old. In 1253 she founded, with the assistance of her two brothers, Albert and Louis, the convent of Hederleben. Because her own convent suffered from want of water she obtained from her brothers the castle of Helpeda, or Helfta, with its surrounding land, and transferred her community to that place in 1258. During her rule, the convent of Helfta became the most famous abode of asceticism and mysticism in Germany. She required her nuns to be educated in the liberal arts, but insisted especially on the study of Holy Scripture. Gertrude was a model abbess, remarkable for her piety as well as the prudent direction of her nuns. About a year and a half before her death, the abbess was seized with apoplexy, and during her sickness gave to all her nuns an example of heroic patience and resignation to the will of God. The Abbess Gertrude must not be confounded with St. Gertrude "the Great". The Abbess Gertrude, quite in contrast with St. Gertrude "the Great", never wrote anything, received no extraordinary revelations from God, and has not been canonized. She was born more than 20 years before Gertrude "the Great", who lived as an ordinary nun in the same convent.

ST. MECHTILD, *Liber specialis gratie*, pars V, i, ii, and the whole of pars VI; ST. GERTRUDE, *Legatus divinae gratiae*, lib. V, c. i, in the Solesmes edition of *Revelationes Gertrudianae ac Mechtildianae* (Paris, 1875, 1877), I, 497-517; II, 373-390, and the *Prefatio* to I; DUNBAR, *Dict. of Saintly Women* (London, 1904), I, 346 sq.; MICHAEL, *Gesch. des deutsch. Volkes seit dem 13. Jahrh.* (Freiburg im Br., 1903), III, 175 sq.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Gertrude of Nivelles**, SAINT, Virgin, and Abbess of the Benedictine monastery of Nivelles near Brussels; b. in 626; d. 17 March, 659. She was a daughter of Pepin I of Landen, and a younger sister of St. Begga, Abbess of Andenne. One day, when she was about ten years old, her father invited King Dagobert and some noblemen to a banquet. When on this occasion she was asked to marry the son of the Duke of Austrasia she indignantly replied that she would marry neither him nor any other man, but that Christ alone would be her bridegroom. After the death of her father in 639, her mother Itta, following the advice of St. Amandus, Bishop of Maestricht, erected a double monastery, one for men, the other for women, at Nivelles. She appointed her daughter Gertrude as its first abbess, while she herself lived there as a nun, assisting the young abbess by her advice. Among the numerous pilgrims that visited the monastery of Nivelles, there were the two brothers St. Foillan and St. Ultan, both of whom were Irish monks and were on their way from Rome to Péronne, where their brother, St. Furseus, lay buried. Gertrude and her mother gave them a tract of land called Fosse on which they built a monastery. Ultan was made superior of the new house, while Foillan remained at Nivelles, instructing the monks and nuns in Holy Scripture. After the death of Itta in 652, Gertrude entrusted the interior management of her monastery to a few pious nuns, and appointed some capable monks to attend to the outer affairs, in order that she might gain more time for the study of Holy Scripture, which she almost knew by heart. The large property left by her mother she used for building churches, monasteries and hospices. At the age of thirty-two she became so weak through her continuous abstinence from food and sleep that she found it necessary to resign her office. After asking the advice of her monks and nuns, she appointed her niece, Wulfetrude, as her successor, in December, 658. A day before her death she sent one of the monks to St. Ultan at Fosse to ask whether God had made known to him the hour of her death. The saint answered that she would die the following day during Holy

Mass. The prophecy was verified. She was venerated as a saint immediately after her death, and a church was erected in her honour by Agnes, the third Abbess of Nivelles. The towns of Geertruidenberg, Breda, and Bergen-op-Zoom in North Brabant honour her as patron. She is also patron of travellers, and is invoked against fever, rats, and mice, particularly field-mice. There is a legend that one day she sent some of her subjects to a distant country, promising that no misfortune would befall them on the journey. When they were on the ocean, a large sea-monster threatened to capsize their ship, but disappeared upon the invocation of St. Gertrude. In memory of this occurrence travellers during the Middle Ages drank the so-called "Sinte Geerts Minne" or "Gertruden-minne" before setting out on their journey. St. Gertrude is generally represented as an abbess, with rats and mice at her feet or running up her cloak or pastoral staff.

DUNBAR, *A Dictionary of Saintly Women* (London, 1904), I, 342-5; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 17 March; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints*, 17 March; DUNBAR in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; BERNOLLI, *Die Heiligen der Merovingen* (Tubingen, 1900), 197-9; *Acta SS.*, March, II, 590-602; MABILLON, *Acta SS. O.S.B.*, sec. II, 442-44; DAUFRESNE DE LA CHEVALERIE, *La perle de Nivelles, ou St. Gertrude, fondatrice et première abbesse du monastère de Nivelles* (Brussels, 1867). Her earliest biography was written by a contemporary monk of Nivelles. It was reprinted by the BOLLANDISTS, loc. cit., and by MABILLON, loc. cit. In 1888 it was re-edited by KRUSCH in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Meroving.*, II.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Gertrude the Great**, SAINT, Benedictine and mystic writer; b. in Germany, 6 Jan., 1256; d. at Helfta, near Eisleben, Saxony, 17 Nov., 1301 or 1302. Nothing is known of her family, not even the name of her parents. It is clear from her life (Legatus, lib. I, xvi) that she was not born in the neighbourhood of Eisleben. When she was but five years of age she entered the aluminate of Helfta. The monastery was at that time governed by the saintly and enlightened Abbess Gertrude of Hackeborn, under whose rule it prospered exceedingly, both in monastic observance and in that intellectual activity which St. Lioba and her Anglo-Saxon nuns had transmitted to their foundations in Germany. All that could aid to sanctity, or favour contemplation and learning, was to be found in this hallowed spot. Here, too, as the centre of all its activity and the impetus of its life, the work of works—the *Opus Dei*, as St. Benedict terms the Divine Office—was solemnly carried out. Such was Helfta when its portals opened to receive the child destined to be its brightest glory. Gertrude was confided to the care of St. Mechtilde, mistress of the aluminate and sister of the Abbess Gertrude. From the first she had the gift of winning hearts, and her biographer gives many details of her exceptional charms, which matured with advancing years. Thus early had been formed between Gertrude and Mechtilde the bond of an intimacy which deepened and strengthened with time, and gave the latter saint a preponderating influence over the former.

Partly in the aluminate, partly in the community, Gertrude had devoted herself to study with the greatest ardour. In her twenty-sixth year there was granted her the first of that series of visions of which the wonderful sequence ended only with life. She now gauged in its fullest extent the void of which she had been keenly sensible for some time past, and with this awakening came the realization of the utter emptiness of all transitory things. With characteristic ardour she cultivated the highest spirituality, and, to quote her biographer, "from being a grammarian became a theologian", abandoning profane studies for the Scriptures, patristic writings, and treatises on theology. To these she brought the same earnestness which had characterized her former studies, and with indefatigable zeal copied, translated, and wrote for the spiritual benefit of others. Although Gertrude vehe-

mently condemns herself for past negligence (Legatus, II, ii), still to understand her words correctly we must remember that they express the indignant self-condemnation of a soul called to the highest sanctity. Doubtless her inordinate love of study had proved a hindrance alike to contemplation and interior recollection, yet it had none the less surely safeguarded her from more serious and grievous failings. Her struggle lay in the conquest of a sensitive and impetuous nature. In St. Gertrude's life there are no abrupt phases, no sudden conversion from sin to holiness. She passed from innocence to sanctity almost unconsciously, and as naturally as she had passed from the aluminate to the community. Outwardly her life was that of the simple Benedictine nun, of which she stands forth preeminently as the type. Her boundless charity embraced rich and poor, learned and simple, the monarch on his throne and the peasant in the field; it was manifested in tender sympathy towards the souls in purgatory, in a great yearning for the conversion of sinners, and in a vehement zeal for the perfection of souls consecrated to God. Her humility was so profound that she wondered how the earth could support so sinful a creature as herself. Her raptures were frequent and so absorbed her faculties as to render her insensible to what passed around her. She therefore begged, for the sake of others, that there might be no outward manifestations of the spiritual wonders with which her life was filled. She had the gift of miracles as well as that of prophecy.

When the call came for her spirit to leave the worn and pain-stricken body, Gertrude was in her forty-fifth or forty-sixth year, and had in turn assisted at the death-bed and mourned for the loss of the holy Sister Mechtilde (1281), her illustrious Abbess Gertrude of Hackeborn (1291), and her chosen guide and confidante, St. Mechtilde (1298). When the community was transferred in 1346 to the monastery of New Helfta, the present Trud-Kloster, within the walls of Eisleben, they still retained possession of their old home, where doubtless the bodies of St. Gertrude and St. Mechtilde still lie buried, though their place of sepulture remains unknown. There is, at least, no record of their translation. Old Helfta is now crown-property, while New Helfta has lately passed into the hands of the local municipality. It was not till 1677 that the name of Gertrude was inscribed in the Roman Martyrology and her feast was extended to the universal Church, which now keeps it on 15 November, although it was at first fixed for 17 November, the day of her death, on which it is still celebrated by her own order. In compliance with a petition from the King of Spain she was declared Patroness of the West Indies; in Peru her feast is celebrated with great pomp, and in New Mexico a town was built in her honour and bears her name. Some writers of recent times have considered that St. Gertrude was a Cistercian, but a careful and impartial examination of the evidence at present available does not justify this conclusion. It is well known that the Cistercian Reform left its mark on many houses not affiliated to the order, and the fact that Helfta was founded during the "golden age" of Cîteaux (1134-1342) is sufficient to account for this impression.

Many of the writings of St. Gertrude have unfortunately perished. Those now extant are:—(1) The "Legatus Divinæ Pietatis"; (2) The "Exercises of St. Gertrude"; (3) The "Liber Specialis Gratiæ" of St. Mechtilde. The works of St. Gertrude were all written in Latin, which she used with facility and grace. The "Legatus Divinæ Pietatis" (Herald of Divine Love) comprises five books containing the life of St. Gertrude, and recording many of the favours granted her by God. Bk. II alone is the work of the saint, the rest being compiled by members of the Helfta community. In the "Exercises" we have the saint at her best. They were written for her Sisters in religion,



and we feel she has here a free hand unhampered by the deep humility which made it so repugnant for her to disclose favours personal to herself. The "Exercises", which are seven in number, embrace the work of the purification and sanctification of the soul from the reception of baptismal grace to the preparation for death. Her glowing language deeply impregnated with the liturgy and Scriptures exalts the soul imperceptibly to the heights of contemplation. When the "Legatus Divinae Pietatis" is compared with the "Liber Specialis Gratiae" of St. Mechtilde, it is evident that Gertrude is the chief, if not the only, author of the latter book. Her writings are also coloured by the glowing richness of that Teutonic genius which found its most congenial expression in symbolism and allegory. The spirit of St. Gertrude, which is marked by freedom, breadth, and vigour, is based on the Rule of St. Benedict. Her mysticism is that of all the great contemplative workers of the Benedictine Order from St. Gregory to Blossius. Hers, in a word, is that ancient Benedictine spirituality which is simply the spirit of the Church and which Father Faber has so well depicted (All for Jesus, viii).

The characteristic of St. Gertrude's piety is her devotion to the Sacred Heart, the symbol of that immense charity which urged the Word to take flesh, to institute the Holy Eucharist, to take on Himself our sins, and, dying on the Cross, to offer Himself as a victim and a sacrifice to the Eternal Father (Congregation of Rites, 3 April, 1825). Faithful to the mission entrusted to them, the superiors of Helfta appointed renowned theologians, chosen from the Dominican and Franciscan friars, to examine the works of the saint. These approved and commended them throughout. In the sixteenth century Lanspergius and Blossius propagated her writings. The former, who with his confrère Loher spared no pains in editing her works, also wrote a preface to them. The writings were warmly received especially in Spain, and among the long list of holy and learned authorities who used and recommended her works may be mentioned: St. Teresa, who chose her as her model and guide, Yezpe, the illustrious Suarez, the Discalced Carmelite Friars of France, St. Francis de Sales, M. Olier, Fr. Faber, Dom Guéranger. The Church has inserted the name of Gertrude in the Roman Martyrology with this eulogy: "On the 17th of November, in Germany (the Feast) of St. Gertrude Virgin, of the Order of St. Benedict, who was illustrious for the gift of revelations."

*Life of St. Gertrude the Great* (C. T. S., London); *DE VERE IN THE MONIH*, 1865, III, 221; *Cath. World*, 1865, II, 405; *Legatus Divinae Pietatis*, passim in *Revelationes Gertrudianae ac Mechtildianae*, I (Poitiers, 1875). Passim in *ST. MECHTILDE, Liber Specialis Gratiae: Révelations de St. Gertrude* (Paris, 1906); *LEDOS, St. Gertrude* (Paris, 1907); *KAULEN in Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; *PREGIER, Gesch. deutsch. Mystik im Mittelalt.* (Leipzig, 1893); *ZIEGELBAUER, Hist. Lit. Bened.* (Vienna, 1754); *MICHAEL, Zeitschr. kath. Theol.* (XXIII, 1899); *Gesch. deutsch. Volkes im Mittelalter* (Freiburg, 1899), II; *GUÉRANGER, Année liturgique, le temps après la Pentecôte*, t. VI; *Eng. tr. Liturgical Year*, VI.

GERTRUDE CASANOVA.

**Gertrude van der Oosten**, VENERABLE, Beguine; b. at Voorburch, Holland; d. at Delft, 6 Jan., 1358. She was born of peasant parents, and was remarkable from childhood for her piety and prudence. Later, in order to gain a livelihood, she entered into service at Delft, where she likewise devoted herself to practices of piety and charity. Her surname of "van Oosten", or "of the East", is due to her custom of singing a hymn which began: "Het daghet in den Oosten", i.e., "Day breaketh in the East", the composition of which is attributed to herself. She lived devoutly in the world, spending much time in exercises of piety and works of charity, and finally determined to abandon all human ties and give herself to the service of God. With this intent she begged, and with difficulty obtained, entrance into the Beguine of Delft. Here, though not a religious, nor bound by vows, she profited by the ample opportunities afforded for the exercise of

her zeal and charity, as well as by the atmosphere of prayer and seclusion, to attain to a very high degree of virtue and contemplation. Gertrude evinced great devotion to the mysteries of the Incarnation, especially to the Sacred Passion, on which account she merited to receive on her body the impression of the sacred stigmata, from which the blood flowed freely seven times a day at each of the canonical hours. Distressed and alarmed at the multitude that flocked to witness such a wonder, she begged that the favour might be withdrawn, and her prayer was so far granted that the blood ceased to flow, but the marks of the sacred stigmata remained. At the same time the great spiritual consolation she had enjoyed was succeeded by dryness and desolation. Gertrude was favoured with the gift of prophecy, having knowledge, at the actual time, of what took place at a distance as well as of what was to happen in the future.

At length, after many years passed among the Beguines in great fervour, austerity, and devotion, the time of her death approached. She had been wont to speak with great delight of this day, to meditate on it devoutly, and even to make it a subject of her frequent songs. She died on the feast of the Epiphany and was buried in the church of St. Hippolytus, Delft, the Beguines having neither a church nor a cemetery of their own at the time. Her name has never been inscribed in the Roman Martyrology, though she is commemorated in various others, and her cultus is merely a local one. Her private dwelling is still preserved with veneration, and the cross before which she received the stigmata is annually exposed on the anniversary of her death.

*Acta SS.*, Jan., I; *KESSEL in Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; *SCRIVAS, Vita SS.*, I; MS. 9364 of the emperor's private library, Vienna.

GERTRUDE CASANOVA.

**Gervaise**, DOM FRANÇOIS ARMAND, Discalced Carmelite, b. at Paris, 1660; d. at Reclus, France, 1761. After completing his humanities with brilliant success, he joined the Discalced Carmelites, and having been nominated prior of a convent, he chanced to meet Bossuet, who recognized in him a fervent religious, a learned writer, and an eloquent orator. Anxious to embrace a more austere life, he entered La Trappe in 1695, where he became the privileged disciple of the Abbé de Rancé, and made his profession in 1696. In the same year Dom Zozime, who had succeeded the Abbé de Rancé after his resignation, died after a few months of administration, and de Rancé then asked the king, with the pressing recommendation of Bossuet, for Dom Gervaise as his second successor.

Dom Gervaise had given unequivocal proofs of his religious spirit and his eloquence; these qualifications led to the hope that his appointment would be of the greatest advantage to the reform, and consequently on 20 October, 1696, he received the abbatial blessing. But his turbulent administration, which in several points was opposed to that of the Abbé de Rancé, soon procured for him numerous enemies who to well-founded accusations added some that were baseless. Dom Gervaise yielded before the storm and tendered his resignation in 1698. Soon, however, he regretted this step and tried to withdraw his resignation, but without success. Under the abbot chosen to fill his place he left La Trappe and began his wandering life from monastery to monastery, exercising to good purpose his talent as a writer. His style is always well-turned and flowing, but he is reproached for being sometimes wanting both in exactitude as to his information and in polemical moderation.

We shall mention only a few of his works: the lives of several Fathers of the Church and ecclesiastical writers; the life of Abélard; the life of Abbot Joachim, Prophet; the life of Suger; a criticism on Marsolier's "Life of the Abbé de Rancé", in which he makes his own apology; finally, the history of the Reform of Cîteaux in France, a work in which he does not treat with suffi-

cient consideration the superiors of the order, and which caused his final disgrace. He was obliged to interrupt its publication, and was banished by order of the king to the monastery of the Reclus, in the Diocese of Troyes, where he died. Until the end of his life he remained faithful to the austerities of the life of La Trappe, observing in all its rigour the rule he had embraced.

MICHAUD, *Biographie universelle*; HERTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1893); DEBOIS, *Histoire de l'abbé de Rancé* (Paris, 1866); GALLARDIN, *Histoire de La Trappe* (Paris, 1844); LE NAIN, *Vie du Rév. Père D. Armand Jean Le Bouthillier de Rancé* (Paris, 1715); CHATEAUBRIAND, *Vie de Rancé* (Paris, 1844).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

**Gervase (JERVIS)**, GEORGE, priest and martyr; b. at Bosham, Suffolk, England, 1571; d. at Tyburn, 11 April, 1608. His mother's name was Shelly, and both his father's and mother's families had been long established in the County of Suffolk. Losing both parents in boyhood, he was kidnapped by pirates and carried off beyond seas, remaining in captivity over twelve years. He lost his religion during that period; but, when at last he was able to return to England, and found that his eldest brother Henry had become a voluntary exile in Flanders in order to be able to practise his religion, George followed him there and was soon reconciled to the Church. He entered the English College at Douai in 1595, and was ordained priest in 1603. He at once went on the English mission. He laboured very successfully for over two years, but was arrested in June, 1606, and banished with several other clergy. He then made a pilgrimage to Rome, and there endeavoured to enter the Society of Jesus, but, not being admitted for some unknown reason, he returned to Douai, where he received the Benedictine habit. His brother Henry had obtained for him a comfortable living near Lille, being anxious to preserve him from the persecution then raging in England. But George was determined to labour for the conversion of his native land, and succeeded in returning safely to England, but was soon arrested and incarcerated. Refusing to take the new oath of allegiance on account of its infringing upon spiritual matters where Catholics were concerned, he was tried, convicted of the offence of merely being a priest, under the statute of 27 Elizabeth, and was hanged, drawn, and quartered at Tyburn. Some authorities say that he did not receive the Benedictine habit until a short time before his death from Father Augustine Bradshaw.

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; CHALLONER, *Memoirs*, II; SNOW, *Benedictine Necrology*.

C. F. WEMYSS BROWN.

**Gervase of Canterbury** (GERVASIUS DOROBORNENSIS), English chronicler, b. about 1141; d. in, or soon after, 1210. If his brother Thomas, who like himself was a monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, was identical with Thomas of Maidstone, they came of a Kentish family. St. Thomas of Canterbury received his religious profession on 16 Feb., 1163, and also ordained him. He was one of the monks who buried the saint after his martyrdom, 29 Dec., 1170. Later on he took a prominent part in the disputes between the monks and Archbishop Baldwin (1185-91) and was one of the monks sent to announce to the archbishop an appeal to the pope. In 1189 he was again one of a deputation sent to lay the matter before King Richard I. As yet, Gervase, though one of the senior monks, had held no prominent office, but about this time he was made sacristan, for in 1193 he attended the new archbishop, Hubert Walter, in that capacity. He probably ceased to hold this office in 1197 when he speaks of one Felix, as sacristan. The rest of his life is obscure. He was still writing in 1199 and there are slight indications in another chronicle, the "Gesta Regum", that he continued to write till 1210, when a sudden change in style and arrangement point to a

new chronicler. His death may therefore be assumed in or soon after that year. Gervase has occasionally been confused with others of the same name, notably with Gervase of S. Ceneri, and thus he is described as prior of Dover by Dom Brial (*Recueil des Historiens de France*, XVII, 1818), which is impossible on chronological grounds. Sir Thomas Hardy identifies him with Gervase of Chichester, but Dr. Stubbs shows good reasons against this theory, as also against confusing him with Gervase of Melkeley.

The works of Gervase consist of: (1) "The Chronicle", covering the period from 1100 to 1199. It was first printed by Twysden in "Historiæ Anglicanæ Scriptores Decem" (London, 1652). (2) The "Gesta Regum", which is in part an abridgment of the earlier chronicle, and from the year 1199 an independent source of great value for the early years of John's reign. (3) "Actus Pontificum Cantuariensis Ecclesiæ", a history of the archbishops of Canterbury to the death of Hubert Walter in 1205, also printed by Twysden with the chronicle. (4) "Mappa Mundi", a topographical work with lists of bishoprics and ecclesiastical foundations in the various counties of England, Wales, and part of Scotland. The works of Gervase were published in the "Rolls Series" in 1879-80 under the editorship of Dr. Stubbs, whose introduction has been the groundwork of all subsequent accounts of Gervase.

STUBBS, *Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury in Rolls Series* (2 vols., London, 1879-80); HARDY, *Descriptive Catalogue* (London, 1862-71); WARNER in *The Academy*, XVIII, 109; XX, 250-1 (1880-81); POOLE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (summarizing Stubbs), s. v.; CHEVALIER, *Bio-bibl.*, s. v. *Gervais*, giving list of sources.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Gervase of Tilbury** (TILBERIENSIS), medieval writer, b. probably at Tilbury, in the County of Essex, England, about 1150; d. at Arlington, about 1220. He is supposed to have been related to English royalty. During his youth he entered the service of Henry of Guienne, later he travelled in many parts of Europe, for a time studied canon law at Bologna, where for a brief period he also taught, and was afterwards at the court of King William II of Sicily till 1189. Upon the death of King William he settled permanently in Arles and was appointed Marshal of the Kingdom of Arles in 1198 by King Otto IV; in virtue of this office he accompanied the king to Rome in 1209 on the occasion of his coronation as emperor. During the years 1210-1214 he composed the "Otia imperialia," for the instruction and entertainment of the emperor, who was excommunicated by the pope in the latter part of 1210, and in 1214, after his defeat at the battle of Bouvines, was forced to retire to the principality of Brunswick. This work was also entitled "Liber de mirabilibus mundi," "Solatia imperatoris," and "Descriptio totius orbis." It was divided into three parts, and contained all facts then known concerning history, geography, and physics. During the Middle Ages it was much read and was twice translated into French in the fourteenth century. Opinions differ in modern times concerning its value. Leibniz calls it a "bagful of foolish old woman's tales"; while by others it is considered very important since in it this medieval teacher of jurisprudence recognizes the correctness of the papal claims in the conflict between Church and Empire.

Leibniz edited it (1744) in his "Scriptores rerum Brunsvicensium" (I, 881-1004) with variants from four Parisian manuscripts and a supplement (II, 751-784). Its account of the Frankish and English kings is included by Duchesne in his "Historiæ Francorum scriptores cœtanei" (I, 19; III, 363-74). Mader edited the same portion in his "De Imperio Romano et Gothorum, Langobardorum, Brittonum, Francorum Anglorumque regnis commentatio" (Helmstadt, 1673). Liebrecht edited a number of geographical and physi-

cal excerpts from it (Hanover, 1856). The references to Virgil were published by Spatzier [Altenglische Marchen (Brunswick, 1830), I, 89-92]. Many of the writings of Gervase have perished. He was formerly reputed to be the author of the "Antiquus dialogus de scaccario", but many critics now ascribe the work to another writer.

PAULI AND LIEBERMANN in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.*, XXVII, 362; POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica mediæ ævi*, I, 507; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (6th ed, Berlin, 1893), 848-85; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. For extracts from the *Otia* see J. STEVENSON, *Radulphi de Cogeshall Chronicon in Rolls Series* (London, 1875), 419-49.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Gervasius and Protasius**, SAINTS, martyrs of Milan, probably in the second century, patrons of the city of Milan and of haymakers; invoked for the discovery of thieves. Feast, in the Latin Church, 19 June, the day of the translation of the relics; in the Greek Church, 14 Oct., the supposed day of their death. Emblems: scourge, club, sword.—The Acts (Acta SS., June, IV, 680 and 29) were perhaps compiled from a letter (Ep. liii) to the bishops of Italy, falsely ascribed to St. Ambrose. They are written in a very simple style, but it has been found impossible to establish their age. According to these, Gervasius and Protasius were twins, children of martyrs. Their father Vitalis, a man of consular dignity, suffered martyrdom at Ravenna under Nero (?). The mother Valeria died for her faith at Milan. The sons are said to have been scourged and then beheaded, during the reign of Nero, under the presidency of Anubinus or Astasius, and while Cajus was Bishop of Milan. Some authors place the martyrdom under Diocletian, while others object to this time, because they fail to understand how, in that case, the place of burial, and even the names, could be forgotten by the time of St. Ambrose, as is stated. De Rossi places their death before Diocletian. It probably occurred during the reign of Antoninus (161-183).

St. Ambrose, in 386, had built a magnificent basilica at Milan. Asked by the people to consecrate it in the same solemn manner as was done in Rome, he promised to do so if he could obtain the necessary relics. In a dream he was shown the place in which such could be found. He ordered excavations to be made in the cemetery church of Sts. Nabor and Felix, outside the city, and there found the relics of Sts. Gervasius and Protasius. He had them removed to the church of St. Fausta, and on the next day into the basilica, which later received the name San Ambrogio Maggiore. Many miracles are related to have occurred, and all greatly rejoiced at the signal favour from heaven, given at the time of the great struggle between St. Ambrose and the Arian Empress Justina. Of the vision, the subsequent discovery of the relics and the accompanying miracles, St. Ambrose wrote to his sister Marcellina. St. Augustine, not yet baptized, witnessed the facts, and relates them in his "Confessions", IX, vii; in "De civ. Dei", XXII, viii; and in "Serm. 286 in natal. Ss. Mm. Gerv. et Prot.", they are also attested by St. Paulinus of Nola, in his life of St. Ambrose. The latter died 397 and, as he had wished, his body was, on Easter Sunday, deposited in his basilica by the side of these martyrs. In 835, Angilbert II, a successor in the See of Milan, placed the relics of the three saints in a porphyry sarcophagus, and here they were again found, January, 1864 (*Civiltà Cattolica*, 1864, IX, 608, and XII, 345).

A tradition claims that after the destruction of Milan by Frederick Barbarossa, his chancellor Rainald von Dassel had taken the relics from Milan, and deposited them at Altbreisach in Germany, whence some came to Soissons; the claim is rejected by Milan (Biraghi, "I tre sepolcri", etc., Milan, 1864). Immediately after the finding of the relics by St. Ambrose, the cult of Sts. Gervasius and Protasius was

spread in Italy, and churches were built in their honour at Pavia, Nola, etc. In Gaul we find churches dedicated to them, about 400, at Mans, Rouen, and Soissons. At the Louvre there is now a famous picture of the saints by Lesueur (d. 1655), which was formerly in their church at Paris. According to the "Liber Pontificalis", Innocent I (402-417) dedicated a church to them at Rome. Later, the name of St. Vitalis, their father, was added to the title. Very early their names were inserted in the Litany of the Saints. The whole history of these saints has received a great deal of adverse criticism. Some deny their existence, and make them a Christianized version of the Dioscuri of the Romans. Thus Harris, "The Dioscuri in Christian Legend", but see "Analecta Boll." (1904), XXIII, 427.

STOKES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; KRIEG in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v., BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints* (19 June).

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Géry** (Lat. GAUGERICUS), SAINT, Bishop of Cambrai-Arras; b. of Roman parents, Gaudentius and Austadiola, at Eposium (Yvois, Carignan), France, about the middle of the sixth century; d. 11 August, between 623 and 626. The Diocese of Cambrai-Arras of recent date compared with the more ancient see of Belgium, Tongres, which dates from the fourth century. The territory, which comprised the Diocese of Cambrai-Arras, like that of Tournai and Térouanne, probably contained Christians before the date of the appearance of its first known bishop, St. Vaast, but their spiritual head must have resided at Reims. The great barbarian invasion of 406 completely overthrew the ecclesiastical organization, but from the beginning of the Merovingian period the Church began to recover, the Diocese of Arras especially being restored by St. Vaast about the beginning of the sixth century. Géry was one of his earliest successors. From his youth Géry led a pious and devout life, and already all things combined to prepare him for the career of zeal and devotion which he was to embrace later on. During one of his episcopal visitations, St. Magnerie, Bishop of Trier, was struck by the exemplary conduct of the young man, and conceived the project of enrolling him in the ranks of his clerics. Géry was not ordained deacon, say his biographers, until he knew the whole Psalter by heart. The episcopal See of Cambrai-Arras soon became vacant, and Géry was called to fill it. King Chilperic II gave his consent and instructed Ægidius, Metropolitan of Reims, to consecrate the new bishop. This installation must have taken place between 585 and 587. Filled with apostolic zeal, Géry devoted his life to the extermination of the paganism which infected the district subject to his authority, and, since the worship of the old gods was deeply rooted in the souls of the barbarous peoples, the bishop destroyed or purchased the idols, which were the objects of their veneration. He erected the church of St-Médard in the chief town of Cambrai. He frequently visited the rural districts and the *villæ* at a distance from his episcopal city, displaying particular solicitude for the ransom of captives.

But political events soon introduced a new dominion, when Clotaire II (d. 629) took possession of Cambrai. The bishop went to pay his respects to the conqueror in his villa of Chelles, probably in 613. At the command of the king he was compelled to go to the sanctuary and national place of pilgrimage of the Franks, St. Martin of Tours, there to distribute alms to the poor. In October, 614, Géry assisted at the Council of Paris. He died after an episcopate of thirty-nine years, and was buried in the church of St-Médard at Cambrai. Géry was honoured with a cult immediately after his death. In the time of his successor Berthold his tomb was already the object of fervent veneration, and the monastery of St-Médard which he had founded profited largely by the offerings

made to him. Mention of his feast is already made in the additions to the Hieronymic martyrology, and in the ninth century in the martyrologies of Wandalbert of Prüm and of Rabanus Maurus. This feast is celebrated on 11 August. The institution of the feast of his exhumation, 18 November, and of his translation, 24 September, dates probably from 1245, as his relics were exhumed in that year by Bishop Guido of Cambrai. Relics of the saint are preserved at Ste-Marie de Liessies, at the Church of St-Géry at Brussels, at the church of the same name at Arras, at St-Donatien at Bruges, at St-Pierre at Douai, and in other churches of Belgium. St-Géry is the patron of Cambrai, subsidiary patron of Brussels, and he is honoured as a protector at Braine-le-Comte (Hainaut, Belgium). On the reliquary in the form of an ostensorium at the Cathedral of Cambrai, which contains the skull of St. Gery, he is represented in the attire of a bishop, mitre on head, without his crosier, right hand lifted in a gesture of benediction and left folded upon his breast.

*Analecta Bollandiana*, vii, 388-398; *Acta SS.*, August, II, 672-693; *Acta SS. Belg.*, II, 271-315; *Mon. Germ. Hist., Script. Rer. Meroving.*, III, 652 sq.; KRUSCH, *Das Leben des Bischofs Gaugerich von Cambrai in Neues Archiv.*, XVI, 227-234; VAN DER ESSEN, *Etude critique et littéraire sur les Vies des saints Merovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique* (Louvain, 1907), 206-211; BOSCHIUS, *De S. Gaugerico . . . commentarius proventus in Acta SS. Belg.*, II, 256-270; FLAHAUIT, *Notes et documents relatifs au culte de St. Gery* (Dunkirk, 1890); *Vie de S. Walfray et notice sur S. Gery* (Charleville, 1851).

L. VAN DER ESSEN.

**Gesellenvereine**, German Catholic societies for the religious, moral, and professional improvement of young men. They owe their origin and present condition to Adolph Kolping, surnamed the Journeymen's Father (*Gesellenvater*). He was born 8 Dec., 1813, of poor parents, and, though he gave early evidence of inclination to study, he was obliged to learn the trade of a shoemaker. As a poor young workman, he became acquainted with the disadvantages suffered by men of his class on their journeys, in factories, and in city lodging-houses. At the age of twenty-three Kolping felt drawn to the priesthood, but reached that goal only in 1845, after years of patient study amidst troubles, privations, and sickness. He was first sent as chaplain to Elberfeld, where a number of journeymen carpenters had founded a choral society with the aid of a teacher and the local clergy. It grew rapidly into a Young Workmen's Society with the acknowledged object of fostering the religious life by means of a closer union among its members, and at the same time of improving their mechanical skill. Kolping frequently addressed the members on subjects of interest to mechanics. He was elected president in 1847, and soon gave to the association the features that have since been distinctive of the Gesellenverein, or Society of Young Journeymen. Hitherto little attention had been paid to this class of workmen. Kolping recognized that, to uplift them morally and socially, it was advisable to establish a widespread organization of similar societies. Its first fruits could not fail to be a respectable body of master-workmen. He resolved to make Cologne, one of the great industrial centres of Germany, the seat of his life-work in this direction. In 1849 he was appointed assistant-priest at the cathedral of that city. With a few zealous friends, ecclesiastics and laymen, he founded at once a Gesellenverein, and began to instruct its members gratuitously on various subjects. The Cologne society soon acquired its own home, and opened therein a refuge, or hospice, for young travelling journeymen. In his efforts to develop the work Kolping was energetic and undaunted. He was eloquent both as speaker and writer. Filled with the zeal of an apostle, he visited frequently the great industrial centres of Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Hungary. His propaganda bore good fruit, and in a short time societies of young Catholic journeymen were

formed in many Rhenish towns, in Westphalia, and finally throughout the German-speaking world. When Kolping died (4 Dec., 1865), the Gesellenverein numbered about 400 branch unions. In 1901 they had reached the number of 1086, with a membership of 80,000 journeymen and 120,000 master-workmen. There are at present more than 1170 unions affiliated to the Central Union at Cologne. Of these there are in Prussia and Northern Germany 505, in Bavaria 222, in the rest of Germany 134. There are 263 in Austria and Hungary, 34 in Switzerland, 8 in Holland, 2 in Luxemburg, 2 in Brussels, 2 at Paris, 1 each in London, Stockholm, Rustchuk (Bulgaria), and Rome. About 360 unions own their own houses—over 220 in Germany, and 90 in Austria-Hungary. There are a general burial fund (established 1904), about 195 local sick funds, besides the general fund, and a general fund to aid travelling journeymen.

These societies or unions aim, in general, at the moral, mental, and professional improvement of young German Catholic journeymen, apprentices, etc. (Gesellen). They develop and cultivate in them strong religious principles and civic virtue. The result is a large and united body of self-respecting and respected master-workmen, distributed over all parts of Germany and throughout the lands bordering on the German Empire. Persuaded that the middle classes can thrive only when they repose on a basis of religion and practical faith, the Gesellenverein cultivates assiduously the religious and moral sense of its members. The entire organization exists primarily for this purpose. There is a quarterly general Communion, and the Easter Communion is preceded by a retreat, or brief spiritual preparation. On Sundays and great holidays special Mass is said for the members of the society. Lectures are given on Sunday evenings by clergymen and laymen; the subjects treated are quite varied, ranging from religious topics to the purely instructive or entertaining. Non-religious festivities, such as excursions, theatricals, evening entertainments, and the like, are allowed, but in moderation, lest they should develop in the members that excessive love of amusement which characterizes modern youth. Since 1890 much attention has been paid to the instruction of members in technical, industrial, and mercantile subjects (538 unions in 1908). Besides providing for Christian doctrine, the societies conduct classes in book-keeping, arithmetic, drawing, literary composition, music, natural sciences, etc. In the larger cities there are free classes in several crafts, e. g., for bakers, tailors, carpenters, workers in metal, painters, shoemakers. This instruction is designed especially for those workmen who aim at establishing a business of their own. Frequently, in the large cities, these classes are attached to local technical and industrial schools, municipal or governmental.

In its organization the Verein contains patriarchal, monarchical, and ecclesiastical elements. In accordance with the "general statute" which Kolping framed and which, with various modifications, is still in force, each Verein conducts its own affairs as local circumstances require, yet always with a regard for the general principles of the organization. At the head of each is a Catholic priest, whose control is supreme. He is nominated by the diocesan "Præses" (president) after consultation with the local authorities, and is appointed by the bishop. He is assisted by a board of managers composed partly of citizens actively interested in the work and partly of members chosen by the Verein. The diocesan president acts as intermediary between the bishop and the Vereins, organizes meetings, holds conferences, etc. In Bavaria, Saxony, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, there is, besides the diocesan president, a "central" president, and in Hungary a "federation" president. All these associations are united in the "Catholic Gesellenverein" under the headship of a president general, who, ac-

cording to Kolping's enactment, is always the president of the local Verein in Cologne. On account of the importance of this position, the presidents of Vienna, Munich, Breslau, and Munster take part in the election. As a rule, only unmarried Catholic journeymen between the ages of 17 and 25 are admitted—after three months' probation—to regular membership. Those who are married or have completed their apprenticeship are retained on the list of honorary or extraordinary members. No member is allowed to join any association whose aims are opposed to those of the Verein. Each member of a local Verein is at the same time member of all the federated societies; hence the importance of the federation as a whole.

The discussion of political matters and every kind of religious polemic are forbidden in the local Verein. Ample provision is made for the material welfare of the members. Each Verein must secure suitable quarters where its members can assemble at evening, especially on Sundays and festivals, for instruction and social enjoyment. The hospices (over 400 in number) provide board and lodging for resident workmen at an exceedingly moderate cost, and for journeymen gratuitously until they find work. In places where there is no regular hospice, the local Verein secures proper accommodation for journeymen in houses under its control. Excellent service has also been rendered in the way of providing employment, establishing funds for the care of the sick, and opening accounts for savings. The principal publication is the "Kolpingsblatt", which appears weekly at Cologne in an edition of 45,000 copies.

The objects for which Kolping strove have been realized to a remarkable degree, as is evident from the wide development of the work he founded. "The Gesellenverein", says Schäffer, "has extended over hundreds of thousands its protective influence, teaching the ignorant, arousing the lukewarm, filling the timid with earnestness and self-respect, strengthening the weak and saving them from the perils to which so many workmen, especially through the efforts of social democracy, are everywhere exposed". These societies are among the few institutions of Catholic origin which have been appreciated, commended, and even imitated by Protestants. The latter, however, have enrolled but a small number of workmen.

Owing to special conditions the Gesellenverein has so far shown but little signs of development in the United States. The almost total absence of the old trades' organization (apprentice, journeyman, master) in the country, the reluctance of the young artisans to travel from place to place, and the phenomenal development of the factory system have prevented the growth of these societies. To this may be added the fact that efforts to create the Gesellenverein have been made by the German Catholics only. Branches of the Gesellenverein exist in Dayton, O., Paterson, N. J., Chicago, Ill., St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., and in New York. The membership varies from 40 (Paterson) to 450 (Dayton). The Dayton branch has a library of 3500 books. All these branches are affiliated to the society at New York, in close relation with the central authority in Germany.

KOLPING, *Der Gesellenverein* (Cologne, 1849); SCHÄFFER, *Adolf Kolping, der Gesellenvater* (3d ed., Paderborn, 1894); WENZEL, *Kolping der Gesellenwahrer* (Berlin, 1896); SCHWEITZER, *Der Kath. Gesellenverein Handbuch* (Cologne, 1905); *Der Kath. Gesellenv. in s. sozialen Bedeutung* (Cologne, 1907).

JOSEPH LINS.

**Gesta Dei per Francos**, the title adopted by Guibert de Nogent (d. about 1124) for his history of the First Crusade. In the eleventh century the name of "Frank" was applied in a general manner to all the inhabitants of Western Europe, being a survival of the political unity established by the Carolingians for the benefit of the Franks. The Byzantine chroniclers never otherwise refer to the Westerns. Hervé, a Norman adventurer in the service of the Byzantine em-

perors in the eleventh century, is called "Francopoulos" (Son of the Franks). It was therefore quite natural that this name of "Frank" should be used by the Orientals in referring to the crusaders, and it is evident that they called themselves by the same name. "Gesta Francorum" is the title of one of the chief accounts of the Crusades. Since the Crusades the word Frank remains in the east a synonym for Western, and to-day the term is still used in that sense. Moreover, the idea that the Franks were a people chosen by God arose soon after their conversion to Christianity, and finds expression many times in the traditions relative to Clovis, which Gregory of Tours transmits to us. We read in one of the prologues of the Salic Law: "Glory to Christ, who loves the Franks! May He preserve their kingdom! May He replenish their leaders with His grace, for this is the strong and brave nation which has richly covered with gold the bodies of the holy martyrs." With Charlemagne the Franks protected the Roman Church from the Lombard invasion, destroyed paganism among the Saxons, drove back the Mussulmans, and established their protectorate over the Holy Sepulchre. Hence the crusade was, for the men of the eleventh century, merely the crowning of that alliance between God and the Franks, and after the discourse of Urban II at Clermont, it was to the cry of "God wills it!" that all made haste to take the cross.

Guibert, b. in Picardy about 1053, was a monk at Saint-Germer-de-Flly, elected Abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy in 1104, had been a witness of the enthusiasm aroused by the preaching of the crusade, perhaps he had even assisted at the Council of Clermont. Desiring to write an account of the Crusades, he chose this title of the "Doings of God through the Franks", and in his account, wherein the marvellous occasionally mingles with reality, he affirms at different times the Divine mission of the Franks. This work, dedicated to Gaudri, Bishop of Laon, is not an original account of the crusade, and in part follows the anonymous author of the "Gesta Francorum". It is nevertheless not without great value, for it shows the profound impression created throughout Europe by the conquest of the Holy Land. Although Guibert was a contemporary of the events which he relates, they receive already in his account an epic colouring. The interest of these seven books, composed between 1108-1112 consists in their revealing to us the doctrine of the providential rôle, which the men of the Middle Ages assigned to the Westerns, but in Guibert's mind the only Franks worth considering were his compatriots, the French. To them the popes turned when they suffered injuries inflicted by other nations, and he contrasts their conduct with that of the Teutons, in revolt against the Church. He therefore considers the crusade as a wholly French undertaking (Bk. II, i). When, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Jacques Bongars (1546-1612) undertook to publish the works of all the known historians of the Crusades, he chose as the title of his collection "Gesta Dei per Francos" (Hanover, 2 v., 1612).

GUIBERT DE NOGENT in *Histor. Occid. Croisades*, IV, 115-263; MONOD, *Le moine Guibert et son temps* (Paris, 1905).

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

**Gesta Romanorum**, a medieval collection of anecdotes, to which moral reflections are attached. It was compiled in Latin, probably by a priest, late in the thirteenth or early in the fourteenth century. The ascription of authorship to Berchorius or Helinandus can no longer be maintained. The original object of the work seems to have been to provide preachers with a store of anecdotes with suitable moral applications. Each story has a heading referring to some virtue or vice (e. g. *de dilectione*); then comes the anecdote followed by the *moralisatio*. The collection became so popular throughout Western Europe that



copies were multiplied, often with local additions, so that it is not now possible to determine whether it was originally written in England, Germany, or France. Oesterley, its latest critical editor (Berlin, 1872), is of opinion that it was originally composed in England, whence it passed to the Continent, and that by the middle of the fourteenth century there existed three distinct families of MSS.: the English group, written in Latin; the Latin and German group; and a third group represented by the first printed editions. The MSS. differ considerably as to number and arrangement of articles, but no one MS. representing the printed editions exists. Probably the editors of the first printed edition selected stories from various MSS. Their volume was a folio issued from the press of Kete-laer and De Leempt at Utrecht, while a second edition was published by Ter Hoenen at Cologne. Shortly after this collection had been published, an enlarged edition, now known as the Vulgate, was issued, containing 181 stories. This was compiled from the third group of MSS., and was printed by Ulrich Zell at Cologne. All these three editions appeared between 1472 and 1475, and subsequent reprints were numerous. The first English translation, based on the English group of MSS., was issued by Wynkyn de Worde about 1510, and was followed by others. These English editions have many stories in common with the Vulgate, but include others derived from the English MSS. None of the English editions, old or new, give the moralizations in their entirety, full as they are of Catholic teaching, dogmatic and moral. Though the title of the work suggests Roman history as the chief source of the stories, many of them are taken from later Latin or German chronicles, while several are Oriental in character. In estimating the wide influence of the "Gesta" it must be remembered that the collection proved a mine of anecdotes, not only for preachers, but for poets, from Chaucer, Lydgate, and Boccaccio down through Shakespeare to Schiller and Rossetti, so that many of these old stories are now enshrined in masterpieces of European literature.

OESTERLEY, *Gesta Romanorum* (Berlin, 1872), critical edition, Latin text, and dissertation; SWAN, *Gesta Romanorum*, standard Eng. tr., first published in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library* (1824); edited by WYNNARD HOOPER (London, 1877), with valuable preface, and again by E. A. BAKER (London, 1905). WYNNARD HOOPER's edition is also reprinted in the *York Library* (London, 1905); WARTON, *History of English Poetry*, Dissertation iii, Vol. III (London, 1781); MADDEN, *Old English Versions of the Gesta Romanorum* (Roxburghe Club, 1838); HERTAGGE, *Introduction to EARLY ENGLISH TEXTS SOCIETY'S* edition of MADDEN'S *Old English Versions* (London, 1879).

EDWIN BURTON.

**Gethsemani** (Hebrew *gat*, press, and *semen*, oil) is the place in which Jesus Christ suffered the Agony and was taken prisoner by the Jews. Saint Mark (xiv, 32) calls it *χωπιον*, "a place" or "estate"; St. John (xviii, 1) speaks of it as *κῆπος*, a "garden" or "orchard". In the East, a field shaded by numerous fruit trees and surrounded by a wall of loose stone or a quick-set hedge forms the *el bostān*, the garden. The name "oil-press" is sufficient indication that it was planted especially with olive trees. According to the Greek version and others, St. Matthew (xxvi, 36) designates Gethsemani by a term equivalent to that used by St. Mark. The Vulgate renders *χωπιον* by the word *villa*, but there is no reason to suppose that there was a residence there. St. Luke (xxii, 39) refers to it as "the Mount of Olives", and St. John (xviii, 1) speaks of it as being "over the brook Cedron". According to St. Mark, the Saviour was in the habit of retiring to this place; and St. John writes: "Judas also, who betrayed him, knew the place; because Jesus had often resorted thither together with his disciples".

A place so memorable, to which all the Evangelists direct attention, was not lost sight of by the early Christians. In his "Onomasticon" (ed. Klostermann, 1904, p. 74), Eusebius of Cæsarea says that Gethsemani is situated "at the foot of the Mount of Olives",

and he adds that "the faithful were accustomed to go there to pray". In 333 the Pilgrim of Bordeaux visited the place, arriving by the road which climbs to the summit of the mountain, i. e. beyond the bridge across the valley of Josaphat. In the time of the Jews, the bridge which spanned the torrent of Cedron occupied nearly the same place as the one which is seen there to-day, as is testified by the ancient staircase cut in the rock, which on one side came down from the town and on the other wound to the top of the mountain. Petronius, Bishop of Bologna (c. 420), and Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, speak of this immense staircase and two other pilgrims counted the steps. Traces of it are still to be seen on the side towards the city, and numerous steps, very large and well-preserved, have been discovered above the present Garden of Gethsemani. The Pilgrim of Bordeaux notes "to the left, among the vines, the stone where Judas Iscariot betrayed Christ". In translating the "Onomasticon" of Eusebius, St. Jerome adds to the article Gethsemani the statement that "a church is now built there" (Onomasticon, ed. Klostermann, p. 75). St. Sylvia of Aquitania (385-388) relates that on Holy Thursday the procession coming down from the Mount of Olives made a station at "the beautiful church" built on the spot where Jesus underwent the Agony. "From there", she adds, "they descend to Gethsemani where Christ was taken prisoner" (S. Silvæ Aquit. Peregr., ed. Gamurrini, 1888, pp. 62-63). This church, remarkable for its beautiful columns (Theophanes, Chronogr. ad an. 682), was destroyed by the Persians in 614; rebuilt by the Crusaders, and finally razed, probably in 1219. Arculf (c. 670), St. Willibald (723), Daniel the Russian (1106), and John of Würzburg (1165) mention the Church of the Agony. The foundations have recently been discovered at the place indicated by them, i. e. at a very short distance from the south-east corner of the present Garden of Gethsemani.

A fragmentary account of a pilgrimage in the fourth century, preserved by Peter the Deacon (1037), mentions "a grotto at the place where the Jews took the Saviour captive". According to tradition it was in this grotto that Christ was wont to take refuge with His disciples to pass the night. It is also memorable for a supper and a washing of the feet which, according to the same tradition, took place there. Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 583), says in one of his sermons that the Church commemorates three suppers. "The first repast", he says, "together with the purification, took place at Gethsemani on the Sabbath day, the first day, i. e. when Sunday was already begun. That is why we then celebrate the vigil" (P. G., LXXXVI, 2392). The second supper was that of Bethany, and the third was that of Holy Thursday at which was instituted the Holy Eucharist. Theodosius (c. 530) describes this grotto in these terms: "There [in the valley of Josaphat] is situated the basilica of Holy Mary, Mother of God, with her sepulchre. There is also the place where the Lord supped with his disciples. There He washed their feet. There are to be seen four benches where Our Lord reclined in the midst of His Apostles. Each bench can seat three persons. There also Judas betrayed the Saviour. Some persons, when they visit this spot, through devotion partake of some refreshment, but no meat. They light torches because the place is in a grotto." Antoninus of Plaisance (570), Arculf, Epiphanius the Hagiopolite, and others make mention of the well-known pasch of which the Grotto of Gethsemani was witness. In the Church of the Agony the stone was preserved on which, according to tradition, Jesus knelt during His Agony. It is related by Arculf that, after the destruction of the church by the Persians, the stone was removed to the grotto and there venerated. In 1165 John of Würzburg found it still preserved at this spot, and there is yet to be seen on the

ceiling of the grotto an inscription concerning it. In the fourteenth century the pilgrims, led astray by the presence of the stone and the inscription, mistakenly called this sanctuary the Grotto of the Agony.

In ancient times the grotto opened to the south. The surrounding soil being raised considerably by earth carried down the mountain by the rains, a new entrance has been made on the north-west side. The rocky ceiling is supported by six pillars, of which three are in masonry, and, since the sixth century, has been pierced by a sort of skylight which admits a little light. The grotto, which is irregular in form, is, in round numbers, 56 feet long, 30 feet wide, and 12 feet high in its largest dimensions. It is adorned with four altars, but of the pictures which formerly covered the walls, and of the mosaic floor, traces only can be found. At a distance of about 130 feet to the south of the grotto is the Garden of Gethsemani, a quadrangular-shaped enclosure which measures about 195 feet on each side. Here are seven olive trees, the largest of which is about 26 feet in circumference. If they were not found there in the time of Christ they are at least the offshoots of those which witnessed His Agony. With the aid of historical documents it has been established that these same trees were already in existence in the seventh century. To the east of the garden there is a rocky mass regarded as the traditional spot where the three Apostles waited. A stone's throw to the south, the stump of a column fitted in a wall pointed out to the native Christians the place where Jesus prayed on the eve of his Passion. The foundations of the ancient church of the Agony were discovered behind this wall.

LESÈTRE in *Fig., Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; VIGOUROUX, *Le N. Testament et les découvertes archéologiques* (Paris, 1896).

BARNABAS MEISTERMANN.

**Gethsemani, ABBEY OF OUR LADY OF**, of the Order of Reformed Cistercians, commonly called Trappists, established in 1848 in Nelson Co., Kentucky, in the Diocese of Louisville, being the first abbey on American soil. On 26 Oct., 1848, a colony of forty Trappists left the Abbey of Melleray, in the Diocese of Nantes, France, under the leadership of Dom Eutrope Proust, and arrived at New Orleans early in December. They travelled by river to Louisville, Ky., where Bishop Flaget, who had greatly desired their coming, received them. On 21 December they took possession of the lands destined for their establishment, and shortly afterwards their number was increased by a second colony of twenty religious from the mother-house. The monks undertook the work of clearing their lands with indomitable energy, and little by little arose the imposing structures which form the present abbey. This is an immense quadrilateral, one side of which is formed by the church, whilst the other three sides contain the monastic quarters, with a commodious guest-house for those who desire to spend a few days in solitude.

In 1850 a pontifical Brief (21 July) erected the new monastery into an abbey. By a unanimous vote Dom Eutrope was elected abbot, and on 1 May, 1851, received the abbatial blessing from Bishop M. J. Spalding of Louisville, in the old cathedral of Bardstown. It was the first ceremony of the kind performed in North America. In 1859 Dom Eutrope resigned and returned to France. He left Dom Benedict Berger in charge, who was soon after elected abbot, and received the abbatial blessing in St. Catherine's Church, New Haven, Ky., 9 May, 1861. Dom Benedict insisted with true religious zeal on the observance of the rule, and under his administration the abbey buildings were finished. The church was solemnly consecrated by Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, 15 Nov., 1866. Stricken with paralysis in 1887, Dom Benedict resigned his charge in 1889. The administration then passed to Dom M. Edward Chaix-Bourbon, who was elected abbot 9 May, 1890, and received the abbatial blessing

in the church of the monastery, 29 September following. Dom Edward applied himself especially to improve the school attached to the abbey since its foundation. He erected new buildings, and transformed it into a college. During a visit to France, upon the advice of physicians, he had to renounce his hopes of seeing Gethsemani again, and on 24 Jan., 1898, he was succeeded by Dom M. Edmond M. Obrecht, first appointed superior and shortly afterwards elected abbot by unanimous vote; he received the abbatial blessing at Gethsemani, 28 Oct., 1898. Through the generosity of Mgr. Batz of Milwaukee, Dom Edmund was able to create the splendid library which contains more than thirty thousand volumes of the principal authors on ecclesiastical sciences.

That the regime of La Trappe is entirely incompatible with the American temperament is a prejudice without foundation. The community has always numbered some, and now numbers over one-third, Americans amongst its religious, some of whom were raised in luxury, and all have found health and happiness at Gethsemani. Another prejudice is the belief that the Trappist life, being a penitential life, is only intended for criminals. Life at Gethsemani is the same as Cistercian life at Clairvaux, a life of contemplation and penance. Moreover, recent decrees of sovereign pontiffs and the constitutions of the order forbid the reception of men who have given public scandal. The community of Gethsemani is at present (1908) composed of 80 religious: 34 members of the choir, 22 of whom are priests, whilst the others are preparing themselves, by the regular studies, for the priesthood; 46 are lay brothers who are more especially engaged in the work of the farm.

Archives of the Abbey of Gethsemani: *Relations of Dom Eutrope in Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (1898); FRANNESCHMIDT, *Illustrierte Geschichte der Trappisten* (Paderborn, 1875); TALON, *Notice sur les monastères de la Trappe* (Paris, 1855).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

**Geulincx, ARNOLD.** See OCCASIONALISM.

**Gezireh** (or DJEZIREH), seat of two Catholic residential sees, one Chaldean, the other Syrian. The Chaldean diocese has been known, at least since 410, as Beit-Zabbai ("Notices et extraits des manuscrits", Paris, XXXVII, 272). Its bishop, John, assisted at a council in 497 (op. cit., 310, 316). Under the Nestorians the diocese was regarded as an episcopal, sometimes as an archiepiscopal see. Later, it was united to Quardou, a diocese of the Kurds, situated on the opposite bank of the Tigris (op. cit., 680). Since the erection of the Chaldean Catholic patriarchate by Julius III, Gezireh has had its own bishops, the succession extending to our own days almost without interruption. The Syrian bishops were at first Jacobites, but, after the conversion to Catholicism of a portion of that sect, a Syrian Catholic bishop was appointed to the see (Lequien, II, 1205, 1579). The present Chaldean Diocese of Gezireh contains four thousand faithful, fourteen priests, seventeen churches and chapels, twelve primary schools for boys and one for girls conducted by the Presentation Sisters. The French Dominicans have a residence there. The Syrian diocese numbers five hundred faithful, eleven native priests, three of whom are regulars, five churches and six primary schools. The city of Gezireh-ibn-Omar, so called to distinguish it from the Gezireh near Bagdad, is situated on the right bank of the Tigris, about 125 miles north of Mossoul in the vilayet of Diarbekir. It has about ten thousand inhabitants, six thousand of whom are Christians and nearly two thousand Catholics. It contains the tombs of several Abbaside princes. The soil is well watered; there are superb forests of oaks, and a rich oil-well is situated at a distance of about twenty-five miles.

CUTNET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II, 511-514; *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* (1896), p. 446; *Missiones Catholicae* (1907), 805, 810.

S. VAILLÉ.

**Gfrörer**, AUGUST FRIEDRICH, German historian; b. at Calw, Württemberg, 5 March, 1803; d. at Karlsbad, 6 July, 1861. Obedient to the wishes of his parents, but against his own inclinations, he devoted himself to the study of theology; was a student at the "Little Evangelical Seminary" of Tübingen from 1817-21, and from 1821-25 continued his studies at the higher seminary of the same place. He completed his education by a series of scientific travels through Switzerland and Italy, after which he returned to his Alma Mater. In 1829, he was appointed vicar in the city of Stuttgart. Having by this time lost all belief in revealed religion, he became convinced that to continue his pastoral duties would involve him in serious conflicts; he therefore resigned his vicarage. At the recommendation of Victor von Bonstetten, a friend of his father, he was appointed third librarian of the public library of Stuttgart (1830) with the title of professor. During his numerous hours of leisure he applied himself with vigour and enthusiasm to the study of literature and history. As the fruit of these labours he published in the following year (1831) his work on "Philo und die judisch-alexandrinische Theosophie" (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1831). This work was preparatory to his larger work entitled "Kritische Geschichte des Urchristenthums" (Stuttgart, 1838, in 5 vols.). In it Gfrörer, probably impelled by David F. Strauss's "Leben Jesu", sought to conceive historically the life and teaching of Christ, and, although writing as a rationalist throughout, he strongly disclaims being "an adherent of the modern champion of negative truths" (i. e. of Strauss). In the first part, with the sub-title "Das Jahr des Heils", he investigates the time in which Christ lived; in the second, entitled "Heilige Sage", he treats of the authenticity and literary character of the first three Gospels, and in the third, "Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit", he discusses the Gospel of St. John. The work, therefore, is a detailed investigation of the character and significance of the New Testament from an historical point of view, and is based on a wealth of materials. At the same time he studied the history of the Thirty Years War, and in 1835 (in Stuttgart) published "Gustav Adolf, König der Schweden und seine Zeit" (4th ed., 1863), in which by emphasizing the political rôle of the Swedish king he took a position diametrically opposed to the views previously held by Protestants.

An equally profound impression, especially in Catholic circles, was produced by his "Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte" (4 vols., Stuttgart, 1841-46). Closing with the year 1305, it brings into prominence the important part played by the Catholic Church in the development of the German Empire, and justly extols the policy of the popes. Shortly afterwards he was appointed professor of history at the Catholic University of Freiburg (Breisgau)—an appointment which at first sight appears surprising, inasmuch as he was a rationalist, the results of whose investigations were not at all times in harmony with Christian doctrine. His call, however, is quite intelligible in view of the tendencies of his recent writings, and of his fair treatment of religious questions, which seemed to indicate a gradual return to more conservative religious opinions. In 1848, he was elected to the German Parliament at Frankfurt as representative of a district of Württemberg; he belonged to the greater German party, and was a fanatical opponent of Prussia. It is a notable fact that, while in Parliament, he proposed a motion for the reunion of Catholics and Protestants, but only on condition that the Holy See would promise never to permit the Jesuits or Redemptorists to settle on German soil. In 1853 he entered the Catholic Church, after all the other members of his family had taken the same step. His later publications are: "Geschichte der ost- und westfränkischen Karolinger" (Freiburg, 1848, 2 vols.); "Die Urgeschichte des menschlichen

Geschlechts" (Schaffhausen, 1855, 2 vols., incomplete), a demonstration that neither critical history nor the natural sciences, in treating of the origin and earliest history of the human race, can lay claim to certainty, when opposed to the earliest traditions of mankind and especially to Holy Writ; "Papst Gregorius VII und sein Zeitalter" (Schaffhausen, 1859-61, in 7 vols.), a part of his "Church History", notable for its brilliant scholarship and conscientious research. Many volumes of lectures were published posthumously: "Geschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts" (Schaffhausen, 1862-73; Vols. I-IV by Weiss; second part of the fourth vol. by Tiedemann, Basle, 1884); "Zur Geschichte deutscher Volksrechte im Mittelalter" (Schaffhausen, 1865, 2 vols.); "Byzantinische Geschichten" (Graz, 1872-74, 2 vols.). His "Prophetæ veteres pseudoeypigraphi latine versi" (Stuttgart, 1840), with translation, is critically unsatisfactory. Gfrörer was a man of unusual ability; he possessed great acumen and great powers of bold and correct combination. He was a prolific author, although his literary researches were sometimes lacking in method.

ALBERDINGK-THYM, A. F. *Gfrörer en zijne werken* (Haarlem, 1870). It should be noted that the author of this work is Gfrörer's son-in-law. *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, IX, 139-144; VON WEECH, *Badische Biographien*, I, 300-304; ROSENTHAL, *Convertitenbilder*, I, 2, 807 sqq.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Ghardaia**, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF, in the French Sahara, separated in 1901 from the Vicariate Apostolic of Sahara and the Soudan. It includes the region between the Prefecture Apostolic of Morocco, the Dioceses of Algeria and Tunis, the Mission of Tripoli, and 20° N. lat. The inhabitants number about 300,000, all Mussulmans, but of different races, such as Arabs and Berbers. In this vast region are nomadic Arab tribes, such as the Larba, the Chaambas, and the Said Ouba; there are sedentary populations in the oases, as those of the oases of Wargla (Uargla), Gurara, Tuat (Twat), Tedikelt, various tribes of the Tuaregs, and lastly the strong and important group of Mozabites in the district of Mزاب.


At present the mission comprises three stations, Ghardaia, Wargla and Elgolea. Twelve missionaries and three lay brothers of the Congregation des Missionnaires d'Afrique (White Fathers) are employed at the different tasks pertaining to a mission in a Mussulman country. Evangelization properly so-called cannot be at once begun in such countries. The task of the missionaries is wholly one of preparation, requiring long and obscure toil of which statistics convey no adequate appreciation. It consists in overcoming by degrees, through benevolent intercourse, the exercise of charity, and instruction, the ancient prejudices which the Mussulmans harbour towards Christians, prejudices that are rooted deeply in the very religion of Mohammed. Only insensibly, therefore, and through appreciation of the benefits conferred by the missionaries and through customary respect for the latter as men of God, do these peoples become detached from Islam, and a new generation grow up in which it is possible to make numerous and permanent conversions, permanent precisely because more numerous, for occasional conversions amid Mussulman surroundings are almost impossible.

*Missiones Catholicae* (Rome, 1907); *Catholic Missions* (London, —); *Annales de la propagation de la Foi* (Lyons, 1901-1909).

CHARLES GUÉRIN.

**Ghent**, DIOCESE OF (GANDENSIS or GANDAVENSIS), at present comprises the whole territory of East Flanders, one of the nine provinces of Belgium. It numbers 1,103,930 inhabitants and 362 parishes. The see was erected by Paul IV ("Super universi", 12 May, 1559) at the request of Philip II, King of Spain and Sovereign of the Low Countries. Till that time Ghent had belonged to the Diocese of Tournai. Situated on the left bank of the Scheldt (Escaut), the new diocese

was bounded on the north by the western arm of that river, on the east by the new Dioceses of Antwerp and Mechlin, detached from Cambrai, on the south by Tournai, and on the west by the new Diocese of Bruges ("Ex injuncto", Pius IV, 1560, and "Regimini universalis Ecclesiæ" especially for Ghent, 7 August,



CHURCH OF SAINT-JACQUES, GHENT

1561). Previous to this Charles V had obtained from Paul III the secularization of the monks of the Abbey of Saint-Bavon, at Ghent (22 July, 1536), and in 1541 they transferred their chapter from the ancient abbey to the parochial church of St. John the Baptist, which henceforth bore the name of Saint-Bavon. In 1559 it was decided that this chapter should become that of the cathedral, and that at the death of Viglius, then mitred provost of said chapter, the revenues of the abbacy, or provostship, should become the episcopal revenues.

After the concordat between Pius VII and the First Consul, Bonaparte (see CONCORDAT OF 1801), the pope called upon all the bishops of France to resign their sees. Prince de Lobkowitz, the Bishop of Ghent, had died at Munster in 1795 and had not been replaced. By the Bull "Qui Christi Domini" (29 November, 1801), Pius VII suppressed all the ancient dioceses throughout the French Republic, and erected sixty new dioceses, among which he re-established that of Ghent, comprising the two departments of Escaut and Lys, i. e. the three ancient dioceses of Ghent, Bruges, and Ypres, to which was added a portion of Mechlin and Dutch Flanders. Gregory XVI detached the part appertaining to Holland (25 August, 1832), and by the erection of the See of Bruges (27 May, 1834), determined the present jurisdiction of the Diocese of Ghent. Ghent has had twenty-four bishops, of whom the last is Mgr Antoine Stillemans, consecrated 27 January, 1890. Among them, Cornelius Jansenius and Antoine Triest are deserving of more special notice.

The former, who must not be confounded with Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, the author of the "Augustinus", was professor of theology at Louvain when Philip II sent him as his representative to the Council of Trent. On his return to Flanders, he was named by the king first Bishop of Ghent, in 1568, and this nomination was confirmed by Pius IV on 6 July of the same year. His numerous and learned commentaries on the Holy Scriptures reveal in him an exegete of great merit. The seventh bishop, Antoine Triest, occupied the see from 1622 to 1657. He was a veritable Mæcenas and the cathedral of Saint-Bavon is indebted to him for most of the masterpieces which adorn it. His generosity towards the poor found expression in important charitable foundations and in the zeal which he displayed in the establishment at Ghent of the Mont de Piété, an institution founded to lend to the poor without interest. Bishop Triest bequeathed considerable sums to this work.

In 1813, during the episcopate of the Prince de

Brogie (1807-1821), the seminarians of Ghent offered an heroic resistance to the despotism of Napoleon. The emperor held the bishop prisoner and twice sought to wrest from him his resignation. He undertook to name a successor, and sent as Bishop of Ghent a canon of Dijon, M. de la Brue de Saint-Bauzille, but all the clergy, with the exception of thirty out of a thousand priests, refused to recognize him. Being called upon to submit to the intruder, the seminarians opposed an energetic refusal, were compelled to enter the imperial regiments, and were taken, some to Wesel, the others to Paris. Many subsequently died at Wesel as a result of contagious diseases and privations of every sort, but all remained faithful to their motto: "Rather soldiers than schismatics".

During the episcopate of Mgr Delebecque (1838-64) nine American bishops sent two of their colleagues to ask priests from the Diocese of Ghent, intending to place under their direction and instruction the seminary which they proposed to found at Troy, New York. Mgr Delebecque acceded to this request, and in the month of August, 1864, MM. van den Hende, Gabriels (now Bishop of Ogdensburg), Roelants, and Puissant embarked for America. The Diocese of Ghent continued its collaboration in the seminary at Troy until July, 1896. It was also at Ghent and under the auspices of Mgr Delebecque that the work was founded, in 1859, which is now known as *le Denier de Saint Pierre*, i. e. Peter's Pence.

Among the clergy of Ghent Jean-François Van de Velde (1743-1823) is most deserving of notice. While he acquired a well-merited reputation as professor of Holy Scripture at the University of Louvain, and his published and manuscript works place him in the front rank of the theologians of his time, he is chiefly entitled to notice for the important part which he played in the religious affairs of his country, first, under Joseph II, by his intrepid opposition to the decrees with regard to marriage (1784), and later, under Napoleon, by his decisive intervention at the national council, which


the emperor assembled at Paris in 1811, and where, as the counsellor of Mgr de Broglie, he presented a "Mémoire sur l'incompétence du concile national à changer la discipline de l'Eglise, en vertu de laquelle le Pape seul donne l'institution canonique aux évêques nommés" (Memorandum concerning the incompetency of the national council to alter the discipline of the Church, in virtue of which the pope alone confers canonical institution on the nominated bishops).

One who was well entitled to be called "the Vincent de Paul of Belgium" also deserves mention. The inexhaustible charity of Canon Pierre-Joseph Triest (1760-1836) was extended to all human miseries, and for their more efficacious relief he founded in succession the Sisters of Charity (1803), the Brothers of Charity (1807), the "Association of Maternal Charity" (1822), the Brothers of St. John of God (1825), and the Sisters of the Holy Childhood of Jesus (1835).



RUE SAINT-JEAN, GHENT  
Showing cathedral tower

We shall speak only of the first and second of these institutions, the development of which was truly extraordinary. The Sisters of Charity now number more than 1300, and their benevolent activity is spread throughout Belgium, Holland, England, the Congo, India (Punjab), and Ceylon. They are engaged not only in the instruction of children, but give intelligent and devoted care to deaf mutes, the insane and incurables.



UNIVERSITY OF GHENT

In Europe more than 6000 infirm are sheltered in their houses. The Congregation of the Brothers of Charity, which numbers about 1000 religious, is spread throughout Belgium and has been extended successively to Canada, the United States, England, Ireland, and the Netherlands. At present it possesses 44 establishments where more than 6000 insane, aged, and sick persons and many other unfortunates are cared for. The

Brothers teach and care for more than 11,000 children and poor youths, 440 deaf mutes and blind persons, 450 youthful delinquents and 1000 foundlings.

Truly remarkable religious monuments of the diocese are: the cathedral of Saint-Bavon and the churches of Saint-Nicholas, Saint-Jacques, and Saint-Michel at Ghent, the church of Saint-Martin at Alost, and the churches of Notre-Dame and Sainte-Walburge at Oudenarde. From an architectural point of view the cathedral of Saint-Bavon at Ghent is one of the most beautiful churches in Belgium and is undoubtedly the richest in objects of art. Among its numerous works of sculpture the tomb of Bishop Triest, by Jérôme Duquesnoy, is incontestably the masterpiece, and has been rightfully called "the most beautiful work of national statuary". The cathedral of Ghent is deservedly famous for the immortal altar-piece of the brothers Hubert and Jan Van Eyck, known as "The Adoration of the Lamb", which was completed in 1432. The cathedral now possesses only the central panel of the picture, the most important portion of the work. The side panels are at Berlin and at Brussels.

HELLIN, *Histoire chronologique des évêques de Gand* (Ghent, 1772); *Almanach du clergé de Gand* (Ghent, 1880-1909); KERSTEN, *Journal historique et littéraire* (Liège, 1834-35 to 1861-62); CLAESSENS, *Quelques éclaircissements sur l'établissement des évêchés dans les Pays-Bas* (Louvain, 1859); IDEM, *La Belgique chrétienne depuis la conquête française jusqu'à nos jours* (Brussels, 1883); DE SMET, *Coup d'œil sur l'histoire ecclésiastique dans les premières années du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Ghent, 1849); VAN DER MOERE, *Récit de la persécution endurée par les séminaristes du diocèse de Gand* (Ghent, 1863). Consult also NAMÉCHE, *Cours d'histoire nationale* (Louvain, 1894); BRAQ, *Vie de Mgr de Broghe* (Ghent, 1844); LAVAUT, *Vie de Mgr Braq* (Ghent, 1897); DAENS, *Vie de Mgr Lambrrecht* (Alost, 1889); DE DECKER, *Jan Frans Van de Velde* (St. Nicholas, 1897); FAELIENS, *Histoire du petit séminaire de St-Nicholas* (St. Nicholas, 1908); *Centenaire de la Congrégation des Frères de la Charité* (Manage, 1908); KERVY, DE VOLKESBEEK, *Les églises de Gand* (Ghent, 1887); GOETGHEBUER, *L'Eglise cathédrale de St-Bavon* (Ghent, 1893); VAN DEN GHEYN, *La cathédrale de St-Bavon*.

G. VAN DEN GHEYN.

**Ghibellines.** See GUELPHS AND GHIBELLINES.

**Ghiberti, LORENZO DI CIONE, sculptor;** b. at Florence about 1381; d. there, December, 1455. He


ushered in the early Renaissance in his native city of Florence as a sculptor in bronze, just as Masaccio led the way in the art of painting, and Brunellesco in architecture. In a competition for the best design for the second bronze door, the one on the north side of the baptistery, Ghiberti carried off the prize offered by the merchants' guild of Florence in 1401; among his many rivals was Brunellesco. The designs presented by Ghiberti and Brunellesco, the subject of which was the Sacrifice of Isaac, are preserved in the Museo Nazionale of Florence. The work of Andrea Pisano on the south portal served as a model for the north portal. The style of the Trecento (Italian Renaissance of the fourteenth century) is apparent in the typical heads, in the lines, and the somewhat stiff character of the action, but there is more freedom in the forms, the expression, and the handling of the spaces. The wings of the doors are divided by vertical and horizontal bands into twenty-eight panels, in each of which the relief is enclosed in a modified quatrefoil. The jambs, lintels and friezes are decorated with leaves and flowers. At the angles of the panels are the heads of prophets and of sibyls. The twenty upper scenes are taken from the life of Christ, the eight lower ones represent the four Evangelists and four Fathers of the Church. The whole composition is sober, pleasing, and harmonious. This portal finished (1403-1424), Ghiberti undertook the eastern, main portal, the work in this showing greater freedom in the treatment and an advance in style. It includes ten scenes from the Old Testament, most of which are subdivided into several subjects. The reliefs produce a pictorial effect by reason of the number of figures, perspective, grouping, landscape and architectural background. They were completed in 1452. Ghiberti here shows himself in the development of sculpture the rival of his contemporary Masaccio. In fact he compels the less responsive art of sculpture to vie with the more vivacious sister art of painting. His "Paradise", for instance, includes a number of lesser subjects from the creation of Adam to his expulsion from Eden; the foremost figures are almost in the round, the relief becoming less marked as the figures, that at the same time grow smaller, recede from the foreground. His effort to follow nature is furthermore shown by the character expressed in the faces and the action; there is withal no loss of grace or beauty. Ghiberti is a master of technic; its perfection is everywhere evident, even in details of ornament. Vases containing vines intertwined with fruits and supporting the figures of various animals, adorn the frames of the doors. Each wing has a separate frame ornamented with statuette in niches divided from each other by decorative busts. Of this gate Michelangelo declared that it was worthy to be the entrance of Paradise. Ghiberti himself, in a description of the work found among his papers, pronounced it his foremost achievement. In one of the small medallions of the framework of the houses, doubtless with a just pride in his achievement, he has preserved his own portrait.

The same high art characterizes his treatment of the reliquary of St. Zenobius in the cathedral of Florence. On three sides are scenes descriptive of the miracles of the saint, the fourth is adorned with a wreath and angels. The reliquary of San Giacinto is decorated with hovering angels, but on the front only. Among the grave-slabs designed by Ghiberti the bas-relief of Leonardo Dati in Santa Maria Novella deserves especial mention. The church of Or San Michele possesses many specimens of the new plastic art of this era of the Renaissance, among them three statues by Ghiberti, the latest and best of the three being that of St. Stephen. Apart from their many great merits these large statues exhibit one weakness of the master, i. e. the treatment of draperies and the pose. Originally a goldsmith, and working mostly in relief,




he lacked practice in the larger style of sculpture. In fact, from Vasari's time, Ghiberti was often unduly admired. He falls occasionally below some of his contemporaries in sharp characterization, in vigorous movement and unaffected naturalness. It must, however, be admitted that in contrast to the harsh realism of Donatello he observed always the dictates of grace and beauty, approaching therein Lucca della Robbia. His art belongs to a period of transition. Clear traces of the earlier Gothic art survive in Ghiberti, e. g. the mannerism of his slender and pleasing rather than expressive figures, also a similar treatment of the background. On the other hand his

**Ghirlandajo** (DOMENICO DI TOMMASO BIGORDI), a famous Florentine painter; b. 1449; d. 11 Jan., 1494. His father, Tommaso di Curradi Bigordi, is spoken of as a dealer (*sensale*) in jewellery. According to Vasari he owes his surname Ghirlandajo, i. e. the "Garland-maker", to a branch of his trade of which he made a speciality, namely, the manufacture of silver or gold crowns or diadems, which formed a kind of head-dress affected by the young women of Florence. Like Verrocchio and the Pollaiuoli, Domenico began as a goldsmith. There existed once in the Florentine church of the Annunziata silver ex-votos and lamps of his workmanship, destroyed during the sack of 1530.



ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST  
Or San Michele, Florence



MAIN PORTAL  
Baptistry of S. Giovanni, Florence  
LORENZO Ghiberti



ST. STEPHEN  
Or San Michele, Florence

study of classic art is visible in the draperies and often in the heads of his figures. His fidelity to nature, moreover, developed in him a strong drift towards realism.

His sense of the beautiful and his originality stamp Ghiberti as the precursor of Raphael. He was no pioneer like Donatello, yet his work, especially his bronze doors, had a lasting influence on his successors. In him native genius was aided by reflection and theory. In a certain sense, therefore, a new era in art may be said to date from him. In his "Commentaries" he critically reviewed the development of art from the time of Cimabue to his own day. While giving an account of his own works he clearly suggests that he consciously strove after a new art. He seems to characterize himself in his description of the second bronze gate, when he says: "In this work I sought to imitate nature as closely as possible, both in proportions and in perspective as well as in the beauty and picturesqueness of the composition and the numbers of figures; some of these scenes contain nearly one hundred figures, others less, but all were executed with the utmost care; the buildings appear as seen by the eye of one who gazes on them from a distance."

FREY, *Vasari's Vita di Lorenzo Ghiberti with the Commentaries of Ghiberti* (Berlin, 1886); PERKINS, *Historical Handbook of Italian Sculpture* (London, 1883); IDEM, *Ghiberti et son école* (Paris, 1886).

A. GIETMANN.

Traces of his early training in the goldsmith's art are recognizable in the splendour of his ornamental decoration, the carvings of his pilasters, also in his friezes and the garlands with which he adorns his work. Artistic ability seems to have run in the family, for Domenico had two brothers, slightly younger than himself, David and Benedetto, his collaborators in nearly all his great works. Together with their brother-in-law, Mainardi, who had married their sister Alessandra, the three Ghirlandajos conducted in their day, under the name and leadership of Domenico, the principal atelier of Florence for the production of works of art. Domenico's master was that singularly distinguished collector and antiquary, Alessio Baldovinetti (1427-1499). By more than one characteristic, e. g. his straining after realism, his anxiety for a perfect expression of life, his taste for analysis, and his technical skill in the use of colours, Alessio was a precursor of Leonardo da Vinci. Domenico was much less impulsive and more fully master of himself, but he assuredly owed Alessio his success in fresco, in which many think him the most perfect painter of his age.

Ghirlandajo's earliest works, e. g. the frescoes of St. Andrea Brozzi, and those in the Vespucci chapel (discovered in 1898) of the church of Ognissanti at Florence, date perhaps from 1472 or 1473, and as yet exhibit little individuality. His "Descent from the Cross", executed when the artist was twenty-three

years of age, is disfigured by the coarse realism of Castagno. His "Virgin Most Pitiful" (Vergine della Misericordia) follows yet the medieval conventionalism, but is remarkable for the beauty of its portraits, in which line Ghirlandajo always excelled. Henceforth his artistic genius seems to have taken a definite form and to have changed but little in its development. There was little time for anything except the regular pursuit of his work in the life of this tireless artist. His enormous output covers a space of little more than fifteen years (1475-1491), and owing to its steady progress can scarcely be divided into periods. Untroubled by passion or conflict his genius grew and expanded like a flower. Though one of the most accomplished artists of the fifteenth century, his life exhibits none of the troubles, complex situations, or contradictions that meet us in the stormy life of Botticelli. The first characteristic work of the young




ST. FELIX I  
Ghirlandajo, Sistine Chapel

master was executed when he was twenty-five (1475), in the collegiate church of San Gimignano. He drew his inspiration from the life of Santa Fina, a maiden of that city who died in the odour of sanctity, 12 March, 1254 (de' Medici, "Vita di Santa Fina", Siena, 1781), to whose memory a chapel had recently been erected (1468) by Giuliano and Benedetto da Majano. The two scenes treated by the artist, the "Vision" of the Saint and her "Burial", exhibit all the elements of his future great work. The first scene is on a large scale, is treated with much taste and in as familiar a manner as was permitted to an Italian artist. In the "Burial" of the Saint something more personal appeals to us. The simple local event, the mere absolution pronounced over the remains of a modest village maiden, is magnified and elevated to a lofty and powerful significance, in the treatment of the assembled multitude. It is no longer an ordinary burial; the entire city, represented by its clergy, magistrates, and citizens, assists at the function, while the beautiful towers of San Gimignano are shown as decoration of the background. In reality what he seeks to put before us is an entire society harmoniously grouped; the picture is a serene portrayal of national life and a triumph of national sentiment. Of a short journey to Rome about this time we possess no accurate information; the artist returned to Florence to paint the fresco of St. Jerome at Ognissanti and his famous fresco of the "Last Supper" in the refectory of the same convent (1480). This very noble composition is the most idealistic of the artist's works, the only one in which he deals with abstract concepts and does not depict contemporary life.

The series of his great works began with a second journey to Rome. From 27 October, 1481, to 15 March, 1482, the artist was at work in the Sistine Chapel. In these six months he painted six portraits of popes and two large frescoes, the "Resurrection" (over which, in the sixteenth century, a mediocre Flemish work was painted), and the "Call of the Apostles". The latter, with Perugino's "Giving of the Keys to St. Peter", is yet the chief masterpiece of that period of Sistine decoration. On his way back to

Florence, he painted an "Annunciation" (1482) at San Gimignano. The remainder of his life seems to have been passed at Florence, where three great undertakings absorbed his activity. From 1482 to 1484, he executed at the Palazzo della Signoria the "Maestà di San Zenobio" and the noble figures of Roman statesmen, modelled after those of Taddeo di Bartolo in the Palazzo Publico of Siena. Of all the frescoes which made this town-hall of Florence the worthy companion of the Sistine Chapel, only those of Ghirlandajo have been preserved. In 1485, he completed in the Sassetti chapel at the Trinità six frescoes illustrative of the "Life of St. Francis". They were not finished when he received the order for his greatest work, the fifteen frescoes of the "Life of St. John the Baptist" and the "Life of the Virgin" which adorn the Tornabuoni chapel in Santa Maria Novella. These paintings, finished in 1490, are rightfully numbered among the most celebrated in Florence. They are Ghirlandajo's most popular work, and are reckoned among the greatest Italian masterpieces. Their merit is not owing to the subject. Dramatic emotion is entirely absent. Never did an artist, not even Michelangelo in his incident from the Pisan war, his tombs of the Medici, permit himself such liberties with his ostensible subject; or presume in the face of all tradition and probability to substitute arbitrarily a subject chosen in conformity with his own tastes and preferences. Only rarely, and in uninteresting traits, does Ghirlandajo force himself to serious conformity with the conventional treatment of his subject.

As a rule Ghirlandajo avoids representing movement. His calm and clear imagination, well-ordered and harmonious, is better adapted to depicting neutral gestures and attitudes nearly always borrowed from daily life. In most of his scenes and those the most beautiful, e.g. the "Nativity of the Virgin" or the "Visitation", the historical *motif* and the actual event are of no moment. The gospel theme is reduced to a minimum, and becomes a mere pretext for a great and magnificently conceived "tableau de mœurs", or representation of contemporary life. The beautiful everywhere diffused, reality in its highest forms, the artistic setting of things, daily life with its infinite variety of subjects, constitute the inexhaustible charm of these marvellous scenes, in which one must not seek depth, emotion, or poetry. No one ever conceived the life about him under such graceful and noble forms as Ghirlandajo. Devoid of imagination, and compelled therefore to substitute for the great drama of the past the multitudinous spectacle of the present, he nevertheless attained, under the circumstances, the highest flights of fancy. Instead of the always hypothetical reconstruction of an imaginary scene, we have the thousand-fold more valuable representation of the very world in which the artist lived, and at one of the periods in which life seems to have been most agreeable. The Florentine republic, at its most dazzling height, lives again for us in these incomparable frescoes. Still earlier, in his "Call of the Apostles" (Sistine Chapel), the artist had introduced in a group of fifty figures foreign to the subject portraits of the principal Florentines then in Rome. In his "Visitation" we behold Florentine ladies of the middle class out walking. In "Zachary driven from the Temple" we admire the portrait of the charming Lorenzo Tornabuoni, prince of the Florentine youth and husband of the beautiful Giovanna degli Albizzi, also those of the artist himself and of his brothers. But it is in the "Apparition of the Angel to Zachary" that this realism finds its fullest expression. This interview, which must have taken place in the retirement of the sanctuary, is presented by the artist before thirty members of the Tornabuoni family, magnificently staged on the steps of the Temple. It is in fact a solemn glorification of the great line of Florentine bankers who built this admirable chapel. In the



THE NATIVITY OF THE VIRGIN  
GHIRLANDAJO, SANTA MARIA NOVELLA, FLORENCE



aforesaid "Life of St. Francis" may be recognized the banker Sasseti, Lorenzo de' Medici, Agnolo Acciajuoli, Paolo Strozzi; in the Sistine Chapel fresco the scholar Argyropoulos, etc.

Behind these living persons it is Florence itself which forms the background of the scene, that admirable city of the end of the fifteenth century in which Botticelli, Leonardo, Angelo Poliziano, and the young Michelangelo were then living. In the "Life of St. Francis" are depicted the square of the Trinità with the old bridge of Taddeo Gaddi, the façades of the Spini and Gianfigliuzzi palaces, the Signoria, with the Marzocco and the Loggia of Orcagna. In the "Visitation" the view of Florence is that seen from the terrace of San Miniato (background of the picture of the "Virgin of the Donor" by H. Van Eyck at the Louvre) with the dome of Brunelleschi, the campanile of Giotto, and the tower of the Signoria. Profusely scattered through these pictures are Renaissance ornaments, decorated pilasters, the "pretty" friezes like those of the famous tribune of Donatello—"Nativity of the Virgin"—terra-cottas of della Robbia, antique bas-reliefs—"Apparition of the Angel to Zachary"—quite a museum of the artistic fancies of Florence. In the "Preaching of St. John the Baptist", the figure of the saint is borrowed from Donatello, while in the audience the naked child seated among the hearers in the foreground is the reproduction of a celebrated antique, "the Child with the Goose". But he is most admirable in his power of creating new "antiques", i. e. of grasping at once their counterparts in actual life. Italian art possesses nothing more beautiful, more Attic, than certain of his "canéphores" or young girls of the people, e. g. who form the retinue in the "Marriage of the Virgin", or the exquisite figure filling a bronze water-basin in the "Nativity". In fact all this ideal summary of Florentine life breathes the pride and joy expressed, in the "Zachary and the Angel", by the inscription: "The year 1490, when the city beautiful among the beautiful, illustrious for her wealth, victories, arts and monuments, was sweetly enjoying abundance, health and peace."

Ghirlandajo executed several altar-pieces, e. g. the charming "Madonna Ingesnati" (Uffizi), the "Adoration of the Shepherds" (1485, Accademia), the "Adoration of the Magi" (1488, Hospital of the Innocents) and the "Visitation" of the Louvre (1491). His portraits, however, are the most thoroughly characteristic of his genius. The most exquisite of these, that of Giovanna degli Albizzi (1488, Paris, former Kann collection) has no equal in Florentine portraiture of the fifteenth century, and is far superior to Botticelli's famous "Bella Simonetta"; indeed, it can scarcely be compared with any other than that of Pollaiuolo at Chantilly. Finally, the "Old Man and the Child" at the Louvre is a work of incomparable ingenuity, displaying a cordiality perhaps unique in Italian art. The picture is one of those which most forcibly recall Flemish good nature; its tenderness and grace of sentiment compel us to overlook the ugliness of the model. About 1480 Ghirlandajo married Costanza di Bartolommeo Nucci (d. 1485). By her he had two sons, Bartolommeo, b. 1481, who entered the Camaldolese Order; and Ridolfo, b. 5 Feb., 1483, who was, like his father, a painter. In 1488 the artist took as his second wife Antonia di ser Paolo di Simone Paoli. He died, almost suddenly, of a malignant fever, at the age of forty-five years. His serenity and his joy in life are typical of the Florentine genius prior to the mystical crisis and the deep emotions of that Counter-Renaissance, which was to let loose the wrath of Savonarola, and interfered so profoundly with the artistic vocation of a Botticelli and a Fra Bartolommeo. Ghirlandajo was a joyous soul, amiable, productive, somewhat impersonal, and had the rare good fortune to represent perfectly the Florentine spirit in its golden prime. Like Carpaccio at Venice he is perhaps

the most national of the Italian masters. He was the instructor of Michelangelo.

VASARI, ed. MILANESI, III (Florence, 1879); MORELLI, *Le opere dei maestri italiani nelle gallerie di Monaco, Dresda e Berlino* (Bologna, 1886); BERENSON, *The Florentine Painters of the Renaissance*, 2nd ed. (London, 1904); STEINMANN, *Die Sztinische Kapelle*, I (Munich, 1902); IDEM, *Ghirlandajo* (Bielefeld, 1897); LOUDI, *Alessio Baldovinnetti* (Florence, 1907); HAUETTE, *Ghirlandajo* (Paris, 1908).

LOUIS GILLET.

**Ghislain**, SAINT, confessor and anchorite in Belgium; b. in the first half of the seventh century; d. at Saint-Ghislain (Ursidongus), 9 October, c. 680. He was probably of German origin. Ghislain lived in the province of Hainault (Belgium) in the time of St. Amand (d. 679) and Saints Waudru, Aldegonde, and Madelberte. With two unknown disciples he made a clearing in the vicinity of Castrilocus (now Mons, in Hainault), taking up later his abode at a place called Ursidongus, where he built an oratory or chapel dedicated to Saints Peter and Paul. Aubert, Bishop of Cambrai, summoned him to the episcopal presence in order to sound the intentions of this almost unknown hermit, but he afterwards accorded him efficient protection. During his visit to Cambrai Ghislain spent some time in the villa of Roisin and received as a gift the estates of Celles and Hornu. He soon entered into relations with St. Waudru, who was induced by him to build a monastery at Castrilocus, his former place of refuge. It is probable that Ghislain influenced the religious vocation of St. Aldegonde, Abbess of Maubeuge, also of St. Madelberte and St. Aldetrude, of whom the first was the sister and the last two the daughters of St. Waudru. One day Aldegonde, in her monastery of Maubeuge, had a vision in which, according to her biographer, the death of St. Amand, Bishop of Tongres, was revealed to her. Ghislain visited the saint in her villa of Mairieu, near Maubeuge, and explained to her that the vision was an announcement of her own approaching death. The intercourse between Ghislain and Aldegonde brought about a perfect understanding between Maubeuge and the monastery founded at Ursidongus under Ghislain's direction. St. Waudru rewarded her counsellor with a portion of the villa of Frameries and of the oratory of St-Quentin, comprised within the boundaries of the villa of Quaregnon. Ghislain died at Ursidongus, and the monastery which he had founded took his name. The relics of the saint were first disinterred c. 929. They were transferred to Grandlieu, near Quaregnon, about the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh, and in 1025 Gerard I, Bishop of Cambrai, removed them to Cateau-Cambrésis. They were visited several times in the course of the Middle Ages by the Bishops of Cambrai. In 1647 they were removed to St-Ghislain, of which place our saint is patron. His feast is celebrated 9 October, and his intercession is sought to ward off convulsions from children. In iconography he is frequently represented with a bear or bear's cub beside him. This is an allusion to the popular legend which relates that a bear, pursued in the chase by King Dagobert, sought refuge with Ghislain and later showed him the place where he should establish a monastery. Moreover, the site of the saint's cella was called *Ursidongus*, "bear's den".

*Acta Sanctorum Belgii*, IV, 375-384; *Analecta Bollandiana*, V, 212-239; FONCELET, *De Vita S. Ghislai a Ravenn Monacho conscripta in Analacta Bollandiana*, VI, 209-235; *Analecta Bollandiana*, VI, 257-289; *Acta Sanctorum*, Oct., 1035-1037; GRESQUIÈRE, *De Sancto Ghislano confessore commentarius praevisus in Acta Sanctorum Belgii*, IV, 337-375; VAN DER ESSEN, *Etude critique et littéraire sur les Vita des saints Mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique*, 249-250 (Louvain, 1907); see also CAHIER, *Caractéristiques des saints dans l'art populaire*, II (Paris, 1867), 593.

L. VAN DER ESSEN.

**Ghost Dance**, the principal ceremonial rite of a peculiar Indian religion which originated about 1887



with Wovoka, *alias* Jack Wilson, an Indian of the Piute tribe in Nevada. He claimed to have obtained his revelation in a vision in which he had been taken into the spirit world and talked with God. Who had promised a speedy return of the old Indian life through the reincarnation of all the dead Indians, the buffalo and other game, upon a new earth, which was already advancing from the west and would push before it the alien whites to their own proper country beyond the ocean, while the Indian believers would be taken up, as by wings, upon the new surface and there reunited with their old-time friends. By performance of the prescribed dance and songs the consummation would be hastened, while in the frequent hypnotic trances brought about by the efforts of the priests the more sensitive subjects were enabled to anticipate the event in visions.

The belief spread among nearly all the tribes eastward of the Missouri, and produced much excitement for several years, until several dates for the great change had passed without realization of the prophecy, when the ferment gradually subsided. In Dakota it led indirectly to an outbreak among the Sioux in the winter of 1890-1, notable events of which were the killing of Sitting Bull and the massacre of Wounded Knee. In the dance, men and women together held hands, facing towards the centre, and danced slowly in a circle, singing the ghost songs, without instrumental accompaniment, while the priests within the circle brought the more sensitive subjects into the trance condition by means of hypnotizing performances. An essential doctrine of the new religion was the brotherhood of man, and in consequence of this all acts and ceremonies of a warlike nature were prohibited.

MOONEY, *The Ghost Dance Religion in 14th Rept. Bur. Am. Ethn.*, II (Washington, 1896).

JAMES MOONEY.

**Giannone, PIETRO**, Italian historian, b. 7 May, 1676, at Ischitella in the province of Capinata, Naples; d. at Turin, 27 March, 1748. He received his first instruction in the house of his uncle, Gaetano Argento, a lawyer, and after having received the degree of Doctor of Law at Naples he began to practise his profession, following the example of his father. He devoted all his leisure time to the study of history. After preparatory work extending over a period of twenty years, he published under the title "Dell' istoria civile del regno di Napoli" (1723, 4 vols.), a work which caused a great sensation, especially on account of its bitter anti-ecclesiastical bias, which led to its repeated translation into English and German. In it Giannone combined a narrative of political matters, founded on historical sources, with an interesting description of the juridical and moral condition of the country; but as he ascribes all existing evils to the malignant influence of the Church, especially the Roman Curia, we may justly assume it a compilation of biased attacks and misstatements. It was immediately put on the Index and its author excommunicated and forced to leave Naples. He went to Vienna where he was pensioned by Emperor Charles VI. He was readmitted to the Church soon after by the Archbishop of Naples who was in Vienna at the time. Having forfeited his pension in 1744 Giannone went to Venice, but the Government, suspecting him on account of his political opinions, surrounded him with spies. He tried to gain the Government's goodwill by publishing a pamphlet entitled: "Lettera intorno al dominio del mare Adriatico", eulogizing Venice's conquest of the Adriatic; he was unsuccessful and was forcibly expelled in the following year. After wandering to and fro for a while he accepted the hospitality of an old book-dealer in Geneva. There he composed his intensely anti-clerical essay: "Il trirregno ossia del regno del cielo, della terra e del papa" (Geneva, 1735, new ed.

Rome, 1895, 3 vols.). Enticed to a village in Savoy, he was arrested, imprisoned in the fortress of Ceva, and transported thence to Turin, where he died. It is reported that before his death he was reconciled with the Church. Giannone's posthumous works are: "Opere postume" (Lausanne, 1760; enlarged, Venice, 1768; new ed., 2 vols., Capolago, 1841). The first volume contains: "Apologia dell' istoria civile del regno di Napoli"; the second: "Indice generale dell' opera dei tre regni". His collected works appeared in Milan (5 vols., 1858). Later, Mancini published his posthumous works in two volumes (Turin, 1859), entitled "Opere inedite", containing the "Discorsi storici e politici sopra gli annali di Tito Livio"; "La chiesa sotto il pontificato di Gregorio il Grande". The autobiography of Giannone was published by Pierantoni (Rome, 1890).

*Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (Paris, 1858), XX, 421-424.  
PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Gibail and Batrun**, a Maronite residential see. Gibail is merely the modern name of Byblos (q. v.) a titular see of Phœnicia. The diocese, administered by the Maronite patriarch through auxiliary bishops, comprises the civil districts of Ehden, Beharra, Gibail and Batrun. It numbers 70,000 faithful, 470 priests, 277 churches and chapels, 14 convents of Bala-dites containing 177 religious, 2 of Aleppines containing 30 religious, and 2 of Isates with 9 religious. There are also two religious houses in which there are 58 sisters. The patriarch resides at Bkerkey, where the patriarchal seminary of Saint-Jean-Marion is also situated, in which there are 30 students. Another seminary containing 32 students has been opened at Rumié. The question of dividing the diocese in such a manner that Gibail should form one diocese, and Batrun another, has been much discussed in recent years. Gibail is a town of about 1000 inhabitants, nearly all of whom are Christians, 650 being Maronites. There are 13 churches; three of them dating from the Crusades are very beautiful. The Catholic Melchite title of Gibail is united to that of Beirut; since 1902 the schismatic Melchite Diocese of Gibail is distinct from Beirut, and has jurisdiction over the mountainous region of Lebanon.

*Missiones Catholice* (Rome, 1907), 818.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Gibault, PIERRE**, missionary, b. at Montreal, Canada, 1737; d. at New Madrid, about 1804; son of Pierre Gibault and Marie Saint-Jean. He was educated at the seminary of Quebec, and ordained a priest 19 March, 1768. Shortly afterwards he was sent by Bishop Briand as missionary, with the title of Vicar-General, to Illinois. In July he arrived at Michilimackinac, where he spent a week attending to the religious wants of the Catholics, some of whom had not seen a priest for many years. By September he had fixed his residence at Kaskaskia. Later he resided successively at St. Genevieve, Vincennes, and Cahokia. In February, 1770, he visited Vincennes, where he found religion in a deplorable state. During his sojourn of two months at this place he converted a Presbyterian family, and revived religious practices among the Catholics. In this year also, he blessed the little wooden chapel that had been erected at Paincourt, the present site of St. Louis. In spite of many difficulties and in the face of grave dangers incident to long journeys, he succeeded in vastly improving religious conditions in the scattered missions of the surrounding country. His journeys led him to such distant points as Peoria, Ouiatenon, St. Joseph's, and Michilimackinac. In 1775 he wrote to the Bishop of Quebec: "This is the fourth voyage I have taken, the shortest of which was five hundred leagues." For a long time he was the only priest in Illinois and Indiana. When George Rogers Clark captured Kaskaskia, in 1778, it was largely owing to Father Gibault's

influence that the inhabitants submitted without protest, and took the oath of allegiance to the Commonwealth of Virginia. Through his influence also the people of Cahokia took the same step. As a volunteer agent of Clark he then proceeded to Vincennes, and won the people of that post to the American cause. In consequence of these proceedings many of the Indian tribes now acknowledged the authority of the States. But the activity of "the patriot priest" did not cease here, for, a year later, when Clark marched upon Vincennes, which meanwhile had been taken by the English, there were among his forces two companies of the Catholic citizens of Illinois. Concerning the last years of Father Gibault's life, little is definitely known. In 1791 he left Illinois, then a part of the Diocese of Baltimore, and retired to the Spanish territory beyond the Mississippi.

ENGLISH, *The Conquest of the Northwest* (Indianapolis, 1896), I; SHEA, *The Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll* (New York, 1888); ALDERING, *The Diocese of Vincennes* (Indianapolis, 1883); LAW, *The Colonial History of Vincennes* (Vincennes, 1858); *Illinois Historical Collection*, I, 171; PEXTON, *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, XII, 452; *Catholic Historical Researches*, II, 55, 117; V, 52; VI, 136.

JOHN J. O'BRIEN.

**Gibbons, JAMES.** See BALTIMORE, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

**Gibbons, JOHN**, Jesuit theologian and controversialist; b. 1544, at or near Wells, Somersetshire; d. 16 Aug. or 3 Dec., 1589, during a visit to the monastery of Himmelbrode, near Trier. He entered Lincoln College, Oxford, in 1561, but left the university without a degree. After studying philosophy and theology for seven years in the German College, Rome, he obtained the doctorate in both, 1576. Gregory XIII gave him a canonry in the Cathedral Church of Bonn, in Germany, but he resigned this on entering the Society of Jesus at Trier, in 1578. In the college of this latter place he filled successively the offices of confessor, professor of theology, professor of Sacred Scripture, prefect of studies, and rector. Though remarkable for his zeal, charity, and admirable administrative ability, he became more eminent on account of his controversial talents, which he displayed in frequent contests with the Lutherans of Germany. When Dr. Allen suggested Father Gibbons as a fit candidate for the English mission, the latter wrote both to the General of the Society and to Dr. Allen, that he hoped he should give no disedification by saying that he had not the spiritual strength necessary for such an enterprise, but that he would lend it all the assistance in his power.

Among his literary works must be mentioned: "Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in Anglia, adversus Calvinum-Papistas et Puritanos" (Trier, 1583). The work was republished on a larger scale in 1588 and 1594, by Dr. John Bridgewater, who numbered among his assistants Cardinal Allen and Dr. Humphrey Ely. Dr. Bridgewater also edited (see, however, Dict. Nat. Biog., s. v.) a posthumous work of Gibbons entitled "Confutatio virulentæ disputationis theologice in qua Georgius Suhn, Professor Academiæ Heidelbergensis, conatus est docere Pontificem Romanum esse Antichristum a prophetis et apostolis prædictum" (Trier, 1589). The Calvinist aspersions on the Roman pontiff are disposed of without much difficulty.

COOPER in Dict. Nat. Biog., s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, I, 56 (Innsbruck, 1892); SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, III; SOUTHWELL, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu*, 453.

A. J. MAAS.

**Gibbons, RICHARD**, brother of Father John Gibbons, b. at Winchester, 1550 or 1549; d. at Douai, 23 June, 1632. After making his early studies in England, and completing a two years' course in philosophy at Louvain and in the German College at Rome, he entered the Society of Jesus, on 1 Sept., 1572, and continued his studies for three years. After his ordination, he taught mathematics for thirteen years,

philosophy for ten, scholastic theology for three and for some time also Hebrew and Scripture, dividing his time between Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and Belgium. For a while he occupied the offices of prefect of studies at Louvain, and of preacher in the Jesuit College at St-Omer. His later years were spent at Douai, in printing ancient manuscripts, and in translating, editing, and annotating various learned works. The following deserve to be noticed: "Historia admiranda de Jesu Christi stigmatibus ab Alphonso Paleato Archiepisc. II. Bononiensi explicata. Accessit tomus II . . . Historiæ admirandæ . . . complectens M. Vigerii S. R. E. Cardinalis de præcipuis Incarnati Verbi mysteriis decachordum Christianum" (Douai, 1616). "R. P. Francisci Ribera . . . in librum Duodecim Prophetarum commentarii . . ." (Douai, 1612). "Historia Anglicana Ecclesiastica a primis gentis susceptæ fidei incunabulis ad nostra fere tempora deducta . . . auctore Nicolao Harpsfeldio" (Douai, 1622). "Ludovici de Ponte Meditationum de Vita et Passione Christi, Libri II, ex Hispanico in Latinum versi" (Cologne, 1612). "A Spiritual Doctrine, containing a Rule to Live Well, with divers Praiers" (Louvain, 1599). "Meditations upon the Mysteries of our Holy Faith, with the Practise of Mental Praier . . ." (Douai?, 1610). "The First Part of the Meditations of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ our Saviour" (1614?). "Translation of Bellarmine's Christian Doctrine".

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in Dict. Nat. Biog., s. v.; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la Compagnie de Jésus*, III; HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

A. J. MAAS.

**Gibert, JEAN-PIERRE**, canonist; b. at Aix, Provence, in 1660; d. at Paris in 1736. He became a cleric at an early age, receiving the tonsure only; he studied at Aix, and became doctor of theology and canon law. He taught ecclesiastical law in the seminaries of Toulon and Aix, and settled in Paris in 1703, where he lived and worked in retirement.

His principal works are: "Doctrina canonum in corpore juris inclusorum, circa consensum parentum requisitum ad matrimonium filiorum minorum" (Paris, 1709); "Institutiones ecclesiasticæ et bénéficiales suivant les principes du droit commun et les usages de France" (Paris, 1720 and 1736); "Usages de l'Eglise gallicane concernant les censures et l'irrégularité considérées en général et en particulier" (Paris, 1724 and 1750); "Tradition ou Histoire de l'Eglise sur le sacrement de mariage" (Paris, 1725); "Consultations canoniques sur les sacrements" (Paris, 1721-1725, and 1750); "Corpus juris canonici per regulas naturali ordine digestas, usque temperatas, ex eodem jure et conciliis, patribus atque aliunde desumptas" (Geneva, 1736; Lyons, 1737), a masterly work on canon law in which the writer deviates from the order of the Corpus Juris. Gibert was a moderate Gallican.

MORÉL, *Grand Dictionnaire historique* (Paris, 1759), quotes a letter from the Oratorian Bougerel (Paris, 1737), which gives a synopsis of Gibert's life; NICÉRON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres de la république des lettres* (Paris, 1727-), XI, 264; SCHULTE, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1880), II, 637.

A. BOUDINHON.

**Giberti, GIAN MATTEO**, Cardinal, and Bishop of Verona, the natural son of Francesco Giberti, a Genoese naval captain, b. at Palermo in 1495; d. at Verona, 30 Dec., 1543. In 1513 he was admitted to the household of Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, and advanced so rapidly in Latin and Greek that he soon became an eminent member of the "Accademia Romana". Later he was appointed the cardinal's secretary, and Leo X, with whom he had political dealings, valued his opinions and advice very highly. In 1521 he was chief intermediary with the envoy of Charles V. He used his great influence over the pope to protect and help struggling men of letters. The choicest intellects met

at his house. He led a severely religious life, and was a member of the *Sodalitium Divini Amoris* of St. Cajetan and Cardinal Caraffa. After his ordination to the priesthood, and the death of Leo X, he was sent by Cardinal Giulio, his patron, on a mission to Charles V, and returned to Rome with the new pope, Adrian VI. Clement VII immediately after his election made him Datario (1523), and in 1524, at the request of the Doge of Venice, he was appointed Bishop of Verona. Being obliged, against his will, to remain in Rome, he had himself represented at Verona by a very zealous vicar-general. Giberti was chosen a member of the Reform Committee decreed by the Fifth Lateran Council, but political events soon put an end to these labours. At Pavia (1525) he tried to make peace between Francis I and Charles V. It was at his prompting that Clement VII espoused the cause of France; the League of Cognac (22 May, 1526) was also his work. After the sack of Rome (1527) he was made to feel the vengeance of the Imperialists; being one of the hostages, he was put in prison and barely escaped death. He succeeded in making his escape, and went to Verona (1528) intending to devote himself entirely to the ruling of his diocese. He was done with politics, all the more because the pope had gone over to the imperial cause. However, he appeared from time to time in the Curia. Paul III recalled him to Rome for the work of the Reform Committee; among other missions he was sent to Trent to make preparations for the council. His wise and unwearying efforts to reform his diocese, whose clergy were in a deplorable state, were crowned with unhoped-for success. In that see Tridentine reforms were put in force long before the council assembled. St. Charles Borromeo, before taking charge of his see at Milan, wished to study Giberti's system at Verona, and chose as his vicar-general a priest from Verona trained in Giberti's school. His first aim was to improve the standard of ecclesiastical knowledge. In his own palace he set up a printing-press which turned out many splendid editions of the Greek Fathers, in whose writings he was very learned. He reformed the choir-school of Verona which had long been famous; for the instruction of the young he had printed the catechism known as "Dialogus", the work of Tullio Crispoldi (Rome, 1539). At Verona, moreover, he gathered around him a group of learned men to assist him in his efforts at reform. His complete works were edited by the famous scholars Pietro and Girolamo Ballerini ("Constitutiones Gibertine", "Costituzioni per le Monache", "Monitiones generales", "Edicta Selecta", "Lettere Scelte", etc., Verona, 1733, 1740), together with an appendix containing the story of his life, a "Dissertatio de restitutâ ante concilium Tridentinum per Jo. Matth. Giberti ecclesiasticâ disciplinâ", and two panegyrics, one in Latin by Fumani, the other in Italian by Castiglione.

DITTRICH in *Hist. Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* (1836), VII, 1-50; IDEM in *Kirchenlexikon*, V, 583 93; also the excellent account by PASTOR, *Gesch. der Papste*, IV (2), 609 sqq.

U. BENIGNI.

**Gibney, MATTHEW.** See PERTH, DIOCESE OF.

**Gibraltar, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.**—Gibraltar is a rugged promontory in the province of Andalusia, Spain, about 6 miles in circumference. Its almost perpendicular walls rise to a height of 1396 feet. The town is on the west side; on the north a narrow isthmus (neutral ground) connects the fortress with the mainland of Spain. The great rock itself is the ancient Mount Calpe, which with Abyla (Ceuta) constituted the famous Pillars of Hercules. In antiquity Gibraltar belonged in turn to the Phœnicians, Carthaginians, Romans, and Visigoths. Scipio took it from the Carthaginians, and it remained Roman territory until A. D. 412, when the Goths became masters of Spain. Being Arians, they built two churches of their faith in the vicinity of Calpe; one at San Rocco, the other, a chapel, on the rock itself. In 710 the Visigothic king-

dom in Spain, after an existence of 300 years, was torn with internal strife. Amid this dissension the Moors crossed from Africa, for the second time (711), under their leader Tarik-Ibn-Zeyad, who sent a detachment of soldiers to Mount Calpe, and had a castle built there, the ruins of which yet excite admiration. The mountain was thenceforth known as Gibel-Tarik, the mountain of Tarik, or Gibraltar. Thus began the Moorish conquest of Spain. Gibraltar was besieged, in 1309, and retaken from the Moors by Alonzo de Guzman. By 1462 it had sustained eight sieges, with varying fortune. The last of these was under Alonzo de Arcos, who captured it from the Moors in 1462, the surrender on this occasion taking place on 20 August, the feast of St. Bernard, in consequence of which he became the patron of Gibraltar. The Infante Don Alonzo gave the city and territory of Gibraltar to the Duke of Medina-Sidonia in absolute and perpetual possession for himself and his successors. Ferdinand and Isabella confirmed this gift, conferring on the Duke of Medina-Sidonia the title of Marquis of Gibraltar; at a later period, however, during the same reign, the place was annexed by the Crown.

During the War of the Spanish Succession, which began in 1701, Gibraltar was besieged (1704) by a squadron commanded by Sir George Rooke and a land force of 1800 English and Dutch under Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt; after three days the city was captured (24 July). The fortress had 100 cannon and ammunition, but a garrison of only 150 men; the inhabitants were reduced to 6000. After a bombardment of six hours the garrison surrendered.

Before a year had passed Spain endeavoured, with the help of France, to recapture Gibraltar. In this, the twelfth siege of Gibraltar, the attacking party had a great preponderance of numbers, but the fortress successfully resisted all their efforts to capture it. By a special decree of February, 1706, Queen Anne declared Gibraltar a free port. In 1713, by the Treaty of Utrecht, it became definitively a British possession, though many attempts were made by the Spaniards to regain it. The last siege, the fourteenth in its history, began 14 July, 1779, and continued for 3 years, 7 months, and 12 days. In April, 1782, the French and Spaniards again bombarded Gibraltar by land and sea, but without success. A peace was finally concluded by which Spain received the island of Minorca in place of Gibraltar. When the city was occupied by the English in 1704, the Spaniards carried away whatever they could and settled in the neighbouring district of San Rocco. Scarcely a dozen persons remained in Gibraltar. It was subsequently populated by people of every nation, especially by Genoese and Maltese, as is evident from the various family names. Spanish is generally spoken by the people, though English is the tongue of public administration.

The population (1908) numbers about 25,000, of whom 16,000 to 18,000 are Catholics; and the rest Jews, Protestants, etc. The garrison varies in number from 3,000 to 5,000 men. Gibraltar is ruled by special laws; has a military governor, an admiral, and a colonial secretary. The Anglican Bishop of Gibraltar does not reside there. Until 1806 Gibraltar belonged to the See of Cadiz. In that year it was made a vicariate Apostolic (since 1840 the vicar is always a titular bishop). The Catholic clergy number 11 secular priests and 5 religious. There are 8 churches and chapels; 3 religious houses for men and 4 for women, with a total of 28 and 61 members respectively. There is but one parish, though three of the churches have each a resident priest. Catholic elementary education is provided for by 6 boys' schools (1136) under the Christian Brothers and the Brothers of St. John of God, and 8 girls' schools (1126). There is also an institute for the higher education of boys (141) and two similar ones for girls (174). There are many other private institutions and schools, the most im-

portant of which is the Rook Academy under the direction of M. Sitman. The poor are cared for in 3 asylums, and there are 2 orphan asylums (65); for the aged, also, there is a house of the Little Sisters of the Poor. Guido Remigio Barbieri, a former Benedictine, born in 1836, was consecrated Bishop of Theodosiopolis and Vicar Apostolic of Gibraltar in 1901.

*Missiones Catholicae* (Rome, 1907), 73-74; *Statesman's Year-Book* (London, 1909); *English Catholic Directory* (London, 1909).

REMIGIO GUIDO BARBIERI.

**Gideon.** See GEDBON.

**Giffard**, BONAVENTURE, b. at Wolverhampton, England, 1642; d. at Hammersmith, Middlesex, 12 March, 1734; second son of Andrew Giffard, of Chillington, Staffordshire. His father, who married Catherine, daughter of Sir Walter Leveson, was slain in a skirmish near his own home, during the Civil War. Owing to the religious persecutions, Bona-venture was sent, with his younger brother Andrew, to Douai to be educated. From Douai, in October, 1667, he went to Paris to pursue his theological studies, and was ordained for the secular mission. Some years later, he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity at the Sorbonne. Having attracted the attention of King James II by his piety and learning, he was appointed preacher to the court. Religion had been in sore straits in England for the previous fifty years. Dr. Smith had been appointed vicar Apostolic of the whole country in 1625, but such was the persecution that he was forced to withdraw to France in 1631, where he remained till his death (1655). For nearly thirty years more his place in England remained unfilled; finally, in 1685, Dr. Leyburn was appointed to succeed him. Pope Innocent XI now entered into negotiations with James II; and, as a result, four vicariates were formed, Dr. Giffard being put in charge of the Midlands. He was consecrated bishop, at Whitehall, by the nuncio, on 22 April, 1688. In religious matters James II displayed too little prudence, and by his high-handed actions gave great offence to the Protestants. Not only did he compel the authorities of Magdalen College, Oxford, to accept Bishop Parker as their president; but, on Parker's death (1688), he had twelve Catholic fellows appointed, and made Dr. Giffard president, despite the fact that the college electors had selected a Protestant, John Hough. The king's nominee took up his residence there on 15 June, 1688. A storm of opposition arose, and he was ejected about five months later. The Revolution followed, and the bishop was seized and imprisoned at Newgate, where he remained nearly two years. He was released on bail, in 1690, and for more than twenty-four years led a perilous life, being frequently compelled to hide from the pursuivants. When Dr. Leyburn died, in 1703, Bishop Giffard was charged to look after his district, and from 1708 till 1713 he had to govern the Western vicariate as well. In this he was aided by his brother Andrew, his vicar-general, till the latter died, 14 Sept., 1714. Henry Howard was nominated as coadjutor to Dr. Giffard in 1720; but, as he died before his consecration, Benjamin Petre was appointed. The old bishop passed away fourteen years later, in 1734, at the age of ninety-two. He was buried beside his brother Andrew, in the churchyard of St. Pancras. A few of his sermons have been preserved, and many of his interesting letters were printed in the "Catholic Miscellany", in 1826 and 1827.

LINGARD, *History of England*, X (Dublin, 1849); BRADY, *Episcopal Succession*; GILLLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v. A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Giffard**, GODFREY, Bishop of Worcester, b. about 1235; d. 26 Jan., 1301. He was the son of Hugh Giffard of Boyton in Wiltshire, and Sybil, the daughter and coheir of Walter de Cormeilles. His

elder brother Walter became Archbishop of York (d. 1279). During the earlier part of his life his success was bound up with that of his brother. When in May, 1264, Walter was elected Bishop of Bath and Wells, Godfrey became canon and subsequently archdeacon of Wells; he also held many other benefices, although only in minor orders, and, as his enemies alleged, not learned. When in August, 1265, Walter became chancellor, Godfrey in 1266 was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer, with leave to appoint a substitute to act during his absence; and when in October, 1266, Walter was translated to York, Godfrey succeeded him as Chancellor of England, and received further benefices from the new Archbishop of York, becoming archdeacon of York and rector of Adlingfleet in 1267. When Bishop Nicholas of Ely was translated from the See of Worcester to that of Winchester, Godfrey was elected by the monks; he received the temporalities of his see in June, 1268. One of his first acts as bishop-elect was to obtain licence to continue the work, begun by Walter Cantelupe, of building and fortifying Hartlebury Castle, which has ever since been the principal palace of the bishops of Worcester. His consecration took place at Canterbury, 23 Sept., 1268, and his enthronement 25 December. During his chancellorship a parliament was held at Marlbridge (52. H. 3) where many useful laws were passed for restraining the abuse of distresses, regulating the incidence of tenure, and improving civil and criminal procedure; the knowledge of general jurisprudence they display is remarkable, and if he did not frame them himself, he deserves credit for having had the wit to employ the superior men who did. He continued in office as chancellor until 28 Oct., 1269, when he handed over the seal to the king.

As bishop Giffard devoted himself to the care of his diocese which he ruled for nearly thirty-four years. In the course of those years two affairs caused him considerable trouble: the disputes with the monks of Worcester cathedral, and that with Malvern Priory. The Worcester feud lasted down to the bishop's death, and reached such a height that when, in 1300, Archbishop Winchelsey visited the priory, the monks presented a formal accusation against the bishop containing thirty-six articles of varying importance to which Giffard's satisfactory answers are still extant. The quarrel appears to date from 1288 when the monks considered that the rights of the church of Worcester had been infringed by the bishop's refusal to allow their precentor to summon those who were to be ordained at an ordination at Westbury. The feeling aroused was intensified by the bishop's attempt, in 1288, to annex the churches in his gift to the prebends in the church of Westbury. This was eventually decided in the bishop's favour in the Arches Court in 1297. Relations were, moreover, strained because of the unwillingness of the priory to admit the bishop's visitations. The difficulty with the priory at Great Malvern was even more complicated. The cause was a claim made by the priory to be independent of the bishops of Worcester, and dependent upon the Abbot of Westminster. The relations between the two houses had been settled in 1217. Giffard's predecessors had had continual trouble with the same priory. The present struggle with Richard of Ware, Abbot of Westminster lasted from 1279 until 1283 and was not really ended then. The climax was reached in September, 1282, when Giffard, as visitor, at the request of some of the monks, deposed the unworthy prior, William of Ledbury. A violent conflict followed, full of incidents, appeals, and counter-appeals and finally the king had to intervene to bring about a compromise.

Besides building the castle at Hartlebury, and rebuilding the church there, Giffard built magnificent mansions at Wick and Alvechurch. Moreover he

ornamented the eastern part of the cathedral with the small columns of marble having joints of gilded brass, which form one of the most graceful characteristics of the present choir and Lady chapel. Even after retiring from the chancellorship he is still found exercising judicial functions, as when, in 1272, with Roger Mortimer he enquired into the injuries done by the townspeople of Oxford to the scholars; and, in 1278, he was at the head of the justices itinerant for the counties of Hereford, Hertford, and Kent. He was buried on 4 Feb. in his cathedral church (Ann. Monast., IV, 551).

THOMAS, *Antiquitates prioratus majoris Malvernæ in agro Wiceniensi, cum chartis originalibus easdem illustrantibus, ex registris Sedis Episcopalis Wigorniensis* (London, 1725); IDEM, *A Survey of the Cathedral Church of Worcester, with an Account of the Bishops thereof* (London, 1736), 135-145; *Annales Monastici*, ed. LUARD in R. S. (London, 1869), IV; *Registrum Episcoporum J. Peckham*, ed. MARTIN in R. S. (London, 1884), II; TOUT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; SMITH and ONSLOW, *Diocesan Histories: Worcester* (London, 1883).

EDWARD MYERS.

**Giffard, WILLIAM**, second Norman Bishop of Winchester from 1100 to 1129. Little is known of his history anterior to his episcopate, except that he was successively canon and dean of Rouen, and ably filled the office of chancellor to William the Conqueror (d. 1087), William Rufus (d. 1100), and Henry I. Since the death of Bishop Walkelin in 1098, no appointment had been made to the See of Winchester during the remaining two years of the reign of Rufus, and the revenues were appropriated by the king. The very first act of Henry I (Stubbs, "Const. Hist." Oxford, 1891-5, I, 329), after his election as king at Winchester, in Aug., 1100, was to give a token of his goodwill to the Church by filling the See of Winchester, and he caused William Giffard, who was still only a deacon, to be duly elected bishop. Henry may have wished to provide himself with a strong supporter in the episcopal body, but, from the first, William would appear to have realized that the points at issue between the king and the Church had become part of the great European quarrel of investitures, and declined to accept the pastoral staff from the king's hands. At the moment, the support of churchmen was necessary to assure Henry's position; he was too prudent to force the acceptance of the sacred symbol, and Giffard was immediately invested with the temporalities of the see. It only remained to arrange for his consecration. Meanwhile St. Anselm had returned from exile, and, strengthened by the decision of the council held at the Vatican in 1099, declined to become the *homo* of a layman.

An uneasy time followed, and embassies were sent to Rome. As bishop-elect, Giffard assisted at the council held at Westminster, 20 Sept., 1102. In spite of his agreement with Anselm, Henry invested the Bishops-Elect of Salisbury and Hereford, and requested Anselm to consecrate them. Anselm was willing to consecrate Giffard, but in spite of the king's repeated insistence declined to consecrate the others. Gerard of York having undertaken to do so, one of the bishops-elect returned his crosier; the consecration ceremony of the remaining two had already begun when Giffard, conscience-stricken, declined to take further part in it. The king failed to intimidate him and he was sent into exile, and his goods confiscated. He had a constant friend and adviser in St. Anselm, and when the latter set out for Rome in April, 1103, Giffard went with him. Anselm's long stay at Lyons began about Christmas, 1103. In the meantime Giffard had been allowed to come back to England, for in 1105 he signed, together with the bishops, the petition begging Anselm to return. Eventually a compromise was effected, Anselm returned 1 Aug., 1107; the realities of feudal homage were retained, but the special form of the gift of ring and crosier was given up by the king. Giffard, who had been ordained priest quietly the day before, was consecrated by Anselm on 11 Aug., 1107.

He regained Henry's confidence and acted for him in several matters of ecclesiastical interest. As Bishop of Winchester one of his first duties was to act as chief commissioner in the completion of the Domesday Record of Winchester, that royal city having been omitted from the Domesday of the Conqueror. In 1110 he negotiated with the king and the community the removal of the so-called "New Minster" (or St. Grimbald's Abbey) founded by King Alfred, which stood in very inconvenient proximity to the cathedral on the north side, to a new site outside the city, under the name of Hyde Abbey.

Eventually this led to serious difficulties with the monks of the cathedral community, in consequence of the bishop's having alienated certain revenues which they conceived to belong to them. The difficulty culminated in 1122 in a strange symbolical pageant by the monks, and the interference of the king. Peace was made, and the bishop grew more and more attached to the community, spending most of his time among them, taking his meals with them, wearing the cowl, and eventually dying in their infirmary. The Canons Regular of St. Augustine were welcomed to England by him and a home was found for them at St. Mary Overy's (now St. Saviour's) in Southwark; near their stately church he built the town-house of the Bishops of Winchester. To him also belongs the honour of having given a first home in England to the monks of the Cistercian Order, by establishing, in Nov., 1128, the abbey of Waverley, near Farnham, in Surrey, a filiation of L'Aumône in the Diocese of Chartres. He died on 25 Jan., 1129, and was buried in the nave of his cathedral church near his predecessor Walkelin.

VENABLES in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* indicates the chief original sources; MILNER, *Winchester* (Husenbeth's ed., Winchester, s. d.), I, 153-6; II, 130, 243; RUIJL, *Life and Times of St. Anselm* (London, 1883), II, 229, 253; STEPHENS, *A History of the English Church* (London, 1904), II, vii; STEPHENS and CAFES, *The Bishops of Winchester* (Winchester, 1907), pt. II, 5-9.

EDWARD MYERS.

**Gifford, WILLIAM**, Archbishop of Reims; b. in Hampshire, 1554; d. at Reims, 11 April, 1629. He was the son of John Gifford, Esquire, of Weston-under-Edge, Gloucestershire, and Elizabeth, daughter of Sir George Throckmorton, Knight, of Coughton, Warwickshire (Wood, "Athen. Oxon.", below). He was sent to Oxford in 1569, where he was entrusted to the care of John Bridgewater, President of Lincoln College, who was a Catholic at heart. Gifford remained at Oxford for about four years, part of which time he spent in the celebrated boarding school kept by the Catholic physician Etheridge, whither he had been removed on the compulsory retirement of Bridgewater for refusal to conform. After this period, Gifford, accompanied by his tutor, proceeded to Louvain (1573), resumed there his studies, and took the degree of M.A. (Athen. Oxon.). After having also obtained his baccalaureate in theology on the completion of a four years' course in that science under Bellarmine, Gifford was forced to quit Louvain owing to the disturbances in the Low Countries. Proceeding thence, he pursued his ecclesiastical studies at Paris, at Reims, which he visited (1577) at the invitation of Dr. Allen, and at the English College at Rome, of which he was admitted a member on 15 Sept., 1579 [Foley, "Records of the English Province", etc., VI (London, 1880), 139; but compare statement there given as to age with date of birth above]. Having been ordained priest in March, 1582 (Foley, "Records", loc. cit.), he was recalled to Reims by Allen as professor of theology at the English College ("Douay Diaries", infra: *Diarium Primum*, 11; *Diarium Secundum*, 189—note statement as to age). The degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on him in December of 1584 at Pont-à-Mousson in Lorraine, after which, returning to Reims, Gifford taught theology at intervals for nearly twelve years.

On Allen's elevation to the cardinalate, Gifford



accompanied him to Rome in the capacity of chaplain, and it is said that during this visit he resided for a time in the household of St. Charles Borromeo. About this time (1597) Gifford was preferred to the deanery of Lille, which office Clement VIII conferred on him at the instance, it is alleged, of the Archbishop of Milan. This dignity he retained for about ten years, and, after his withdrawal from Lille (c. 1606), he was made "rector magnificus" of Reims University. In 1608, Gifford, who had always held the Benedictines in high esteem and befriended them in many ways, took the habit of that order and subsequently became prior at Dieulouard (Dieulewart). In 1611, Father Gabriel of St. Mary, as Gifford was known in religion, went into Brittany and laid the foundation of a small community of his order at St. Malo. He was favourably received by the bishop, and a chair of divinity was assigned to him (Petre, op. cit. infra). He was one of the nine definitors chosen in 1617 to arrange the terms of union among the Benedictine congregations in England, of which province he was elected first president in May of the same year. In 1618, Gifford was succeeded coadjutor to Cardinal Louis de Lorraine, Archbishop of Reims, with the title of *Episcopus Archidialis* (Bishop of Archidal). On the death of Guise, he succeeded to the archbishopric, becoming also, by virtue of his office, Duke of Reims and First Peer of France.

Before his death, which occurred in 1629, he had acquired a high reputation as a preacher. His writings include: "Oratio Funebris in exequiis venerabilis viri domini Maxemiliani Manare præpositi ecclesiæ D. Petri oppidi Insulensis" (Douai, 1598); "Orationes diversæ" (Douai); "Calvino-Turcismus", etc. (Antwerp, 1597 and 1603). The latter work, begun by Dr. Reynolds, Gifford completed and edited. He translated from the French of Fronto-Duceus, S. J., "The Inventory of Errors, Contradictions, and false Citations of Philip Mornay, Lord of Plessis and Mornay". He also wrote, at the request of the Duke of Guise, a treatise in favour of the League. The "Sermones Adventuales" (Reims, 1625) were a Latin rendering by Gifford of discourses originally delivered in French. He assisted Dr. Anthony Champney in his "Treatise on the Protestant Ordinations" (Douai, 1616); other of Gifford's MSS. were destroyed in the burning of the monastery at Dieulouard in 1717.

WOOD, *Athenæ Oxoniensis*, ed. BLISS, II (London, 1815), col. 453 sqq., essays an orderly narration of the events in Gifford's life; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; *Records of the English Catholics, I—Douay Diaries* (London, 1878), *passim*; GILLow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v. Giffard; PETRE, *Notices of the Eng. Colleges and Convents on the Continent*, etc. (Norwich, 1849), 28, 30 sqq.; MARLOT, *Histoire de Rheims*, IV (1846), 450, 535 sqq.; SNOW, *Benedictine Chronology*, 37; DUTHILLEUL, *Bibliographie Douaisienne* (Douai, 1842), 46-47 (no. 119); LEWIS OWEN, *Running Register* (1626), 91; FITS, *De Angliæ Scriptoribus*, 809; GARDINER, *History of England*, I, 140; WELDON, *Chron. Notes*, 105, 159. For a more intimate insight into certain phases of Gifford's character, see BUTLER in *The Month*, CIII (1904); POLLEN, *ibid.* (1904); KNOX, *Letters of Card. Allen* (1882); private documents and letters, some of which are published in the *Appendix Documentorum Inædutorum (Douay Diaries)*, xxii (326), lxi (395), etc.; and DODD, *Church Hist. of England*, ed. TIERNEY (London, 1839), II.

P. J. MACAULEY,

**Gift**, SUPERNATURAL, may be defined as something conferred on nature that is above all the powers (*vires*) of created nature. When God created man, He was not content with bestowing upon him the essential endowments required by man's nature. He raised him to a higher state, adding certain gifts to which his nature had no claim. They comprise qualities and perfections, forces and energies, dignities and rights, destination to final objects, of which the essential constitution of man is not the principle; which are not required for the attainment of the final perfection of the natural order of man; and which can only be communicated by the free operation of God's goodness and power. Some of these are absolutely supernatural,

i.e. beyond the reach of all created nature (even of the angels), and elevate the creature to a dignity and perfection natural to God alone; others are only relatively supernatural (preternatural), i.e. above human nature only, and elevate human nature to that state of higher perfection which is natural to the angels. The original state of man comprised both of these, and when he fell he lost both. Christ has restored to us the absolutely supernatural gifts, but the preternatural gifts He has not restored.

The absolutely supernatural gifts, which alone are the supernatural properly so called, are summed up in the Divine adoption of man to be the son and heir of God. This expression, and the explanations given of it by the sacred writers, make it evident that the sonship is something far more than a relation founded upon the absence of sin; it is of a thoroughly intimate character, raising the creature from its naturally humble estate, and making it the object of a peculiar benevolence and complaisance on God's part, admitting it to filial love, and enabling it to become God's heir, i.e. a partaker of God's own beatitude. "God sent his Son . . . that he might redeem them who were under the law: that we might receive the adoption of sons (*τὴν υἱοθεσίαν*). And because you are sons, God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying: Abba, Father. Therefore now he is (Gr. text: thou art) not a servant, but a son. And if a son, an heir also through God" (Gal., iv, 4-7) "Who hath blessed us with [all] spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ . . . Who hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children (*υἱοθεσίαν*) through Jesus Christ unto himself" (Eph., i, 3-5). "Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called, and should be the sons of God" (I John, iii, 1). Further, this exalted estate is described as a communication or partnership with the only-begotten Son of God, a participation in the privileges which are peculiar to Him in opposition to mere creatures. "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us. . . . And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as we also are one: I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one" (John, xvii, 21-23). It is also styled *fellowship* (*κοινωνία*) "with the Father, and with his Son" (I John, i, 3); and "the communication (*ἡ κοινωνία*) of the Holy Ghost" (II Cor., xiii, 13). Divine adoption is a new birth of the soul (John, i, 12, 13; iii, 5; I John, iii, 9; v, 1; I Pet., i, 3; and i, 23; James, i, 18; Titus, iii, 5; Eph., ii, 5). This regeneration implies the foundation of a higher state of being and life, resulting from a special Divine influence, and admitting us to the dignity of sons of God. "For whom he foreknew, he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son; that he might be the firstborn amongst many brethren" (Rom., viii, 29). Cf. also II Cor., iii, 18; Gal., iii, 26, 27; iv, 19; Rom., xiii, 14. As a consequence of this Divine adoption and new birth we are made "partakers of the divine nature" (*θελας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, II Pet., i, 4). The whole context of this passage and the passages already quoted show that this expression is to be taken as literally as possible; not, indeed, as a generation from the substance of God, but as a communication of Divine life by the power of God, and a most intimate indwelling of His substance in the creature. Hence, too, the inheritance is not confined to natural goods. It embraces the possession and fruition of the good which is the natural inheritance of the Son of God, viz., the beatific vision. "We are now the sons of God; and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know, that, when he shall appear, we shall be like to him: because we shall see him as he is" (I John, iii, 2). "We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then [in the beatific vision] face to face" (I Cor., xiii, 12). The Fathers have not hesitated to call this super-

natural union of the creature with God the *deification* of the creature. This is a favourite expression of St. Irenaeus ("Adv. Hær." III, xvii, xix; IV, xx, etc.), and is frequently used by St. Athanasius (see Newman, "St. Athanasius", II, 88). See also St. Augustine (? Serm. cxi, "In Nat. Dom."), quoted by St. Thomas (III, Q. i, a. 3).

In order to live worthy of our Divine dignity and to attain our Divine end, we stand in need of supernatural aid. This supernatural aid to a supernatural end is called *grace* (q. v.). For our present purpose it will be sufficient to note that grace is either habitual (i. e. sanctifying, making us pleasing to God) or actual (i. e. enabling us to produce works deserving of salvation). There are other aids sometimes bestowed less for our own benefit than for the benefit of others. These are called *gratiae gratis datæ* (*charismata*, q. v.). They do not directly and immediately help to the attainment of our end, but assist as it were from without. The theological virtues and the moral virtues are graces properly so called. So, too, are the gifts of the Holy Ghost (see HOLY GHOST).

It may be well here to say a few words on the preternatural (relatively supernatural) gifts bestowed on our first parents, which are sometimes confused with the supernatural gifts properly so called. In the beginning God exempted man from the inherent weakness of his nature, i. e. the infirmities of the flesh and the consequent infirmities of the spirit. He made man immortal, impassible, free from concupiscence and ignorance, sinless, and lord of the earth. These privileges are beyond man's nature, but not beyond that of some higher creature (e. g. the angels); hence they are preternatural (*præter naturam*). The Fathers look upon them as a glorification of nature, applying the words of Ps. viii, 5-9. In point of fact these gifts were not conferred apart from the supernatural gifts; a preternatural state is, however, conceivable, and the separability of the two sets of gifts is clear from our now possessing the supernatural without the preternatural gifts. "Although distinct and separable, yet integrity and grace, when bestowed together, unite into one harmonious and organic whole. The Fathers look upon this union in the original state of man as an anticipation of his state of final beatitude in the vision of God, so that grace bears to integrity the same relation which the future glory of the soul bears to the future glory of the body. Integrity and grace, when combined, elevate man to the most perfect likeness with God attainable in this life; they dispose and prepare him for the still more complete likeness of eternal life."

RIPALDA, *De Ente Supernaturali*, lib. I, disp. i (Paris, 1871); SCHRADER, *De Triplici Ordine* (Vienna, 1864); PALMIERI, *De Gratia* (Gulpen, 1885); WILHELM and SCANNELL, *Manual of Catholic Theology*, I, 428 sqq. (3rd ed., London, 1906); SCHEEBEN, *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*, II, 240 sqq.; ULLATHORNE, *The Endowments of Man* (3rd ed., London, 1888); and the various works mentioned in the articles referred to in the text.

T. B. SCANNELL.

**Gift of Constantine.** See DONATION OF CONSTANTINE.

**Gift of Tongues.** See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

**Gifts of the Holy Ghost.** See HOLY GHOST.

**Gilbert**, NICOLAS-JOSEPH-LAURENT, poet, b. at Fontenoy-le-Château, 1751; d. at Paris, 12 November, 1780. His parents were poor farmers. He pursued his studies at the Collège de l'Arc at Dôle, where the professor of literature boasted of having made poets of all his pupils except Gilbert. Upon leaving college in 1769, he settled at Nancy and tried to open a public course in literature. In 1772 he competed unsuccessfully for a prize at the French Academy. In 1774 he went to Paris, where Fréron won for him the favour of the archbishop. Young and unknown, he had the courage to oppose the triumphant and all-powerful

chiefs of the philosophical party. Although there is a little juvenile audacity in the fury of his attacks, the sincerity of his religious convictions cannot be doubted. He died of brain fever caused by a fall from his horse. His enemies reported that he died insane; his partisans claimed that he died in misery at the hospital. Neither report is true. After the accident which caused his death, he was taken to the Hôtel-Dieu, but was soon removed to his own house, where he died. The story of his poverty is untrue, for at the time of his death he was drawing three pensions, which constituted for that time a rather large income. Gilbert's works consist of a Persian novel, "*Les familles de Darius et d'Eridame*" (Paris, 1770), a satire in prose, "*Le carnaval des auteurs*" (Paris, 1773), a few odes, and satires. Three pieces, one ode and two satires, have given him a lasting reputation: the "*Ode imitée de plusieurs psaumes*" (1788), usually known under the title of "*Adieux à la vie*", struck the first personal and melancholy notes which were the characteristic of the Romantic school; in the satires "*Le dix-huitième siècle*" (1775) and "*Mon apologie*" (1778) there is a force, movement, and eloquence which one does not find elsewhere in the poetry of that time. He vigorously opposes the manners of the time and castigates the philosophers and the Academy. His words are those of a man who writes with freedom, emotion, and sincerity, though his style is not always equal to the thought.

PÉTTIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature françaises* (Paris, 1898), VI; GIDEL, *Histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1898), III.

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

**Gilbert**, SIR JOHN THOMAS, Irish archivist and historian, b. in Dublin, 23 January, 1829; d. there, 23 May, 1898. He was the son of John Gilbert, an English Protestant, Portuguese consul, at Dublin, and Marianne, an Irish Catholic, daughter of Henry Costello. From her the future historian inherited his ardent patriotism, which was surpassed only by a deep spirit of religion which characterized him through life. His early days were spent at Brackstown, Meath. He was educated at Dublin, and at Prior Park, near Bath, England. He received no university training, as his mother preferred to sacrifice that rather than allow his faith to be imperilled in the Protestant University of Dublin. In 1846 his family moved to Blackrock, a suburb of the Irish metropolis, where he resided till his death, fifty-two years later.

From his boyhood, he manifested a decided taste for history and archaeology. When only nineteen, he was elected to the Council of the Celtic Society, and thus became associated with some of the famous writers and orators of the age, Butt, Duffy, Ferguson, Mitchell, O'Hagan, and Smith O'Brien. In 1851 appeared his essay, "*Historical Literature of Ireland*". Four years later he became a Member of the Royal Irish Academy, and secretary of the Irish Archaeological Society, among whose members were O'Curry, O'Donovan, Graves, Todd, and Wilde. In 1854-9 he published his "*History of the City of Dublin*" in 3 vols., a work of remarkable erudition, which placed him among the greatest historians of the country. In 1863 his "*History and Treatment of the Public Records of Ireland*" caused considerable sensation by demonstrating to the government the futility of entrusting the publication of Irish State documents to men unskilled in the language and history of the nation. From this time till his death his pen was never idle, and he filled the most important posts in all the historical and antiquarian societies. He was librarian of the Royal Irish Academy for thirty-four years. In 1891 he married the brilliant Irish novelist, Rosa Mulholland. He received the honorary degree of LL.D. from the Royal University in 1892, and five years later was knighted for his services to archaeology and history. In addition to the works already men-

tioned, his most important writings are the "History of the Viceroy of Ireland" (1865), "Calendar of the Ancient Records of Dublin" (7 vols., 1889-98); "History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland, 1641-9" (7 vols., 1882-91); "Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland, 1688-91" (1892). Celtic scholars are indebted to him for the photographic reproductions of the celebrated ancient Irish MSS., for the establishment of the Todd lectureship in Celtic, and also for editions of "Leabhar na h-Uidhre" and "Leabhar Breac."

LIFE by ROSA MULHOLLAND GILBERT (London, 1905); FALKNER in *Dic. Nat. Biog.*

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Gilbert de la Porrée** (GILBERTUS PORRETANUS), Bishop of Poitiers, philosopher, theologian and general scholar; b. at Poitiers in 1076; d. in 1154; studied under Hilary in Poitiers, under Bernard of Chartres at the famous school there, and finally under Anselm at Laon, where he probably first met Peter Abelard. Returning later to Chartres, he taught philosophy and the arts there for about fifteen years, receiving a canonry and holding at intervals the office of chancellor of the school. He was present at the Council of Sens (1141), at which Abelard was censured. The following year we find him teaching in Paris, with John of Salisbury among his pupils; but only for a brief space, for in 1142 he became Bishop of Chartres. His high character for learning and ecclesiastical zeal seems to have won for him the universal respect and veneration of his contemporaries. But his teaching regarding the Blessed Trinity involved him in trouble for a time. Two of his own archdeacons, alarmed at its novelty, reported it to Eugene III, and induced St. Bernard to oppose Gilbert's doctrines in the pope's presence at the Councils of Paris (1147) and Reims (1148). The dispute ended amicably without any very definite issue. Gilbert died universally regretted in the year 1154.

He lived and taught during the critical epoch when the great scholastic synthesis, both in philosophy and in theology, was just beginning to take shape. The principles, methods, and doctrines of purely rational research were being extended from philosophy to theology and applied—often rashly, as with Abelard—to the elucidation of revealed truth. Aristotle's philosophy was finding its way through Moorish and Jewish channels into the Christian schools of Europe, gradually to supplant Platonic influences there, and the discussion of the great central problem of the validity of knowledge—the controversy on the Universals, as it was then called—was waxing warm and vehement. Gilbert's place among his contemporaries was a leading and honoured one; while his philosophical writings secured for him a fame that long survived him. In his "Liber Sex Principiorum" he explained the last six categories of Aristotle, the latter having treated expressly only the first four. The work immediately took its place as a scholastic textbook, side by side with the "Isagoge" and the "Categories", and was studied and expounded for three centuries in the medieval schools. His "Commentary on the Four Books of Boethius", especially on the two "De Trinitate", contain those applications of his doctrine on the Universals which for a time brought his orthodoxy under suspicion.

Gilbert's attitude on the controverted question of the Universals has been very variously interpreted: as ontological realism (Prantl), empiric realism (Clerval, Zigliara), moderate realism ill-defined (de Wulf, Turner). The latter is, perhaps, nearest to the truth. Gilbert's doctrine, like that of Abelard, is an attempt, though only partially successful, to repudiate the extreme realism of the epoch, with its pantheistic tendencies. The universal concept (of the *genus* or class) has corresponding to it in the world of sense a number of similar singular objects. This similarity is, however, explained by Gilbert in a way that brings

it quite near identity. The created essence (*forma nativa*, *eidōs*) of the individual member of a class is a copy of the Divine exemplar, "singularis in singularibus, sed in omnibus universalis" (John of Salisbury, *Metal.*, II, xvii). He means that the *forma nativa* is not really (numerically) one and the same in *omnibus*, but only conceptually, i. e. by the consideration of the mind; so much is fairly evident from another reference of his to "universalia . . . quæ ab ipsis individuis humana ratio quodammodo abstrahit" (P. L., LXIV, 1374). Yet there are grounds for supposing that he attributed to the *forma nativa*, as it is in the individual, the universality of the logical concept. In the actual individual he distinguishes between the common or class essence which he calls *subsistentia*, e. g. "humanity" or "human nature" in the abstract, and that which makes it an existing individual and which he calls *substantia*, e. g. "Plato". This process of objectifying and dividing off the ab-



GILBERT DE LA PORRÉE AND PUPILS  
XII Century MS., Valenciennes Library

stract from the concrete, in the individual, he carried so far as to allege that in it "universality" was a distinct *subsistentia*, different from "singularity", and that the "unity" of the individual was a *subsistentia* distinct from the individual which it made "one". He thus mistook mental distinctions for real; and he carried his error into theology. Between God and His Divinity, the Father and His Paternity, the Son and His Sonship, the Holy Ghost and His Procession, the Divine Persons and the Divine Nature, he saw a distinction which is really due to our human way of grasping reality—as a concrete embodying an abstract, a singular containing a universal, an essence determined by an existence—but which Gilbert, with his Platonizing tendency to model the ontological upon the logical, conceived to be due to a division and plurality in the Godhead Itself. This was an excessive reaction against the Pantheism which would submerge all the real distinctions of things in an identity with one indivisible Divine existence.

Gilbert's "Liber Sex Principiorum" and his "Commentary on Boethius" are in P. L., CLXXXIV and LXIV. He also left numerous commentaries on various books of the Old and New Testaments. A philosophical work called "Liber de Causis", sometimes attributed to him, is in reality an abridged Latin translation, through the Arabic, of the "Elevatio Theologica" of Proclus, a Greek Neo-Platonist of the fifth century.

BERTHAUD, *Gilbert de la Porrée* (Paris, 1892); CLERVAL, *Les Ecoles de Chartres au moyen âge* (Paris, 1905); POOLE, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought* (London, 1884); DE WULF, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* (Louvain and Paris, 1895); TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903).

P. COFFEY.

**Gilbert Foliot**, Bishop of London, b. early in the twelfth century of an Anglo-Norman family and connected with the earls of Hereford; d. at London in 1186. He became a monk at Cluny in France, where he rose to the rank of prior; then he was abbot at Abbeville, and later at Gloucester. He became Bishop of Hereford in 1147. As abbot and bishop he took an important part in ecclesiastical and national affairs, was a supporter of Empress Matilda and a confidential adviser of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1163 he was transferred to the Bishopric of London, though such a translation was very exceptional at the time; but he received the support of Becket and the special consent of Alexander III. Foliot was a man of learning and eloquence and a good administrator. The austerity of his life was almost too widely known. However, in the great struggle for the rights of the Church between Henry II and St. Thomas of Canterbury he definitely took the king's side. In the stormy scenes at Clarendon and Northampton and during the prolonged negotiations of the years of St. Thomas's exile, his name is foremost among the opponents of his archbishop; and he was one of the prelates who, by their remonstrances against a renewed excommunication in 1170, brought about indirectly St. Thomas's martyrdom. It may be true that Gilbert was opposed to Becket's personality and methods more than to his aims, but Henry II would have been more than a match for a diplomatic bishop. A king who combined to such an extent intelligence and passion could have been checked only by a wave of popular enthusiasm. (See THOMAS BECKET, SAINT).

Gilbert Foliot's name appears on nearly every page of the Becket controversy and reference must be made to the bibliography of St. Thomas.

The treatment of Foliot's character is particularly full in L'HUILIER, *St Thomas de Cantorbéry*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1891); see also PERRY in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XIX, 358 sqq.

F. F. URQUHART.

**Gilbertines**, ORDER OF, founded by St. Gilbert, about the year 1130, at Sempringham, Gilbert's native place, where he was then parish priest. His wish originally had been to found a monastery, but finding this impossible, he gave a rule of life to the seven young women whom as children he had taught at Sempringham, and built for them a convent and cloister to the north of his parish church. He received the support of his bishop, Alexander of Lincoln, and in a year's time the seven virgins of Sempringham made their profession. Gilbert seems to have been determined to copy the Cistercians as much as possible. At the suggestion of William, Abbot of Rievaulx, he instituted lay sisters to attend to the daily wants of the nuns, and soon added a company of lay brothers to do the rougher work in the farms and fields. These he recruited from among the poorest serfs of his parish and estates. For eight years the little community at Sempringham continued to flourish, and it was not till about 1139 that the infant order was increased by another foundation. Alexander of Lincoln gave to the nuns of Sempringham the island of Haverholm, near Sleaford, in Lincolnshire, the site of one of his castles destroyed in the contest between King Stephen

and his barons. Alexander's deed of gift makes it clear that the nuns had by this time adopted the Cistercian rule "as far as the weakness of their sex allowed". The fame of Sempringham soon spread far and wide through that part of England, and the convent sent out several colonies to people new foundations. In 1148 Gilbert travelled to Cîteaux in Burgundy to ask the Cistercian abbots there assembled in chapter to take charge of his order. This they refused to do, declining to undertake the government of women, and so Gilbert returned to England, determined to add to each of his convents a community of canons regular, who were to act as chaplains and spiritual directors to the nuns. To these he gave the Rule of St. Augustine. Each Gilbertine house now practically consisted of four communities, one of nuns, one of canons, one of lay sisters, and one of lay brothers. The popularity of the order was considerable, and for two years after Gilbert's return from France he was continually founding new houses on lands granted him by the nobles and prelates. These houses, with the exception of Watton and Malton, which were in Yorkshire, were situated in Lincolnshire, in the low-lying country of the fens. Thirteen houses were founded in St. Gilbert's life, four of which were for men only.

The habit of the Gilbertine canons consisted of a black tunic reaching to the ankles, covered with a white cloak and hood, which were lined with lamb's wool. The nuns were in white, and during the winter months were allowed to wear in choir a tippet of sheepskin and a black cap lined with white wool. The scapular was worn both by the canons and the nuns. The whole order was ruled by the "master", or prior general, who was not Prior of Sempringham, but was called "Prior of All". His authority was absolute, and the year formed for him a continual round of visitations to the various houses. He appointed to the chief offices, received the profession of novices, affixed his seal to all charters, etc., and gave or withheld his consent regarding sales, transfers, and the like. He was to be chosen by the general chapter, which could depose him if necessary. This general chapter assembled once a year, at Sempringham, on the rogation days, and was attended by the prior, cellarer, and prioress of each house.

St. Gilbert, soon finding the work of visitations too arduous, ordained that certain canons and nuns should assist him. These also appeared at the general chapter. A "priest of confession" was chosen to visit each house and to act as confessor extraordinary. A Gilbertine monastery had only one church; this was divided unevenly by a wall, the main part of the building being for the nuns, the lesser part, to the south, for the canons. These had access to the nuns' part only for the celebration of Mass. The nunnery lay to the north, the dwellings of the canons were usually to the south. At Sempringham itself, and at Watton, we find them at some distance to the north-east. The number of canons to be attached to each nunnery was fixed by St. Gilbert at seven. The chief difficulty Gilbert experienced was the government of the lay brothers. They were mostly rough and untamed spirits who needed the control and guidance of a firm man, and it would have been surprising had there been no cases of insubordination and scandal among them. Two instances especially claim our attention. The first is related by St. Ælred, Abbot of Rievaulx, and gives us an unpleasant story of a girl at Watton Priory who had been sent there to be brought up by the nuns; the second was an open revolt, for a time successful, of some of the lay brothers at Sempringham.

From their foundation till the dissolution of the monasteries the Crown showed great favour to the Gilbertines. They were the only purely English order and owed allegiance to no foreign superiors as did the Cluniacs and Cistercians. All the Gilbertine houses

were situated in England, except two which were in Westmeath, Ireland. Notwithstanding the liberal charters granted by Henry II and his successors, the order had fallen into great poverty by the end of the fifteenth century. Henry VI exempted all its houses from payments of every kind—an exemption which could not and did not bind his successors. Heavy sums had occasionally to be paid to the Roman Curia, and expenses were incurred in suits against the real or pretended encroachments of the bishops. By the time of the Dissolution there were twenty-six houses. They fared no better than the other monasteries, and no resistance whatever was made by the last Master of Sempringham, Robert Holgate, Bishop of Llandaff, a great favourite at court, who was promoted in 1545 to the Archbishopric of York. The Gilbertines are described as surrendering “of their own free will”, each of the nuns and canons receiving “a reasonable yearly pension”. Only four of their houses were ranked among the greater monasteries as having an income above £200 a year, and as the order appears to have preserved to the end the plainness and simplicity in church plate and vestments enjoined by St. Gilbert, the Crown did not reap a rich harvest by its suppression.

For bibliography see the article on GILBERT, SAINT; also GASQUET, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (London, 1899); P. L. CXCIV; HÉLYOT, *Histoire des ordres religieux*, II (Paris, 1792); FLOYD, *An Extinct Religious Order and Its Founder in The Catholic World*, LXII (New York, 1896).

R. URBAN BUTLER.

**Gilbert Islands**, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, comprises the group of that name, besides the islands of Ellice and Panapa. The most important members of the group, which consists of sixteen low atolls, are Tapiteuca, Arorai, Apemama, Maiana, Marakei, and Nonouti, which cluster near the Equator, and constitute the most easterly link in the chain of islands which make up Micronesia. The natives are of Malay in type, and until the advent of the white man were given over to savagery and, in some instances, cannibalism. Nominally under the protection of Great Britain, the islands are practically self-governed, and a sort of republicanism prevails. The principal industry is the preparation and exportation of copra, which is very plentiful, although there is some little traffic in shark fins.

Upon the partition of the Vicariate of Micronesia, the Gilbert Islands were erected into an independent vicariate by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, dated 17 July, 1897, and the present vicar Apostolic, Mgr. Joseph Leray, titular Bishop of Remesiana, was placed at its head, and, with several missionary priests from the Congregation of the Sacred Heart, he entered upon the evangelization of the islands. The population of the vicariate is estimated at between 30,000 and 40,000, of whom 14,000 are Catholics. There are 12 churches and 56 chapels under the care of 19 priests, 96 parochial schools, with an attendance of 1700 boys and 1500 girls, 2 schools for catechists with a combined attendance of 50, 12 orphanages which shelter 400 orphans, 11 houses of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart, with 35 religious, and 8 houses of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart with 20 nuns.

*Miss. Cath.* (Rome, 1907); HERDER, *Konversations Lex.*; *Ann. Eccl.* (1909); *Statesman's Year Book* (1909); SPITZ, *Catholic Progress in the Gilbert Islands in The Tablet* (London, April, 1904).

STANLEY J. QUINN.

**Gilbert of Sempringham**, SAINT, founder of the Order of Gilbertines, b. at Sempringham, on the border of the Lincolnshire fens, between Bourn and Heckington. The exact date of his birth is unknown, but it lies between 1083 and 1089; d. at Sempringham, 1189. His father, Jocelin, was a wealthy Norman knight holding lands in Lincolnshire; his mother, name unknown, was an Englishwoman of humble rank. Being

ill-favoured and deformed, he was not destined for a military or knightly career, but was sent to France to study. After spending some time abroad, where he became a teacher, he returned as a young man to his Lincolnshire home, and was presented to the livings of Sempringham and Tirington, which were churches in his father's gift. Shortly afterwards he betook himself to the court of Robert Bloet, Bishop of Lincoln, where he became a clerk in the episcopal household. Robert was succeeded in 1123 by Alexander, who retained Gilbert in his service, ordaining him deacon and priest much against his will. The revenues of Sempringham had to suffice for his maintenance in the court of the bishop; those of Tirington he devoted to the poor. Offered the archdeaconry of Lincoln, he refused, saying that he knew no surer way to perdition. In 1131 he returned to Sempringham and, his father being dead, became lord of the manor and lands. It was in this year that he founded the Gilbertine Order, of which he was the first “Master”, and constructed at Sempringham, with the help of Alexander, a dwelling and cloister for his nuns, at the north of the church of St. Andrew.

His life henceforth became one of extraordinary austerity, its strictness not diminishing as he grew older, though the activity and fatigue caused by the government of the order were considerable. In 1147 he travelled to Cîteaux, in Burgundy, where he met Eugene III, St. Bernard, and St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh. The pope expressed regret at not having known of him some years previously when choosing a successor to the deposed Archbishop of York. In 1165 he was summoned before Henry II's justices at Westminster and was charged with having sent help to the exiled St. Thomas à Becket. To clear himself he was invited to take an oath that he had not done so. He refused, for, though as a matter of fact he had not sent help, an oath to that effect might make him appear an enemy to the archbishop. He was prepared for a sentence of exile, when letters came from the king in Normandy, ordering the judges to await his return. In 1170, when Gilbert was already a very old man, some of his lay-brothers revolted and spread serious calumnies against him. After some years of fierce controversy on the subject, in which Henry II took his part, Alexander III freed him from suspicion, and confirmed the privileges granted to the order. Advancing age induced Gilbert to give up the government of his order. He appointed as his successor Roger, prior of Malton. Very infirm and almost blind, he now made his religious profession, for though he had founded an order and ruled it for many years he had never become a religious in the strict sense. Twelve years after his death, at the earnest request of Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, he was canonized by Innocent III, and his relics were solemnly translated to an honourable place in the church at Sempringham, his shrine becoming a centre of pilgrimage. Besides the compilation of his rule, he has left a little treatise entitled “De constructione monasteriorum”. His feast is kept in the Roman calendar on 11 February.

*Acta SS.*, 4 Feb.; ARCHER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; DALGAIN, *Life of St. Gilbert* in NEWMAN, *Lives of English Saints* (London, 1844); DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1846), v. 2; GRAHAM, *St. Gilbert of Sempringham and the Gilbertines* (London, 1901); ZÖCKLER, *Gilbert in HERZOG AND HAUCK, Realencyklopädie* (Leipzig, 1899), VI, 664-5. See also bibliography under GILBERTINES.

R. URBAN BUTLER.

**Gildas**, SAINT, surnamed the WISE; b. about 516; d. at Houat, Brittany, 570. Sometimes he is called “Badonicus”, because, as he tells us, his birth took place the year the Britons gained a famous victory over the Saxons at Mount Badon, near Bath, Somersetshire (493 or 516). Two biographies of Gildas exist—one written by an unknown Breton monk of the Abbey of Rhuy in the eleventh century, the other by



Caradoc, a Welshman, in the twelfth century. Both biographies contain unchronological and misleading statements, which have led some critics to reject the lives as altogether valueless. Ussher, Ware, Bale, Pits, and Colgan endeavour to adjust the discrepancies by contending that there were at least two saints named Gildas, hence their invention of such distinctive surnames as "Albanicus", "Badonicus", "Hibernicus", "Historicus", etc. The more general opinion, however, adopted by Lanigan, Leland, Healy, Stillingfleet, Mabillon, Bollandus, and O'Hanlon, is that there was but one St. Gildas. The discrepancies may be accounted for by the fact that the lives were drawn up in separate countries, and several centuries after the saint existed. As to Caradoc's statement that Gildas died at Glastonbury, O'Hanlon remarks that Glastonbury appropriated more saints than Gildas (*Lives of Irish Saints*, I, 493).

Both narratives agree in several striking details, and may thus be harmonized: Gildas was born in Scotland on the banks of the Clyde (possibly at Dumbarton), of a noble British family. His father's name was Cau or Nau; his brother's, Huel or Cuil. He was educated in Wales under St. Ilut, and was a companion of St. Samson and St. Peter of Léon. Having embraced the monastic state, he passed over to Ireland, where he was advanced to the priesthood. He is said to have lived some time in Armagh, and then to have crossed to North Britain, his teaching there being confirmed by miracles. On his return to Ireland, at the invitation of King Airmire, he strengthened the faith of many, and built monasteries and churches. The Irish annalists associate him with David and Cadoc in giving a special liturgy or Mass to the second order of Irish saints. He is said to have made a pilgrimage to Rome. On the homeward journey his love of solitude caused him to retire to the Isle of Houat, off Brittany, where he lived a life of prayer, study, and austerity. His place of retreat having become known, the Bretons induced him to establish a monastery at Rhuys on the mainland, whither multitudes flocked (Marius Sepet, "St. Gildas de Rhuys", Paris, s. d.). It was at Rhuys he wrote his famous epistle to the British kings. His relics were venerated there till the tenth century, when they were carried for safety into Berry. In the eighteenth century they were said to be preserved in the cathedral of Vannes. He is the patron of several churches and monasteries in Brittany and elsewhere. His feast is locally observed on 29 January; another feast, 11 May, commemorates the translation of his relics.

The authentic work of St. Gildas, "De excidio Britannie liber querulus", is now usually divided into three parts: (1) The preface; (2) A sketch of British history from the Roman invasion to his own time; (3) An epistle of severe invective addressed to five petty British kings—Constantine, Vortipor, Cyneglas, Cynan, and Maelgwn. In the same epistle he addresses and rebukes the clergy whom he accuses of sloth and simony. His writings are clearly the work of a man of no ordinary culture and sanctity, and indicate that the author was thoroughly acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures.

Gildas is regarded as the earliest British historian, and is quoted by Bede and Alcuin. Two MSS. copies of his writings are preserved in Cambridge University library.

STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1887); CHALLONER, *Britannia Sancta* (London, 1745); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 29 January; HADDAN AND STUBBS, *Councils* (Oxford, 1869), I, 44 sq.; USSHER, *Works*, V, 506, VI, 216; LANIGAN, *Ecc. Hist. Ir.*, I, ix; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, 29 January; FORBES, *Kalendar Scottish SS.*; HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*; GILLES, *Works of Gildas and Nennius* (London, 1841); P. L., LXIX; COLGAN, *Acta SS. Hb.*, 176 sq.; MABILLON, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* (Venice, 1733, 1740), I, 138 sq.; *Acta SS.*, January, III, 573 sq.; TOUT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; GAMMACK in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

COLUMBA EDMONDS.

**Gil de Albornoz**, ALVAREZ CARILLO, a renowned cardinal, general, and statesman; b. about 1310 at Cuenca in New Castile; d. 23 Aug., 1367, at the Castle of Bonriposo, near Viterbo, in Italy. His father, Don García, was a descendant of King Alfonso V of Leon, and his mother, Teresa de Luna, belonged to the royal house of Aragon. After studying law at Toulouse, he became royal almoner, soon after Archdeacon of Calatrava, and, finally, on 13 May, 1338, Archbishop of Toledo. In 1340 he accompanied King Alfonso XI on his campaign against the Moors, saved the life of the king in the battle of Rio Salado on 30 Oct., 1340, and took part in the siege of Algeiras in 1344. As Archbishop of Toledo he held two reform synods, one at Toledo in May, 1339 (Mansi, XXV, 1143-8), the other at Alcalá in April, 1347 (Mansi, XXVI, 123-6). In March, 1350, Alfonso XI was succeeded by his son Pedro "El Cruel", whom Albornoz on various occasions severely rebuked for his cruelty and lasciviousness. As a result the king conceived a deadly hatred of him and sought his life. The archbishop fled from Spain and took refuge at the papal court in Avignon, where Clement VI received him kindly and created him Cardinal-Priest of San Clemente, 17 Dec., 1350, whereupon Albornoz resigned as Archbishop of Toledo. Two years and a half later Innocent VI entrusted him with the restoration of papal authority in the ecclesiastical territories of Italy. The Bull appointing him legate and vicar-general of the Papal States with extraordinary powers was issued on 30 June, 1353. During the sojourn of the popes at Avignon the ecclesiastical territories of Italy had, to all intents and purposes, become lost to the popes. The intrepid cardinal set out for Italy in the autumn of 1353 at the head of a small army of mercenaries. After gaining the support of the influential Archbishop Giovanni Visconti of Milan and that of Pisa, Florence, and Siena, he began his military operations against the powerful Giovanni di Vico, Prefect of Rome, Lord of Viterbo and usurper of a large tract of papal territory. The latter was defeated in the battle of Orvieto, 10 March, 1354. A treaty was concluded at Montefiascone on 5 June, whereupon Giovanni di Vico made his submission to the cardinal at Orvieto. In order to gain the support of the prefect for the future, the cardinal appointed him Governor of Corneto for twelve years. Innocent VI was displeased at the easy terms of the treaty, but the cardinal justified his act by pointing out the necessity of prudence for his final success. The pope had already previously sent Cola di Rienzi, the former tribune of Rome, to Italy to be used by the cardinal as he saw fit. The cardinal did not trust the visionary Rienzi, and for a time kept him at Perugia; but upon the repeated request of the Romans and of Rienzi himself, he finally appointed him Senator of Rome, to replace Guido dell' Isola who showed himself powerless against the intrigues of the Roman nobility. On 1 Aug., 1354, Rienzi entered Rome and was hailed by the people as a liberator. Soon, however, his cruelty, his oppressive taxes, and his costly revelries made him hated, and during a popular tumult on 8 Oct., 1354, he fell a victim to the fury of the mob. After the fall of Rienzi, the cardinal restored order in Rome.

The submission of Giovanni di Vico resulted in the return of the Papal States (in their narrow sense) and the Duchy of Spoleto to papal authority. Albornoz now turned his attention to the restoration of the March of Ancona and the Romagna. After gaining to his side Gentile da Mogliano of Fermo and Ridolfo da Varano of Camerino, he began military operations against the two powerful Malatestas of Rimini. The Malatestas allied themselves with their enemy, Francesco degli Ordelaffi, who had usurped a large part of the Romagna. They also won over the faithless Gentile da Mogliano. Ridolfo da Varano, to whom the cardinal had given the supreme command of the papal army, gained a signal victory over Galeotto de' Mala-

testa near Paterno, and on 2 June, 1355, a treaty was concluded with the Malatestas, which was approved by Innocent VI on 20 June. Henceforth the Malatestas were faithful allies of the papal forces. Their submission was soon followed by that of Montefeltro, which brought the districts of Urbino and Cagli under the power of the cardinal. Shortly after, the cities of Sinigaglia and Ancona, and the two brothers Bernardino and Guido da Polenta, Lords of Ravenna and Cervia, submitted to the cardinal. Towards the end of 1355 Albornož was appointed Bishop of Sabina. Giovanni and Riniero de' Manfredi, of Faenza, and Francesco degli Ordelaffi, of the Romagna, stubbornly refused to submit. In 1356 a crusade was preached against them by order of the pope. The Manfredi surrendered Faenza to Albornož, 10 Nov., 1356, but Ordelaffi and his wife, the warlike Marzia, were still unconquered. The cardinal had repeatedly asked Innocent VI to be recalled to Avignon. Now that all the usurpers of the Papal States with the exception of Ordelaffi had been subdued, the pope granted his request and sent Androin de la Roche, Abbot of Cluny, to replace him in Italy. Before returning to Avignon, the cardinal held a meeting of the vicars of the papal territory on 29 April, 1357, and the two following days. At this meeting he published his famous Constitutions for the Papal States, "Constitutiones Sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ", generally known as the "Egidian Constitutions". When he made known to the assembled vicars his intention to return to Avignon, they all urged him to remain, at least till September. He reluctantly consented and at once began military operations against Ordelaffi. On 21 June he took Cesena, and Bertinoro fell into his hands on 25 July. When the cardinal departed for Avignon in September, Ordelaffi was still master of Forlì and a few other strongholds of the Romagna. On 23 October the cardinal arrived at Avignon, was received with high honours by the pope, and hailed as "Pater Ecclesiæ".

Albornož remained only a short time at Avignon. His successor in Italy, the Abbot of Cluny, lacked the military training to contend successfully with the skilled and valiant Ordelaffi. Moreover, the intrigues of Giovanni di Vico in the Papal States and fresh disturbances in Rome required the presence of Albornož in Italy. The pope ordered him to return thither in December, 1358. He at once began operations against Ordelaffi, whose endeavours to buy the Condottiere Lando and his Grand Company into his service he frustrated by a contract with Lando. Ordelaffi was finally compelled to surrender, and on 4 July, 1359, the cardinal took possession of Forlì. He allowed Ordelaffi to rule as papal vicar over Forlimpopoli and Castrocaro. In Rome, during the cardinal's absence, the people had established the *septemviri* to rule jointly with the senator. Deeming it imprudent to go against the will of the people, he consented to the new arrangement, but reserved the appointment of the senator to the pope. With the exception of Bologna, the entire pontifical territory now again acknowledged the sovereignty of the pope. Giovanni d'Ollegio, who had possession of Bologna, was engaged in a war with Bernabò Visconti of Milan, who attempted to become master of Bologna. Unable to contend with the powerful Bernabò, Giovanni d'Ollegio surrendered Bologna to the cardinal, who tried in vain to arrive at an amicable arrangement with Bernabò. Meanwhile Innocent VI had died (12 Sept., 1362). Albornož refused the tiara which was offered him, and Urban V was elected pope. Under him Albornož continued his military operations against Bernabò, whose stubborn resistance was the principal obstacle to the crusade which Urban V intended to undertake against the Turks. When all other attempts failed, the pope published a crusade against Bernabò in the spring of 1363. In April the cardinal gained a victory at Salaruolo, near Modena, and the complete subjection of this stub-

born tyrant was now only a question of time. But the idea of a crusade against the Turks had so completely taken possession of the pope that on 13 March, 1364, a hurried peace was concluded, the conditions of which were extremely favourable to Bernabò, who received 500,000 gold florins for his surrender of the city and principality of Bologna.

The cardinal had now completed the difficult task that had been entrusted to him by Innocent VI. He had again subjected the whole pontifical territory to the papal authority and thereby made it possible for the pope to return to Rome. But he did not receive the gratitude which he had so well earned. Urban V gave credence to the cardinal's enemies who accused him of having misappropriated papal moneys. In consequence the management of the temporal affairs of the Romagna was taken from Albornož and given to the Bishop of Ravenna. Hereupon the cardinal asked to be recalled from Italy and addressed a letter to the pope in which he gave an account of his management. The pope discovered his mistake and in his answer gave due credit for the inestimable service which Albornož had performed for the papacy. In 1367 Urban V returned to Rome; Albornož received him at Viterbo, but died before the pope came to Rome. In accordance with his wish he was buried in the church of St. Francis at Assisi, but four years later his remains were transferred to Toledo. His Constitutions for the Papal States were among the earliest books printed in Italy (Jesi, 1473); they remained in force until 1816. He is also the author of a compilation of all the documents relating to the subjection of the March of Ancona. They are preserved in the papal archives under the title "Codex legationis Cardinalis Egidii Albornožii". In his will (29 Sept., 1364) he provided for the foundation of the Spanish College of St. Clement at Bologna (Collegium Albornožianum) with 24 Spanish students and 2 chaplains.

Rashdall (Hist. of Universities, Oxford, 1895, I, 200) says that it was the first Continental college "on a scale at all approaching that with which we are familiar in the English Universities", and was the model of many others in Italy and Spain. It still flourishes upon its ancient site, in sumptuously adorned sixteenth-century buildings, under control of the Spanish Government, which sends thither candidates for the diplomatic service who have the B.A. degree of a Spanish university.

Wurm, *Cardinal Albornož, der zweite Begründer des Kirchenstaats* (Paderborn, 1892); CHRISTOPHE, *Hist. de la papauté pendant le XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1853), II; SALVI, *Il Cardinale Egidio Albornož e gli archivi di Sanginesio, documenti originali di sua legazione* (Camerino, 1890); MURATORI, *Annali d'Italia* (Venice, 1823), XIX; WERUNSKY, *Italiensche Politike Papst Innocenz VI. und König Karls IV.* (Vienna, 1878); SEPULVEDA, *De vitâ et rebus gestis Egidii Albornožii Carilli S. R. E. Cardinalis libri tres* (Rome, 1521), Sp. tr. by VELA (Toledo, 1566), and DOCAMPO (Bologna, 1612); It. tr. by STEPHANO (Bologna, 1590).

MICHAEL OTT.

Giles (Lat., *Egidius*), SAINT, Abbot, said to have been born of illustrious Athenian parentage about the middle of the seventh century. Early in life he devoted himself exclusively to spiritual things, but, finding his noble birth and high repute for sanctity in his native land an obstacle to his perfection, he passed over to Gaul, where he established himself first in a wilderness near the mouth of the Rhone and later by the River Gard. But here again the fame of his sanctity drew multitudes to him, so he withdrew to a dense forest near Nîmes, where in the greatest solitude he spent many years, his sole companion being a hind. This last retreat was finally discovered by the king's hunters, who had pursued the hind to its place of refuge. The king [who according to the legend was Wamba (or Flavius?), King of the Visigoths, but who must have been a Frank, since the Franks had expelled the Visigoths from the neighbourhood of Nîmes almost a century and a half earlier] conceived a high esteem for

the solitary, and would have heaped every honour upon him; but the humility of the saint was proof against all temptations. He consented, however, to receive thenceforth some disciples, and built a monastery in his valley, which he placed under the rule of St. Benedict. Here he died in the early part of the eighth century, with the highest repute for sanctity and miracles.

His cult spread rapidly far and wide throughout Europe in the Middle Ages, as is witnessed by the numberless churches and monasteries dedicated to him in France, Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the British Isles; by the numerous MSS. in prose and verse commemorating his virtues and miracles; and especially by the vast concourse of pilgrims who from all Europe flocked to his shrine. In 1562 the relics of the saint were secretly transferred to Toulouse to save them from the hideous excesses of the Huguenots who were then ravaging France, and the pilgrimage in consequence declined. With the restoration of a great part of the relics to the church of St. Giles in 1862, and the discovery of his former tomb there in 1865, the pilgrimages have recommenced. Besides the city of St-Gilles, which sprang up around the abbey, nineteen other cities bear his name. St-Gilles, Toulouse, and a multitude of French cities, Antwerp, Bruges, and Tournai in Belgium, Cologne and Bamberg in Germany, Prague and Gran in Austria-Hungary, Rome and Bologna in Italy, possess celebrated relics of St. Giles. In medieval art he is a frequent subject, being always depicted with his symbol, the hind. His feast is kept on 1 September. On this day there are also commemorated another St. Giles, an Italian hermit of the tenth century (*Acta SS.*, XLI, 305), and a Blessed Giles, d. about 1203, a Cistercian abbot of Castafeda in the Diocese of Astorga, Spain (*op. cit.*, XLI, 308).

*Acta SS.* XLI, 284-304; *Analecra Bollandiana*, VIII, 103; IX, 393; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, III, 401; GUÉRIN, *Les Petits Bollandistes*, X, 401.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Gillespie**, (1) ELIZA MARIA (in religion Mother MARY of ST. ANGELA), b. in Washington county, Pennsylvania, 21 February, 1824; d. at St. Mary's convent, Notre Dame, Indiana, 4 March, 1887. She was the daughter of John Purcell Gillespie and Mary Madeleine Miers, the latter a convert to the Church. After her husband's death, Mrs. Gillespie in 1838 went with her three children to her former home, Lancaster, Ohio. Eliza Maria first attended the school of the Dominican sisters at Somerset, Ohio, and completed her studies at the Visitation Convent at Georgetown, D. C., in 1844. Her kinsman, Thomas Ewing of Ohio, was then eminent in public life, and this fact, joined to her beauty and accomplishments, made her at once a prominent figure in the social life of Washington and of Ohio. Her sympathy was roused by the sufferings of the Irish people during the famine, and she and her cousin, Eleanor Ewing, by their joint efforts, collected a large sum of money for their relief. In 1853 she felt the call to the religious life and determined to enter the order of the Sisters of Mercy. She went to Notre Dame, Indiana, to bid farewell to her brother, who was there engaged in his studies for the priesthood, and here she met Rev. Edward Sorin, provincial of the Congregation of the Holy Cross in the United States, through whose influence she was led to cast her lot with this small and struggling community. She received the religious habit in 1853, taking the name of Sister Mary of St. Angela. She was then sent to France, where she made her novitiate at the convent of the Sisters of Bon Secours, at Caen, making her religious profession by special dispensation 8 December, 1853, at the hands of Very Rev. Father Moreau, the founder of the congregation.

In January, 1855, Sister Angela returned to America and was made superior of St. Mary's Academy at

Bertrand, Michigan. On 15 August, 1855, she transferred the academy to its present location near Notre Dame, Indiana, and procured for it a charter from the Indiana legislature. When the Civil War broke out Mother Angela organized a corps of the Sisters of the Holy Cross to care for the sick and wounded soldiers. She established hospitals, both temporary and permanent, and, when generals failed to secure needed aid for the sick and wounded, she made flying trips to Washington on their behalf. Her headquarters were at Cairo, Illinois, in ill-provided buildings. The close of the war left her physically enfeebled, but she returned to St. Mary's and resumed her educational work, and compiled two series of readers for use in Catholic schools, the "Metropolitan" and "Excelsior".

In 1869, at the advice of Bishop Luers of Fort Wayne, the Sisters of the Holy Cross in the United States determined on a separation from the members of the congregation in France. This was effected, with Mother Angela as superior of the new community. Under her rule thirty-five institutions were founded throughout the United States, among them St. Cecilia's and Holy Cross Academies, Washington, D. C.; St. Mary's Academy, Salt Lake City, Utah; St. Mary's Academy, Austin, Texas; St. Catherine's Normal Institute, Baltimore, Maryland; and Hawke's Hospital, Mt. Carmel, Columbus, Ohio. Mother Angela was the moving spirit in the establishment in 1865 of the "Ave Maria", to whose pages she made many contributions. On laying down the burdens of her superintendence, Mother Angela was chosen mistress of novices at St. Mary's, and in September, 1886, she was again made the head of St. Mary's Academy, at which post she remained until her death.

*In Memoriam, Mother Mary of St. Angela* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1887).

(2) NEAL HENRY GILLESPIE, brother of the foregoing; b. in Washington county, Pa., 19 January, 1831; d. at St. Mary's, Notre Dame, Indiana, 12 November, 1874. He was one of the first students of the University of Notre Dame, Indiana, and in 1849 received the first degree conferred by that institution. On 1 September, 1851, he entered the novitiate of the Congregation of the Holy Cross at Notre Dame, Ind., made his religious profession 15 August, 1853, and was ordained priest 29 June, 1856, at Rome, where he had been sent to complete his theological studies. Returning to America, he filled the post of vice-president and director of studies at Notre Dame (1856-59), and then was appointed president of the College of St. Mary of the Lake, Chicago, Illinois. In 1863 he was called to the mother-house of the congregation at Le Mans, France, where he remained until 1866. He then returned to Notre Dame, and assumed the editorship of the "Ave Maria", which position he filled until his death. In addition to his editorial labours, he was a frequent contributor to its pages, as well as to many other Catholic periodicals.

JOHN G. EWING.

**Gillis**, JAMES, Scottish bishop; b. at Montreal, Canada, 7 April, 1802; d. at Edinburgh, 24 February, 1864. He was the only son of a native of Banffshire, who had emigrated to Canada and married there. Educated in the Sulpician college at Montreal, where he acquired a perfect knowledge of French, he came to Scotland in 1816, and next year entered the seminary at Aquhorties, studying afterwards at St. Nicholas's College in Paris, and at Issy. He was ordained priest on 9 June, 1827, and was stationed at Edinburgh, where his preaching soon attracted attention. He visited France in 1829 to collect money for his church, and again in 1831 to raise funds for the foundation of an Ursuline convent—the first religious house established in Scotland since the sixteenth century—which was opened in 1835. In July, 1838, he

was consecrated at Edinburgh as Bishop of Limyra and Coadjutor of the Eastern District. A subsequent visit to Paris, where he was much esteemed, resulted in the acquisition of what remained of the library of the Scotch College, and in the promise of an annual grant to Scotland from the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. In 1852 Bishop Gillis succeeded Bishop Carruthers as Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District. During his twelve years' tenure of this office he did much for the advancement of Catholicism, founding many new missions, introducing several religious orders (including Jesuits, Oblates of Mary, and Sisters of Mercy) into his district, and receiving into the Church many converts, among them Viscount and Viscountess Feilding, afterwards Earl and Countess of Denbigh. In 1857 he preached in Orléans cathedral an eloquent panegyric, in French, of Joan of Arc (published in London in the same year), receiving in return from the Mayor of Orléans the heart of King Henry II of England, who had died at Chinon, on the Loire, in 1189. Bishop Gillis was buried in St. Margaret's convent, his own foundation, on 26 February, 1864. The nuns of St. Margaret's are in possession of his library.

GORDON, *Cath. Church in Scotland* (Glasgow, 1869), 480-491; BELLESHEIM, *Hist. of Cath. Church of Scotland*, tr. (Edinburgh, 1890), IV, 282, 286-291; *The Times*, obituary notice (26 February, 1864); *Hist. of St. Margaret's Convent* (1886).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

**Gilmore, PATRICK SANSFIELD**, musician; b. at Ballygar, Galway, Ireland, 25 Dec., 1829; d. at St. Louis, 24 Sept., 1892; a kinsman of Daniel O'Connell. In 1848 he arrived at Boston, Mass., becoming leader successively of the Suffolk, Boston Brigade, and Salem bands. In 1858 he founded "Gilmore's Band", in later years famous as the leading military and concert-band of America. When war was declared, Mr. Gilmore and band enlisted with the 24th Mass. Volunteers, accompanying General Burnside to South Carolina. After the temporary discharge of bands from the field, Governor Andrews placed their reorganization in Mr. Gilmore's hands, and General Banks created him bandmaster general. For patriotic and musical services at the inauguration of Governor Hahn of Louisiana, one hundred prominent representatives of the army, navy, and New Orleans civic government, tendered Mr. Gilmore a complimentary banquet at the historic old St. Charles Hotel, presenting him with an inscribed silver goblet containing five hundred gold pieces, and a letter from Governor Hahn to President Lincoln, introducing "P. S. Gilmore" as "a musician of the highest abilities and a true gentleman, who had rendered important aid to the nation's cause by his faithful and patriotic services".

In celebration of the establishment of national peace, Mr. Gilmore organized and conducted two of the most gigantic popular festivals known in musical history—the National and International Peace Jubilees, held at Boston in 1869 and '72, in which thirty thousand singers, two thousand instrumentalists, the most famous composers, vocal and instrumental artists of the day, and the best military bands of Europe participated. Coliseums were erected for the occasions, holding respectively sixty thousand and one hundred and twenty thousand persons. In recognition of these achievements, Mr. Gilmore was presented by the citizens of Boston with gold medals and the sum of fifty thousand dollars. In 1873 he went to New York, as bandmaster of the 22nd Regiment. In 1878, during a concert-tour of the principal cities of Europe, he received a medal from the French government. In 1892, "Gilmore's Band", numbering one hundred men, were celebrating by a great national festival-tour the four-hundredth anniversary of America's discovery by Columbus, when his death occurred suddenly, consoled by the last Sacraments of the Church. Both civic and military honours were paid him in death, and memorial services were held over

VI.—36

the entire country. Fourteen years after his death, on 15 May, 1906, under the auspices of an illustrious committee and directorship, a great Gilmore Memorial Concert was given in Madison Square Garden (originally Gilmore's Garden), and an audience of ten thousand honoured his memory. P. S. Gilmore won his title of "Father of Military Bands", by his elevation of the brass band to a dignified musical status. He was the first to mellow the brasses by the introduction of reeds, to claim a place for the band on the concert-platform, and to popularize classical music by adapting orchestral arrangements for reed-band interpretation. From the quick-steps, marches, and dances characterizing band-music at its start, his unique personal effort attained in the single programme of his representative last concert, to the great works of the tone-masters, Bach, Schumann, Handel, Rubenstein, Wagner, and Liszt. He was at once a popular entertainer and an educator of the people. Many songs (words and music), marches, etc. were composed by Mr. Gilmore, who also wrote "The History of the Boston Peace Jubilee".

MARY G. CARTER.

**Gilmour, RICHARD.** See CLEVELAND, DIOCESE OF.

**Gil of Santarem, BLESSED**, a Portuguese Dominican; b. at Vaozela, diocese of Viseu, about 1185; d. at Santarem, 14 May, 1265. His father, Rodrigo Pelayo Valladaris, was governor of Coimbra and councillor of Sancho I. It was the wish of his parents that Gil should enter the ecclesiastical state, and the king was very lavish in bestowing ecclesiastical benefices upon him. When he was still a boy, he already held prebends at Braga, Coimbra, Idanha, and Santarem. Gil, however, had no desire to be an ecclesiastic; his ambition was to become a famous physician. After devoting some time to the study of philosophy and medicine at Coimbra, he set out for Paris, with the intention of perfecting himself in the science of medicine and obtaining the doctor's degree. If we may give credence to his unknown contemporaneous biographer, he was accosted on his journey by a courteous stranger who promised to teach him the art of magic at Toledo. As payment, so the legend runs, the stranger required that Gil should make over his soul to the devil and sign the compact with his blood. Gil obeyed and, after devoting himself seven years to the study of magic under the direction of Satan, went to Paris, easily obtained the degree of doctor of medicine, and performed many wonderful cures. One night while he was locked up in his library a gigantic knight, armed head to foot, appeared to him and, with his sword drawn, demanded that Gil should change his wicked life. The same spectre appeared a second time, and threatened to kill Gil if he would not reform. Gil now repented of his evil ways, burnt his books of magic and returned to Portugal, where he took the habit of St. Dominic in the newly-erected monastery at Palencia, about 1221. Shortly after, his superiors sent him to the Dominican house at Scalabis, the present Santarem. Here he led a life of prayer and penance, and for seven years his mind was tormented by the thought of the compact which was still in the hands of Satan. Finally, his biographer narrates, the devil was compelled to surrender the compact and place it before the altar of the Blessed Virgin. Gil returned to Paris to study theology and on his return to Portugal became famous for his piety and learning. He was twice elected provincial of his order in Spain. Benedict XIV ratified his cult on 9 March, 1748.

*Acta SS.*, May, III; *TOURON, Histoire des hommes illustres de l'ordre de St Dominique* (Paris, 1743), 76-94; *QUÉTIF-ÉCHARD, Scriptores Ord. Præd.* (Paris, 1719), I, 241-4; *GUÉRIN, Vies des Saints* (Paris, 1860), V, 532-7; *RECHAC, SS. Frères Prêcheurs* (Paris, 1647), 215-63; *BARBOSA, Bibliotheca Lusitana* (Lisbon, 1747), II, 378-80.

MICHAEL ORT.

**Gindarus**, a titular see of Syria Prima, in the Patriarchate of Antioch. Pliny (*Hist. nat.*, V, 81) locates it in Cyrrhæstia, as does Strabo (*XVI*, 2, 8), who says it

was a celebrated haunt of brigands. Ptolemy (V, xiv) speaks of it as being in the region of Seleucia, and Stephen of Byzantium (s. v.) makes it a small town situated near Antioch. The first and only known Bishop of Gindarus was Peter, who assisted at the Council of Nicea in 325 (Gelzer, *Patrum Nicænorum nomina*, p. 61) and at that of Antioch in 341 (Lequien, *Oriens Christ.*, II, 789). Yet the episcopal see is not mentioned in the sixth-century "Notitia" of Antioch (*Echos d'Orient*, 1907, 144), nor in that of the tenth century (op. cit., 1907, 94); it is also missing from the list of cities of Syria given by the geographer Hierocles and George of Cyprus. It is probable that it was never an important town, and that its see, of early creation, soon disappeared. Under the Emperor Theodosius the Great, Gindarus was only a small village which he fortified (P. G., XCVII, 517), and in the time of Justinian I, when the relics of the martyr, St. Marinus, afterwards transferred to Antioch, were found there, Gindarus possessed only a *periodeutes* and not a bishop. It is now Djendéris, on the Afrin-Sou, in the vilayet and the sanjak of Aleppo, not far from Kal'at Semaan, the famous monastery of St. Simon Stylites.

S. VAILLÉ.

**Ginoulihiac, JACQUES-MARIE-ACHILLE**, a French bishop; b. at Montpellier (department of Hérault), 3 Dec., 1806; d. there, 17 Nov., 1875. Immediately after his ordination to the priesthood (1830) he was appointed professor in the seminary at Montpellier, and later (1839) vicar-general at Aix. Consecrated Bishop of Grenoble in 1853, he was appointed the following year assistant to the pontifical throne, and knight of the Legion of Honour. At the Council of the Vatican, Ginoulihiac spoke publicly on philosophical errors (30 Dec., 1869), on the rule of faith (22 March and 1 April, 1870), and on the pope's infallibility (23 May and 28 June, 1870). On this latter point he sided with the minority and left Rome before the session of 18 July, in which the doctrine was defined. In 1870 he was transferred from Grenoble to the archiepiscopal See of Lyons. Fearing the Prussian invasion, the inhabitants of Lyons vowed to erect a basilica at Fourvières if the city were spared. The written pledge, signed by thousands of inhabitants, was placed on the altar of the Blessed Virgin by the archbishop himself. In 1873, in fulfilment of this promise, he laid the corner-stone of the magnificent edifice which to-day stands on the hill of Fourvières. While at Grenoble, Bishop Ginoulihiac wrote and published several letters and pastorals, especially on the condition of the Pontifical States (1860), on Renan's "Life of Jesus" (1863), and on the accusations of the press against the Encyclical of 8 Dec., 1864, and the Syllabus (1865). His works are "Histoire du dogme catholique pendant les trois premiers siècles de l'Eglise et jusqu'au concile de Nicée" (Paris, 1852, 1865); "Les épitres pastorales, ou réflexions dogmatiques et morales sur les épitres de Saint Paul à Timothée et à Tite" (Paris, 1866); "Le concile œcuménique" (Paris, 1869); "Le sermon sur la montagne" (Lyons, 1872); "Les origines du christianisme", a posthumous work published by Canon Servonnet (Paris, 1878).

*La France Ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1876), 765-9; *L'épiscopat français*, by the SOCIÉTÉ BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE (Paris, 1907).

C. A. DUBRAY.

**Gioberti, VINCENZO**, Italian statesman and philosopher; b. at Turin, 5 April, 1801; d. at Paris, 26 October, 1852. When still very young he lost his parents, and at the age of sixteen he was admitted among the clerics of the court; he studied theology at the Turin University, and obtained there the doctorate; he was ordained priest in 1825 and appointed court chaplain and professor in the theological college. In 1828 he made a journey through Lombardy, and became friendly with Manzoni and other great men. He caused Rosmini's philosophy to be known in Pied-

mont, though at a later date he became its opponent. At this time under the pen-name "Demofilo," he was writing articles in Mazzini's "Giovane Italia", printed at Marseilles. In 1833 he resigned his court chaplaincy, and soon after was arrested on suspicion of political intrigues. Nothing could be proved against him, but he was expelled from the country and went to Paris, where he made many friends. He now ceased contributing to the "Giovane Italia", and Cousin offered him a chair of philosophy on condition that he would not oppose Cousin's own philosophical system. Though financially in very straitened circumstances, Gioberti refused the offer. He then accepted an offer to teach philosophy in a private school at Brussels conducted by an Italian. During his stay in Brussels most of his works were published.

In 1841, on the appearance of his book "Del Buono", the Grand Duke of Tuscany offered him a chair in the Pisa University, but King Charles Albert objected, and the offer came to nothing. His fame in Italy dates from 1843 when he published his "Del primato morale e civile degli Italiani", which he dedicated to Silvio Pellico. Starting with the greatness of ancient Rome he traced history down through the splendours of the papacy, and recounting all that science and art owed to the genius of Italy, he declared that the Italian people were a model for all nations, and that their then insignificance was the result of their weakness politically, to remedy which he proposed a confederation of all the states of Italy with the pope as their head. It is curious that in this work he is very severe on the French, yet he has not a word to say about the Austrians who then occupied Lombardy and the Venetian territory. Pope and prince received the work very coldly, and a few Jesuits wrote against it. In 1845 he was once more in Paris and published the "Prolegomeni al Primato", in which he attacked the Jesuits; and in 1847 he printed "Il Gesuita Moderno", a large sized pamphlet, full of vulgar invective; in 1848 this was followed by an "Apologia del Gesuita Moderno". These works were answered in 1849 by the Jesuit Father Curci's "Divinazione sulle tre ultime opere di V. Gioberti". Early in 1848, when Italy was burning with hopes of liberty and independence, Gioberti returned to his native land and was joyously received by his fellow-townsmen. Soon afterwards he went to Milan to calm the over-impetuous and to oppose Mazzini; from there he visited King Charles Albert at Sommacampagna. He received a mission for Rome, and on his arrival his reception was so enthusiastic that the pope became alarmed. On his return from Rome the king wanted to appoint him senator of the kingdom, but Gioberti preferred to be elected as deputy; he became president of the Chamber and, in July, he joined the Collegio cabinet. After the unfortunate Salasco armistice he broke up the cabinet, declared for a continuation of the war against Austria, and bitterly assailed the Revel ministry. He next founded a society to propagate the idea of a federated Italy, with the King of Piedmont and not the pope at its head. In December he became president of the ministry (with Rattazzi and other democrats), but whereas the new cabinet was all for war, Gioberti had learned caution, and was anxious to reorganize the army. Moreover, he wanted Piedmont to re-establish in their estates the pope and the Grand Duke of Tuscany, who had been driven out by the revolution; so he quarrelled with his fellow-ministers and resigned on 20 February, 1849, but in the newspapers he carried on the quarrel. After the disastrous battle of Novara (23 March, 1849), Victor Emmanuel II offered him a portfolio; he agreed to join the ministry but would not take a portfolio. He was then sent as plenipotentiary minister to Paris to solicit French aid in Italy. He was unsuccessful, and finding he was out of favour at Turin he resigned his post, but remained in Paris, where, after three years



passed in study, he died. In 1851 he published his "Rinnovamento civile d'Italia" which contains an impassioned criticism of political events from 1848 onwards. This last book, while it clings to the idea of a federated Italy, shows that Gioberti was a republican, and that he hoped the loss of the papal temporal power would bring about the religious renovation of Italy. Thereupon all his works were put on the Index. His closing years were embittered by seeing his hopes shattered, and this bitterness finds an echo in his works.

Gioberti's philosophy is a mixture of pantheistic ontologism with Platonism and traditionalism. The ontologism of Malebranche, as modified by Cardinal Gerdil, had been taught him at the Turin University. His first principle is that the *primum cognitum* of the human intellect is idea or being; i. e., absolute and eternal truth as far as "human intuition" can grasp it is God Himself. "Being" he calls the *primum philosophicum*, because in the mental order it is the *primum psychologicum*, and in the order of existing things it is the *primum ontologicum*; it is the common foundation of all reality and all knowledge. Intuition of being embraces the judgment, "being exists or is necessarily", which is not the result of any mental process, but is the spontaneous effect produced when being presents itself to the mind. But in being we merely see its relative attributes, not its essence, which remains unknown (the superintelligible) and is the object of revealed religion. Among these relative attributes is comprised the creative act, by intuition of which, in being, we arrive at a knowledge of its results, namely, contingent things, and thus establish the *formula idealis*, "being creates existing things", *ens creat existentias*. This judgment is synthetical a priori, not in the Kantian sense, but by "objective synthesis" resulting from the revelation of being. However, intuition of the idea remains too indeterminate; and hence the necessity of speech which so circumscribes the idea that we can contemplate or re-think it (this is pure traditionalism).

His theory of creation is the most important part of his system and requires a longer explanation. He calls the idea also the *Esse Universale*, which is common to and identical in all things, and which is nothing more or less than their possibility itself. Before the creation the idea (being, God) is *universalis* and abstract. It becomes concrete by its own act, individuating itself, making itself finite, and multiplying itself. "To create is therefore to individuate." In this process the intelligible that was absolute becomes relative; there are two cycles to the process, one descending, inasmuch as the idea infringes on the concrete (*mimesis*), the other ascending, inasmuch as it reaches out more and more towards the intelligible absolute (*methexis*), and participates of the Divine Being (this is pure Platonism). Thus he arrives at the conclusion that in the intellectual order the ideas of created things are so many steps in the scale of the Divine Essence. And as regards creation, he adopts the saying of Hegel that "logic . . . is nothing but creation". From all this, Gioberti's pantheism is evident. No doubt he is always asserting that God was distinct from His creatures; but the sincerity of these statements is not beyond question. As a matter of fact, after his separation from the Mazzinians they published a letter of his to the "Giovane Italia" in which he expressly stated that "pantheism is the only true and sound philosophy". His theory of *mimesis* and *methexis* is also used to prove the immortality of the soul. Then again the idea of being is made the foundation of moral obligation as a binding force, and, inasmuch as it approves or disapproves, we have the concepts of merit and demerit. The aim of the moral law is to bring to pass the perfect union of existences and being, in other words to complete the methexic cycle. Man endowed with freedom can ap-

proach or keep away from being; hence the origin of evil; and when such aversion from being is endless it becomes necessary and immanent. Later, however, recognizing that this would be an exception to the "logical" law of methexis, he denied this eternal immanence of evil.

It is noteworthy that, in politics, he denied the sovereignty of the people. In Gioberti's theory the object of religion is the supernatural and the superintelligible, which meant according to him the essence of being revealed by means of speech. On the other hand he treats at length of the harmony between religion and science or civilization. But as a rule all his vague theorizing was tinged with rationalism, and even in his latest works he writes: "science and civilization must go on throwing light on what is supernatural and superintelligible in religion"; and again, "modern rationalism is destined to bring about the union of orthodoxy and science". His philosophical works are: "Teoria del sovrannaturale" (1838; 2nd ed., with replies to critics, 1850); "Introduzione allo studio della filosofia" (1840); "Lettere sugli errori politico-religiosi di Lamennais" (1840); "Del Bello" and "Del Buono" (1841); "Errori filosofici di Antonio Rosmini" (1842). Mention should also be made of his posthumous works: "Riforma Cattolica"; "Filosofia della Rivelazione"; "Protologia". His complete works in thirty-five volumes were published at Naples, in 1877.

MASSARI, *Ricordi e Carteggio di V. Gioberti* (Turin, 1860); MAURI, *Della vita e delle opere di Gioberti* (Genoa, 1853); SPARENTA, *La filosofia di Gioberti* (Naples, 1864); *Civiltà Cattolica*, II, Ser. IV, 143; III, Ser. IV, 481, 641, Ser. V, 280; *LIBERATORE*, *Della conoscenza intellettuale* (Naples, 1879), I, ii.

U. BENIGNI.

**Giocondo**, FRA GIOVANNI, Italian architect, antiquary, archæologist, and classical scholar, b. in Verona, c. 1445; d. in Venice (?), c. 1525. He became a Dominican at the age of eighteen and was one of the many of that order who became pioneers of the Renaissance; afterwards, however, he entered the Franciscan Order. Giocondo began his career as a teacher of Latin and Greek in Verona where Scaliger was one of his pupils. The young priest, a learned archæologist and a superb draughtsman, early visited Rome, sketched its ancient buildings, wrote the story of its great monuments, and completed and explained many defaced inscriptions. He stimulated the revival of classical learning by making collections of ancient MSS., one of which, completed in 1492, he presented to Lorenzo de' Medici. Giocondo soon returned to his native town where he built bridges and planned fortifications for Treviso, acting as architect, engineer, and even head-builder during the construction. The most beautiful building in Verona and one of the most perfect in all Europe, the Palazzo del Consiglio, the decorations of whose loggia are famous, was designed by Giocondo at the request of Emperor Maximilian, and de Quincey attributes also the church of Santa Maria della Scala to him. Venice then summoned him with other celebrated architects to discuss the protection of the lagoons against the rivers; Giocondo's plan of altering the Brenta's bed and leading this river to the sea was accepted by the Venetians, and the undertaking was a complete success.

Between 1496 and 1499 Giocondo was invited to France by the king, and made royal architect. There he built two bridges of remarkable beauty, the Pont Notre-Dame and the Petit Pont, and designed the palace of the Chambre des Comptes, the Golden Room of the Parliament, and the Château of Gailion (Normandy), one façade of which has been removed to the Ecole des Beaux Arts to serve as a model for students of architecture. In France Giocondo discovered a manuscript of Pliny the Younger, containing his correspondence with Trajan. He published this in Paris, dedicating the work to Louis XII. Between 1506 and

1508 he returned to Italy, wrote four dissertations on the waters and waterways of Venice and constructed the splendid Fondaco dei Tedeschi (1508), decorated by Titian and Giorgione. When in 1513 the Rialto and its environs were burned, Giocondo was one who presented plans for a new bridge and surrounding structures, but he left Venice for Rome when the designs of a rival (Michelangelo?) were chosen by the republic for which he had done such monumental work. The Vatican welcomed him (1514) and on Bramante's death he superintended (with Raphael and San Gallo) the erection of St. Peter's; but it was Fra Giocondo alone who improved and strengthened the foundations of the great basilica and the piers inadequately supporting its dome.

Two Italian editions of Pliny's "Epistles" were published by Giocondo, one printed in Bologna (1498) and one from the press of Aldus Manutius (1508). He edited Cæsar's "Commentaries" and made the first design (drawing) of Cæsar's bridge across the Rhine. He was among the first to produce a correct edition of Vitruvius, printed at Venice in 1511, illustrated with figures and dedicated to Pope Julius II; and published the works of Julius Obsequens, Aurelius Victor, and Cato's "De re rustica". In addition to his classical and mathematical knowledge he was a master of scholastic theology. His last work was, probably, the rebuilding of the bridge of Verona (1521), for in a letter to Giuliano de' Medici, in 1513, Giocondo then called himself "an old man".

CUMMINGS, *History of Architecture in Italy*; YRIARTE, *Venice, tr. SITWELL* (Philadelphia, 1896); LONGFELLOW, *Architecture in Italy, Greece and the Levant* (New York, 1903); MICHAUD, *Biog. Universelle, Ancienne et Moderne* (Paris, 1855); MARINELLI in *Rassegna d'Arte* (Milan, 1902), 59 sqq.

LEIGH HUNT.

**Giordani**, TOMMASO, composer, b. at Naples in 1738; d. at Dublin, Ireland, February, 1806. The family came to London in 1752, and settled in Dublin in 1764. Tommaso was one of the leading musicians in the Irish capital from 1764 to 1781, when he returned to London; after two years, he came back to Dublin, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was concerned in an opera-house and in a music-shop, neither of which was financially successful. Among his compositions are a number of operas, an oratorio "Isaac" (1767), and a vast quantity of overtures, sonatas, concertos, quartets, songs, etc. He was organist of the pro-cathedral from 1784 to 1798, and conducted a Te Deum of his own at the celebration upon the recovery of King George III, 30 April, 1789. Among his pupils were Lady Morgan, Tom Cooke, and others, and it was at one of his Rotunda concerts that John Field, the inventor of the nocturne, made his debut (4 April, 1792). His last opera, "The Cottage Festival", was produced at the Theatre Royal, Dublin, 28 Nov., 1796. His song "Caro mio ben" is still occasionally heard.

GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians*, ed. MAITLAND (London, 1906), II; EITNER, *Quellenlexikon* (1900-1904); GRATTAN-FLOOD, *Hist. of Irish Music* (3d ed., Dublin, 1909); contemporary files of Dublin papers.

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Giordano**, LUCA, Neapolitan painter; b. at Naples, 1632; d. in the same place, 12 Jan., 1705. He was esteemed the marvel of his age for the rapidity with which he covered with frescoes vast ceilings, domes, and walls in Italy and Spain, and was known as Luca "Fa Presto" (make haste), as the demand for his work was so great that his father was continually urging him to greater dispatch, until at length he was able to work with extraordinary speed. He was undoubtedly the chief of the *Machinisti*, as the popular quick-painting decorators of Italy came to be called, and perhaps no other painter has left so many pictures. He was a pupil of Ribera, and then of Pietro da Cortona, and a constant copyist of the works of Raphael.

Some of his earliest paintings were for the churches of Naples, but in 1679 he was invited to Florence, and in 1692 to Madrid, where he painted the immense ceiling and staircase of the Escorial, and an enormous number of separate pictures. In 1702 he accompanied the King of Spain to Naples, and there he spent the last three years of his life. There are sixty of his pictures in Madrid, and about half that number in Naples, while the galleries of Dresden, Munich, Paris, Vienna, Rome, and St. Petersburg, all boast of a large number of his works. He executed several etchings, and is believed to have also worked in pastel.


DOMINICI, *Vite de' Pittori Scultori e Architetti Napolitani* (Naples, 1742-45); CONCA, *Descrizione odepiorica della Spagna* (Parma, 1793); HAKERT, *Memorie de' Pittori Messinesi* (Naples, 1792).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

**Giordano Bruno**. See BRUNO, GIORDANO.

**Giorgione** (GIORGIO BARBARELLI, ZORZO DA CASTELFRANCO), Italian painter, b. at Castelfranco in or before 1477; d. in Venice in October or November, 1510. Little is known of his life. His very origin has been disputed, some authorities claiming his father to have been of the great Barbarelli family and his mother a peasant girl of Vedelago, while later investigators find no proof of this, call the Barbarelli tradition false, and make him the descendant of peasants from the March of Treviso. Giorgione means "big George"; Ruskin calls him "stout George"; all agree that he was a large, handsome man, of splendid and attractive presence. In Venice he studied under Giovanni Bellini, with Titian as a fellow-pupil. His great artistic talent developed rapidly, he outstripped his master, broke away from the timid and traditional style of the day, and became a great influence in art, even Titian following his teachings and imitating his colour, method, and style. To-day there is much confusion even in the great Continental galleries concerning the attribution of pictures to Titian and to Giorgione. With rare musical skill on the lute and with a fine voice, the talented youth was early admitted to the best Venetian society, and painted portraits of nearly all the great people; Caterina Cornaro, Gonzales (Gonzalvo) of Cordova, and two dogs being a few of his sitters. His portraits were the first to be painted in the "modern manner", and are full of dignity, truth of characterization, simplicity, and a silvery quality unsurpassed even by Velazquez. The precocious and versatile young man was the first to paint landscapes with figures, the first to paint genre—movable pictures in their own frames with no devotional, allegorical, or historical purpose—and the first whose colours possessed that ardent, glowing, and melting intensity which was so soon to typify the work of all the Venetian School.

Giorgione was the first to discard detail and substitute breadth and boldness in the treatment of nature and architecture; and he was the first to recognize that the painter's chief aim is decorative effect. He never subordinated line and colour to architecture, nor an artistic effect to a sentimental presentation. He possessed the typical artistic temperament, and this, with his vigour and gaiety, made him the true poet-painter, a "lyrical genius" (Morelli). He is well called the "joyous herald of the Renaissance". The vigour of his chiaroscuro, the superb "relief" in his work, the "grand style", and his mastery of perspective may have come in part from a study of Leonardo da Vinci, who was in Venice when Giorgione was twenty-four years old; but no trustworthy records show that the two ever met. Giorgione painted the widest range of subjects from altar-piece to *fête-champêtre*, employed few figures—usually three—in his compositions, and imitated the actual texture of draperies as none had ever done before. His method was to paint in tempera and then glaze in oil, a process contributing to great brilliance, transparency,



THE CASTELFRANCO ALTAR-PIECE  
THE MADONNA ENTHRONED WITH ST. LIBERALE AND ST. FRANCIS  
GIORGIONE, COSTANZI CHAPEL, CHURCH OF CASTELFRANCO



and permanence of colour. Giorgione introduced into Venice the fashion of painting the fronts of houses in fresco (in 1507-08 he thus decorated, with Titian, the magnificent Fondaco dei Tedeschi); and *cassoni* (marriage-chests) and other pieces of furniture were not too humble for his magic brush.

All his life was spent in Venice where his extraordinary personality started a School of Giorgione, and where his pictures, in great demand during his lifetime, had a host of imitators and copyists. Very little of his work is authenticated, and only three paintings have never been called in question by any expert or critic. The first of these is the Castelfranco altar-piece, painted when he was twenty-seven years old for the church of his native town. Here are the Madonna and Child enthroned, with Sts. Liberale and Francis below, "one of the two most perfect pictures in existence" (Ruskin); it is full of reverie, serenity, and religious sentiment, the very landscape-background awakening devotional feelings. The other unquestioned works are the "Adrastus and Hypsipyle" (called for 350 years the "Giovannelli Figures" or the "Stormy Landscape with Soldier and Gypsy"), more sombre than the altar-piece but more romantic in treatment, and the "Æneas, Evander, and Pallas" (the "Three Philosophers" or the "Chaldean Sages"), probably completed by Sebastiano del Piombo, Giorgione's pupil. The greatest rival authorities are agreed that four other works are undoubted Giorgiones: the "Knight of Malta", "Judgment of Solomon", the "Trial of Moses" (all in the Uffizi), and "Christ Bearing the Cross" in Mrs. Gardner's collection (Boston, U. S. A.). Many great canvases are denied Giorgione by modern negative criticism simply because they do not quite attain the high standard of excellence arbitrarily set for this master by connoisseurs. Tradition says his death was due to grief because his lady-love proved false; probably the plague—then raging in Venice—carried him off. He was buried on the Island of Poveglia. Other works attributed to Giorgione are: "The Concert", Pitti Gallery, Florence; "Venus", Dresden Gallery; "Fête Champêtre", Louvre; "Madonna and Child", Prado.

COOK, *Giorgione* (London, 1900); GRONAU in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1894); IDEM in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, Vol. XVIII, pt. IV; MORELLI, *Italian Painters*, tr. FROULKES (London, 1892); ANONIMO, *Notes on Pictures . . . in Italy*, tr. MUSSI, ed. WILLIAMSON.

LEIGH HUNT.

**Giotto di Bondone**, a Florentine painter, and founder of the Italian School of painting, b. most probably, in 1266 (not 1276), in the village of Vespignano near Florence, in the valley of the Mugello; d. at Milan, 8 Jan., 1337. Very little is known of his early history. Vasari relates that Cimabue, rambling one day in the neighbourhood of Colle, saw a young shepherd lad drawing one of his sheep on a piece of smooth slate with a pointed stone, and that Cimabue thereupon took the lad with him and instructed him. The story is a pretty bit of fancy. There is no reason for believing that Giotto was ever a shepherd. It is possible that his father was a peasant; if so, he was in easy circumstances and certainly a freeholder. A document dated 1320 styles him *vir proclarus*; such an epithet would not be applied to a man in straitened circumstances. As a matter of fact nothing is known of Giotto until he was thirty years old. This unfortunate gap in his personal history robs us of a story which would be of intense interest as showing the growth of his genius, and reduces us to the merest conjectures. However, without in any way detracting from Giotto's pre-eminence in Italian art, it is impossible to accord him that quasi-miraculous, providential importance that Florentine nationalism soon raised to a kind of dogma in the history of art. According to Vasari he arose in a barbarous age and straightway

revealed a fully developed art to a wondering world. This is not credible. The thirteenth century, the century of the great cathedrals and of the French school of carving whose numerous pupils were met with in all parts of Christendom, cannot be called a barbarous age. In Italy itself a widespread renaissance was taking place. At Naples and at Rome the admirable school of the *marmorarii* of which the Cosmati are the most illustrious, recalled to life much antique beauty of form. The mosaic-workers, with Jacopo Torriti and the artists who created the marvels of the Baptistery of Florence, likewise the painters, with Pietro Cavallini whose fresco cycles in Santa Maria in Trastevere (Rome) exhibit all Giotto's breadth of form, are satisfactory proof of an earlier renewal of artistic spirit and power. The "Rucellai Madonna" by Duccio dates from 1285. Twenty years earlier, perhaps the very year of Giotto's birth, Nicolò Pisano had completed the pulpit in the Baptistery of Pisa. That of Siena followed in 1272. The lovely fountain at Perugia dates from 1278. Then came the works of Giovanni Pisano, whose sympathetic genius is in more than one way akin to that of Giotto. Amid this rich and wondrous development of art the young master grew up. Though he was by no means its creator, it certainly reached in him its highest expression.

As an artist Giotto is a true son of St. Francis. It is at Assisi that he is first found, in that very basilica which was the cradle of Italian painting, and which still enshrines the most perfect records of its early history. There every master of note in the peninsula might have been seen at work. Giunta of Pisa was decorating the lower church, while Cavallini or one of his pupils was painting scenes from the Old Testament in the upper church. Cimabue was at the same time ornamenting the choir and the transept. It was doubtless in the train (*brigata*) of Cimabue that Giotto came to Assisi in 1294, and that he became acquainted with the works of the *marmorarii*, whose style so influenced his own. In 1296 Cimabue set out for Rome, whereupon Giovanni da Muro, General of the Franciscans (1296-1304), entrusted to Giotto the execution of the wonderful story of St. Francis which the painter accomplished in the famous twenty-eight scenes of the upper church. This is at once the source of Giotto's glory and the earliest example of the Italian School. In these scenes Giotto followed St. Bonaventure's life of St. Francis officially approved by the chapter of 1263 as the only official text. The first twenty-one frescoes are entirely by Giotto's hand; the remaining seven were finished from his designs by his pupils. All have suffered greatly from the humidity and from restorations. They are, nevertheless, incomparable monuments of art, and in many ways the very greatest for the history of modern painting. The intense impression created by St. Francis, the historical nearness of his truly evangelical personality, and his likeness to Jesus Christ borne out by the miracle of the *stigmata*, thenceforth influenced art to an incalculable degree. For the first time in centuries painters, until then limited to the repetition of consecrated themes, to an unvarying reproduction of hieratic patterns, were free to improvise and create. Painting was no longer an echo of tradition, but rose at once to all the dignity of invention. In the portrayal of the wonderful life-story of St. Francis, to his own age a real image of Jesus Christ, current events and the everyday life of the period were seized on and appropriated. Art no longer worked on conventional models, abstract and ideal; its models were to be the realities of nature, which the humblest intelligence is capable of appreciating. Representation of real life was to become the object of all painting. Henceforth there must always be a likeness between the painting and the object painted. The true portrait of St. Francis had to be given to the public, which must see his actions and the place where he lived, must also grasp all local



peculiarities of topography, people, dress, and architecture. This principle of actuality and reality underlay the artistic revolution initiated by Giotto. Since the days of the catacombs nothing so important had occurred in the history of painting.

The germ of all this was to be found in the very earliest portrait of St. Francis, e. g. that of the "Sagro Speco" at Subiaco and in those of the lower church at Assisi and the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli, where the figure of the saint is inset between two rows of small panel-pictures descriptive of events in his life. To enlarge these vignettes into frescoes and thereby tell the story of Francis in heroic outlines was equivalent to equating the power of artistic expression and the new vastness of the pictorial framework; this prompted, in consequence, a background overflowing, so to speak, with contemporary life. This much Giotto undertook to do, and his success was

famous mosaic that adorns the vestibule of St. Peter's, was done in collaboration with Cavallini; moreover, the original has long since disappeared beneath successive restorations. A fourteenth-century copy may be seen in the Spanish Chapel at Florence.

The frescoes from the life of Christ, which Giotto executed for St. Peter's, were destroyed in the time of Nicholas V, when the choir of old St. Peter's was being remodelled. His Roman masterpieces, however, were the three frescoes ordered by Boniface VIII for the loggia or balcony of the Lateran to commemorate the famous jubilee of 1300. They represented the baptism of Constantine, the erection of the Lateran Basilica, and the proclamation of the jubilee. The first and second have perished, and only a fragment of the third remains, inset in the eighteenth century in one of the great pillars of the basilica, where it is yet visible. The pope stands between two acolytes, in the



BONIFACE VIII  
Giotto, St. John Lateran, Rome



GIOTTO  
Ancient painting, Santa Croce, Florence



CAMPANILE OF GIOTTO  
Florence

marvellous. One is astounded at the multitude of things he suddenly brings within the domain of painting. Such an invasion of realism is not met with again till the seventeenth century, when Rubens gives us its counterpart in his life of Marie de' Medici. All Italy is there; cities and their environs, the walls of Arezzo, the temple of Minerva and the church of San Damiano at Assisi, the façade of the Lateran, the graceful interior of the Greccio church, the landscapes of Alvernia and Subasio, rural scenes like St. Francis's sermon to the birds, domestic interiors as in the "Death of the Lord of Celano", scenes from ecclesiastical life, e. g. chapter meetings and choir services. Every type of existence is laid under tribute: monks, peasants, townfolk, burghers, popes, bishops, singers by the roadside, men at drink, at feasts, and funerals. No peculiarity of place, condition, costume, or person, escapes the far-sweeping eye of the painter. He has put into his paintings every phase of life, and it is all so genuine and accurate, so true to reality that in his work, after five centuries, the Italian *trecento* still lives for us, despite the deplorable state of the frescoes, the defects of his perspective, and the childlike archaism of certain technical formulæ. No painter has ever surpassed Giotto in this power of gathering details from real life, and of surrounding the commonplace with an artistic halo. Herein also lies the power of all literary creators of life, from Dante in his "Divina Commedia" to Balzac in the "Comédie Humaine". The genius of Giotto was brought into further prominence by the works he executed at Rome, whither he was called in 1298 by Cardinal Stefaneschi. It may be noted at once that the "Navicella", i. e. the

act of giving his blessing. The loss of this fresco is somewhat compensated for by a seventeenth-century sketch (in the Ambrosian Library at Milan) which restores the ensemble of the original scene. It was a magnificent representation of an actual spectacle, a vast historical panorama of which the painter must have been an eyewitness, an immense portrait gallery showing the pope, the cardinals, the army, and the Roman people; all this on the occasion of a momentous event in the history of Christendom.

From Rome Giotto returned to Florence, perhaps in 1301, and painted the "Last Judgment" in the chapel of the Podestà. This fresco is in a way a political manifesto, being a kind of idealized grouping of all classes of Florentine society, somewhat after the manner of Dante's great poem. Therein can be recognized Dante himself, Brunetto Latini, Corso Donati, Cardinal d'Acquasparta, and Charles of Valois. The "Life of Mary Magdalen", which completed the chapel decorations, is now so faded and discoloured as to be beyond recognition. In 1306, Giotto was called to Padua to paint the Capella dell' Arena, built by Enrico Scrovegni in expiation of the crimes of his father, the famous usurer Reginaldo. On the lateral walls the artist treated in thirty-six frescoes scenes from the life of Christ and of the Blessed Virgin. Beneath these scenes he placed fourteen small cameo figures, allegories of the vices and virtues; on the end wall above the scene of the Annunciation, he painted a "Last Judgment". With this work a new epoch opens in the career of Giotto. It is the first of those vast complete series, or great decorative poems, conceived by him with systematic thoroughness, and meant to

develop fully a single great idea. It is truly a living organism, at once pictorial and theological, such as is met with later in the Spanish Chapel, on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, and in the Camera della Segnatura. This introduction of allegory, on an elevated and magnificent scale, is his new master-concept. His work is henceforth dominated by an attempt to bring out the moral meaning and by unity of purpose. The historical element, of course, still held the place of honour; it had not varied for centuries, had been the same since the mosaics of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna and Santa Maria Maggiore at Rome. Giotto, indeed, continued to use the earlier conceptions, but could not fail to imbue with his own wonderful realism the traditional treatment of these sacred scenes. There is, perhaps, no pictorial type more striking than Giotto's Judas in the scene of the kiss. Circumstances here forced the artist's genius into a new path. Since his imagination had not in these sacred scenes the freest play, he turned to the perfection of artistic style; consequently the Padua frescoes are a new phase in his realization of the beautiful. In the mind of Giotto life now appears as conditioned by art. This preoccupation with the artistic presentation of things is striking at Padua from the earlier scenes, those depicting the story of St. Joachim and the marriage of the Blessed Virgin, where there are charming pastorals rarely equalled, such as "Joachim among the shepherds", the "Meeting at the Golden Gate". One scene in particular, the marriage cortège of the Blessed Virgin, is introduced merely that the artist may develop a beautiful plastic theme, a frieze of white-veiled girls, quite like the procession of Greek maidens in the Panathenæan festivals. Ghiberti mentions other paintings made by Giotto for the Friars Minor at Padua. However, the most perfect examples of the master's maturer skill are his frescoes at Assisi, between 1310 and 1320, in the lower church of the famous basilica of St. Francis. He began in the right transept with the addition of two miracles of the saint as a kind of appendix or supplement to the "Life" which he had painted twenty years earlier in the upper church. Facing these he painted nine frescoes of the Holy Childhood, a replica of the Padua frescoes but superior for delicacy and charm. In his quality of historian Giotto never rose above this work, the most exquisite of all his narrative frescoes. His crowning work, however, in this period, was the decoration of the roof-groining over the high altar. In it he sets forth the "Triumph of St. Francis", together with the triumphs of the virtues which were the foundation of the order: poverty, chastity, obedience. This is the earliest example of those *trionfi* which from the Campo Santo at Pisa to Mantegna and Titian are a favourite theme of Italian art. It is moreover the earliest masterpiece of monumental art. The earlier "Psychomachia" of the poet Prudentius, so often treated by French sculptors and outlined by Giotto himself in the aforesaid tiny allegories of the Capella dell' Arena, takes on here a larger development. We seem to hear, as it were, an orchestration of incomparably greater variety and significance. The intimate meaning of life and thought, the power of plastic art, and the genius of beautiful symbols; the majesty of harmonious order, the beauty of the types, personifications, and persons; the wondrous blending of fact and fancy; the perfect preservation of the original colours, all combine to make this magnificently planned ensemble one of the immortal works of painting. It seems to breathe the puissant moral ideas of the Middle Ages, while one of its lovely figures, the well-known Lady Poverty, suggests from afar all the mystic and quaintly modern poetry of Botticelli's "Primavera".

The closing years of Giotto's life (1320-27) were spent at Florence. His work at this period in the

church of Santa Maria del Carmine and the palace of the Podestà, where he painted an allegory of Good Government (a theme of Ambrogio Lorenzetti at Siena in 1337), has almost entirely perished. Of all his work in the Bardi and Peruzzi chapels in the Franciscan church of Santa Croce there survive but some remnants. The Bardi chapel contains in six scenes a new life of St. Francis, besides four figures of the greater Franciscan saints: St. Clare, St. Elizabeth, St. Louis IX, King of France, and St. Louis of Toulouse. (St. Louis of Toulouse was canonized in 1317; the decoration of the chapel must, therefore, be of later date.) The Peruzzi chapel contains six scenes from the lives of St. Paul and St. John the Evangelist. These frescoes were whitewashed over in the eighteenth century, were discovered in 1840, and have suffered much in the course of restoration. In this final evolution of his art, Giotto, now a master and sure of his own powers, seems to lean towards the abstract in the treatment of his subjects. He appears to subordinate all to the rhythm of the composition. An almost excessive desire for balance and symmetry gives to these later works an aspect of stiffness, somewhat the impression of bas-reliefs. They seem somewhat cold and academic. And yet they reveal incomparable beauty and figures of genuine sculptural perfection. In the "Resurrection of St. Paul" the group of the Disciples leaning over the empty sepulchre, though two centuries earlier than Raphael, is almost the same as the group of young geometricians in the latter's "School of Athens".

There is no evidence that Giotto ever visited Ferrara, Ravenna, or any of the other places where frescoes are attributed to him. King Robert of Anjou induced him to visit Naples in 1330, and he remained there three years, but left no trace of his influence on the local school. As for the pretended journey to Avignon and his death there, it is well known to be a fiction. Simone di Martino is the true author of the admirable frescoes in the papal palace at Avignon. In his later years Giotto, recognized as chief among Italian artists, was more or less *capomaestro* or Master of the Works for all public constructions in Florence. We are told that he aided in designing the Porta San Giovanni of the Baptistery, the work of Andrea Pisano (1330). It is certain that he drew the plans for the Campanile in 1334. Perhaps the designs for the fifty-eight bas-reliefs by Andrea are partly his, recalling as they do in more than one particular the "Virtues and Vices" at Padua. There are very few of Giotto's panels, properly so-called. One large "Madonna di Maestà" in the Accademia at Florence is interesting when compared with that of Duccio. A triptych of the "Life of St. Peter" painted in 1298 for Cardinal Stefaneschi is preserved in the sacristy of the canons at St. Peter's. Finally, his "St. Francis receiving the Stigmata", at the Louvre, is a youthful résumé of the noble frescoes at Assisi.

No painter ever made such an impression on his age as Giotto. All fourteenth-century art betrays his influence. No school was ever so numerous nor so homogeneous as the *Gotteschi*. Taddeo and Agnolo Gaddi, Orcagna, Spinello, and others, it is true, are weak enough imitators of their master. Indeed, outside of Florence there is no originality save at Siena where Simone di Martino and the Lorenzetti worked, and later at Padua in the days of Jacopo Avanzo and Altichieri. The triumph of Giotto, and the thorough manner in which his successors imitated him, proved how fully he embodied the national genius. In painting he invented that *dolce stil nuovo*, that *vulgare eloquium* which Dante created in the realm of poetry. He is truly the founder of the art of painting in Italy.

He was not handsome, says Petrarch, who was his friend, as was also Dante, whose portrait he so often painted. Nor must it be imagined that this great painter of St. Francis was either a mystic or an ascetic.

He loved life too well for that. He has left us in a canzone, mediocre enough as poetry, a satire on "Holy Poverty" and the excesses of the "Fratricelli", the radicals among the Franciscans of that time. Moreover, the Florentine novelists, Boccaccio and Sacchetti, tell many anecdotes of him in which he figures as a bon-vivant, jovial, good-natured, with a sense of humour and a pardonable eccentricity. He may have been wealthy, as he worked diligently and charged good prices for his work. He married Cinto di Lapo del Pela by whom he had eight children. The eldest, Francesco, registered in 1341 as a member of the guild of painters at Florence.

VASARI, *Vite de' Pittori* (ed. Florence, 1878), I; CROWE AND CAVALCABELLE, *History of Italian Painting*, ed. DOUGLAS, II; *GiOTTO and the Giottoesque* (London, 1903); VENTURI, *Storia dell'Arte italiana* (Milan, 1907), V; BERENSON, *The Florentine Painters of the Renaissance* (New York, 1898); THODE, *Franz von Assisi und die Anfänge der Kunst der Renaissance in Italien* (Berlin, 1885); IDEM, *GiOTTO* (Bielefeld, 1899); ZIMMERMAN, *GiOTTO und die Kunst Italiens im Mittelalter* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1899-1900); RUSKIN, *GiOTTO and His Works in Padua* (London, 1853-60); IDEM, *Fors Clavigera* (London, 1871-1874); IDEM, *Mornings in Florence* (London, 1875); FREY, *GiOTTO in Monthly Review*, Dec., 1900, and Feb., 1901; PERKINS, *GiOTTO* (London, 1902).

LOUIS GILLET.

**Giovannelli**, RUGGIERO, composer, b. at Velletri, near Rome, in 1560; d. at Rome, 7 January, 1625. In 1584 he was appointed choir-master at the church of San Luigi de' Francesi in Rome, and subsequently at the Chiesa dell' Anima. As a composer of madrigals he was exceedingly fertile, and his six books of them, with one of canzonets and villanelles, appeared between the years 1585 and 1606. So great was his fame as a choir-master and composer that on the death of the illustrious Palestrina, he was appointed his successor, 12 March, 1594. Among his sacred works are some beautiful masses for eight and twelve voices, and some pleasing motets. So little is known of his later years that biographers could formerly find no trace of Giovannelli after 1615, at which date he published the second volume of his new edition of the Graduale known as the "Medicean". However, thanks to the researches of W. H. Frey, of Berlin, it is now certain that Giovannelli lived ten years longer. He was buried in the church of Santa Marta.

BAINI, *Memorie storico-critiche* (Rome, 1828); EITNER, *Quellenlexikon* (1900-1904); GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians*, ed. MATTLAND (London, 1906), II; *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* (Ratisbon, 1909), XXII.

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Giovanni Bosco**, VENERABLE. See BOSCO, GIOVANNI MELCHIOR, VENERABLE.

**Giovinazzo**. See MOLFETTA, GIOVINAZZO, AND TERLIZZI, DIOCESE OF.

**Giraldi**, GIOVANNI BATTISTA (surnamed CINTIO), Italian dramatist and novelist; b. at Ferrara, Italy, 1504; d. there, 1573. He studied philosophy and medicine in his native town. Under the patronage of the family ruling over his native region, he served for a while as secretary to the dukes of Ferrara, but wearying of his duties, he gave himself up to academic life as a professor in turn at the Universities of Mondovì, Turin, and Pavia. Among his minor works there is a disquisition on the methods to be observed in the composition of epic, romance, drama, etc. (*Discorsi intorno al compor romanzi, commedie e tragedie*, etc.), which shows him to be one of the leading literary critics of the time. He essayed the pastoral drama with the "Egle", and the epic with the "Ercole". His dramatic labours extended further, to the production of one comedy, the "Eudemoni", and nine tragedies, among which are the "Didone", the "Cleopatra", the "Selene", and his best play, the "Orbecche". Even more than for the "Orbecche", a rather gory piece, Giraldi is remembered for his collection of tales, the "Ecatommithi" (Hecatommithi). In this he feigns, therein imitating the framework of Boccaccio's "Decameron", that a company of men and women, fleeing

from the sack of Rome in 1527, take ship at Civitavecchia for Marseilles, and beguile the tedium of the journey by reciting a hundred tales, divided into ten decades. As a matter of fact there are 112 tales in the work. The style of the "Hecatommithi" has little to recommend it, being rather cold and colourless; and although the author announces his purpose of telling stories that shall stigmatize vice, and exalt virtue and religion, he does not wholly avoid the licentious and unbecoming. It is worthy of note that the seventh tale of the third decade tells the story of the Moor of Venice, later used in Shakespeare's "Othello".

Tragedie (ed. Venice, 1581-3); *Ecatommithi* (ed. Florence, 1834); BILANCINI, G. B. *Giraldi e la tragedia italiana nel sec. XVI* (Aquila, 1889); VECOLI, *L'intento morale degli Ecatommithi* (Camajore, 1890).


J. D. M. FORD.

**Giraldi**, UBALDO (UBALDO A SANCTO CAJETANO), an Italian canonist; b. in 1692; d. in 1775. He was a member of the Piarists (*Clerici regulares Scholarum piarum*), was twice assistant general-councillor of his congregation, was provincial of the Roman province, rector of the Piarist college at Rome, and Apostolic examiner for the Roman clergy. He published an edition, with additions (Rome, 1757), of the "Institutiones Canonice" of Remy Maschat, also a Piarist. The "Expositio juris pontificii" of Giraldi (Rome, 1769; re-edited, 1829-1830) is not a treatise on canon law. The author merely reproduces the principal texts of the Decretals and of the Council of Trent, adding thereto such papal documents as interpret or modify their meaning, with a brief commentary of his own. His last work, on which his reputation is chiefly based, was a new edition with notes and additions of Barbosa's great work on parish priests, "Animadversiones et additamenta ex posterioribus summorum pontificum constitutionibus et sacrarum congregationum decretis desumpta, ad Aug. Barbosa, de Officio et Potestate parochi" (Rome, 1773, new ed., 1831).

SCHULTE, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechtes* (Stuttgart, 1875-1880), III, 534-535; HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

A. VAN HOVE.


**Giraldus Cambrensis** (GERALD DE BARRY) was a distinguished writer, historian, and ecclesiastic of the early Middle Ages; b. in Manorbier, Pembrokeshire, about the year 1147; d. probably between the years 1216 and 1220. His father, William de Barry, was one of the most powerful of the Welsh nobility at the time. Though Gerald's brothers adopted the profession of arms he himself followed a more peaceful course, devoted himself to study, and, influenced by his uncle, the Bishop of St. David's, resolved to become an ecclesiastic. He went to Paris to continue his studies; and, if we are to believe his own account, he was looked upon here as a model of piety and learning. He returned to England about 1172, and was employed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on various ecclesiastical missions in Wales, where he distinguished himself for his efforts to remove the abuses then flourishing in the Welsh Church. He was appointed Archdeacon of Brecknock. On the death of his uncle, the Bishop of St. David's (1176), the chapter fixed upon Giraldus as the man most likely to withstand the aggressions of the Archbishop of Canterbury and submitted his name to Henry II. The king promptly rejected him in favour of one of his Norman retainers; the chapter acquiesced in the decision; and Giraldus, disappointed with the result, withdrew to Paris and here continued his studies. In 1180 he returned to Wales and received an appointment from the Bishop of St. David's, which he soon resigned, and was sent by Henry II to accompany Prince John on his Irish expedition (1184). While in Ireland he composed his work "Topographia Hibernica", which purports to give a description of the country, but is full of legends and tales, as well as the "Expugnatio Hibernica". The latter work is not entirely unreliable, but



ST. FRANCIS UNDERGOING THE ORDEAL BY FIRE  
HONORIUS III CONFIRMING THE RULE OF ST. FRANCIS



GIOTTO—FRESCOES IN SANTA CROCE, FLORENCE



THE FUNERAL OF ST. FRANCIS  
ZACHARY IN THE TEMPLE







requires to be read with care. He left Ireland in 1186, and two years later accompanied Archbishop Baldwin in his journeys through Wales, preaching the crusade. Here, according to his own account (*Itinerarium Cambriae*), his eloquence met with such a response that Wales was denuded of its fighting men. He went to France, but was recalled to England in 1190, where he informs us he was offered the Bishopric of Bangor and, in 1191, that of Llandaff.

On the death of Peter de Leia, 1198, the chapter of St. David's again nominated Giraldus for the bishopric; but Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, refused confirmation. Representatives of the canons followed Richard to France, but before they could interview him he died; his successor, King John, received them kindly, and granted them permission to hold an election. They were unanimous in their selection of Giraldus; and, as Hubert still refused to confirm the election, Giraldus started for Rome, where he had an interview with Innocent III. The archbishop, however, had anticipated him, and, as the pope was not convinced that St. David's was independent of Canterbury, the mission of Giraldus proved a failure. It was in connexion with this that he wrote his book "*De jure Menevensis Ecclesiae*". Giraldus returned, and was supported by the chieftains of Wales, while King John warmly espoused the cause of the Archbishop of Canterbury. After a long struggle the chapter of St. David's deserted Giraldus, and having been obliged to escape secretly from Wales he fled to Rome. Pope Innocent III annulled both elections, and Geoffrey Henlaw was appointed to the See of St. David's, despite the strenuous exertions of Giraldus, who afterwards was reconciled with the king, and received from him a small pension. At the next election in St. David's, 1214, his name was passed over in silence. He was alive after 1216, as it is evident from the way in which he speaks of John that that king was already dead.

De Barry was a writer of remarkable brilliancy and force, a narrator rather than a historian, full of self-confidence, and at times courage, and on the whole neither the model of perfection which he proclaims himself to be, nor the despicable character which he is oftentimes painted. His works are published in the *Rolls Series*; and in the prefaces to the volumes may be sought indications as to probable dates of composition and publication. Appended is a list of de Barry's writings: "*Topographia Hibernica*"; "*Expugnatio Hibernica*"; "*Itinerarium Cambriae*"; "*Gemma Ecclesiastica*"; "*De Instructione Principum*"; "*De Rebus a se gestis*"; "*Vita S. Davidis II episcopi Menevensis*" (which Brewer considers as, more probably, the work of Giraldus); "*Descriptio Cambriae*" (published as the last); "*Vita Galfridi Arch. Eboracensis*"; "*Symbolum Electorum*"; "*Invectionum Libellus*"; "*Speculum Ecclesiae*"; "*Vita S. Remigii*"; "*Vita S. Hugonis*"; "*Vita S. Davidis archiepiscopi Menevensis*"; "*Vita S. Ethelberti*"; "*Epistola ad Stephanum Langton*"; "*De Giraldo Archidiacono Menevensi*"; "*De Libris a se scriptis*"; "*Catalogus brevior librorum*"; "*Retractationes*"; "*De jure Menevensis Ecclesiae*". See introduction to his works by the editors, Brewer and Dimock.

The works of Giraldus dealing especially with Ireland: the "*Topography*", and "*History of the Conquest*", though long regarded as possessing considerable authority, did not escape hostile criticism. In "*Cambrensis Eversus*" (1662), under the pseudonym of Gratianus Lucius, Dr. Lynch, of whose personal history little is known, produced a work which, though controversial in character, entitles the author to repute rather as a painstaking chronicler than as a controversialist of a high order. After criticizing the "*Topography*" adversely, and showing that the title of the second book, the "*Conquest of Ireland*", is a misnomer, the writer of "*Cambrensis Eversus*" disproves

de Barry's title of historian, and meets his charges against the Irish people. Giraldus is impeached with ignorance of the language, and unfamiliarity with the country; he is said to have embodied in his works unauthenticated narratives, with little regard for chronology; his own admission that he had "followed the popular rumours of the land" is extended in meaning, and perhaps unduly insisted upon.

Nor is the "*Cambrensis Eversus*" merely a collection of arbitrary accusations and unsubstantial rejoinders, made with a view to effect the discredit of de Barry as a writer of history. What might be urged as the greatest imperfection of Lynch's polemic, its too great wealth of detail, had not escaped the attention of the able author, who excuses the diffuseness to which he is compelled by asseverating his determination to follow Giraldus closely to the end. Whatever may be said as to the ability with which Lynch discharged his task of controversialist, there can be no denial of the thoroughness and, above all, the sincerity of his methods. He does not pick out the weak points in his opponent's armour, and never shirks the issue; but grapples with every difficulty, as the order of his opponent suggests.

Perhaps the most serious accusation levelled against Giraldus, next to the indictment of bias and dishonesty, is that wherein he is impeached of being addicted to the cult of the superstitious and the practice of witchcraft. If this be true, and Merlin would seem to have exercised a considerable sway over the mind of de Barry, then it would be vain to seek in the writings of the latter the reflex of that calm discrimination and sober balance of judgment which should characterize the historian. Finally, it may be said that the student of Irish history, by reading the works of Giraldus in the light of "*Cambrensis Eversus*", cannot fail to derive a helpful knowledge of the period which they embrace.

GIRALDUS, *De Rebus a se gestis*, and *De jure Menevensis Ecclesiae*; Brewer's Introduction to vol. I of the edition of works of Giraldus in the *Rolls Series*; life of Giraldus in *Itinerarium Cambriae*, tr. HOARE (London, 1806); WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra*, II, 374; LYNCH, *Cambrensis Eversus*, ed. KELLY (3 vols., Dublin, 1848-51). JAMES MACCAFFREY.

Girard, JEAN-BAPTISTE, known as Père Girard, a Swiss pedagogue, b. at Fribourg, 17 December, 1765; d. there, 6 March, 1850. At sixteen he entered the novitiate of the Franciscans at Lucerne; after spending some time teaching in the colleges of the order, he went to Würzburg for his philosophical and theological studies, and was there ordained to the priesthood. Returning to Fribourg in 1789, he spent ten years in missionary work and in teaching philosophy to the young men of his order. His admiration for Kantian ideas, although restricted, was the occasion of suspicion of his orthodoxy. Upon the invitation of Stapfer, minister of arts and sciences, Girard wrote a plan for education in Switzerland and was called to Berne where he remained four years. In 1804 he was recalled to Fribourg, and took up work in the primary schools.

As director of the schools in Fribourg (1807-1823), Girard made education compulsory, organized the school administration, insisted on the adoption of good textbooks and methods, and introduced the monitorial system, avoiding the abuse of mere memory exercise and making every study converge to the child's complete education. These reforms, though crowned with success, were the occasion for bitter opposition from those who did not realize the importance of education, or adhered to the old routine methods. In 1809 Girard was sent to Yverdon to make a report to the Government on Pestalozzi's institution. He had met the latter in Berne and professed the greatest admiration for his ability as an educator, while differing from him on several important points, especially on the value of the monitorial system. This

method, in fact, which Girard applied, was opposed by the bishop and the civil authorities of Fribourg, in 1823. Girard abandoned his school and went to Lucerne as professor of philosophy in the gymnasium. In 1834 he returned to Fribourg, where he remained till his death, engaged in educational pursuits and in the publication of some of his works. He had a great reputation in France, being a Knight of the Legion of Honour, and a corresponding member of the Académie des Sciences morales et politiques.

Besides many reports and memoirs, his principal writings are: "Cours de philosophie fait au Lycée de Lucerne" (1829-31); "Des moyens de stimuler l'activité dans les écoles" (1835); "Parallèle entre la philosophie et la physique" (1840); and "Cours éducatif de langue maternelle" (Paris, 1840-48). These works banish abstractions that are above the child's intelligence, principles and rules being taught chiefly by means of concrete examples, and difficulties being introduced gradually. They contain the foundation of modern educational textbooks, and are still well worth studying. Père Girard ranks next to Pestalozzi among Swiss pedagogues.

MICHEL, *Biographie du Père Girard in L'éducation pratique* (Paris, 1839-40); COMPAYRÉ in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v.; DAGUER in Buisson, *Dictionnaire de pédagogie* (Paris, 1887), I, 1, 1178.

C. A. DUBRAY.

**Girardon, François**, noted sculptor of the reign of Louis XIV, b. at Troyes, France, 1630; d. at Paris, 1715. The son of a bronze-founder, he studied first under the sculptor François Anguier and afterwards at Rome. Returning to France he was taken into the service of the king, working under Lebrun, whose favourite he was. After Lebrun's death in 1690 he exerted great influence as professor of the academy of sculpture and painting, of which institution he later became the chancellor. Like the other sculptors of his time he followed in the footsteps of Bernini, but the influence of the old school of Fontainebleau was also perceptible in his work. The Louvre possesses the model of his spirited equestrian statue of the king which was erected in the Place Vendôme and destroyed during the Revolution. One of his finest works is the monument to Richelieu, in the church of the Sorbonne; the dying cardinal lies on a richly draped sarcophagus, supported by the figure of religion, while the figure of science mourns at his feet. Among his other sepulchral monuments are those in memory of his wife, the Princess de Conti, and the minister Louvois. The bust of Boileau is forceful, but the wig on the beardless head reveals the tendency of the art of the age of Louis XIV to weaken its stateliness by effeminacy. Both these qualities are seen in the "Rape of Proserpine", an imitation of Bernini, which relies on the effect of contrast. The "Nymphs Bathing", a relief intended, like the work just mentioned, for the park of Versailles, is a good example of his decorative, voluptuous style. Among other figures in the park of Versailles, either produced by him or under his direction, attention may be called to the allegorical statue, "Winter as an Old Man".

CORRAUD DE BRÉBAN, *Notice sur la vie et les œuvres de Fr. Girardon* (Paris and Troyes, 1850).

G. GIETMANN.

**Giraud de Borneil**, a Provençal troubadour, b. about the middle of the twelfth century, at Excideuil in the Viscounty of Limoges. The precise dates of his life are not known, but according to the best authorities, it fell between 1160 and 1219. Although of humble birth Giraud de Borneil counted among his patrons many kings, as: Richard Cœur de Lion, whom he accompanied to Palestine, on the Third Crusade; Bohemond III, Prince of Antioch; Fernando III of Castile; Alfonso IX of Leon; Pedro II of Aragon, to whom he addressed several poems, and Sancho, King of Navarre, who did not deserve the admiration the poet

bestowed upon him. With his feudal lord, Gui V, Viscount of Limoges, however, he was not always on good terms. His life was simple and studious. In winter he frequented the schools of learning and studied literature under the most celebrated teachers of the period. In summer, accompanied by two singers who recited his songs, he visited the courts of his royal patrons. He never married, and at death divided his property between some poor relations and his parish church of Saint-Gervais. Giraud enjoyed in his time a very high reputation. Dante, in the "De vulgari eloquio" (II, 2), reckons him one of the three great troubadours, Arnaud Daniel and Bertrand de Born being the other two. An anonymous Provençal biographer of the thirteenth century goes so far as to say: "He was the best troubadour of those who lived before him or came after him, and for that reason was called the master of the troubadours, a title which is still applied to him in the opinion of those who know something about poetry and love." Dante, however, challenges this verdict and places Arnaud Daniel far above Giraud de Borneil (Purgatory, XXVI). No complete edition of Giraud de Borneil's works has as yet appeared. The eighty poems ascribed to him with some certainty are scattered through various collections, including: Raynourd, "Choix des poésies originales des troubadours" (Paris, 1816), and Millot, "Histoire littéraire des troubadours" (Paris, 1774). His early poems, in which the influence of Arnaud Daniel is felt, belong to that form called in Provençal *trobar clus*, in which the meaning is involved and obscure. He soon rejected this manner and claimed in a *tenso* (poem in form of a dialogue) that "easy and simple poetry is more esteemed and liked". Among the best of his poems are: an *alba* (song at daybreak), where he makes a graceful compromise between the popular and the studied forms of poetry; the love songs addressed to Alamanda d'Estanc; a few *serventes* (political and satirical poems), in which the poet gives expression to the chivalrous ideals of the age, and some *pastorelas*.

DREZ, *Leben und Werke der Troubadours* (Zwickau, 1829); *Histoire littéraire de la France* (Paris, 1832), XVII; MILLOT, *Histoire littéraire des troubadours* (Paris, 1774), II; LA CROIX DU MAINE, *Bibliographie française* (Paris, 1772).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

**Girba**, a titular see in the province of African Tripoli. It is an island, in ancient times called Meninx, and included three principal cities, Meninx, Tipasa, and Girba, whence its present name. At least two bishops of Girba are known, Monnulus and Vincent, who assisted at the Councils of Carthage in 255 and 525 (Toulotte, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne* Proconsulaire, Paris, 1892, pp. 353 and 380). In the seventh century it is again found under the name of Terepiti, a corrupt form for Gergiton or Gerbiton (Byzant. Zeitschrift, II, 1893, 26, 31). During the Middle Ages the Christians of Sicily and Aragon disputed its possession with the Arabs, and the Spaniards seized upon it several times during the sixteenth century, notably in 1510 and 1535. In 1560 the Corsair Dragut surprised the Spanish fleet, which lost thirty vessels and five thousand men. The garrison was put to death, and with the bones of the slain the Turks built a pyramid called Bordjer-Rious, the fortress of the skulls, which existed until the middle of the nineteenth century, when the bones were removed to the Christian cemetery of Houmt-Souk. To-day the island of Djerba numbers forty thousand souls, several hundreds of whom are Maltese Catholics who earn a livelihood as sponge-fishers. The climate is mild and the soil well cultivated. The island belongs to the regency of Tunis, which is under French protectorate.

SMITH, *Dict. of Gr. and Roman Geog.* (London, 1828), II, 329, s. v. *Meninx*. S. VAILLÉ.

**Girdle**. See CINCTURE.

**Girgenti**, DIOCESE OF (AGRIGENTINA).—Girgenti is the capital of a province in Sicily and is situated about


three miles from the sea, on a steep rock overlooking a rich plain watered by the Drago. Besides a trade in vegetables, fruits, and cereals, it is a mining centre for sulphur, soda, chalk, copper, and iron. Its marble quarries are also rich. The Greeks called it Acragas; the Romans Agrigentum. It was founded by a Greek colony from Gela about 582 B. C. The upper portion of the town was already in existence. It was called Camicum from its position on a platform of Mt. Camicus, and was surrounded by cyclopean walls. The Greeks settled at the foot of this acropolis, which they made the acropolis of their city; soon the town was doing a rich trade with the Carthaginians, and was reckoned, after Syracuse, the first town in Sicily. Like other Doric towns, it became a republic, but was often under the control of tyrants, e. g. Phalaris the Cruel (570-555), Theron (488-472), who with Gelon of Syracuse defeated the Carthaginians under Hamilcar near Himera (480 B. C.). The war of Thasydeus, son and successor of Theron, on Hieron of Syracuse, brought Agrigentum under the tyrants of Syracuse (471 B. C.), but it soon regained its freedom. In 406 the Carthaginians under Hannibal and later under Himilco besieged the city, captured it, slew the inhabitants, and despoiled the temples of their artistic treasures, which were carried off to Carthage. Once more it regained autonomy, only to fall under the tyranny of Phintias (288 B. C.). After this it became the centre of Carthaginian resistance to Rome. In 262 the Romans captured it for the first time, and in 210 they gained complete control. The wealth and splendour of the ancient city are attested by all writers, and by ruins that remain till this day. The principal antiquities are: the temple of Jupiter on the acropolis, of which seven columns of the peristyle remain; that of Minerva, to which many of the townsfolk fled in 406 B. C., seeking death under its ruins rather than fall into the hands of the Carthaginians; in the district known as Neapolis the temple of Hercules mentioned by Cicero in his "Oratio in Verrem"; the Temple of Concord, in old Ionic style, the best preserved of them all, because used as a church in later times; over one of the cornices was carved a treaty of alliance between Agrigentum and Lilybæum. There are, moreover: the temple of Juno Lacinia; the temple of Æsculapius, which contained a bronze statue of the god (this work of Myron was carried away to Carthage but restored by Scipio Africanus); the temple of Olympian Jove, according to Polybius the largest and most beautiful in Sicily. In 1401 three colossal caryatides supporting an architrave were dis-



RUINS OF TEMPLE OF CASTOR AND POLLUX, GIRGENTI

covered; the fact was commemorated in the coat of arms of Girgenti. Other edifices of the city were: the temple of Castor and Pollux, of which there remains an architrave supported on four pillars; the temple of Vulcan; that of Ceres and Proserpine; and the remains of a stadium. In 827 the Arabs, called in by the Byzantine tribune Euphemios, captured the city, and spread over the whole island. In the eleventh century Girgenti was the centre of Saracen resistance to the Normans, who finally captured it in 1087; thenceforth it shared the fortune of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

In the roll of its illustrious citizens are found the names of the philosophers Empedocles and Acron; the historian Philinos; the musician Metellos, Plato's master; the dramatists Archion and Carenos; the orator Sophocles; the humanist Nicolò la Valle; and the dramatist Francescodel Carretto. Among the natural curiosities of note in the neighbourhood is the hill of Maccalubba, studded with small craters, about thirty inches deep, spouting cold water, carbonic acid, and hydrogen mixed with asphaltum, chalk, sulphate of lime, etc. The cathedral is built of ancient materials, and has a beautiful Madonna by Guido Reni, and paintings by Nunzio Magro. The church of S. Nicolò exhibits a very fine Norman doorway. Girgenti venerates St. Liber-



LOWER PART OF CAMPANILE, CATHEDRAL OF GIRGENTI

tinus as its earliest apostle; he is said to have been sent thither by St. Peter. The earliest bishop of whose date we are certain is St. Potamius, a contemporary of Pope Agapetus I (535-36). St. Gregory I, Bishop of Agrigentum, said to have been martyred in 262, is probably only a double of the homonymous bishop who was a contemporary of St. Gregory the Great. The list of bishops, interrupted by the Saracen invasion, began again in 1093 with St. Gerlando. Other bishops of note are: Rinaldo di Acquaviva (1244), who restored the cathedral and crowned King Manfred, for which latter action he was excommunicated by Alexander IV; and Fra Matteo Gimmara, called the Blessed. Girgenti is a suffragan of Monreale, has 66 parishes and 381,000 souls, 10 religious houses for men, and 42 for women. It is

also a centre for the Azione Cattolica Sociale in Sicily. PIRRI, *Sicilia Sacra* (1838), II, 263-384; 3rd ed., I, 691-764; CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia*, XXI; PIGONE, *Memorie storiche agrigentine*; Rocco, *Girgenti in Italia Artistica* (Bergamo, 1904), X; CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibl.*, s. v.

U. BENIGNI.

There are, moreover: the temple of Juno Lacinia; the temple of Æsculapius, which contained a bronze statue of the god (this work of Myron was carried away to Carthage but restored by Scipio Africanus); the temple of Olympian Jove, according to Polybius the largest and most beautiful in Sicily. In 1401 three colossal caryatides supporting an architrave were dis-

Gisbert, BLAISE, French rhetorician and critic; b. at Cahors, 21 February, 1657; d. at Montpellier, 21 February, 1731. Having entered the Society of Jesus

in 1672, he taught the humanities, rhetoric, and philosophy, after which he devoted himself for a long time to preaching. The pleasure which Gisbert took in discussing pulpit eloquence with Lamoignon, the intendant of Languedoc, impelled him to write an essay on sacred eloquence, which he entitles "Le bon goût de l'éloquence chrétienne" (Lyons, 1702). He spent ten years in retouching this essay, and augmented it considerably by adding to the rules examples drawn from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, especially St. John Chrysostom. The second edition appeared at Lyons in 1715 under the title "L'Eloquence chrétienne dans l'idée et dans la pratique". The work, which comprises twenty-three chapters, does not follow the rigorous order of a didactical treatise and is without the dryness of a scholastic manual. It has been rightly called "un livre éloquent sur l'éloquence". It contains a series of talks on the faults to be avoided in the pulpit, on the qualities necessary to the preacher, on the matter and form of sermons, on oratorical action and decorum. Gisbert's book sufficed to make its author famous not only among the Catholic clergy, but even among Protestant pastors. One of them, Jacques Lenfant (1661-1728) carefully annotated it, and another, Kornrumpf, translated it into German. An Italian translation also appeared during Gisbert's lifetime, and later a Latin translation. The latest and best French edition is that of Crampon and Boucher (Paris, 1865). As a sort of supplement Gisbert wrote reflections on the collections of sermons printed in France from 1570 to about 1670. In this he considers, according to the somewhat narrow ideals of his age, ten orators before Bossuet and Bourdaloue. The MS. of this interesting "Histoire critique de la chaire française depuis François I<sup>er</sup>" was lost, but was finally recovered by Mgr Puyol and published by Fathers Chérot and Griselle, S.J., in the "Revue Bourdaloue", 1902-04.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus*, III, 1461; *Revue Bourdaloue*, 1902, 128.

PAUL DEBUCHY.

**Giulio Romano**, properly GIULIO DEI GIANNUZZI, also known as GIULIO PIPPI, a famous architect and painter, the best-known of Raphael's pupils, and the unique representative of the so-called "Roman School"; b. at Rome in 1492; d. at Mantua in 1546. At the age of 19, Giulio placed himself under Raphael, who had just finished after three years (1509-12) the Halls of the Segnatura and Heliodorus. In 1514, Raphael was appointed general overseer of works by Leo X, conducted in 1519 the excavations of ancient Rome, and found it difficult to carry out all his undertakings. It came thus to pass that the assistant was soon the factotum and right hand of the master, who during the later portion of his career seldom found time (except for a few portraits) to take a brush into his hands.

As an artist, Giulio has no originality; as a painter, he is merely a *tempérament*, a prodigious worker. His manual dexterity is unaccompanied by any greatness of conception or high moral principle. He enlarged and executed in fresco or on canvas the drawings and studies completed by Raphael for his pictures. In this way were completed, within eight years, "Fire in the Borgo" (1513), the cartoons of the "Acts of the Apostles" (1512-1514), the loggias of the Vatican (1514-1519), the frescoes of the Farnesina (1518), and many other famous works such as the "Lo Spasimo" (Christ bearing the Cross), the "Pearl", the "Virgin with the Fish" (Madrid), the "St. Michael" of the Louvre, and "The Holy Family" executed for Francis I (1518). With all his cleverness Giulio never caught the real glow of Raphael's genius; the master's divine ideas became vulgarized in passing through Giulio's more material brain. Moreover he was carried away by the power of Michelangelo's works (the Sistine

Roof was uncovered in 1512), which, however, he misinterpreted as the brute force of physical strength. Thus Raphael's graceful figures often became in Giulio's hands coarse muscular giants like the "Ignudi" and the "Prophets". Giulio is also responsible for the brick-coloured tones and plaster flesh-tints of the men and women in Raphael's later works, the artistic defects of which are in many cases entirely due to Giulio. A number of the master's most beautiful conceptions have come down to us only under this imperfect form, spoiled for ever by the triviality and lack of delicacy of the execution, and the pity of it is that, on the strength of Raphael's signature, these works seemed to impress the seal of sanction on many serious defects in the French School of the seventeenth century. Much time and discussion would have been saved if in arguing over the famous "Transfiguration" (1520), for instance, it were admitted that in its present state, as completed by Giulio, it is impossible to say what the master's original idea was, since the secret of it is buried with him in the grave. As for the "Battle of Constantine", and the "Coronation of the Virgin", it would be as well to admit that they retain nothing whatever of Raphael.

Although the sole interest of this early portion of Giulio's career consists in the light it throws on Raphael's work, it is of greater artistic importance than all Giulio's subsequent independent efforts. Yet even they are not without interest. They show us Giulio developing, though with undoubted talent, some of the defects and deadly vices which lay hidden in the Renaissance movement. The most serious of these defects is dilettantism, or virtuosity for its own sake. Giulio had not with impunity devoted ten years simply to the execution of another's ideas; he came to believe that in art the thought is of no account, the form everything. The necessary connexion between the idea and its expression, between art and life, quite escaped him. This was the grave defect of the Italian spirit—the abuse of art, the worship of form, the indifference to subject, and it could hardly fail to prove fatal to an artist whom it had obsessed.

An opportunity of translating this erroneous principle to canvas on a large scale was afforded to Giulio by the Duke of Mantua. For 22 years (1524-1546) the artist was absolute master of all the works of art executed in that town. He entirely remodelled the interior decoration of the old palace (the Palazzo di Corte), lavishing on it all the resources of his inexhaustible fancy. He refashioned the interior of the cathedral; he raised the important church of San Benedetto, and he built from roof to cellar the famous Palace of Tajetto, near the gates of the town.

It is especially in these two palaces, which were almost entirely painted by him or his pupils, that Giulio marks an epoch in the history of art. His lively but superficial fancy, incapable of deep emotion, of religious feeling, or even of observation, attracted him to neutral subjects, to mythological paintings, and imaginary scenes from the world of fable. Therein under the cloak of humanism, he gave expression to a sensualism rather libertine than poetical, an epicureanism unredeemed by any elevated or noble quality. It is this that wins for Giulio his distinctive place in art. His conception of form was never quite original; it was always a clever and "bookish" compromise between Raphael and Michelangelo. His sense of colour grows ever louder and uglier, his ideas are void of finesse, whatever brilliancy they show is second-hand. His single distinctive characteristic is the doubtful ease with which he played with the commonplaces of pagandom. In this respect at least, paintings like those of the "Hall of Psyche" (1532) are historical landmarks. It is the first time (even if we include the Farnesina) that an appeal is made to the senses with all the brutal frankness of a modern work. Unlike Raphael's "Galatea" and his "Three Graces",

examples of Elysian happiness in a race in the state of innocence, Giulio's decorations resemble saturnalia of lubricity itself. The vulgarity of the drawing leaves no illusion as to the nature of its intention; nothing remains of the ancient myth, thus stripped of all its ideal signification, but what serves to excite the senses. Thus art, losing all moral import, sinks inevitably to the level of a game of conventional rules, and the cloak of fiction serves only to disguise the grossness of the instincts, which have ousted every laudable ideal.

Such was the result of "art for art's sake" in his case, and the danger of such principles was aggravated by the superstitious reverence for the antique in the sixteenth century. The word *antique* was held to purify and sanctify everything: all things were lawful in the name of erudition, the antique became a fetish. In the Hall of Troy (1534-1538) in the Palazzo di Corte, and in his "Triumph of Titus and Vespasian" in the Louvre, Giulio, following in the footsteps of Mantegna, had given evidence that he too was among the learned, the connoisseurs, the men of disinterested culture, and no doubt concluded that he was thereby entitled to dispense with the claims of morality in the rest of his works. It was not long until the same specious reasoning became the fashion in Europe. Primatice introduced it to the Court of Fontainebleau; and Rubens, who spent eight years (1600-1608) at the Court of Mantua, brought it back with him to Flanders. Giulio is the originator of those lascivious pictures, dating from 1630 to 1638, which are in the Prado and Torre de la Pareja galleries at Madrid. Mantua, Giulio's town, rather than Rome was the teacher of the seventeenth century. The consequences of these principles were disastrous. The antique, indeed, could only be the religion of the few, but, by constituting fable the sole vehicle of the beautiful, Giulio, vulgarian though he was, fell into the error of "aristocratizing" art, and thus of severing its indispensable bond with the real. Henceforth its public became fewer; art, becoming the property of an intellectual class, was exposed to all the risks inherent in caste and party spirit. It was now a privileged possession, a code-language for use only among the initiated. Emancipated from morality (thanks to the sophism of the antique), deprived of the necessary support of reality, and immune from the common-sense verdict of the general public, it gave utterance only to aimless, useless, soulless, lifeless abstractions. As an example may be cited the most famous of Giulio's works, the "Hall of the Giants" (1532-1534) in the Palace of the Tajetto. It is difficult to say whether the artist was here the dupe of his imagination, or whether the work was the result of a jocular wager, for it is certainly a freak, a shock like those that used to startle the yokels in the Gardens of Castello and of Pratolino. But the effect here is brought about by such palpable illusion, the imposture is so enormous, it demands so many concessions from the spectator, it presupposes such a lack of all critical power on his part, that it is hard to understand such a pleasantry, though for Giulio's sake one would gladly wish it such. The


effort is so out of proportion to the result that one cannot repress a feeling of pity. Such a lack of dignity comes as a shock. There is, of course, in the Italian genius a substratum of scepticism, of irony, of parody, which outsiders can never quite realize. But was it worth while to heap Pelion on Ossa, to shake the whole world, to create such a cataclysm of colour, merely to raise a smile? Or can it be that the logical outcome of the doctrine of "art for art's sake" is nothing more or less than the bizarre and the burlesque?

Distinguished by such characteristics and marked by such defects, Giulio Romano occupies nevertheless an important place in the history of art. More than any other, he aided in propagating the pseudo-classical, half-pagan style of art so fashionable during the seventeenth century, and it is mainly through his influence that after the year 1600 we find so few religious painters in Europe. It was reserved to a Dutchman—Rembrandt—to reconcile art and moral-

ity once more. By his influence as a pupil of Raphael, Giulio contributed to spread the evil germs of Italian Art—carelessness of finish, bravura, lack of sincerity, lack of truth, mannerism, love of the grotesque. He painted many altar-pieces; the best is the "Stoning of St. Stephen" in S. Stefano at Genoa, executed before leaving Rome, when the mantle of Raphael was still on him. His Madonnas, such as the "Madonna della Gatta" (Naples), the "Madonna della Catina" (Dresden), are mere genre pictures without feeling or religious depth, having the sort of abstract beauty we expect in bas-reliefs. The "Nativity" of the Louvre is an attempt to reproduce the chiaro-oscuro of Corregio.

VASARI, *Vite de' più eccellenti pittori*, ed. MILANESI (Florence, 1878); D'ARCO, *Storia della vita e delle opere di Giulio Romano* (1838; 2nd ed. with appendix 1842); *Arti ed artefici di Mantova* (Mantua, 1857); WOERMANN, *Geschichte der Malerei*, II (Leipzig, 1882); CROWE and CAVAL-ling, 1882); CASELLE, *History of Italian Painting*; BUCKHARDT, *Der Cicerone*, ed. BODE (Berlin, 1879); BERENSON, *Central Italian Painters of the Renaissance* (New York, 1903).

LOUIS GILLET.



GIULIO ROMANO  
By himself, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

Giuseppe Maria Tommasi, BLESSED, cardinal, noted for his learning, humility, and zeal for reform; b. at Licata, Sicily, of a princely family, 12 September, 1649; d. in Rome, 1 January, 1713. Though destined by his father for the Spanish Court, he joined the Clerks Regular of the Theatine Order at Palermo, 24 March, 1665, renouncing his primogeniture and the principedom in favour of his brother. He was professed 25 March, 1666. He studied philosophy, first at Messina, and later, owing to poor health, at Ferrara and Modena; and theology in Rome and Palermo. He was ordained priest on Christmas Day, 1673. To a wide knowledge of Greek, he united the study of Ethiopic, Arabic, Syriac, Chaldaic and Hebrew—converting his master, a Jewish rabbi, to Christianity. From the Psalters in these different languages, he collected the titles of the Psalms. He devoted himself to the study of Scripture and the Fathers. Searching the chief libraries, archives, and monuments, he retraced the ancient ecclesiastical discipline and liturgy.

His valuable works (*Codici Tommasiani*), published



chiefly from ancient codices in the Vatican and Valtellian Libraries and the Library of Christina of Sweden, were highly praised by the different academies of Europe, even Protestant. Chief among his publications are the "Codices sacramentorum non-gentis annis antiquiores" (Rome, 1680), partly transcribed by Mabillon in his "Liturgia Gallicana". Following these, in order of time, were: "Psalterium" (Rome, 1683), according to the Roman and Gallican editions, published under the name of "Giuseppe Maria Caro". In this work Tommasi introduced Origen's symbols (obeli and asterisks), obsolete for nine centuries. Under the same pen-name Tommasi wrote "Responsalia et Antiphonaria Rom. Eccl.", etc. (Rome, 1686); "Sacrorum Bibliorum Tituli, sive capitula" (Rome, 1688); "Antiqui libri Missarum Rom. Eccl." or the Antiphonary of Pope Saint Gregory, entitled "Comes", written by Alcuin at the order of Charlemagne (Rome, 1691); "Officium Dominicæ Passionis", used by the Greeks on Good Friday, translated into Latin (Rome, 1695). Under his proper name he published "Speculum" (Rome, 1679); "Exercitium Fidei, Spei et Caritatis" (Rome, 1683); "Breviarium psalterii" (Rome, 1683); "Vera norma di glorificar Dio" (Rome, 1687); "Fermentum" (Rome, 1688); "Psalterium cum canticis" (Rome, 1697); "Indiculus institutionum theologiarum veterum Patrum" (3 vols., Rome, 1709; 1710; 1712), an exposition of theological theory and practice, derived from original patristic sources. Tommasi also wrote numerous *opuscula*, the last four published by G. Mercati (Rome, 1905). In 1753 Vezzosi published his works in eleven quarto volumes.

Tommasi's efforts at reform were directed not to the introduction of the new, but to the restoration and maintenance of the old. He was not always upheld and was sometimes rebuked for his zeal. Innocent XII made him examiner of the bishops, or of the clergy. Clement XI appointed him consultant of the Theatine Order, theologian of the "Congregatio super Disciplinâ Regulari" and other congregations, consultant of the Congregations of Rites and Indulgences, and *qualificator* of the Holy Office. The same pope created him cardinal-priest of the Title of S. Martino ai Monti and compelled him to accept the honour. Taking St. Charles Borromeo for his model, Tommasi practised humility and charity towards the poor. He taught catechism to the children of the poor in his titular church. He introduced the use of Gregorian chant in his church. On his death he was mourned by all, even by the pope, who so admired his sanctity that he consulted him before accepting the papacy. He was beatified by Pius VII, 5 June, 1803. Every year the Arcadians hold a religious and literary commemoration in his honour. His body rests in the church of S. Martino ai Monti.

BORROMEO, *Vita* (Venice, 1713); FONTANINI in *Giornale dei Letterati d'Italia*, XVIII-XXVI; BERNINI, *Vita* (Rome, 1714); VEZZOSI in introduction to the works of Tommasi; MABILLON, *Liturgia Gallicana* (1689-1729); BENEDICT XIV, *Brief*, 20 March, 1745, in *Opp. omnia*, XV (1846), 509; *Opuscoli inediti del Beato Card. Giuseppe Tommasi*, ed. MERCATI in *Studi e Testi* (Rome, 1905); CARINI, *L'Arcadia dal 1690 al 1890* (1891), 73-81; WICKHAM LEGG, *The Reformed Breviary of Cardinal Tommasi in The Church Historical Society* (London, 1904), LXXX, 5 sqq.; VEZZOSI, *Scrittori di Chierici Regolari detti Teatini*, II (1780), 409-414, 416-427.

FRANCESCO PAOLI.

**Giusti, GIUSEPPE**, poet and patriot; b. 1809, at Monsumano near Pescia, Italy; d. 31 March, 1850, at Florence. He received his early training under a private tutor and in an academy at Florence. Then he entered the University of Pisa to take up the study of jurisprudence. He did not give overmuch attention to his legal course, yet eventually he secured his degree, in 1834, after a delay due in part to a political satire written by him which displeased the authorities. Now establishing himself in Florence, ostensibly for the practice of law, he really devoted himself to

literary pursuits. When his health began to fail, he travelled about the peninsula with the hope of recovering it, visiting Rome, Naples, Leghorn, Milan, Pisa, and other places. In the meantime he had been active as a poet, and, trusting in the reform promised by the grand duke, Leopold II, he addressed to him an encomiastic ode quite different from the satirical verses with which he had assailed him previously. He was admitted into membership in the Accademia della Crusca. Entering seriously into political life as a legislator, he was elected a deputy to the first and second Tuscan Legislative Assemblies, in which he signalized himself by his patriotic endeavours. At first he favoured the return of the grand duke, but when the latter came under Austrian auspices Giusti withdrew from public life. By this time tuberculosis, the fatal malady threatening him, began to assert itself all too plainly, and on 31 March, 1850, he died of it in the mansion of his friend, the Marquis Gino Capponi, who, like himself, was a sturdy Catholic and patriot.

Among his early compositions there figure his *scherzi*, as he called them, little lyrics of which some were amorous and others of varied import, and which were scattered broadcast through the land in manuscript form. In 1844 they were published at Leghorn with his sanction. It is obvious that he began his lyric career under the influence of Petrarch; later, however, he developed a romantic and elegiac strain of his own. Notable among his purely lyrical compositions is the "Fiducia in Dio", which sets forth his hope and faith as a Catholic Christian. With tremendous force does he express himself in his political satires, in which, departing from the conventional employment of the *terza-rima* and the blank verse, he uses a variety of lyric measures. Taken in their entirety, his political satires present a picture of Italy in his day. They are directed against social abuses of many sorts, and at the same time they express a longing for political and moral regeneration. In view of the frankness and the acridity with which he assailed the grand-ducal government and the Austrians, it is surprising that he escaped the dungeon to which so many other Italian patriots of the time were condemned. In prose he published but little. Mention may be made, however, of his "Proverbi toscani", a collection of proverbs annotated by him, and his "Epistolario", a collection of his letters. These letters are rather too studied and polished in form, but they remain valuable for the autobiographical information that they contain. On the basis of them, the librarian, Guido Biagi, has prepared a volume entitled "Vita di Giuseppe Giusti, scritta da lui medesimo" (Florence, 1893).

MARTINI, *Memorie inedite* (Milan, 1894); FRASSI, *Vita di G. Giusti* (Florence, 1859); *Poesie di G. Giusti*, with an essay by CARDUCCI, *Della vita e delle opere di G. Giusti* (Florence, 1859); *Versi e prose*, an edition by GIUSTI himself (Florence, 1846). Annotated selections from his works, edited by FIORETTO (Verona, 1876); by FRIZZI (Milan, 1880); and by BIAGI (Florence, 1890).

J. D. M. FORD.

**Giustiniani, LORENZO, SAINT.** See LAWRENCE JUSTINIAN, SAINT.

**Glaber, RAOUL**, Benedictine chronicler; b. in Burgundy before 1000; d. at Cluny about 1050. In early boyhood he was so wayward and mischievous that his uncle, a monk, to safeguard him, forced him to enter the monastery of St-Léger de Champeaux at the age of twenty. However, he adopted only the monastic habit. He tells us that through pride he resisted and disobeyed his superiors, and quarrelled with his brethren. Finally he was expelled. He then entered the monasteries of Notre-Dame du Moutier and St-Benignus at Dijon. Abbot William of Dijon, who appreciated Raoul's literary talents, became his warm friend and took him in 1028 as his companion on a journey to

Suza in Italy. Yielding again to his roving disposition, Glaber quietly ran away and entered the monastery of St-Germain d'Auxerre. Thanks to his learning, he was sure of a refuge, as he tells us, wherever he chose to go. Judging, then, by the mediocre talent displayed in his writings, this fact alone shows us to what depths literary culture had sunk in his time. The monks at St-Germain got him to restore or compose the inscriptions on the numerous altars in their church, and on the tombs of the saints who were buried in it. When this was done his wanderings began again, and he tried the religious life at Beza, and at Cluny under St. Odilo. He seems at this time to have acquired with increasing years a disposition more in keeping with his profession, and he died at Cluny about 1050. His was a proud, indocile, restless spirit. From his writings we learn that he always had a lively faith, but was extraordinarily superstitious. Of his works there remain: "Wilhelmi abbatis gestorum liber", the life of his superior at Dijon, printed in *Acta SS.*, 1 Jan., 57 sqq.; and his "Chronicle", for which he is chiefly remembered. This is a history of the world, as he knew it, from the year 900 till 1045. It was written in Latin, partly at Cluny and partly at St-Germain. Glaber is quite devoid of literary style; and critical spirit he has none, the most trivial events and tales being put on exactly the same plane as the most important facts. His chronology and geography are quite deficient; yet, despite all its faults, the work is interesting and useful, as it gives us an insight into the customs and morals of an age when Christianity on the continent had reached a very low ebb.

PROT, *Raoul Glaber* (Paris, 1887); SACKUR, *Studien über Glaber in Neu. Archiv Ges. alt. deu. Gesch.*, XIV, 377-418; GUTZOR, *Coll. des mêm.*, VI (Paris, 1823); PETIT, *Raoul Glaber in Rev. historique* (1892), XLVIII, 283-300; GEBHART, *Momes et papes* (Paris, 1896), 1-62.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Glabrio**, MANIUS ACILIUS, consul at Rome during A. D. 91, with Trajan. He belonged to one of the noblest families of Rome, no fewer than nine of his name having held the consular office, the first being that Acilius Glabrio who was consul in A. U. C. 563 (191 B. C.), conquered the Macedonians at the battle of Thermopylæ, and in whose honour the Temple of Piety, now the church of S. Nicola in Carcere, was erected. The family attained great wealth and power, and their gardens, in the early imperial period, covered the whole of what is now the Pincian Hill. The subject of the present memoir was put to death by Domitian in the year 95. Suetonius (Domit., c. x) tells us that the emperor caused several senators and ex-consuls to be executed on the charge of conspiring against the empire—*quasi molitores rerum novarum*, "as contrivers of novelty"—and among them he names "Acilius Glabrio, who had previously been banished from Rome". The charge of "contriving novelties" seems in this particular case—not, however, in the others which are mentioned with it—to denote adhesion to the Christian religion. Dio Cassius (lxvii, 12, 14) tells us, as also does Juvenal (Sat., iv, 94), that, during his consulship and before his banishment, Glabrio was forced by Domitian to fight with a lion and two bears in the amphitheatre adjoining the emperor's villa at Albanum. This amphitheatre still exists, and was excavated in 1887. It is partly hollowed out of the side of the mountain, and commands a remarkable view. Xiphilinus, speaking of the executions of 95, says that some members of the imperial family and other persons of importance were condemned for atheism, as having embraced "the customs and persuasions of the Jews", that is, of course, the Christian Faith. Among these he mentions Clemens and Domitilla, of whose Christianity there is no doubt. Glabrio was involved in this trial and suffered under this indictment, so that we could have little doubt that he too was a Christian, even if we had not

the archæological evidence of which we shall now speak.

Glabrio was put to death in his place of exile, concerning the location of which we have no knowledge. But his body was brought to Rome, and buried on the Via Salaria, in the catacomb of Priscilla. Here the crypt, in which he with many of his family and dependents was laid to rest, was discovered in 1888. Henceforth there can be no doubt of his religion, or concerning the cause of his execution. Unfortunately, the crypt had been wrecked by treasure-seekers, the date of whose vandalistic action can be fixed as the time of Clement VIII (1667-70). The hypogæum was of very unusual form, consisting of a single large ambulaeum or "cryptoporticus in gamma", that is turned at right angles with its own staircase. The places for tombs were all large "arcosolia", or niches for sarcophagi; there was not a single locus of the usual cemeterial pattern in the walls. At the end of the longer arm of the gamma a passage was opened into a large hall, nine yards by four and a half, barrel-vaulted and with a square "lucernarium", which had apparently originally been a cistern for water. It had contained an altar, raised over a tomb, with spiral columns of giallo antico, and was at one time beautifully decorated, but had been entirely wrecked. In it, however, were found fragments of a marble sarcophagus, with the inscription ACILIO GLABRIO . . . FILIO still legible. Other fragments were afterwards discovered, which placed it beyond doubt that here was a burying-place of the Acilian family, round one of their race who apparently had been a martyr. The lettering of the chief inscription being of the time of Domitian or thereabouts, and the fact that the hypogæum itself belongs to the earliest age of Christianity, is sufficient to enable us to feel certain that we have here the tomb of the famous consul. The date and the circumstances connected with the translation of his relics to Rome from the place where he suffered are not known.

DE ROSSI, *Bullettino di arch. Crist.* (1888-9), p. 15; (1890), p. 97; LANCIANI, *Pagan or Christian Rome* (London, 1892), p. 4; IDEM, in *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, July, 1891); FROTHINGHAM, in *American Journal of Archaeology* (Boston, June, 1888); LE BLANT, *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscriptions* (Paris, 1888), p. 113; MARUCCHI, *Le Catacombe Romane* (Rome, 1903), pp. 459-66; ARMELLINI, *Gli antichi cimiteri* (Rome, 1893); ALLARD, *Les catacombes de Rome* (Paris, 1896).

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

**Glagolitic** (or GLAGOLITSA; Slavonic *glagol*, a word; *glagolati*, to speak). An ancient alphabet of the Slavic languages, also called in Russian *bukvitsa*. The ancient Slavonic when reduced to writing seems to have been originally written with a kind of runic letters, which, when formed into a regular alphabet, were called the Glagolitic, that is the signs which spoke. St. Cyril, who, together with his brother St. Methodius, translated the Greek liturgy into Slavonic when he converted the Bulgarians and Moravians, invented the form of letters derived from the Greek alphabet with which the church Slavonic is usually written. This is known as the Cyrillic alphabet or *Kirillitsa*. The Cyrillic form of letters is used in all the liturgical books of the Greek Churches, whether Catholic or schismatic, which use the Slavonic language in their liturgy, and even the present Russian alphabet, the *Grazhdanska*, is merely a modified form of the Cyrillic with a few letters omitted. The order of the letters of the alphabet in the Glagolitic and in the Cyrillic is nearly the same, but the letters bear no resemblance to each other, except possibly in one or two instances. Jagić upholds the theory that St. Cyril himself invented the Glagolitic, and that his disciple St. Clement transformed it into Cyrillic by imitating the Greek uncial letters of his day. There is a tradition, however, that St. Jerome, who was a Dalmatian, was the inventor. Some of the earliest Slavic manuscripts are written in the Glagolitic characters. The Cyrillic alphabet continued to be used for

writing the Slavonic in Bulgaria, Russia, and Galicia, while the Southern and Western Slavs used the Glagolitic. These Slavs were converted to Christianity and to the Roman Rite by Latin missionaries, and gradually the Roman alphabet drove out the use of the Glagolitic, so that the Bohemians, Slovenians, Moravians, and part of the Croats used Roman letters in writing their languages. In Southern Croatia and in Dalmatia (often treated as synonymous with Illyria in ancient times) the Glagolitic has continued in use as an ecclesiastical alphabet in writing the ancient Slavonic. Although the Slavic peoples bordering on the Adriatic Sea were converted to the Roman Rite, they received the privilege, as well as their brethren of the Greek Rite, of having the Mass and the offices of the Church said in their own tongue. Thus the Roman Mass was translated into the Slavonic, and, in order to more fully distinguish the Western Rite from the Eastern Rite among the Slavic peoples, the use of the Glagolitic alphabet was reserved exclusively for the service books of the Roman Rite, just as the Cyrillic was used for the Greek Rite.

The use of the Glagolitic Missal and office books, while permitted in general among the Slavs of Dalmatia and Croatia from the earliest times since the Slavonic became a liturgical language under Pope John VIII, was definitely settled by the Constitution of Urban VIII, dated 29 April, 1631, in which he provided for a new and corrected edition of the Slavic Missal conformable to the Roman editions. In 1648 Innocent X provided likewise for the Slavic Breviary, and by order of Innocent XI the new edition of the Roman-Illyrian Breviary was published in 1688. In the preface to this Breviary the pope speaks of the language and letters employed therein, and gives St. Jerome the credit for the invention of the Glagolitic characters: "Quum igitur Illyricarum gentium, quæ longe lateque per Europam diffusæ sunt, atque ab ipsis gloriosis Apostolorum Principibus Petro et Paulo potissimum Christi fidem edoctæ fuerunt, libros sanctos jam inde a S. Hieronymi temporibus, ut pervertusta ad nos detulit traditio, vel certe a Pontificatu fel. rec. Joannis Papæ VIII, prædecessoris nostri, uti ex ejusdem datâ super eâ re epistolâ constat, ritu quidem romano, sed idiomate slavonico, et caractere S. Hieronymi vulgo nuncupato conscriptos, opportuna recognitione indigere compertum sit." The new edition of the Roman Ritual in Glagolitic form had previously been published in the year 1640.

The latest editions of the Missal and ritual are those of the Propaganda, "Missale Romanum, Slavicâ linguâ, glagoliteo caractere" (Rome, 1893), and "Rimski Ritual (Obrednik) izdan za zapoviedi Sv. Otca Pape Paula V" (Rome, 1894). There was a former edition of the Glagolitic Missal, "Ordo et Canon Missæ, Slavice" (Rome, 1887), but on account of the numerous errors in printing and text it was destroyed, and only a few copies are in existence. The use of the Latin language in the Dalmatian seminaries since the year 1828 has had the effect of increasing the use of the Latin in the Roman Rite there, and the use of the Glagolitic books has accordingly diminished. Of course the non-Slavic inhabitants of Dalmatia and Croatia have always used the Latin language in the Roman Rite. At present the Slavonic language for the Roman Rite, printed in Glagolitic characters, is used in the Slavic churches of the Dioceses of Zengg, Veglia, Zara, and Spalato, and also by the Franciscans in their three churches in Veglia, one in Cherso, two in Zara, and one in Sebenico. Priests are forbidden to mingle the Slavonic and Latin languages in the celebration of the Mass, which must be said wholly in Slavonic or wholly in Latin.

KUBEK, *Staroslavjanski Slovar* (Ungvár, 1906); *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, V (Leipzig, 1881); NILLIS, *Kalendarium Manuale*, I (Innsbruck, 1896); *Echos d'Orient*, VIII (Paris, 1905).

ANDREW J. SHIPMAN.

**Glaire**, JEAN-BAPTISTE, priest, hebraist, and Biblical scholar; b. at Bordeaux, 1 April, 1798; d. at Issy, near Paris, 25 Feb., 1879. Having completed a course of serious study at Bordeaux, he went to the seminary of Saint-Sulpice at Paris, the courses of which he followed simultaneously with those of Oriental languages at the Sorbonne (State Faculty of Theology). After his ordination to priesthood, in 1822, he began to teach Hebrew at the seminary of Saint-Sulpice. In 1825 he was made assistant to the Abbé Chaunac de Lanza, professor of Hebrew at the Sorbonne, and succeeded him as lecturer in 1831. He was professor of Sacred Scripture in 1836, became dean of the faculty in 1841, and retired in 1851. His numerous works are out of date, but it should be remembered that he did much for the study of Holy Scripture, and, furthermore, in a very conservative way.

The following are his chief publications.—On Oriental languages: "Lexicon manuale hebraicum et chaldaicum", Paris, 1830 (correction of the "Lexicon" of Gesenius); "Principes de grammaire hébraïque et chaldaïque", Paris, 1832 and 1843; "Manuel de l'hébraïsant", Paris, 1850; "Principes de grammaire arabe", Paris, 1861. On Holy Scripture: "Introduction historique et critique aux livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament", Paris, 1836, several times re-edited; he summarized it in his "Abrégé d'introduction" etc., Paris, 1846, which also went through several editions; "Les Livres saints vengés, ou la vérité historique et divine de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament", Paris, 1845. The portion of his work which endures consists of his translations of the Bible: "La sainte Bible en latin et en français", Paris, 1834; "Torah Mosché, le Pentateuque", Hebrew text with translation and annotations; "La sainte Bible selon la Vulgate", Paris, 1871-1873, an exact but too literal version; the translation of the New Testament, also frequently published separately, was specially examined and approved at Rome. Glaire's translation was inserted in the "Bible polyglotte" of Vigouroux, Paris, 1889-1890. With Viscount Walsh, Glaire edited the "Encyclopédie catholique" (Paris, 1854—), to which he contributed a number of articles.

A. BOUDINON.

**Glanville**, RANULF DE, Chief Justiciar of England; b. at Stratford, Suffolk, England, date unknown; d. before Acre, Palestine, 1190. He was of a baronial house which got its name from Glanville, in Normandy, and which in England held property in Norfolk and Suffolk. His father was William de Glanville, of whom he was a younger son, though eventually, on the death of an elder brother, he inherited the family estates and honours. Both before and after his appointment to the judicial bench, he held the shrievalty of various counties, which seems to betoken employment in the Exchequer; in particular he was Sheriff of the great County of York from 1163 till the death of King Henry II, save a short break, and in 1173 he became Sheriff of Lancashire. In the latter year, in concert with William the Lion, King of Scots, and the French king, there broke out the great rebellion of King Henry's sons against their father, and in the following year the Scottish king entered England with a mighty host, King Henry being then in Poitou. However, in July, Robert Stuteville, Sheriff of Yorkshire, and Glanville, the latter doubtless at the head of the men of Lancashire, encountered the invaders near Alnwick and utterly routed them, King William himself becoming Glanville's prisoner.

In 1176 we find Glanville a justice itinerant, and in 1180 he became Chief Justiciar of England. He had now reached the zenith of royal favour, which position he kept throughout the remainder of Henry's reign, being on occasion employed on various embassies, negotiations, and warlike expeditions, and in 1182 was appointed an executor of the king's will. In 1189

Henry II died. At the coronation of his successor, Richard I, the same year, Chief Justiciar Glanville was present, and when that prince took the cross, Glanville joined him, contributing a large sum towards the crusade. In the autumn of 1190 he died at the siege of Acre, a victim to the unwholesomeness of the climate. By his wife, Bertha, a daughter of a neighbouring Suffolk landowner, Theobald de Valognes, he left three daughters. Glanville is the reputed author of a celebrated work entitled "*Tractatus de Legibus et de Consuetudinibus Regni Angliæ*", the oldest known treatise on English jurisprudence, more likely written by his illustrious nephew and secretary, Hubert Walter. Furthermore, he founded two abbeys, both in Suffolk, viz., Butley, for Black Canons, in 1171, and Leiston, for White Canons, in 1183; also a leper hospital at Somerton, in Norfolk.

MATTLAND in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, new ed., VII, 1292-4 (London, 1903); FOSS, *Biogr. Dict. Judges of England* (London, 1870). The treatise "*De Legibus*", etc., has been several times printed, for the first time in or about 1554. An English translation by John Beames appeared in London in 1812.

C. T. BOOTHMAN.

**Glarean (LORITI), HENRY**, the most distinguished of Swiss humanists, poet, philosopher, geographer, mathematician, and musician, was born at Mollis, near Glarus, Switzerland, in June, 1488, and died at Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 27 March, 1563. Loriti, or Glarean, as he came to be called after 1511, from the name of the town near which he was born, received his first instruction (as did Oswald Myconius, Rudolf Agricola, and others) from Michael Rubellus, at Rottweil. Rubellus also paid special attention to the development of his pupil's musical talent. In 1506 Glarean entered the University of Cologne, where he devoted himself to philosophical and theological studies, and learned music and mathematics from Cochleus, and Greek from Cæsarius. In 1510 he became a Licentiate and Master of Arts. In 1512 Maximilian I showed his appreciation of a poem which Glarean composed in his honour by raising its author to the dignity of poet laureate. In 1514 the University of Basle received him among its *Magistri* and licensed him to conduct a *bursa*, or students' hall. Among his pupils was Ægidius Tschudi, who was afterwards to become famous as an historian of Switzerland and as a zealous defender of Catholicism in the Canton of Glarus.

While at Basle Glarean formed a strong attachment for Erasmus, who in turn, acting as *parens et præceptor*, remained to the last a devoted friend and no doubt influenced his attitude in the midst of religious agitation and troubles. Glarean carried a recommendation from him when he started for Paris in 1517; here, too, he gathered pupils around him in a *bursa* and entered into close scientific intercourse with Budæus, Faber Stapulensis, and Faustus Andrelinus. On the death of the last-named, Glarean became the recipient of a royal allowance, although he received no mandate to lecture publicly. In 1522 he settled at Basle, where he had a large following; but the continued advance of the religious movement which he, as an admirer of Luther's writings and an intimate friend of Zwingli, Myconius, and Ecclompadius, had originally sympathized with, gave him little satisfaction. He severed his relations with the partisans of the Reformation, and in 1529 emigrated with Ber, Amerbach, and Erasmus, to Freiburg-im-Breisgau. He laboured in this university until his death, and was one of its most celebrated professors.

Glarean was the author of numerous and important works. In the course of his public and private teaching he produced a multitude of editions of, and commentaries on, ancient writers, among whom were Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Horace, Ovid, Donatus, Cæsar, Sallust, Terence, Boethius, Lucan, Valerius Maximus, Eutropius, and Curtius. He made distinguished contributions to his favourite sciences,


music and geography. He published at Basle, in 1547, his "*Dodekachordon*", which was based on twenty years' study of ancient and ecclesiastical music, and introduced twelve tones, instead of the eight only which had been known until then. The "*Dodekachordon*" was recently published in the sixteenth volume of the "*Publikation alterer praktischer und theoretischer Musikwerke*" (Leipzig, 1888-90). The standing of Glarean as a geographer rests on his "*Helvetiæ Descriptio*", a verse composition (Basle, 1515; also re-edited by Bernoulli in 1890), one of the earliest and most widely read descriptions of Switzerland; also on his "*Liber de Geographiâ unus*" (Basle, 1527), which is an exhaustive and specific study, in forty chapters, of the principles of mathematical geography. A find of historical interest was a manuscript map of the world, dated 1510, in which he, like Waldseemüller, used for the newly discovered continent the name of "*Terra America*". The library of Glarean eventually passed, through his friend, Bishop S.E. von Knöringen, to the University of Ingolstadt, and is now at Munich.

SCHREIBER, *Heinrich Loriti Glareanus* (Freiburg, 1837); FRIEZE, *Glarean* (Frauenfeld, 1890); OBERMUMMER, *Zwei handschriftliche Karten des Glareanus in der Münchner Universitätsbibliothek in Jahresbericht der geograph. Gesellsch.* (Munich, 1892), s. 67-74; ELZER, *de Henrico Glareano geographo* (Bonn, 1896); HAYWOOD, *Glareanus, His Geography and Maps in Geographical Journal* (1905), XXV, 647-64.

OTTO HARTIG.

**Glas, JOHN.** See SANDEMANIANS.

**Glasgow, I. ARCHDIOCESE OF (GLASGUENSIS)**, in the south-west of Scotland, comprising at the present day the Counties of Lanark, Dumbarton, and



CATHEDRAL OF ST. MUNGO, GLASGOW  
(Formerly Catholic)

Renfrew, part of Ayrshire north of Lugton Water, the district of Baldernock in Stirlingshire, and the Cumbrae Isles. The see was founded between 540 and 560 by St. Kentigern, or Mungo, who died 13 Jan., 601. He also established on the Welsh model a religious community, which served as a much needed centre to preserve the Faith among the surrounding Christian population. In his time Cathures, as the place was originally called, stood at the northern limit of the little kingdom of the Strathclyde Britons, which extended on the west of the island southwards as far as Carlisle in Cumberland. On the north-west were the Scots of Dalriada, and on the north-east the Picts, who were then being converted to Christianity by St. Columba and his missionary monks from Iona. On the east the Strathclyde Britons, like their brethren in Wales, were pressed by the Angles and Saxons westward to the sea.

On account of the struggle of races for mastery and the confusion of the times that followed there appears to have been no regular succession of bishops till the time of Alexander I of Scotland, son of St. Margaret. His brother and successor on the throne, St. David, while prince of this region under the name of Cumbria, may be said to have restored the Diocese of Glasgow.

The first bishop of the restored see was John Eochy, or Achaius, who held it from 1115 till 1147. He had twenty-three successors in actual possession till 1560, when the Catholic Faith was abolished by act of the Scottish Parliament. Nearly all these bishops of Glasgow took an active share in the government of the country, whether as chancellors or treasurers of the kingdom or as members of regency during the minority of a sovereign. Robert Wishart (consecr. 1272, d. 1316) was conspicuous for his patriotism during the War of Independence, and was the close friend of Wallace and Bruce. William Turnbull (consecr. 1447, d. 1454) obtained in 1450 from Pope Nicholas V the charter of foundation for the University of Glasgow. On 9 January, 1492, Innocent VIII raised the see to metropolitan rank, attaching to it the suffragan dioceses of Argyll, Dumblane, Dunkeld, and Galloway. James Beaton, nephew of the celebrated cardinal of the same surname, was the fourth and last archbishop of the old hierarchy. In 1560, eight years after his nomination, he was forced to retire to France, where he acted as confidential agent of Queen Mary, and later



INTERIOR OF CATHEDRAL OF ST. MUNGO, GLASGOW

openly as ambassador for James VI, till his death in Paris, 25 April, 1603. He carried away with him the diocesan records, two of which deserve special mention: (1) "Registrum Vetus Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Glasguensis", in handwriting of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and (2) "Liber Ruber Ecclesiæ Glasguensis", with entries from about 1400 to 1476. These, along with other records, were in 1843 printed in a handsome volume for the Maitland Club under the title: "Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis: Monumenta Ecclesiæ Metropolitanæ Glasguensis a sede restauratâ sæculo ineunte XII ad reformatam religionem". A more splendid memorial of those times still remains in the old cathedral of St. Mungo, which was begun by Bishop Jocelyn (consecr. 1175, d. 1199) and received its last additions from Archbishop Blackader (consecr. 1484, d. 1508). The building as a national monument is administered by a department of Government, and the chancel is used for the Presbyterian worship of the State Church.

Glasgow did not again become a centre of Catholic life till about the beginning of the nineteenth century. The great industrial development which then began drew to the city and its neighbourhood Catholics from the Scottish Highlands and later, in far greater numbers, from Ireland. In 1828 the Holy See erected the Western District or Vicariate of Scotland, and the first vicar Apostolic to reside in Glasgow was Andrew Scott, Bishop of Eretria (b. 1772, d. 1846). He was succeeded by John Murdoch, Bishop of Castabala (b. 1796, d. 1865) and John Gray, Bishop of Hypsopolis (b. 1817, d. 1872). On the resignation of Bishop Gray in 1869 Charles Eyre (b. 1817, d. 1902) was consecrated Archbishop of Anazarba and appointed administrator Apostolic. On the restoration of the Scottish hierarchy by Leo XIII, 4 March, 1878, the Archbishopric of

Glasgow was re-established, and Archbishop Eyre was transferred to the restored see. He had consolidated the work of his predecessors in the former vicariate, and had laid the foundations for a complete diocesan organization. In 1884 he obtained from the Holy See the erection of a cathedral chapter with a provost and eleven canons. He introduced a thorough system of inspection in religious knowledge for the schools of the archdiocese. He was also the founder in 1874 of the diocesan college for higher studies, to house which he erected in 1892 at his own cost a building worthy of the purpose. He was succeeded in 1902 by John Aloysius Maguire (b. 1851), who had been consecrated as auxiliary bishop in 1894. The Catholics of the Glasgow district are computed at 380,000 out of a general population within the same bounds of 1,180,000. The number of Catholic baptisms in 1906 was 14,785. Taking the statistics available for 1908, there are 91 quasi-parishes, with 271 priests on active service distributed over 21 deaneries. There are 7 religious communities of men, and 16 of women. There are Catholic elementary schools in all the quasi-parishes, besides 14 upper-schools and a training college for female teachers. The teaching staff of the archdiocese numbers 1230. The number of children presented in 1907 for religious examination in the elementary schools was 55,350. There are 15 charitable institutions of various kinds, and there is a conference of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in nearly every quasi-parish.

*Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis*, with Introduction, printed for the Maitland Club (Edinburgh, 1843); *The Catholic Directory for Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1908); *The Western Catholic Calendar* (Glasgow, 1908).

JOHN RITCHIE.

II. GLASGOW UNIVERSITY.—Forty years later than St. Andrews, Glasgow University was founded by Bull of Nicholas V, dated 7 January, 1450-1, granted at the request of James II, who acted on the advice of William Turnbull, Bishop of Glasgow. The bishop and his successors were to be ex-officio chancellors of the university; the foundation also provided for a rector, doctors and masters in the four faculties. Originally, it appears, most of the students enrolled were ecclesiastics, secular and regular, especially of the Dominican Order: "many of the Friars Predicators were diligent students" (Munim., i, 34) "and took a deep interest in the success of the university" (Stewart, p. xiii); and Bishop Turnbull warmly encouraged his clergy both to learn and to teach. He also procured from James II a royal charter in 1453. The Bull constituted a "studium generale, tam in theologia ac iure canonico et civili quam in artibus et quavis alia licita facultate", after the pattern of Bologna. The foundation of a college followed soon; it stood at first near Rotten Row; later, on a site given by Lord Hamilton in High Street, where it remained till 1870. The college (*Padagogium*) was ruled by three "regents"; the students were distributed in four "nations", originally called *Clidisdalix*, *Thevidalix*, *Albanix*, *Rosay*, now surviving as *Glothiana*, *Loudoniana*, *Transfortiana*, *Rothseiana*. Among the most famous names in the early annals of the university are: William Elphinstone, afterwards Bishop of Aberdeen and founder (in 1494-5) of Aberdeen University; the poet Robert Henryson; John Knox; Cardinal Beaton; and James Beaton, his nephew, chancellor of the university and Archbishop of Glasgow in 1560, when, upon the establishment of Protestantism, he fled to France.

The university, almost destroyed in the religious troubles, was refounded by James VI, then a minor under Morton's regency, in 1577 (*Nova Erectio*), with increased endowments, and reorganized by Andrew Melville or Melvin. From that time it has continued to increase; Dr. Weir (op. cit.) calculated the number of students at various epochs as follows: at beginning of sixteenth century, 50; at beginning of seventeenth



century, 100; at beginning of eighteenth century, 400; at beginning of nineteenth century, 700; in 1870-1, 1279; in 1889-90, 2180. In 1907-8 there were 1905 men students (arts, 691; science, 275; theology, 56; medicine, 623; law, 208). In 1892 a neighbouring institution, established in 1883, for the higher education of women (Queen Margaret College) was incorporated into the university, and there are now some 600 female students.

The development of the university kept pace with the growth of Glasgow, and the increasing commercial importance of the city was reflected in the advance of scientific studies. The brothers William and John Hunter, in medicine; the philosophers Francis Hutcheson, Thomas Reid, and Adam Smith, are the great names in the eighteenth century, as teachers; Tobias Smollett, James Boswell, Francis Jeffrey, and Thomas Campbell as students. The university was also made famous by the Foulis printing press and the mechanical experiments of James Watt, inventor of the steam-engine. But perhaps the most world-wide celebrity that Glasgow University can boast is the late William Thomson, Lord Kelvin, who taught and carried on his researches here for fifty years till his retirement in 1899. Sir Richard Jebb and Dr. Gilbert Murray were successively professors of Greek from 1874 to 1899; the Cairds, John and Edward, were great names in Scotland; and the medical faculty has been and is still graced by men of European reputation, such as Lord Lister and Sir W. MacEwen.

The government of the university has been subjected to revision by royal commission many times, particularly in 1830, 1858, 1889. The old college was abandoned in 1870 for the large, and still largely expanding, buildings on Gilmorehill. The teaching staff numbers 32 professors, 50 lecturers, and 40 assistants. The total revenues from all sources (including Government annual grant of £20,000) amount to about £80,000. Magnificent additions to the equipment of the scientific and medical faculties have recently been made, the cost of which has been defrayed partly by the Carnegie Trust and partly by special subscription.

*Munitimenta Universitatis Glasguensis* (Glasgow, 1854); REID, *Statistical Account of the University* (1799); BAILLIE, *Letters and Journals*; INNES, *Early Scottish History* (1861); WEIR, *preface to Memorials of the Old College* (Glasgow, 1871); STEWART, *University of Glasgow, Old and New* (1891); COUTTS, *A Short Account of the University of Glasgow prepared in connexion with the Ninth Jubilee in 1901*; the last author has a larger work in preparation. RAIT in *Transactions of the Glasgow Archaeol. Soc.*, V, 1908.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

**Glastonbury Abbey** [GLÆSTINGABURH; called also YNYSWITRIN (Isle of Glass) and AVALON (Isle of Apples)], Benedictine monastery, Somersetshire, England, pre-eminently the centre of early Christian tradition in England. Though now thirteen miles inland from the Bristol Channel, it was anciently an island encircled by broad fens, the steep conical hill called Glastonbury Tor rising therefrom to a height of about four hundred feet. Thus, difficult of access and easy of defence, it formed a natural sanctuary round which has gradually clustered a mass of tradition, legend, and fiction so inextricably mingled with real and important facts that no power can now sift the truth from the falsehood with any certainty.

**TRADITIONAL ACCOUNT OF FOUNDATION.**—For the early history of the foundation the chief authority is William of Malmesbury in his "De antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesie" and "De Gestis Regum" (lib. I). The former work, composed apparently about 1135, was written for the express glorification of Glastonbury and consequently gives the legendary history much more fully than the latter. Malmesbury's story of the foundation and early years is briefly as follows:

In the year 63 A. D. St. Joseph of Arimathea with eleven companions was sent to Britain from Gaul by

St. Philip the Apostle. The king of the period, Aviragus, gave to these twelve holy men the Island of Ynyswitrin and there, in obedience to a vision, they built a church in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This church, called the *vetusta ecclesia* or *lignea basilica*, from its being constructed of osiers wattled together, was found more than one hundred years later by Fagan and Deruvian, missionaries sent to Lucius, King of the Britons, by Pope Eleutherius. Here therefore the missionaries settled, repaired the *vetusta ecclesia*, and, on their departure, chose twelve of their converts to remain in the island as hermits in memory of the original twelve. This community of twelve hermits is described as continuing unmodified until the coming of St. Patrick, the Apostle of the Irish, in 433, who taught the hermits to live together as cenobites, himself became their abbot, and remained at Glastonbury until his death, when his body was buried in the *vetusta ecclesia*. After St. Patrick his disciple, St. Benignus, became abbot at Glastonbury, while St. David of Menevia is also stated to have come thither, built another church, and presented a famous jewel known as the Great Sapphire of Glastonbury. The chronicler then goes on to record the death and burial of King Arthur at Glastonbury and gives a list of British saints who either died and were buried at Glastonbury, or whose bodies were translated thither on the gradual western advance of the conquering English.

The first impression produced on a modern mind by William of Malmesbury's pages is that the whole is one barefaced invention, but on this point the late Professor Freeman may be quoted as an unbiased authority (Proc. of Somerset Archeological Soc., vol. XXVI): "We need not believe that the Glastonbury legends are facts; but the existence of those legends is a great fact. . . . The legends of the spot go back to the days of the Apostles. We are met at the very beginning with the names of St. Philip and St. James, of their twelve disciples, with Joseph of Arimathea at their head, . . . we read the tale of Fagan and Deruvian; we read of Indractus and Gildas and Patrick and David and Columb and Bridget, all dwellers in or visitors to the first spot where the Gospel had shone in Britain. No fiction, no dream could have dared to set down the names of so many worthies of the earlier races of the British Islands in the *Liber Vitæ* of Durham or Peterborough. Now I do not ask you to believe these legends; I do ask you to believe that there was some special cause why legends of this kind should grow, at all events why they should grow in such a shape and in such abundance, round Glastonbury alone of all the great monastic churches of Britain." And he explains the "special cause" as follows: "The simple truth then is this, that among all the greater churches of England, Glastonbury is the only one where we may be content to lay aside the name of England and fall back on the older name of Britain, . . . as I have often said, the talk about the ancient British Church, which is simply childish nonsense when it is talked at Canterbury or York or London, ceases to be childish nonsense when it is talked at Glastonbury." This much therefore seems certain, that when at last the West Saxons captured Glastonbury there already existed there, as at Glendalough or Clonmacnoise, a group of small churches built in the typical Celtic fashion and occupied by the British monks. One of these, the oldest and most venerated of all, the *vetusta ecclesia* or *lignea basilica*, was preserved, and by its survival stamped the later buildings at Glastonbury with their special character. Indeed its successor, falsely called the Chapel of St. Joseph, is the chief feature and loveliest fragment in the ruins that exist to-day.

With the coming of the English the mist clears. In the first years of the eighth century Ina, King of the West Saxons, founded the great church of the Apostles Sts. Peter and Paul, and endowed the monastery,

granting certain charters which, in substance at any rate, are admitted as genuine (see Dugdale, "Monasticon Anglicanum", I). The monastery, thus firmly established, maintained a high reputation until the advance of the Danes in the ninth century, when it was ravaged and despoiled and sank into a low state. From this it was raised by the work of St. Dunstan who, as a boy, received his education in the cloister at Glastonbury, and later became abbot there, ruling the monastery, except for one brief period of banishment, until his elevation to the episcopate. (See DUNSTAN, SAINT.) There can be no doubt that St. Dunstan enforced the Rule of St. Benedict at Glastonbury as a part of his reform there, the fact being expressly recorded by his first biographer and intimate friend "the priest B.", who also tells us that in his day Irish pilgrims, learned men from whose books Dunstan himself learned much, were in the habit of coming to Glastonbury to worship at the tomb of one of their worthies, a Patrick, though doubtless not the Apostle of the Irish, which seems a clear proof of an independent Irish tradition confirming the local one mentioned above.

From St. Dunstan's date until the Norman Conquest the abbey prospered exceedingly, but in 1077 Egelnoth, the last Saxon abbot, was deposed by the Conqueror, and Thurstan, a Norman monk of Caen, installed in his place (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1077). The new abbot at once began to change the local use as to the liturgy and chant for that of Fécamp. Violent disputes followed, which in 1083 ran so high that the abbot, to enforce obedience, called in armed soldiers, by whom two or three of the monks were slain and many more wounded. After this the king removed Thurstan, who was restored, however, by William Rufus and died as abbot in 1101. Under his successor Herlewin the abbey revived, but in 1184 a great fire destroyed almost the entire monastery, including the *relicta ecclesia*. Rebuilding was begun at once. The beautiful stone chapel built on the site and in the shape of the *lignea basilica* was finished and consecrated on St. Barnabas' day, 1186, and the *major ecclesia* and other buildings commenced. Soon after this, however, with the consent of King Richard I, the abbey with all its revenues was annexed to the See of Bath and Wells, the bishop styling himself Bishop of Bath and Glastonbury. This meant disaster to the abbey, and an appeal was made to the pope. After much costly litigation the monks were upheld by the Holy See on every point, and the abbey's independence secured. To this incident must be assigned the long delay in completing the great church, which was not consecrated until 1303, one hundred and nineteen years after the fire. From this date until its suppression the history of the abbey is without exceptional incident. It continued to be one of the greatest pilgrim centres of England, and its connexion with the ancient British and Saxon Churches seems to have created a tendency to regard it almost as the representative of the "nationalist" aspect of the Church in England, as distinct from, and at times opposed to, the "international" forces centred at Christchurch, Canterbury. This was accentuated and embittered by a personal rivalry due to the claim of both churches to possess the body of the great St. Dunstan. No one denied that the saint had been buried at Canterbury, but the Glastonbury claim was based on a pretended transfer, alleged to have taken place in 1012; the relics, on their arrival at Glastonbury, being hidden away and not produced for public veneration until after the great fire in 1184, when a shrine was erected. That the whole story was a fabrication is clear from a letter of Eadmer, a monk of Canterbury, who declares that he had himself been present when the body was moved during the building of Lanfranc's cathedral at Canterbury in 1074, and also from the formal search and finding of the body in the Canterbury shrine in 1508 by

Archbishop Warham, who then ordered the suppression of the Glastonbury shrine under pain of excommunication (Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, II, 222-33).

Second only to St. Dunstan's shrine as an attraction to pilgrims was the tomb of King Arthur. The claim that Arthur was buried at Glastonbury seems to be a late one. In the "Gesta Regum" (I, xxviii) William of Malmesbury says expressly that the burial-place of Arthur was unknown. However, in his "De antiquitate Glastoniensis ecclesie" (Cap. De nobilibus Glastonia sepultis), the text of which is in a very corrupt state, a passage asserts that Arthur was buried at Glastonbury *inter duas pyramides*. Professor Freeman rejects this as an interpolation added after Geoffrey of Monmouth's time, when the Arthurian legend had reached its final form through that writer's fabrications. There is clear evidence that the two pyramids did actually exist, and in 1191, we are told, Abbot Henry de Soliaco made a search for Arthur's body between them. Giraldus Cambrensis, who writes apparently as an eyewitness of the scene, relates (*Speculum Ecclesie*, dist. ii, cap. ix) that at a depth of seven feet a large flat stone was found, on the under side of which was fixed a leaden cross. This was removed from the stone and in rude characters facing the stone were the words *Hic jacet sepultus inclitus Rex Arturius in insula Avallonia*. Under this at a considerable depth was a huge coffin of hollowed oak containing the bones of the king and his Queen Guinevere in separate compartments. These were later removed to a shrine in the great church. Leland (*Assertio Arthuri*, 43, 50, 51) records that he saw both the tomb and the leaden cross with the inscription, and Camden (*Britannia*, Somerset) states that the latter still existed in his day, though he does not say where it was when he saw it.

**SUPPRESSION OF THE ABBEY.**—In 1525 Abbot Bere died, and Richard Whiting, chamberlain of the abbey, was chosen for the post by Cardinal Wolsey, in whose hands the community had agreed to place the appointment. For ten years he ruled his monastery in peace, winning golden opinions on all hands for his learning, piety, and discreet administration. Then in August, 1535, came Dr. Richard Layton, the most contemptible of all the "visitors" appointed by Thomas Cromwell, to hold a visitation in the name of King Henry VIII. He found everything in perfect order, though he covers his disappointment with impudence. "At Bruton and Glastonbury," he writes to Cromwell, "there is nothing notable; the brethren be so straight kept that they cannot offend: but fain they would if they might, as they confess, and so the fault is not with them". But the end was not far distant. The lesser monasteries had gone already, and soon it was the turn of the greater houses. By January, 1539, Glastonbury was the only religious house left standing in all Somerset, and on 19 September, in the same year, the royal commissioners arrived without previous warning. Abbot Whiting was examined, arrested, and sent up to London to the Tower for Cromwell to examine in person. Meanwhile the commissioners, regarding Glastonbury as part of the royal possessions already in view of the intended attainder of the abbot, proceeded to "dispatch with the utmost celerity" both their business as spoilers and the monks themselves. Within six weeks all was accomplished, and they handed over to the royal treasurer the riches still remaining at the abbey, which had previously been relieved of what the king chose to call its "superfluous plate", among which is specially mentioned "a superaltar garnished with silver gilt and part gold, called the Great Sapphire of Glastonbury". The words of Layton, quoted above, bear witness to the admirable condition of the monastery as regards spirituals under Abbot Whiting. As one of the indictments brought against him was that of mismanagement in temporals, it is worth while to quote Crom-

well's own note in his manuscript "Remembrances" as to the booty obtained from Glastonbury at this, the second, spoliation: "The plate of Glastonbury, 11,000 ounces and over, besides golden. The furniture of the house of Glaston. In ready money from Glaston £1,100 and over. The rich copes from Glaston. The debts of Glaston, [evidently due to the abbey] £2,000 and above." While his monastery was being sacked and his community dispersed, Abbot Whiting was kept a prisoner in the Tower of London and subjected to secret examination by Cromwell. It is curious that the ordinary procedure of law, by which a bill of attainder should have been presented to and passed by Parliament, was utterly ignored in his case; indeed his execution was an accomplished fact before Parliament came together. His condemnation and execution and the appropriation of his monastery with its possessions to the Crown could only be justified legally by the abbot's attainder, but no trace that any trial did take place can be found. Such an omission, however, was not likely to trouble Cromwell, as is shown by the note in his autograph "Remembrances": "Item. The Abbott of Glaston to be tryed at Glaston and also executyd there with his complices." Accordingly Abbot Whiting was sent back to Somersetshire, still apparently in ignorance of the fact that there was now no Glastonbury Abbey for him to return to. He reached Wells on 14 November, where some sort of a mock trial seems to have taken place, and the next day, Saturday, 15 November, he with two of his monks, John Thorne and Roger James, was carried from Wells to Glastonbury. At the outskirts of the town the three martyrs were fastened to hurdles and dragged by horses up the steep sides of Tor Hill to the foot of St. Michael's tower at its summit. Here all were hanged, their bodies beheaded and cut into quarters, Abbot Whiting's head being fixed over the great gateway of his ruined abbey as a ghastly warning of the punishment prepared for such as opposed the royal will (see RICHARD WHITING, BLESSED). There can be no doubt that a special example was deliberately made of Glastonbury, inasmuch as by its wealth, its vast landed possessions, its munificence, and the halo of sanctity with which its past history and present observance had crowned it, it was by far the greatest spiritual and temporal representative of Catholic interests still surviving in England. The savagery with which it was attacked and ruined was intended to and did strike terror into all the West of England, and during Henry's lifetime there was no further resistance to be feared from that part of his realm. During the brief restoration of Catholicism in Queen Mary's reign, some of the surviving monks petitioned the queen to restore their abbey again, as having been the most ancient in England. The queen's death, however, put an end to all hopes of restoration.

**BUILDINGS.**—Very little of the vast pile of buildings now remains above ground, but in its main lines the abbey followed the usual plan, a vast cruciform church on the north side, with cloister, conventual buildings, abbot's lodgings, and rooms for guests all south of this. The one unique feature was at the west end of the great church, where the west door, instead of opening to the outer air in the usual way, gave entrance to a so-called "Galilee", which in turn led into the church of St. Mary, the westernmost part of the entire edifice. This famous church, now often called in error the Chapel of St. Joseph of Arimathea, was built between 1184 and 1186 to take the place of the original *vetusta ecclesia* which had been entirely destroyed in the great fire of 1184. It is said to preserve exactly the size and shape of the original building and measures sixty feet by twenty-four. The Galilee was added about a century later when the western part of the great church was being completed to form a connexion between the two churches, thus making the whole western extension about one hundred and nine feet long. This western

part is the most perfect of all the ruins. The Norman work of 1184, exquisite in design and very richly decorated, has stood perfectly, although in the fifteenth century a crypt was excavated beneath it to the depth of some eleven feet. At the same period tracery in the Perpendicular style was inserted in the Norman windows at the west end, portions of which still remain. Of the great church (400 feet by 80), the piers of the chancel arch, some of the chapels at the east side of the transepts, and a large portion of the outer wall of the choir aisles are practically all that remains. The nave consisted of ten bays; the transepts of three each, the outer two on either side being extended eastward to form chapels. The choir at first had four bays only, but was increased to six in the later fourteenth century, the chapels behind the high altar being again modified in the fifteenth century. It is much to be regretted that so large a part of the buildings has been destroyed, but since the ruins were for long used as a kind of quarry, from which anyone might carry off materials at sixpence a cartload, the wonder is that anything at all is left. The ruins have recently been purchased at the cost of £30,000 (\$150,000) through the action of the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Anglican) and are now held by trustees as a kind of national monument. Every effort is being made to preserve what is left, and also, by means of excavation, to recover all possible knowledge of what has been destroyed.

One curious relic still exists. The church clock, formerly in the south transept of the great church, was removed in 1539, carried to Wells, and placed in the north transept of the cathedral there. It bears the inscription *Petrus Lightfoot monachus fecit hoc opus*, and was constructed in the time of Abbot de Sodbury (1322-35). The outer circle of the dial has twenty-four hours on it, another within this shows the minutes, and a third again gives the phases of the moon. Above the dial is an embattled tower in which knights on horseback revolve in opposite directions every hour as the clock strikes and represent a mimic tournament. The original works were removed from Wells some years ago and may be seen, still working, in the Victoria and Albert Museum at South Kensington. This, with Lightfoot's other clock at Wimborne Minster, Dorset, are commonly held to be the oldest known. Of the conventual buildings the abbot's kitchen and a small part of the hospice alone survive. The former is an octagon set within a square and crowned with an octagonal pyramid. Within it is square in plan, the roof rising in the centre to the height of seventy-two feet. The upper part forms a double lantern of stone, which was formerly fitted with movable wooden shutters so that the smoke might always be let out on the side away from the wind. Practically all the rest is level with the ground, but mention must be made of the library, of which Leland, who saw it in Abbot Whiting's time, declares that no sooner was he over the threshold but he was struck with astonishment at the sight of so many remains of antiquity; in truth he believed it had scarce an equal in all Britain. In the town, amongst other buildings erected by various abbots, are the court-house, the churches of St. Benignus and St. John the Baptist, the tithe barn, a fourteenth-century building and the finest existing specimen of this class of structure, also the Pilgrim's Inn, a late Perpendicular work built at the end of the fifteenth century, where, it is said, all visitors used to be treated as guests and entertained for two days at the abbot's expense.

Still in the neighbourhood, in many places, one sees the ruined abbey's coat of arms: *Vert*, a cross bottonée *argent*; in the first quarter the Blessed Mother of God standing, on her right arm the Infant Saviour, a sceptre in her left hand.

THE GLASTONBURY THORN (*Crataegus Oxyacantha Præcox*) is a variety of hawthorn, originally found only at Glastonbury, which has the peculiarity of

flowering twice in the year, first about Christmas time and again in May. By a curious irony of fate the first mention of the Holy Thorn flowering at Christmas-tide is contained in a letter written by Dr. Layton to Thomas Cromwell from Bristol, dated 24 August, 1535. "By this bringer, my servant," he writes, "I send you Relicks: First, two flowers wrapped in white and black sarsnet, that on Christen Mass Even, *hora ipsa qua Christus natus fuerat*, will spring and burgen and bare blossoms. *Quod expertum est* saith the Prior of Mayden Bradley." In a life of St. Joseph of Arimathea, printed in 1520 by Richard Pyerson, a pupil of Caxton, there is, however, an earlier notice of its coming into leaf at Christmas:

The Hawthornes also, that groweth in Werall  
[Wearyall Hill]

Do burge and bere grene leaves at Christmas

As freshe as other yn May . . .

Later references to the fact abound, e. g. Sir Charles Sedley's verse:

Cornelia's charms inspire my lays,

Who, fair in nature's scorn,

Blooms in the winter of her days,

Like Glastonbury Thorn

and the lines in Tennyson's "Holy Grail":

. . . Glastonbury, where the winter thorn

Blossoms at Christmas, mindful of Our Lord.

The original thorn tree on Wearyall Hill was cut down in 1653 by some fanatical soldier of Cromwell's army, to the great annoyance of Bishop Goodman of Gloucester who wrote to the Lord Protector complaining of the outrage; but before that date slips had been taken from it, and many specimens now exist which blossom about Christmas time. The blossoms of the Christmas shoots are usually much smaller than the May ones and do not produce any haws. It is noteworthy also that plants grown from the haws do not retain the characteristics of the parent stem, and the Glastonbury gardeners propagate the thorn by budding and grafting only. Botanists are not yet agreed as to the origin of the Glastonbury thorn. Some have desired to identify it with the Morocco thorn, introduced into England about 1812, which puts forth its leaves very early in the year, sometimes even in January; while others claim it as the Siberian thorn, which begins to produce its shoots in January. Neither of these varieties, however, has the special peculiarity of the Glastonbury thorn, that of flowering twice. Possibly the truth may be that the Glastonbury thorn was originally an individual or "sport", and not a true variety; but if this is so it is certainly remarkable that for four hundred years the peculiarity of the tree has been preserved and transmitted to its progeny. The legend that the original tree grew from the staff of St. Joseph of Arimathea, which was thrust into the ground and took root, is found before the destruction of the abbey, but the date of its origin cannot now be ascertained.

TANNER, *Notitia Monastica* (London, 1744), 458-60; WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *De Antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesie* in GALE, *Scriptores XV* (Oxford, 1891), also ed. HEARNE (Oxford, 1722); IDEM, *Gesta Regum*, ed. STUBBS, in *Rolls Series* (London, 1887); IDEM, *Gesta Pontificum*, ed. HAMILTON, in *Rolls Series* (London, 1870); all three works in P. L., CLXXXIX; JOHN OF GLASTONBURY, *Chronica . . . de rebus Glastoniensibus*, ed. HEARNE (Oxford, 1726); ADAM DE DOMERHAM, *Historia de rebus . . . Glastoniensibus*, ed. HEARNE (Oxford, 1727); GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, *Speculum Ecclesie*, ed. BREWER, in *Rolls Series* (London, 1873); *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. THORPE, in *Rolls Series* (London, 1861); KEMBLE, *Codex Diplomaticus ævi Saxonici* (London, 1839); DE GRAY BIRCH, *Cartularium Saxonum* (London, 1885); WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691), II; *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. STUBBS, in *Rolls Series* (London, 1874); LELAND, *Itinerary*, ed. HEARNE (Oxford, 1710); IDEM, *De Scripturis Britannicis*, I, xlii, ed. HALL (Oxford, 1709); IDEM, *Collectanea*, ed. HEARNE (Oxford, 1715); IDEM, *Assertio Arthuri* (London, 1544), tr. ROBINSON (London, 1582); MABILLON, *Annales O.S.B.* (Paris, 1703); YEPES, *Crónica general de la Orden de San Benito* (Valladolid, 1613), IV; BROWN-WILLIS, *History of Mitred Abbies* (London, 1718); I; DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1846), I; RETNER, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia* (Douai, 1626); CRESSY, *Church History of Brittany* (Rouen, 1668); EYTON, *Domesday Studies*:

*Somerset* (London, 1880); GASQUET, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (London, 1888); IDEM, *Last Abbot of Glastonbury and other Essays* (London, 1908); BAUMER, *Die Benedictiner-Martyrer in England unter Heinrich VIII* in *Studien O.S.B.*, VIII, 502-31; IX, 22-38, 213-234; HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION, *Third Report*, 182, 201, 260, 301, 351, 360, 362; ARCHBOLD, *Somerset Religious Houses* (Cambridge, 1892); COLLINSON, *History of Somerset* (Bath, 1791), II; PHELPS, *History of Somersetshire* (London, 1836); ROBINSON, *History of Glastonbury Abbey* (London, 1844); EYSTON, *Little Monument to the . . . Abbey . . . of Glastonbury*, ed. HEARNE (Oxford, 1722); WARNER, *History of the Abbey of Glaston* (Bath, 1826); SOC. ANTIQ., *Vetusta Monumenta*, IV (London, 1815); WILLIS, *Archæological History of Glastonbury Abbey* (Cambridge, 1866); GUEST, *Origines Celtice*, ed. STUBBS (London, 1883), II; *Inquisition of the Manors of Glastonbury Abbey*, ed. JACKSON (London, 1882); *Rentala et Custumaria . . . Monasterii B. M. Glastoniæ*, ed. ELTON and HOBHOUSE (London, 1891); WILLIAMS, *Somerset Medieval Libraries*, 45-98 (Bristol, 1897); GASQUET and BISHOP, *The Bosworth Psalter*, 15, 18-21 (London, 1908); MARSON, *Glastonbury . . . the English Jerusalem* (Bath, 1909); *Notes and Queries for Somerset and Dorset* (1890-), passim. The following are some of the more important articles in the *Proceedings of the Somerset Archeological Society*: FREEMAN, *Presidential Address at Glastonbury*, *ibid.*, vol. XXVI; IDEM, *King Ine*, *ibid.*, XX; GREEN, *St. Dunstan at Glastonbury*, *ibid.*, XI; PARKER, *Glastonbury Abbey Ruins*, *ibid.*, XXVI; WARRE, *Glastonbury Abbey*, *ibid.*, I; IDEM, *The Ruins of Glastonbury Abbey*, *ibid.*, IX; JONES, *The Reputed Discovery of King Arthur's Remains at Glastonbury*, *ibid.*, IX; BOND, *Report on Excavation at Glastonbury* in 1908, *ibid.*, LIX; JACKSON, *Sacærie, Bishop of Bath and Glastonbury*; BATTEN, *The Holy Thorn of Glastonbury*, *ibid.*, XXVI. On this last subject see also LOUDON, *Arboretum . . . Britannicum*, II, 833, 838, 839; GERARD, *Herbald* (London, 1597); CAMDEN, *Britannia*, *Somerset*.  
G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

**Glebe** (Lat. *glæba*) originally signified, in common law, any farm, estate, or parcel of land, and the word is so used in the Theodosian Code. But in ecclesiastical law it has become the technical term for land permanently assigned for the maintenance of the incumbent of a parish, and is the oldest form of parochial endowment. This use of the word is found in numerous medieval charters, of which Du Cange gives a few examples, and formerly no church could be consecrated unless thus endowed with a house and glebe. The fee-simple was held to be in abeyance, that is, without an owner in the eyes of the law, but the freehold belonged to the incumbent. It could be leased, sold, or exchanged, with the bishop's consent, and was sometimes allowed to be mortgaged for the purpose of repairing the parsonage or church. In England and Scotland, where glebe is held by the established Churches of those countries, there are now special laws regarding the leasing, sale, or exchange of such property, and all such transactions are subject to the approval of the land commissioners. In the Catholic Church, glebe, where it exists, is regarded as mensal property, and canon law regulates the conditions which govern its possession. The alienation of mensal property is now held by most legists to require the special permission of the pope, and even then only certain justifying causes are recognized, viz: (1) necessity, as when a church is overburdened with debt; (2) utility, or the opening for an advantageous exchange; (3) to redeem captives or feed the poor in time of famine; (4) convenience, as when the land is so situated that its produce cannot be gathered without great expense. Certain specified formalities have also to be complied with. (See PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.)

BOUX, *De parochia* (Paris, 1852); FERRARIS, *Bibl. prompt.* (Rome, 1886-95); SMITH, *Elements of Eccl. Law* (New York, 1877-89). For the English law see PHILLIMORE, *Ecclesiastical Law* (London, 1905). See also bibliography under PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Glendalough, DIOCESE OF.** See DUBLIN.

**Glendalough, SCHOOL OF.**—Glendalough (the Valley of the Two Lakes) is a picturesque and lonely glen in the heart of the Wicklow Mountains. The fame of its monastic school is chiefly due to its founder, St. Kevin (q. v.), and to Laurence O'Toole, the last of the canonized saints of Ireland. Kevin (Ir. *Coemghen*, the fair-begotten) was born near Rathdrum towards the close of the fifth century, and lived to the age of

120 years. His earliest tutor was St. Petroc of Cornwall, who had come to Leinster about 492, and devoted himself with considerable ardour to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, in which his pupil also became proficient. Kevin next studied under his uncle, St. Eugenius, afterwards Bishop of Ardstraw, who at that time lived at Kilnamanagh in Wicklow, where he taught his pupils all the sacred learning which he had acquired in the famous British monastery of Rosnat.

Young Kevin was at this time a handsome youth, and had unconsciously won the affections of a beautiful maiden, who once followed him to the woods. The young saint perceiving her, threw himself into a bed of nettles, and then gathering a handful scoured the maiden with the burning weeds. "The fire without", says the biographer, "extinguished the fire within", and Kathleen repenting became a saint. There is no foundation for the story, which Moore has wedded to immortal verse, that Kevin flung the unhappy Kathleen from his cave, in the face of Lugduff, into the depths of the lake below. Kevin then retired into the wilds of the Glendalough valley, where he spent many years in a narrow cave, living alone with God in the practice of extreme asceticism. In the course of time, holy men gathered round him, and induced him to build the monastery, whose ruins still remain lower down in the more open valley to the east. Here his fame as a saint and scholar attracted crowds of disciples, so that Glendalough became for the east of Ireland what the Arran Islands were for the west—a great school of sacred learning, and a novitiate in which the young saints and clergy were trained in virtue and self-denial.

One of the most celebrated of the pupils of St. Kevin at Glendalough was St. Moling, the founder of the well-known monastery, called from him St. Mullins, on the left bank of the Barrow in the south-west of the County Carlow. Like his master Kevin, he was a man of learning and extreme austerity, living, it is said, for a long time, as Kevin did, in a hollow tree. He was also an elegant writer both in Latin and in Irish. Several Irish poems have been attributed to him, his prophecies were in wide circulation, and the "Yellow Book of St. Moling" was one of those which Keating had in his hands, but which has since been unfortunately lost. Of all the scholars of Glendalough, however, St. Laurence O'Toole was by far the most distinguished. A great scholar, bishop, patriot, and saint, he owed his entire training in virtue and in learning to this school. So far did he carry his devotion to St. Kevin that, even after he had become Archbishop of Dublin, he made it a practice to retire from the city, and spend the whole Lent in the very cave in the face of the rock over the lake where St. Kevin had lived so long alone with God.

The existing ruins at Glendalough still form a very striking scene in that wildly beautiful mountain valley. Within the area of the original enclosure are the great church, or cathedral, built probably in the time of St. Kevin, a fine round tower still 110 feet in height, the building called St. Kevin's *Cro* or kitchen, and the Church of the Blessed Virgin, for whom Kevin, like most of the Irish saints, had a particular devotion. The building called St. Kevin's kitchen was doubtless the private oratory and sleeping-chamber of the saint, the latter being in the croft overhead, as in St. Columba's house at Kells.

HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*; LANIGAN, *History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1827); PETRIE, *Round Towers*; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*.

JOHN HEALY.

Glennon, JOHN JOSEPH. See ST. LOUIS, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

**Gloria in Excelsis Deo.**—The great doxology (*hymnus angelicus*) in the Mass is a version of a very old Greek form. It begins with the words sung by the angels at Christ's birth (Luke, ii, 14). To this verse

others were added very early, forming a doxology. In a slightly different form it occurs at the beginning of a "morning prayer (*προσευχὴ ἑωθινή*)" in the "Apostolic Constitutions", VII, xlvii. This text, which has a subordination colouring (*ὁ μόνος κύριος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*), will be found in Duchesne, "Origines du Culte chrétien" (2nd ed., Paris, 1898, p. 158, n. I). It goes back at least to the third century; Probst (*Lehre und Gebet der drei ersten christl. Jahrhunderte*), Tübingen, 1870, p. 290) thinks even to the first. A very similar form is found in the Codex Alexandrinus (fifth century) and in Pseudo-Athanasius, "de Virginitate", §20 (before the fourth century), in P. G., XXVIII, 275. Extended further, and with every trace of subordinationism corrected, it is sung by the Byzantine Church at the Orthros. In this form it has more verses than in the Latin, and ends with the Trisagion (*ἁπολόγιον τὸ μέγα*, Rome, 1876, p. 57). It is not used in the Liturgy by any Eastern Church. Only the first clause (the text of Luke ii, 14) occurs as part of the people's answer to the words, "Holy things for the holy", at the elevation in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions (Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, Oxford, 1896, p. 25), as part of the Offertory and Communion prayers in St. James's Liturgy (*ibid.*, pp. 45, 64), at the kiss of peace in the Abyssinian Rite (p. 227), in the Nestorian Prothesis (p. 248) and again at the beginning of their Liturgy (p. 252), in the Byzantine Prothesis (p. 361). The tradition is that it was translated into Latin by St. Hilary of Poitiers (d. 366). It is quite possible that he learned it during his exile in the East (360) and brought back a version of it with him (so Beletus, "Rationale divinorum officiorum", c. 36; Durandus, "Rationale", IV, 13, who thinks that he only added from "Laudamus te" to the Mass, and notes that Innocent III attributes it to Telesphorus, others to Symmachus). In any case, the Latin version differs from the present Greek form. They correspond down to the end of the Latin, which however adds: "Tu solus altissimus" and "Cum sancto Spiritu". The Greek then goes on: "Every day I will bless thee and will glorify thy name for ever, and for ever and ever" and continues with ten more verses, chiefly from psalms, to the Trisagion and Gloria Patri.

The "Liber pontificalis" says "Pope Telesphorus [128-139?] ordered that . . . on the Birth of the Lord Masses should be said at night . . . and that the angelic hymn, that is Gloria in Excelsis Deo, should be said before the sacrifice" (ed. Duchesne, I, 129); also "that Pope Symmachus [498-514] ordered that the hymn, Gloria in excelsis, should be said every Sunday and on the feasts [natalicia] of martyrs." The Gloria is to be said in its present place, after the "Introit" and "Kyrie", but only by bishops (*ibid.*, 263). We see it then introduced first for Christmas, on the feast to which it specially belongs, then extended to Sundays and certain great feasts, but only for bishops. The "Ordo Romanus I" says that when the Kyrie is finished "the pontiff, turning towards the people, begins Gloria in Excelsis, if it be the occasion for it [si tempus fuerit]" and notes specially that priests may say it only at Easter (ed. C. Atchley, London, 1905, pp. 130, 148). The "Ordo of St. Amand" (Duchesne, "Origines", appendix, p. 460) gives them leave to do so only on Easter Eve and on the day of their ordination. The Gregorian Sacramentary (*dicatur Gloria in excelsis Deo, si episcopus fuerit, tantummodo die dominico sive diebus festis; a presbyteris autem minime dicatur nisi solo in Pascha*) and Walafrid Strabo, "Liber de exordiis", c. 22, in P. L., CXIV, 945, note the same thing. Berno of Constance thinks it a grievance still in the eleventh century (*Libellus de quibusdam rebus ad Missæ officium pertinentibus*, c. 2, in P. L., CXLII, 1059). But towards the end of the same century the Gloria was said by priests as well as by bishops. The "Micrologus" (by the same Berno of Constance, 1048) tells us that "On every feast that



has a full office, except in Advent and Septuagesima, and on the feast of the Innocents, both the priests and the bishop say Gloria in excelsis" (c. ii). It then became, as it is now, an element of every Mass except in times of penance. Even in Advent, until it began to be considered such a time, it was said. As early as Amalarius of Metz (ninth century) (*De officiis eccl. libri IV*, IV, 30), it was said during Advent "in some places". This would apply, of course, to bishops' Masses on Sundays and feasts at that time. So also Honorius of Autun (1145) in the twelfth century, "*Gemma animæ*", III, 1. White vestments were used, and the Gloria said, in Rome during Advent to the end of the twelfth century, "*Ordo Romanus XI*", 4. After that, Advent was gradually considered a time of penance, in imitation of Lent. The *Te Deum* and Gloria were left out during it, and the use of purple vestments introduced.

The so-called *farced* Glorias were a medieval development. As in the case of the Kyrie, verses were introduced into its text for special occasions. Such expanded forms were very popular, especially one for feasts of the Blessed Virgin that seems to have been used all over Europe. Thus in the *Sarum Missal*, after the words "*Domine Fili unigenite, Jesu Christe*", "*Spiritus et alme orphanorum paraclyte*" is added; after "*Filius Patris*" is inserted "*Primogenitus Mariæ virginis matris*". Again: "*Suscipe deprecationem nostram, ad Mariæ gloriam*", and the end: "*Quoniam tu solus sanctus, Mariam sanctificans, Tu solus Dominus, Mariam gubernans, Tu solus altissimus, Mariam coronans, Jesu Christe*" (ed. Burntisland, 1861-1883, col. 585-6). The following rubric says: "*In omnibus aliis missis quando dicendum est, dicitur sine prosa*"; that is, in other Masses than those of the B. V. M., the additional tropes—called *prosa*—are to be omitted. These tropes added to liturgical texts *ad libitum* were contained in special books, "*Libri troparii*". In spite of repeated commands to expunge them, they were still sung in places when the Missal was revised by order of Pius V in 1570. In the Bull "*Quo primum*" of that year (printed at the beginning of the Missal) the pope forbids anything to be added to, or changed in, the text of the books then published. The popularity of the forms about the Blessed Virgin accounts for the rubric in the Missal after the Gloria: "*Sic dicitur Gloria in excelsis, etiam in missis B. Mariæ quando dicendum est.*" Since then these "*farced*" forms have happily disappeared. It may be noted here that the Gloria, originally foreign to the Milanese and Mozarabic Rites, has displaced the older Trisagion in them since the seventh century—an obvious Roman importation (Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 183 and note).

The present law about the use of the Gloria is given by the "*Rubricæ generales*" of the Missal, VIII, 3. It is to be said in Mass whenever the *Te Deum* is said at Matins—with two exceptions. It is therefore omitted on *ferias* (except in Easter-tide), Ember days, vigils, during Advent, and from Septuagesima till Easter, when the Mass is *de tempore*. The feast of Holy Innocents, but not its octave, is kept with purple vestments and without the *Te Deum* or Gloria. We have seen this already in the "*Micrologus*" (above). Nor is the Gloria said at Requiem or votive Masses, with three exceptions: votive Masses of the Blessed Virgin on Saturdays, of Angels, and those said "*pro re gravi*" or for a public cause of the Church, unless with purple vestments, have the Gloria. The two cases in which it occurs without the *Te Deum* in the Office are Maundy Thursday (when the whole Mass is an exception in Passion-tide and has no correspondence with the canonical hours) and Holy Saturday in the first Easter Mass. The Gloria always involves "*Ite missa est*" at the end of Mass. When it is not said that versicle is changed to "*Benedicamus Domino*" or, in Requiems, to "*Requiescant in pace.*"

The manner of saying it is described in the "*Ritus*

celebrandi Missam", IV, 7. In the "*Ordo Romanus I*" (above) the celebrant turns to the people to say the first words. That is no longer observed. At high Mass as soon as the Kyrie is finished the celebrant, facing the altar in the middle, intones: "*Gloria in excelsis Deo*", raising, joining, and lowering his hands, and bowing his head at the word *Deo*. Meanwhile the deacon and subdeacon stand behind him in line. They then come to his right and left and with him continue the Gloria in a low voice. All bow at the holy name (it occurs twice) and at the words: "*Adoramus te*", "*Gratias agimus tibi*", "*Suscipe deprecationem nostram*", and make the sign of the cross at the last clause. They then go *per viam breviorē* (genuflecting first, according to the usual rule) to the sedilia and sit. Meanwhile the choir immediately continues: "*Et in terra pax*", and sings the text straight through. In the former Missal four chants were printed for the celebrant's intonation (for Doubles, Masses of B. V. M., Sundays, and Simples). This intonation ought to be in every way part—the beginning—of the melody continued by the choir; so in the new ("*Vatican*") edition of the missal, eighteen alternative chants are given, one for each Gloria in the Gradual. Obviously, when a plain-song Mass is sung, the celebrant should intone the Gloria to the same chant (and at the same pitch) as its continuation by the choir. The ideal is for the choir to go on at once without any sort of prelude by the organ; "*Et in terra pax*" etc. is the second half of the same sentence as "*Gloria in excelsis Deo*". In a figured Mass so exact a correspondence is not possible. But in any case the choir may never repeat the celebrant's words. Every Gloria in a figured Mass must begin: "*Et in terra pax*". The custom—once very common—of ignoring the celebrant and beginning again "*Gloria in excelsis*" is an unpardonable abomination that should be put down without mercy, if it still exists anywhere. While the Gloria is sung, the celebrant, ministers, and servers bow (or uncover) at the holy name and the other clauses, as above. During the last clause the celebrant and ministers rise and go to the altar *per viam longiorē* (genuflecting at the foot, according to rule) and go to their places for the "*Dominus vobiscum*" before the Collect. At a sung Mass the same order is observed by the celebrant alone. At low Mass he recites the Gloria straight through *clara voce*, making the sign of the cross during the last clause (In gloria Dei Patris. Amen).

Mystic and edifying reflexions on the Gloria will be found in Durandus and Gihir (see below). Durandus sees much symbolism in the fact that the Church (that is, men) continues the angels' hymn. By the birth of Christ who restores all things in heaven and on earth (Eph., i, 10), angels and men, separated by original sin, are now reconciled; men may now hope some day to join in the angels' hymns. Gihir gives a devotional commentary on the text, word for word. He sees a mystic reason for the order of the words: *Laudamus, benedicimus, adoramus, glorificamus*. One may be edified by such considerations without attributing so much subtlety to the unknown subordinationist who apparently first arranged them. It will be noticed that the Gloria is a hymn of praise addressed to each Person of the Holy Trinity in turn, although the clause about the Holy Ghost is very short (*cum sancto Spiritu*) and is evidently an afterthought. It does not occur in the text of the Apostolic Constitutions. It will also be seen that the clauses are arranged in parallels with a certain loose rhythm. This rhythm is much more evident in the Greek original (measured of course by accent); for instance:

Κύριε βασιλεῦ ἐπουράνιε,  
Θεὲ πάτερ παντοκράτωρ.

Lastly, it would be difficult to find in any Liturgy a more beautiful example of poetry than our *hymnus*

*angelicus*. The Gloria and the Te Deum are the only remains we now have of the *psalmi idiotici* (psalms composed by private persons instead of being taken from the Biblical Psalter) that were so popular in the second and third centuries. These private psalms easily became organs for heretical ideas, and so fell into disfavour by the fourth century (Batiffol, "Histoire du Bréviaire romain", Paris, 1895, 9-12). The extraordinary beauty of these two (to which one should add the *Φῶς λαμπρόν*) is a witness to the splendour of that outburst of lyric poetry among Christians during the time of persecution.

For texts and variations of the Gloria see BUNSEN, *Analecta ante-nicæna* (London, 1854), III; PROBST, *Lehre u. Gebet*, p. 289; WARREN, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* (Oxford, 1881); *The Mass of Flavius Illyricus* in P. L., CXXXVIII, 1314; DURANDUS, *Rationale divinarum officiorum*, IV, 13; BONA, *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo*, II, 2; BENEDICT XIV, *De SS. sacrificio Missæ*, II, iv, 9-17; DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (2nd ed., Paris, 1898), 158; GIER, *Das heilige Messopfer* (6th ed., Freiburg im Br., 1897), 361-374; CABROL, *Le livre de la prière antique* (Paris, 1900), IX, 150-156; DE HERDT, *Sacra Liturgiæ praxis* (9th ed., Louvain, 1894), §§ 211, 314; THALHOFER, *Handbuch der kath. Liturgik* (Freiburg im Br., 1890), I, 361 sqq.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**Gloria Patri.** See DOXOLOGY.

**Glorieux, ALPHONSE JOSEPH.** See BOISE, DIOCESE OF.

**Glory.**—This word has many shades of meaning which lexicographers are somewhat puzzled to differentiate sharply. As our interest in it here centres around its ethical and religious significance, we shall treat it only with reference to the ideas attached to it in Holy Scripture and theology.

I. SCRIPTURE.—In the English version of the Bible the word GLORY, one of the commonest in the Scripture, is used to translate several Hebrew terms in the Old Testament, and the Greek *δόξα* in the New Testament. Sometimes the Catholic versions employ brightness, where others use glory. When this occurs, the original signifies, as it frequently does elsewhere, a physical, visible phenomenon. This meaning is found for instance in Ex., xxiv, 16: "And the glory of the Lord dwelt upon Sinai"; in Luke, ii, 9, and in the account of the Transfiguration on Mount Thabor. In very many places the term is employed to signify the witness which the created universe bears to the nature of its Creator, as an effect reveals the character of its cause. Frequently in the New Testament it signifies a manifestation of the Divine Majesty, truth, goodness, or some other attribute through His incarnate Son, as, for instance, in John, i, 14: "(and we saw his glory, the glory as it were of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth"; Luke, ii, 32, "A light to the revelation of the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel"; and throughout the prayer of Christ for his disciples, John, xvii. Here too, as elsewhere, we find the idea that the perception of this manifested truth works towards a union of man with God. In other passages glory is equivalent to praise rendered to God in acknowledgment of His majesty and perfections manifested objectively in the world, or through supernatural revelation: "Thou art worthy, O Lord our God, to receive glory, and honour, and power: because thou hast created all things", Apoc., iv, 11; "Give glory to the Lord, and call upon his name", Ps. civ, 1 (cf. Ps. cv, i).

The term is used also to mean judgment on personal worth, in which sense the Greek *δόξα* reflects the signification of the cognate verb *δοκέω*: "How can you believe, who receive glory one from another: and the glory which is from God alone, you do not seek?" John, v, 44; and xii, 43: "For they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God". Lastly, glory is the name given to the blessedness of the future life in which the soul is united to God: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared

with the glory to come", Rom., viii, 18. "Because the creature also itself shall be delivered from the servitude of corruption, into the liberty of the glory of the children of God", ib., 21. The texts cited above are representative of multitudes similar in tenor, scattered throughout the sacred writings.

II. THEOLOGICAL.—The radical concept present under various modifications in all the above expressions is rendered by St. Augustine as *clara notitia cum laude*, "brilliant celebrity with praise". The philosopher and theologian have accepted this definition as the centre around which they correlate their doctrine regarding glory, divine and human.

1. *Divine Glory.*—The Eternal God has by an act of His will created, that is, has brought into being from nothingness, all things that are. Infinite Intelligence, He could not act aimlessly; He had an objective for His action; He created with a purpose; He destined His creatures to some end. That end was, could be, no other than Himself; for nothing existed but Himself, nothing but Himself could be an end worthy of His action. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord God" (Apoc., i, 8); "The Lord hath made all things for himself" (Prov., xvi, 4). Did He, then, create in order that from His creatures He might derive some benefit? That, for example, as some present-day theories pretend, through the evolution of things towards a higher perfection the sum of His Being might be enlarged or perfected? Or that man by co-operating with Him might aid Him in the elimination of evil which He by Himself is unable to cast out? No; such conceits are incompatible with the true concept of God. Infinite, He possesses the plenitude of Being and Perfection; He needs nothing, and can receive no complementary increment or superfluous accession of excellence from without. Omnipotent, He stands in need of no assistance to carry His will into execution.

But from His infinity He can and does give; and from His fullness have we all received. All things are, only because they have received of Him; and the measure of His giving constitutes the limitations of their being. Contemplating the boundless ocean of His reality, He perceives it as imitable *ad extra*, as an inexhaustible fund of exemplar ideas which may, if He so wills, be reproduced in an order of finite existence distinct from, yet dependent on His own, deriving their dower of actuality from His infinite fullness which in imparting sustains no diminution. He spoke and they were made. Everything which His fiat has called into existence is a copy—finite indeed and very imperfect, yet true as far as it goes—of some aspect of His infinite perfection. Each reflects in fixed limitation something of His nature and attributes. The heavens show forth His power; earth's oceans are

... the glorious mirror where the Almighty's form  
Glasses itself in tempests . . .

The summer flower, though only to itself it live and die, is a silent witness before Him of His power, goodness, truth, and unity; and the harmonious order which binds all the innumerable parts of creation into one cosmic whole is another reflection of His oneness and His wisdom. Yet, as each part of creation is finite, so too is the totality; and therefore its capacity to reflect the Divine Prototype must result in an infinitely inadequate representation of the Great Exemplar. Nevertheless, the unimaginable variety of existing things conveys a vague hint of that Infinite which must ever defy any complete expression external to Itself. Now this objective revelation of the Creator in terms of the existences of things is the glory of God. This doctrine is authoritatively formulated by the Council of the Vatican: "If any one shall say that the world was not created for the glory of God, let him be anathema" (Sess. III, C. i, can. 5).

This objective manifestation of the Divine nature

constitutes the Universe—the book, one might say, in which God has recorded His greatness and majesty. As the mirror of the telescope presents an image of the star that shines and wheels in the immeasurably remote depths of space, so does this world reflect in its own fashion the nature of its Cause between Whom and it lies the gulf that separates the finite from the Infinite. The telescope, however, knows not of the image which its surface bears; the eye and mind of the astronomer must intervene in order that the significance of the shadow and its relation to the substance may be grasped. To praise, in the exact sense of the term, demands not alone that worth be manifest, but also that there be a mind to acknowledge. The unconscious testimony of the universe to its Creator is rather potential than actual glory. Hence, this glory which it renders to Him is called in theological phrase *gloria materialis*, to distinguish it from the *formal glory* rendered to God by His intelligent creatures. They can read the writing in the book of creation, understand its story, accept its lessons, and reverently praise the Majesty which it reveals. This praise involves not merely intellectual perception, but also the practical acknowledgment by heart and will which issues in obedience and loving service. The endowment of intelligence with all that it implies—spirituality and free-will—renders man a higher and nobler image of the Creator than is any other being of this visible world. The gift of intellect also imposes on man the duty of returning to God that formal glory of which we have just spoken. The more perfectly he discharges this obligation, the more does he develop and perfect that initial resemblance to God which exists in his soul, and by the fulfilment of this duty serves the end for which he, like all else, has been created.

The natural revelation which God has vouchsafed of Himself through the world interpreted by reason has been supplemented by a higher supernatural manifestation which has culminated in the Incarnation of the Godhead in Jesus Christ: “and we saw his glory, the glory as it were of the Father, full of grace and truth”. Similarly the natural resemblance to God and the relation of our being to His, as established by creation, are supplemented and carried into a higher order by His communication of sanctifying grace. To know God through the medium of this supernaturally revealed truth, to serve Him in love springing from this grace is to be “Filled with the fruit of justice, through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God” (Phil., i, 11). In manifesting the glory of God by the development of their proper powers and capacities, inanimate creatures reach that perfection or fulness of existence which God has prescribed for them. Likewise man achieves his perfection or subjective end by giving glory to God in the comprehensive sense above indicated. He attains the consummation of his perfection not in this life, but in the life to come. That perfection shall consist in a direct, immediate, intuitive perception of God; “We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known” (I Cor., xiii, 12). In this transcendent knowledge the soul shall become, in a higher measure than that which obtains by virtue of creation alone, a participant and therefore an image of the Divine nature; so “we shall be like to him: because we shall see him as he is” (I John, iii, 2). So that objectively and actively the life in heaven shall be an unending ineffable manifestation and acknowledgment of the Divine majesty and perfections. Thus we understand the Scriptural language in which the future life of the blessed is described as a state in which “we all beholding the glory of the Lord with open face, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord” (II Cor., iii, 18).

The Catholic doctrine on this subject is defined by

the Council of Florence (see Denzinger, 588). (See CREATION; GOOD.)

2. *Human Glory*.—To enjoy glory before men is to be known and honoured on account of one's character, qualities, possessions, position, or achievements, real or imaginary. The moral question arises, is the desire and pursuit of this glory lawful? The doctrine on the subject is succinctly stated by St. Thomas (II-II, Q. cxxxii). Posing the question whether the desire of glory is sinful, he proceeds to answer it in the following sense: Glory imports the manifestation of something which is estimated honourable, whether it be a spiritual or a corporal good. Glory does not necessarily require that a large number of persons shall acknowledge the excellence; the esteem of a few, or even of oneself, may suffice, as, for example, when one judges some good of his own to be worthy of praise. That any person esteem his own good or excellence to be worthy of praise is not in itself sinful; nor, in like manner, is it sinful that we should desire to see our good works approved of men. “Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works” (Matt., v, 16). Hence the desire of glory is not essentially vicious. But a vain, or perverse desire for renown, which is called *vainglory*, is wrong; for it is founded not on truth but falsehood. The desire of glory becomes perverse, (a) when one seeks renown because of something not really worthy; (b) when one seeks the esteem of those whose judgment is undiscriminating; (c) when one desires glory before men without subordinating it to righteousness. *Vain-glory* may become a deadly sin, if one seek the esteem of men for something that is incompatible with the reverence due to God; or when the thing for which one desires to be esteemed is preferred in one's affections before God; or again, when the judgment of men is sought in preference to the judgment of God, as was the case with the Pharisees, who “loved the glory of men more than the glory of God” (John, xii, 43). The term “*vainglory*” denotes not alone the sinful act, but also the vicious habit or tendency engendered by a repetition of such acts. This habit is ranked among the capital sins, or, more properly vices, because it is prolific of other sins, viz., disobedience, boastfulness, hypocrisy, contentiousness, discord, and a presumptuous love of pernicious novelties in moral and religious doctrine.

ST. THOMAS, I-I, QQ. xii, xlv, xlv, xciii, ciii; II-II, QQ. ciii, cxxxii; IDEM, *Concl. Gent.*, t. RICKARD, *God and His Creatures*, II, ch. xlv; III, ch. xxviii, xxix, lvi-lxiii; IV, ch. liv. See also theological and philosophical textbooks, in which the subject is treated under Creation, The End of Man, Eternal Life; WILHELM AND SCANNELL, *Manual of Catholic Theology* (New York, 1899), vol. I, bk. III, pt. I; GRAY and MASSIE in HAST, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; HASTINGS, *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (New York, 1906), s. v.; PACE, *The World-copy according to St. Thomas in The Catholic University Bulletin*, vol. V.

JAMES J. FOX.

**Glosses, SCRIPTURAL**.—I. ETYMOLOGY AND PRINCIPAL MEANINGS.—The modern English word *gloss* is derived directly from the Latin *glossa*, itself a transcript of the Greek γλῶσσα. In classical Greek γλῶσσα (Attic γλῶττα) means the tongue or organ of speech and figuratively a tongue or language. In the course of time Greek grammarians, commenting on the works of Greek authors, used the word γλῶσσα to designate first a word of the text which needed some explanation, and next the explanation itself. And it is in this last sense that Christian writers have principally employed the word *glossa*, gloss, in connexion with Holy Writ. Among them, as among Greek grammarians, a gloss meant an explanation of a purely verbal difficulty of the text, to the exclusion of explanations required by doctrinal, ritual, historical, and other obscurities; and the words which were commonly the subject of their glosses may be reduced to the following five classes: (1) foreign words; (2) provincial dialectal terms; (3) obsolete words; (4) technical

terms; or (5) words actually employed in some unusual sense or in some peculiar grammatical form. As these glosses consisted of a single explanatory word, they were easily written between the lines of the text or in the margin of manuscripts opposite the words of which they supplied the explanation. In the process of time the glosses naturally grew in number, and in consequence they were gathered in separate books where they appeared, first in the same order of succession as they would have had if written in the margin of the codices, and ultimately in a regular alphabetical order. These collections of glosses thus formed kinds of lexicons which gave the concrete meaning of the difficult words of the text and even historical, geographical, biographical, and other notices, which the collectors deemed necessary or useful to illustrate the text of the Sacred writings. A lexicon of the kind is usually called a glossary (from Lat. *glossarium*), but bears at times in English the simple name of a gloss. From a single explanatory word, interlined or placed in the margin, the word gloss has also been extended to denote an entire expository sentence, and in many instances even a sort of running commentary on an entire book of Sacred Scripture. Finally the term gloss designates a word or a remark, perhaps intended at first as an explanation of the text of Holy Writ, and inserted for some time either between the lines or in the margin of the Sacred Books, but now embodied in the text itself, into which it was inserted by owners or by transcribers of manuscripts, and in which it appears as if an integral part of the Word of God, whereas it is but a late interpolation.

II. GLOSSES AS MARGINAL NOTES.—As is quite natural, the margin has always been the favourite place for recording explanatory words or remarks of various kinds concerning the text of the Bible. And in point of fact, marginal notes of varying nature and importance are found in nearly all manuscripts and printed editions of the Sacred Scriptures. With regard to the Hebrew text, these glosses or marginal notes are mostly extracts from the Masorah or collection of traditional remarks concerning Holy Writ. They usually bear on what was regarded as a questionable reading or spelling in the text, but yet was allowed to remain unmodified in the text itself through respect for its actual form. Thus, at times the margin bids the reader to transpose, interchange, restore, or remove a consonant, while at other times it directs him to omit or insert even an entire word. Some of these glosses are of considerable importance for the correct reading or understanding of the original Hebrew, while nearly all have effectually contributed to its uniform transmission since the eleventh century of our era. The marginal notes of Greek and Latin manuscripts and editions of the Scriptures are usually of a wider import. Annotations of all kinds, chiefly the results of exegetical and critical study, crowd the margins of these copies and printed texts far more than those of the manuscripts and editions of the original Hebrew. In regard to the Latin Vulgate, in particular, these glosses gradually exhibited to readers so large and so perplexing a number of various textual readings that to remedy the evil, Sixtus V., when publishing his official edition of the Vulgate in 1588, decreed that henceforth copies of it should not be supplied with such variations recorded in the margin. This was plainly a wise rule, and its faithful observance by Catholic editors of the Vulgate and by its translators, notably by the authors of the Douay Version, has secured the object intended by Sixtus V. Despite the explicit resolve of James I. that the Protestant Version of Holy Writ to be published during his reign should not have any marginal notes, that version—the so-called Authorized Version—appeared in 1611 with such notes, usually recording various readings. The glosses or marginal notes of the British Revised Version published 1881–85, are greatly in excess over those of the Version of 1611.

They give various readings, alternate renderings, critical remarks, etc., and by their number and character have startled the Protestant public. The marginal notes of the American Standard Revised Version (1900–1901) are of the same general description as those found in the British Revised Version of Holy Writ.

III. GLOSSES AS TEXTUAL ADDITIONS.—As stated above, the word *gloss* designates not only marginal notes, but also words or remarks inserted for various reasons in the very text of the Scriptures. The existence of such textual additions in Holy Writ is universally admitted by Biblical scholars with regard to the Hebrew text, although there is at times considerable disagreement among them as to the actual expressions that should be treated as glosses in the Sacred Writings. Besides the eighteen corrections of the Scribes which ancient Rabbis regard as made in the sacred text of the Old Testament before their time, and which were probably due to the fact that marginal explanations had of old been embodied in the text itself, recent scholars have treated as textual additions many words and expressions scattered throughout the Hebrew Bible. Thus the defenders of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch naturally maintain that the more or less extensive notices found in the Mosaic writings and relative to matters geographical, historical, etc., decidedly later than Moses' time, should be regarded as post-Mosaic textual additions. Others, struck with the lack of smoothness of style noticeable in several passages of the original Hebrew, or with the apparent inconsistencies in its parallel statements, have appealed to textual additions as offering a natural and adequate explanation of the facts observed. Some have even admitted the view that Midrashim, or kinds of Jewish commentaries, were at an early date utilized in the framing or in the transcription of our present Hebrew text, and thus would account for what they consider as actual and extensive additions to its primitive form. And it can hardly be doubted that by means of the literary feature known as "parallelism" in Hebrew poetry, many textual additions can be detected in the Hebrew text of the poetical books, notably in that of Job. All scholars distinctly maintain, however, and indeed justly, that all such glosses, whether actually proved, or simply conjectured, do not interfere materially with the substantial integrity of the Hebrew text. The presence of similar textual additions in the text of the Septuagint, or oldest Greek translation of the Old Testament, is an established fact which was well known to the Roman editors of that version under Sixtus V. One has only to compare attentively the words of that ancient version with those of the original Hebrew to remain convinced that the Septuagint translators have time and again deliberately deviated from the text which they rendered into Greek, and thus made a number of more or less important additions thereunto. These translators frequently manifest a desire to supply what the original had omitted or to clear up what appeared ambiguous. Frequently, too, they adopt paraphrastic renderings to avoid the most marked anthropomorphisms of the text before them: while at times they seem to be guided in their additions by Jewish Halacha and Haggadah. Glosses as textual additions exist also in manuscripts of the New Testament, owing to a variety of causes, the principal among which may be given as follows: copyists have embodied marginal notes in the text itself; at times they have supplemented the words of an Evangelist by means of the parallel passages in the other Gospels; sometimes they have completed the quotations from the Old Testament in the New. Finally, textual additions appear in the manuscripts and printed editions of the Latin Vulgate. Its author, St. Jerome, has freely enough inserted in his rendering of the original Hebrew historical, geographical, doctrinal remarks which he thought more or less

necessary for the understanding of Scriptural passages by ordinary readers. He complains at times that during his own life copyists, instead of faithfully transcribing his translation, embodied in the text notes found in the margin. And after his death manuscripts of the Vulgate, especially those of the Spanish type, were supposedly enriched with all kinds of additional readings, which, together with other textual variations embodied in early printed copies of the Vulgate, led ultimately to the official editions of St. Jerome's work by Popes Sixtus V and Clement VIII. But however numerous and important all such glosses may actually be, they have never materially impaired the substantial integrity either of the Greek New Testament or of the Latin Vulgate.

IV. GLOSSES AS SCRIPTURAL LEXICONS.—With regard to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, most rabbinical commentaries are little more than collections of glosses, or "glossaries", as they are usually called, inasmuch as their chief object is to supply explanations of Hebrew words. A part of the Masorah may also be considered as a kind of glossary to the Hebrew Bible; and the same thing may be said in reference to the collections of Oriental and Western readings given in the sixth volume of the London Polyglot. As regards the Greek Bible texts, there are no separate collections of glosses; yet these texts are taken into account, together with the rest of the Greek literature, in a certain number of glossaries which afford explanations of difficult words in the Greek language. The following are the principal glossaries of that description: (1) the lexicon of Hesychius, a Greek grammarian of the fourth century of our era; (2) the "*Λέξεων συναγωγή*" (collection of glosses) of the celebrated patriarch Photius (d. 891); (3) the lexicon of Suidas, apparently an author of the tenth century; (4) the "*Etymologium Magnum*" by an unknown writer of the twelfth or the thirteenth century; (5) the "*Συναγωγή λέξεων*" of the Byzantine monk Zonaras; (6) the "*Dictionarium*" of the Benedictine Varius Phavorinus, published early in the sixteenth century. Most of the glosses illustrating the language of Scripture which are found in the works of Hesychius, Suidas, Phavorinus, and in the "*Etymologium Magnum*", were collected and published by J. C. Ernesti (Leipzig, 1785-86). The best separate gloss on the Latin Vulgate, as a collection of explanations chiefly of its words, is that of St. Isidore of Seville, which he completed in 632, and which bears the title of "*Originum sive Etymologiarum libri XX*". It is found in Migne, P. L., LXXXII.

V. GLOSSES AS COMMENTARIES.—As Scriptural commentaries there are two celebrated glosses on the Vulgate. The former is the "*Glossa Ordinaria*", thus called from its common use during the Middle Ages. Its author, the German Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), had some knowledge of Greek and made extracts chiefly from the Latin Fathers and from the writings of his master, Rabanus Maurus, for the purpose of illustrating the various senses—principally the literal sense—of all the books of Holy Writ. This gloss is quoted as a high authority by St. Thomas Aquinas, and it was known as "the tongue of Scripture". Until the seventeenth century it remained the favourite commentary on the Bible; and it was only gradually superseded by more independent works of exegesis. The "*Glossa Ordinaria*" is found in vols. CXIII and CXIV of Migne, P. L. The second gloss, the "*Glossa Interlinearis*", derived its name from the fact that it was written over the words in the text of the Vulgate. It was the work of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117), who had some acquaintance with Hebrew and Greek. After the twelfth century copies of the Vulgate were usually supplied with both these glosses, the "*Glossa Ordinaria*" being inserted in the margin, at the top and at the sides, and the "*Glossa Interlinearis*" being placed between the lines of the Vulgate text; while later, from

the fourteenth century onward, the "Postilla" of Nicholas of Lyra and the "Additions" of Paulus Brugenensis were added at the foot of each page. Some early printed editions of the Vulgate exhibit all this exegetical apparatus; and the latest and best among them is the one by Leander a S. Martino, O. S. B. (six vols. fol., Antwerp, 1634).

FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Græca* (Hamburg, 1705-28); J. A. ERNESTI, *De vero usu et indole glossariorum græcorum* (Leipzig, 1742); J. C. ERNESTI, *Hesychii Alexandrini glossæ sacræ* (Leipzig, 1786); ALBERTI, *Glossarium sacrum in sacros Novi Fœderis libros* (Leyden, 1735); MARTIN, *De l'origine du Pentateuque* (Paris, 1887), I; CORNELI, *Introductio in utriusque Test. libros sacros* (Paris, 1885), I; ABBOTT, *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments* (London, 1891); SWEETE, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1900).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

#### Glosses, Glossaries, Glossarists (IN CANON LAW).

—A gloss (Gk. *γλῶσσα*, Lat. *glossa*, tongue, speech) is an interpretation or explanation of isolated words. To gloss is to interpret or explain a text by taking up its words one after another. A glossary is therefore a collection of words about which observations and notes have been gathered, and a glossarist is one who thus explains or illustrates given texts. In canon law, glosses are short elucidations attached to the important words in the juridical texts which make up the collections of the "*Corpus Juris Canonici*" (q.v.). But the term *gloss* is also given to the ensemble of such notes in any entire collection, e.g. the Gloss of the "*Decretum*" of Gratian, of the "*Liber Sextus*", etc. The Glossarists are those canonists who lived during the classic period of canon law, from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, though many left works other than glosses. The canonists of Bologna in particular, favoured the method of the glossarists, and affixed to text and words the meaning which they should bear. In the beginning the masters noted down on their own copies of the "*Decretum*" of Gratian a few words by way of résumé, and as a help in their lectures; in course of time such notes passed into the copies of their pupils. These brief notes, at first inserted between the lines, soon overflowed the margins, and became copious enough to form a framework within which the real text was enshrined, as may be seen by an examination of ancient manuscripts and certain editions of the "*Corpus Juris Canonici*". Moreover, later glosses were of such ample proportions as to become at times small commentaries containing discussions on the opinions of previous canonists. As each master added his own gloss the notes began to swell in volume; but care was always taken to indicate the particular author by placing a significant abbreviation after his gloss, thus: Hug. or H. Huguccio; Jo. Fa. or F. (Joannes Faventinus), etc. Gradually this mass of glosses took on in the schools a permanent form, a necessary condition to its usefulness in teaching; and became a kind of secondary canonical text, less authoritative, of course, than the original, but supplying material for oral commentary. Thus arose "ordinary gloss" (*glossa ordinaria*), endowed with a certain authority, not indeed official (as though it were actually the law on the point), but none the less real, since it represented the opinion and authority of the canonists who wrote it down, but chiefly because it expressed the teaching at the time. Hence it comes to pass that a medieval canonical gloss is often quoted even in our day; the quotation is made quite as the quotations from the canons or chapters of the "*Corpus Juris Canonici*", except that the word on which the gloss bears is always indicated, e.g. "*Gl(ossa)*" in c. Licet, v, De Crimine falsi, v° (verbo) "*Falsitatis*" (the gloss on the word "*falsitatis*", in ch. Licet, fifth book of the Decretals).

It is not easy to illustrate in a few words the legal learning that lies hidden in the glosses of canon law collections. The principal heads of information are as follows: (a) résumé of the case; (b) deter-



mination of the question to be solved; (c) division of the text and statement of conclusions drawn; (d) interpretation of important words; (e) examples of real or fictitious cases showing the application of the law; (f) discussion of the various readings of the same text as given in different manuscripts; (g) countless references to parallel texts; (h) axioms or mnemonic helps (brocardica) often in leonine hexameter verses; (i) allusions to the teaching of various masters, and to solutions given on various occasions by pontifical letters. Evidently the juridical value of these glosses for the teaching of canon law in our day has greatly lessened; historically, however, they still offer much precious information. The more eminent of the glossarists will be treated biographically, in their own places among the canonists of renown. Attention will be confined here to what is strictly essential in this connection. The gloss of the "Decretum" of Gratian was the work of John Zimeke, called the Teutonic (Joannes Simeca Teutonicus), between 1211 and 1215; he profited by the notes of his predecessors as well as those which he had made himself. This work, remodelled and completed by Bartholomew of Brescia (Bartholomæus Brixiensis) in 1245 or 1246, became the "ordinary gloss" of the "Decretum". Before their incorporation in the collection of Gregory IX, the so-called Five Compilations of papal Decretals (Quinque compilationes antiquæ) had all been glossed. Tancredus, archdeacon of Bologna, had written on the first of these collections (the "Breviarium" of Bernard of Pavia) a gloss which was received as its "glossa ordinaria" until the appearance of the Decretals of Gregory IX in 1234. This last collection, as is known (see CORPUS JURIS CANONICI), caused the Five Compilations to disappear; in turn it was glossed by the masters of Bologna. The author of its "ordinary gloss" was Bernard of Botone, also known as Bernard of Parma (Bernardus Parmensis), who composed it shortly before 1263; afterwards it received many additions, especially from Joannes Andrea, identified by the prefix *Add.* and at the end the initials *Jo. Andr.* It is to this famous canonist we owe the "glossa ordinaria" of the "Liber Sextus"; he wrote this glossa about the year 1305. Many manuscripts contain also the gloss of Joannes Monachus, famous as Cardinal Lemoine, written also about 1305. The gloss of Joannes Andrea on the "Clementinæ", compiled soon after the appearance of this collection (1317), has become its "glossa ordinaria", with additions however by Franciscus de Zabarellis, later a cardinal, and Archbishop of Florence (d. 1417). The "Extravagantes" of John XXII were glossed as early as 1325, by Zenzelin (Zenzelinus) de Cassaris. (See also CORPUS JURIS CANONICI; DECRETALS, PAPAL.) The "Extravagantes Communes" had no regular gloss, but when Jean Chappuis edited this collection, in 1500, he included glosses of many authors that he came across in his manuscripts. All the glosses of the Corpus Juris are given in the official edition of Gregory XIII (1582); since then they have not been revised, and recent critical editions of the text omit them.

LAURIN, *Introductio in corpus juris canonici* (Freiburg, 1889); SCHNEIDER, *Die Lehre von der Kirchenrechtsquellen* (Ratisbon, 1892); SCHULTE, *Die Geschichte der Quellen des canonischen Rechts von Gratian bis auf die Gegenwart*, I and II (Stuttgart, 1875-1877).


A. BOUDINHON.

**Glossolalia.** See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

**Gloves, EPISCOPAL.**—Liturgical gloves (*chirotheca*, called also at an earlier date *manica*, *wanti*) are a liturgical adornment reserved for bishops and cardinals. Other ecclesiastics, including abbots, cannot use them without a special papal privilege. They are worn only at a pontifical Mass, never at any other function, and then only to the washing of the hands before the Sacrifice. Episcopal gloves at the present day are knitted by machine or hand from silk thread, and are

ornamented on the back with a cross; the border of the opening for the hand is also, as a rule, embellished. The colour of the gloves must correspond with the liturgical colour of the feast or day in the services of which they are worn; episcopal gloves, however, are never black, as they are not used on Good Friday nor at the celebration of Masses for the dead. When a bishop is consecrated the gloves are put on him by the consecrator, aided by the assisting bishops, just after the Blessing. The use of episcopal gloves became customary at Rome probably in the tenth century, outside of Rome they were employed somewhat earlier. Apparently they were first used in France, as the earliest traces of the custom are found in this country, whence it gradually spread into all other parts and even to Rome. The chief reason for the introduction of the usage was probably the desire to provide a suitable adornment for the hands of the bishop, rather than practical considerations such as the preservation of the cleanliness of the hands, etc. Episcopal gloves appertained originally to bishops, but at an early date their use was also granted to other ecclesiastics, thus no later than 1070 the abbot of the monastery of San Pietro in Cielo d'Oro at Pavia received this privilege, the first certain instance of such permission.

In the Middle Ages these gloves were either knitted or otherwise produced with the needle, or else they were made of woven material sewed together; the former way seems to have been the more usual. Gloves made by both methods are still in existence, as for example, in Saint-Sernin at Toulouse, at Brignoles, in S. Trinità at Florence, in the cathedrals of Halberstadt and Brixen, in New College at Oxford, Confens in Savoy, and other places. In the later Middle Ages it became customary to enlarge the lower end, giving it the appearance of a cuff or gauntlet, and even to form the cuff with a long point which hung downwards and was decorated with a tassel or little bell. The back of the glove was always ornamented, sometimes with an embroidered medallion or some other form of embroidery, sometimes with a metal disk having on it a representation of the Lamb of God, a cross, the Right Hand of God, saints, etc., the disk being sewn on to the glove, or, at times, the ornamentation was of pearls and precious stones. The gloves were generally made of silk thread or woven fabric, rarely of woollen thread, sometimes of linen woven material. Up to the end of the Middle Ages the usual colour was white, although the gloves at New College, Oxford, are red; apparently it was not until the sixteenth century that the ordinances as to liturgical colours were applied to episcopal gloves. Even in the Middle Ages the occasions on which the gloves were worn were not many, but their use was not so limited as to-day, for in the earlier period they were occasionally worn at the pontifical Mass after Communion, at solemn offices, and during processions. Episcopal gloves are symbolical of purity from sin, the performance of good works, and carefulness of procedure.



EPISCOPAL GLOVE  
XV Century, Cathedral  
of Brixen



EPISCOPAL GLOVE  
With pointed  
gauntlet

BARRAUD, *Des gants dans les cérémonies religieuses* in *Bulletin monumental* (Paris, 1867), XXXIII; DE MONTAULT, *Les gants pontificaux* (Paris), XLII, XLIII; DE LINAS, *Pontificalia de S. Louis d'Anjou in Revue de l'art chrétien* (Paris, 1861), V; BOCK, *Geschichte der liturg. Gewänder* (Bonn, 1866), II; BRAUN, *Die pontificalen Gewänder des Abendlandes* (Freiburg im Br., 1898); IDEM, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient* (Freiburg im Br., 1907); DE FLEURY, *La Messe* (Paris, 1889), VIII.

JOSEPH BRAUN.

**Gluttony** (From Lat. *glutire*, to swallow, to gulp down), the excessive indulgence in food and drink. The moral deformity discernible in this vice lies in its defiance of the order postulated by reason, which prescribes necessity as the measure of indulgence in eating and drinking. This deordination, according to the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, may happen in five ways which are set forth in the scholastic verse: "Præ-propere, laute, nimis, ardentem, studiose", or, according to the apt rendering of Father Joseph Rickaby: too soon, too expensively, too much, too eagerly, too daintily. Clearly one who uses food or drink in such a way as to injure his health or impair the mental equipment needed for the discharge of his duties, is guilty of the sin of gluttony. It is incontrovertible that to eat or drink for the mere pleasure of the experience, and for that exclusively, is likewise to commit the sin of gluttony. Such a temper of soul is equivalently the direct and positive shutting out of that reference to our last end which must be found, at least implicitly, in all our actions. At the same time it must be noted that there is no obligation to formally and explicitly have before one's mind a motive which will immediately relate our actions to God. It is enough that such an intention should be implied in the apprehension of the thing as lawful with a consequent virtual submission to Almighty God. Gluttony is in general a venial sin in so far forth as it is an undue indulgence in a thing which is in itself neither good nor bad. Of course it is obvious that a different estimate would have to be given of one so wedded to the pleasures of the table as to absolutely and without qualification live merely to eat and drink, so minded as to be of the number of those, described by the Apostle St. Paul, "whose god is their belly" (Phil., iii, 19). Such a one would be guilty of mortal sin. Likewise a person who, by excesses in eating and drinking, would have greatly impaired his health, or unfitted himself for duties for the performance of which he has a grave obligation, would be justly chargeable with mortal sin. St. John of the Cross, in his work "The Obscure Night of the Soul" (I, vi), dissects what he calls spiritual gluttony. He explains that it is the disposition of those who, in prayer and other acts of religion, are always in search of sensible sweetness; they are those who "will feel and taste God, as if he were palpable and accessible to them not only in Communion but in all their other acts of devotion". This he declares is a very great imperfection and productive of great evils.

BALLERINI, *Opus Theologicum Morale* (Prato, 1898); GENCOT, *Theologia Moralis Institutiones* (Louvain, 1898); JOSEPH RICKABY, *Aquinas Ethics* (London, 1896); DEVINE, *Manual of Mystical Theology* (London, 1903).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

**Gnesen-Posen**, ARCHDIOCESE OF, in the Kingdom of Prussia. The archdiocese includes the Dioceses of Gnesen and Posen, which were separate up to 1821. Since that time they have been united under one archbishop. Besides these dioceses the ecclesiastical province also embraces the Bishopric of Culm (q.v.).

I. HISTORY.—The Bishopric of Posen (Lat., *Posnania*; Polish, *Poznan*) was founded in 968 under Miecyslaw or Mesko, Duke of Poland. Unable to cope with internal enemies, he sought the support of the German Emperor Otto I and became one of his vassals. Converted by his pious wife, Dubravka, daughter of Duke Boleslaw I of Bohemia, he was baptized, and, in order to promote the Christianization of his dominions, undertook to establish a permanent

ecclesiastical organization. The first bishop was Jordan (968–82), who was appointed suffragan to the Archbishop of Magdeburg, in 970. Posen continued to be the only bishopric in Poland until the Diocese of Gnesen was created (Lat., *Gnesna*; Polish, *Gniezno*). The latter place was chosen by Duke Boleslaw as a suitable location for a shrine for the remains of St. Adalbert, who had suffered martyrdom at the hands of the heathen Prussians. When the Emperor Otto III made his pilgrimage to the grave of St. Adalbert in 1000, he established an archbishopric in Gnesen without consulting Bishop Unger of Posen (982–1012), and placed it under the jurisdiction of Radim or Gaudentius, brother of St. Adalbert. At the same time he created the Bishoprics of Cracow, Breslau, and Kolberg, and incorporated them in the new archdiocese. On the death of Boleslaw, Posen was severed from Magdeburg in the course of the strife engendered by the national opposition to Germanism. Bishop Paulinus, elected in 1037, was the first bishop consecrated in Gnesen. St. Norbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg, succeeded in obtaining a papal rescript in 1133, in which the metropolitan jurisdiction of his archiepiscopal see over Posen was still recognized. But since the twelfth century, Posen has undisputedly been *de facto* a suffragan of Gnesen. Both bishoprics were dependent on the temporal rulers of the country, who nominated the bishops at will, disposed arbitrarily of the benefices and prebends, and confiscated the estates of the bishops on their death.

The archiepiscopal See of Gnesen, richly endowed with estates and tithes, soon surpassed the older Bishopric of Posen both in extent and importance, and grew to be the most influential bishopric in the dukedom. In the thirteenth century the archbishops acquired the Principality of Lowicz. The diocese was further augmented by the addition of the suffragan Bishoprics of Lebus, Włocławek, and Plock in the thirteenth century; of Wilna and Lutzk in the fourteenth; of Samogitia in the fifteenth, and of Culm in the sixteenth. Its prelates also obtained many extremely valuable privileges, both ecclesiastical and temporal. At the Council of Constance they were given the rank and title of *Primas Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lithuaniae*, thereby getting ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all the Bishops of Poland and Lithuania. At the Fifth Lateran Council in 1515 they were honoured with the title of papal *Legatus natus*. In 1741 they received the privilege of wearing cardinal's vestments with the exception of the hat. The primacy entitled them to rank as princes of the empire. From 1572 they held authority as regents of the empire during an interregnum, superintended the election of the king and crowned the successful candidate.

The domestic condition of both bishoprics left much to be desired during the first few centuries of their existence, even with respect to the spiritual and moral training of the clergy. Such was the charge made by Pope Innocent III in a letter to Henry I, Archbishop of Gnesen (1200–19), in 1207. He censured the prelate on the ground that the majority of the priests were living in open matrimony, that the clergy were presenting frivolous plays before the laity, that theatrical performances were being given in churches, and so forth. Most of the credit for the improvement of both dioceses is due to the activities of the monasteries, mainly of German foundation. These included abbeys of the Benedictines, Cistercians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, Knights Templar and Knights of St. John, and convents of Poor Clares, all of which became centres of prosperous development. Many of the bishops, also, displayed a beneficent solicitude for education, although on this point there is very little precise information to be obtained. But at least we know that in the synodical statutes of 1257 Archbishop Fulk of Gnesen (1232–58)

directed the parish priests to establish and maintain schools; also that Bishop John VII (Lubrański) of Posen (1499-1520) founded a college at Posen, and other educational establishments.

Hussitism became widely disseminated throughout both dioceses in the fifteenth century. Its progress was mainly due to the fact that a great number of the sons of the Polish nobility attended the University of Prague. Bishop Stanislaus I (Ciołek) of Posen (1428-37) found himself at open variance with the city of Bentschen, whose inhabitants had become prevalently Hussite, and was even compelled to fly from his diocese. His successor, on the other hand, Andreas of Bnin (1439-79), forced the city to deliver into his hands five Hussite preachers, whom he had burned at the stake in 1439. The further spread of the Hussite movement was checked by the recall of all Poles living in Bohemia, and by the prohibition of all commercial intercourse with that country. The doctrines of Luther, however, found some ready supporters amongst the inhabitants, thanks largely to feuds between the clergy and the nobility. They found acceptance first in the towns—in Danzig as early as 1518. In Posen, Bishop John Lubrański (1499-1520) favoured the cause of the Reformation, sent to Leipzig for Christopher Endorf the humanist, and gave him an appointment in the high school. Petrus Tomicki (1520-25), the new bishop, seemed blind to the danger that menaced the Church. It was not until 1523 that strict measures for the preservation of the Faith were taken at the instance of the king. A kind of inquisition tribunal was instituted, and, at a synod convoked at Lenczyc by Archbishop John Laski (1510-31) of Gnesen, the bull of Pope Leo X excommunicating Luther was published. In 1534 the young men of Poland were forbidden to attend foreign schools. This restraint was somewhat relaxed under Laski's successors, Matthias Drzewicki (1531-35) and Andreas Krzycki (1535-37), the latter of whom was the composer of songs to Venus Vulgiva and on other degrading themes. The conduct of Archbishop Jacob Uchański (1562-81) in his attempts to establish a national church was marked by the greatest duplicity. The Moravian Brethren meanwhile obtained a footing in the Bishopric of Posen in spite of the opposition of Bishop Benedict Izdbieński (1546-53).

The defeat of the Reformation in Poland was mainly due to the energy of Cardinal Hosius. He instigated the promulgation and execution of the decrees of the Council of Trent throughout the country, and had the Jesuits sent thither. Bishop Adam Konarski (1562-74) brought them into Posen in 1571, and in Gnesen Archbishop Stanislaus Karnkowski (1582-1603) entrusted them with the direction of the seminaries of Gnesen and Kalisz. From a national standpoint, the effect of the victory of the Counter-Reformation was that the German element in both dioceses became almost completely Polonized. Among the most important of the subsequent prelates may be mentioned: of the Archdiocese of Gnesen, Cardinal Bernhard Maciejowski (1604-08), Laurentius Gembiński (1616-24), Matthias Lubieński (1641-52), Cardinal Michael Radziejowski (1687-1705), and Stanislaus Szembek (1706-22); of Posen, Andreas Opałowski (1607-23), Andreas Szokłowski (1636-50), Bartholomew Tarto (1710-15), Prince Theodore Czartoryski (1739-68).

The decline of Poland resulted in its partition among Russia, Austria, and Prussia (1773, 1793, and 1795). The Archbishop of Gnesen retained jurisdiction only over that part of the kingdom that fell to the share of Prussia, and the Diocese of Posen was also reduced in extent. When the Prussian occupation took effect, the Church was assured of the continued enjoyment of all her possessions, but after the insurrection of 1797 all her estates were confiscated. Pius VII transferred the primacy to the Archbishop of Warsaw; but the

title of prince was still attached to the Archbishopric of Gnesen until it too was withdrawn in 1829 by order of the cabinet. At the reorganization of ecclesiastical affairs in Prussia in 1821, the Russian-Polish part of the Diocese of Posen was cut off; the see was raised to an archbishopric, and joined to Gnesen under one prelate. Each bishopric, however, retained its own suffragan, its own cathedral chapter, and its own consistory. Timotheus Górzeński (d. 1825) was consecrated first Archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, after he had been Bishop of Posen since 1809. The city of Posen, which in the interim had outstripped Gnesen in size and importance, was designated the official seat of the diocese. Since the Prussian regime began, both chapters have had the joint right of electing the archbishop. This right, however, has already proved illusory in several elections, the archiepiscopal throne having been left vacant on several occasions for lengthy periods. After the brief incumbency of Theophilus Wolicki (1828-29), the archdiocese was ruled by Martin Dunin (1831-42), a graduate of the Collegium Germanicum. Although he met the views of the government as far as possible on all questions concerning the schools and religious seminaries, he, with the Archbishop of Cologne, Clement August von Droste-Vischering, defended the discipline of the Church regarding mixed marriages so steadfastly that he was removed from his see, exiled from his diocese, and later, on his return to Gnesen, was arrested and confined in the fortress of Kolberg. It was only in 1840 that he was reinstated, as the result of the personal interposition of King Frederick William IV. Leo Przłuski (1845-65) was succeeded by Miecislaus Halka Ledóchowski (1866-86), one of the first victims of the "Kulturkampf". On the 24 November, 1873, he was requested to abdicate his office by the chief president of the Province of Posen. Upon his refusal, he was summoned to appear before the court, arrested on the 3 February, 1874, and kept in prison at Ostrowo until February, 1876. Forbidden to stay in Prussia, he went to Rome, and was raised to the cardinalate by Pius IX in March, 1876. The Prussian government had him deposed by the supreme court of the state, and ordered a new election. Both cathedral chapters refused to carry out this order, whereupon the Prussians confiscated the episcopal possessions. Both suffragan bishops, the official Korytkowski, and other clergymen were persecuted by the government, and had variously to suffer imprisonment, exile, fines, the suspension of stipends, and deposition. In 1883, 165 of the 555 parishes in the two dioceses were without a pastor, and of these 131, embracing 165,000 souls, were absolutely without any clergyman whatsoever.

In the beginning of 1886 Ledóchowski resigned his incumbency into the pope's hands. The latter appointed a German, Julius Dinder, to the archbishopric (1886-90). From the outset his German nationality inspired the distrust of the Poles. He was bitterly attacked by Polish newspapers and at public meetings, because he carried out the wishes of the administration in ordering religious instruction to be given to the higher classes of the secondary schools in the German tongue. Even his attitude in espousing in general the cause of the Poles wherever their rights were affected did nothing to mitigate his unpopularity. He was succeeded by a Pole, Florian von Stablewski (1891-1906), who, as in the case of Dinder, was nominated by the pope. He did his best to keep on good terms with the civil government, promoted the education and training of the clergy by founding seminaries and preparatory colleges in Gnesen and Posen, improved the Catholic unions and societies, and caused the publication of several Catholic daily and weekly journals. But in spite of his conciliatory policy he was subjected to the attacks of both the German and Polish elements as a result of the ex-

cessively obnoxious conditions that prevailed throughout the archdiocese. Since his death it has been without a spiritual head. The diocese is at present in a very troubled state. The Polish population is bitterly hostile to the administration in consequence of the exclusion of their language from the schools, and of the plantation laws and expropriation policy inaugurated by the Prussian government. The schools have been altogether removed from the influence of the archbishop, the clergy, and the parents of the pupils; the intermediate schools are, for the most part, under the guidance of Protestant directors and teachers. In consequence of the plantation of German settlers, mostly of Protestant extraction, many parishes have been brought to the verge of ruin. The efforts of the government to Germanize the country and the consequent resistance of the Poles have, in many cases, exceeded all legitimate bounds, and have given rise to conditions which are very detrimental to the interests of the Catholic Church.

II. STATISTICS.—The Archdiocese of Gnesen-Posen embraces the Prussian governmental department of Posen, the department of Bromberg (with the exception of the circle, or district, of Bromberg), the circles of Deutsch-Krone and the circle of Thorn in Western Prussia and several small places in Pomerania. The total population in 1900 consisted of 1,272,499 souls, of whom some 110,000 were Germans. Each of the dioceses has a suffragan and its own cathedral chapter. During the vacancy of the see the administration of the Diocese of Posen is administered by the suffragan as capitular vicar and administrator general. The cathedral chapter is composed of a provost, a dean, eight canons and four honorary canons (1 vacant). At the beginning of 1909 the bishopric included 26 deaneries, 348 parish churches, 104 chapels-of-ease, 91 oratories and public chapels, 69 private chapels, 554 priests, 97 clerics, 951,020 souls. There is a clerical seminary (Seminarium Leoninum) at Posen with 5 professors and 97 alumni, and 2 preparatory colleges. There have been no male orders in either diocese since the Kulturkampf. The following female orders and congregations have institutions in the diocese: the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul have 13 convents with 112 sisters; the Grey Sisters of St. Elizabeth have 21 with 141 sisters; the Sisters of Mercy of St. Charles Borromeo 3 with 28 sisters; the Servants of the Immaculate Conception, 8 with 42 sisters. The church at Posen is the official cathedral of the diocese. It was built between 1772 and 1775 on the site of an older structure. It contains numerous memorial tablets and monuments of former bishops, and also the famous golden chapel of Rauch. A collegiate chapter with a provost, a dean, and two canons is attached to the parish church ad Sanctam Mariam Magdalenam, formerly the church of the Jesuits. In the Diocese of Gnesen the provost of the cathedral chapter has jurisdiction as vicar capitular and administrator general. The chapter consists of the provost and six canons. At the beginning of 1909 the diocese included 17 deaneries 207 parish churches, 29 chapels-of-ease, 64 oratories and chapels, 277 priests, 438,425 Catholics. There is one seminary at Gnesen, with 3 professors and 31 students, one archiepiscopal preparatory college, and 9 ecclesiastical hospitals. There are 8 convents of the Sisters of St. Elizabeth with 38 sisters, 5 of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul with 33 inmates, and six of the Servants of the Immaculate Conception with 38 sisters. The Gothic cathedral at Gnesen, the largest religious sanctuary in all Poland, dates from the 14th century. It contains the silver sarcophagus enclosing the relics of St. Adalbert, to which thousands make pilgrimages each year. There are collegiate chapters attached to the church of St. George in Gnesen, and to the parish church in Kruschwitz.

Bibliography in FINKEL, *Bibliografia Historji Polskie*, i.e. Bibliography of Polish History (Cracow, 1876). Authorities in THEINER, *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae* (4 vols., Rome, 1860-64); *Codex diplomaticus Majoris Poloniae*, I (Posen, 1877-81); *Monumenta Poloniae historica*, III (Lemberg 1878); ULANOWSKI, *Statuta Capitulum Gnesensis et Posnaniensis* (Cracow, 1897); IDEM, *Acta viderorum ecclesiasticorum ducesium Plocensis. Wladislaviensis et Gnesensis 1422-1533* (Cracow, 1909—); IDEM, *Acta capitulum Posnaniensis et Wladislaviensis* (Cracow, 1909—). The earlier books on the Archbishops of Gnesen are surpassed by the authoritative work of KORYTKOWSKI, *Archiepiskopi Gnieznienscy, prymasowie i metropolici polscy od roku 1000 az doroku 1821* (i.e. "The Archbishops of Gnesen, primates and metropolitans of Poland from the year 1000 to the year 1821", 5 vols., Posen, 1887-91); also IDEM, *Pralaci i kanonicy katedry metropolitańskiej gnieznienskiej* (i.e. "The prelates and canons of the metropolitan cathedral at Gnesen", 4 vols., Gnesen, 1882-83). For the Bishops of Posen cf. RZEPNICKI, *Vita præsulum Poloniae* (2 vols., Posen, 1761—), and KOZLOWSKI, *Zwoly prymasow i archybiszkupow gnieznienskich i poznanskiach w skróceniu* (i.e. "Brief biographies of the primates and Archbishops of Gnesen and Posen", Posen, 1887). On the diocese itself, cf. LUKASZEWICZ, *Diocesi Poznanski* (3 vols., Posen, 1858), and KORYTKOWSKI, *Brevs descriptio archidiecesis Gnesensis et Posnaniensis* (Gnesen, 1888); concerning the churches cf. KOHTE and WARSCHAUER, *Verzeichnis der Kunstdenkmale der Provinz Posen* (4 vols., Posen, 1895-98); also POLKOWSKI, *Katedra Gnieznienska* (i.e. "The Cathedral of Gnesen", Gnesen, 1874). Numerous essays dealing with both dioceses can be found in the *Zeitschrift der Historischen Gesellschaft für die Provinz Posen* (Posen, 1885—). Cf. also art. POLAND.

JOSEPH LINS.

**Gnosticism**, the doctrine of salvation by knowledge. This definition, based on the etymology of the word (γνῶσις "knowledge", γινώσκω, "good at knowing"), is correct as far as it goes, but it gives only one, though perhaps the predominant, characteristic of Gnostic systems of thought. Whereas Judaism and Christianity, and almost all pagan systems, hold that the soul attains its proper end by obedience of mind and will to the Supreme Power, i.e. by faith and works, it is markedly peculiar to Gnosticism that it places the salvation of the soul merely in the possession of a quasi-intuitive knowledge of the mysteries of the universe and of magic formulæ indicative of that knowledge. Gnostics were "people who knew", and their knowledge at once constituted them a superior class of beings, whose present and future status was essentially different from that of those who, for whatever reason, did not know. A more complete and historical definition of Gnosticism would be: "A collective name for a large number of greatly-varying pantheistic-idealistic sects, which flourished from some time before the Christian Era down to the fifth century, and which, while borrowing the phraseology and some of the tenets of the chief religions of the day, and especially of Christianity, held matter to be a deterioration of spirit, and the whole universe a deprivation of the Deity, and taught the ultimate end of all being to be the overcoming of the grossness of matter and the return to the Parent-Spirit, which return they held to be inaugurated and facilitated by the appearance of some God-sent Saviour". However unsatisfactory this definition may be, the obscurity, multiplicity, and wild confusion of Gnostic systems will hardly allow of another. Many scholars, moreover, would hold that every attempt to give a generic description of Gnostic sects is labour lost.

ORIGIN.—The beginnings of Gnosticism have long been a matter of controversy and are still largely a subject of research. The more these origins are studied, the farther they seem to recede in the past. Whereas formerly Gnosticism was considered mostly as a corruption of Christianity, it now seems clear that the first traces of Gnostic systems can be discerned some centuries before the Christian Era. Its Eastern origin was already maintained by Gieseler and Neander; F. Ch. Bauer (1831) and Lassen (1858) sought to prove its relation to the religions of India; Lipsius (1860) pointed to Syria and Phœnicia as its home, and Hilgenfeld (1884) thought it was connected with later Mazdeism. Joel (1880), Weingarten (1881), Koffmane (1881), Anrich (1894), and Wobbermin (1896)

sought to account for the rise of Gnosticism by the influence of Greek Platonic philosophy and the Greek mysteries, while Harnack described it as "acute Hellenization of Christianity". For the last twenty-five years, however, the trend of scholarship has steadily moved towards proving the pre-Christian Oriental origins of Gnosticism. At the Fifth Congress of Orientalists (Berlin, 1882) Kessler brought out the connexion between Gnosis and the Babylonian religion. By this latter name, however, he meant not the original religion of Babylonia, but the syncretistic religion which arose after the conquest of Cyrus. The same idea is brought out in his "Mani" seven years later. In the same year F. W. Brandt published his "Mandäische Religion". This Mandæan religion is so unmistakably a form of Gnosticism that it seems beyond doubt that Gnosticism existed independent of, and anterior to, Christianity. In more recent years (1897) Wilhelm Anz pointed out the close similarity between Babylonian astrology and the Gnostic theories of the Hebdomad and Ogdoad. Though in many instances speculations on the Babylonian *Astraltheorie* have gone beyond all sober scholarship, yet in this particular instance the inferences made by Anz seem sound and reliable. Researches in the same direction were continued and instituted on a wider scale by W. Bousset, in 1907, and led to carefully ascertained results. In 1898 the attempt was made by M. Friedländer to trace Gnosticism in pre-Christian Judaism. His opinion that the Rabbinic term *Minnim* designated not Christians, as was commonly believed, but Antinomian Gnostics, has not found universal acceptance. In fact, E. Schürer brought sufficient proof to show that *Minnim* is the exact Aramæan dialectic equivalent for *ἔθνη*. Nevertheless Friedländer's essay retains its value in tracing strong antinomian tendencies with Gnostic colouring on Jewish soil. Not a few scholars have laboured to find the source of Gnostic theories on Hellenistic and, specifically, Alexandrian soil. In 1880 Joel sought to prove that the germ of all Gnostic theories was to be found in Plato. Though this may be dismissed as an exaggeration, some Greek influence on the birth, but especially on the growth, of Gnosticism cannot be denied. In Trismegistic literature, as pointed out by Reitzenstein (Poimandres, 1904), we find much that is strangely akin to Gnosticism. Its Egyptian origin was defended by E. Amélineau, in 1887, and illustrated by A. Dietrich, in 1891 (Abraxas Studien) and 1903 (Mithrasliturgie). The relation of Plotinus's philosophy to Gnosticism was brought out by C. Schmidt in 1901. That Alexandrian thought had some share at least in the development of Christian Gnosticism is clear from the fact that the bulk of Gnostic literature which we possess comes to us from Egyptian (Coptic) sources. That this share was not a predominant one is, however, acknowledged by O. Gruppe in his "Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte" (1902). It is true that the Greek mysteries, as G. Anrich pointed out in 1894, had much in common with esoteric Gnosticism; but there remains the further question, in how far these Greek mysteries, as they are known to us, were the genuine product of Greek thought, and not much rather due to the overpowering influence of Orientalism.

Although the origins of Gnosticism are still largely enveloped in obscurity, so much light has been shed on the problem by the combined labours of many scholars that it is possible to give the following tentative solution: Although Gnosticism may at first sight appear a mere thoughtless syncretism of well nigh all religious systems of antiquity, it has in reality one deep root-principle, which assimilated in every soil what it needed for its life and growth; this principle is philosophical and religious pessimism. The Gnostics, it is true, borrowed their terminology almost entirely from existing religions, but they only used it to illus-

trate their great idea of the essential evil of this present existence and the duty to escape it by the help of magic spells and a superhuman Saviour. Whatever they borrowed, this pessimism they did not borrow—not from Greek thought, which was a joyous acknowledgment of and homage to the beautiful and noble in this world, with a studied disregard of the element of sorrow; not from Egyptian thought, which did not allow its elaborate speculations on retribution and judgment in the netherworld to cast a gloom on this present existence, but considered the universe created or evolved under the presiding wisdom of Thoth; not from Iranian thought, which held to the absolute supremacy of Ahura Mazda and only allowed Ahriman a subordinate share in the creation, or rather counter-creation, of the world; not from Indian Brahminic thought, which was Pantheism pure and simple, or God dwelling in, nay identified with, the universe, rather than the Universe existing as the contradictory of God; not, lastly, from Semitic thought, for Semitic religions were strangely reticent as to the fate of the soul after death, and saw all practical wisdom in the worship of Baal, or Marduk, or Assur, or Hadad, that they might live long on this earth. This utter pessimism, bemoaning the existence of the whole universe as a corruption and a calamity, with a feverish craving to be freed from the body of this death and a mad hope that, if we only knew, we could by some mystic words undo the cursed spell of this existence—this is the foundation of all Gnostic thought. It has the same parent-soil as Buddhism; but Buddhism is ethical, it endeavours to obtain its end by the extinction of all desire; Gnosticism is pseudo-intellectual, and trusts exclusively to magical knowledge. Moreover, Gnosticism, placed in other historical surroundings, developed from the first on other lines than Buddhism. When Cyrus entered Babylon in 539 B.C., two great worlds of thought met, and syncretism in religion, as far as we know it, began. Iranian thought began to mix with the ancient civilization of Babylon. The idea of the great struggle between evil and good, ever continuing in this universe, is the parent idea of Mazdeism, or Iranian dualism. This, and the imagined existence of numberless intermediate spirits, angels and devas, was the conviction which overcame the contentedness of Semitism. On the other hand, the unshakable trust in astrology, the persuasion that the planetary system had a fatalistic influence on this world's affairs, stood its ground on the soil of Chaldea. The greatness of the Seven—the Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, the Sun, Jupiter, and Saturn—the sacred Hebdomad, symbolized for millenniums by the staged towers of Babylonia, remained undiminished. They ceased, indeed, to be worshipped as deities, but they remained *ἀρχόντες* and *δυνάμεις*, rulers and powers whose almost irresistible force was dreaded by man. Practically, they were changed from gods to devas, or evil spirits. The religions of the invaders and of the invaded effected a compromise: the astral faith of Babylon was true, but beyond the Hebdomad was the infinite light in the Ogdoad, and every human soul had to pass the adverse influence of the god or gods of the Hebdomad before it could ascend to the only good God beyond. This ascent of the soul through the planetary spheres to the heaven beyond (an idea not unknown even to ancient Babylonian speculations) began to be conceived as a struggle with adverse powers, and became the first and predominant idea in Gnosticism. The second great component of Gnostic thought is magic, properly so called, i. e. the power *ex opere operato* of weird names, sounds, gestures, and actions, as also the mixture of elements to produce effects totally disproportionate to the cause. These magic formulæ, which caused laughter and disgust to outsiders, are not a later and accidental corruption, but an essential part of Gnosticism, for they are found in all forms of Christian Gnosticism and likewise in Man-



deism. No Gnosis was essentially complete without the knowledge of the formulae, which, once pronounced, were the undoing of the higher hostile powers. Magic is the original sin of Gnosticism, nor is it difficult to guess whence it is inherited. To a certain extent it formed part of every pagan religion, especially the ancient mysteries, yet the thousands of magic tablets unearthed in Assyria and Babylonia show us where the rankest growth of magic was to be found. Moreover, the terms and names of earliest Gnosticism bear an unmistakable similarity to Semitic sounds and words. Gnosticism came early into contact with Judaism, and it betrays a knowledge of the Old Testament, if only to reject it or borrow a few names from it. Considering the strong, well-organized, and highly-cultured Jewish colonies in the Euphrates valley, this early contact with Judaism is perfectly natural. Perhaps the Gnostic idea of a Redeemer is not unconnected with Jewish Messianic hopes. But from the first the Gnostic conception of a Saviour is more superhuman than that of popular Judaism; their *Manda d'Haye*, or *Soter*, is some immediate manifestation of the Deity, a Light-King, an *Æon* (*Αἰών*), and an emanation of the good God. When Gnosticism came in touch with Christianity, which must have happened almost immediately on its appearance, Gnosticism threw itself with strange rapidity into Christian forms of thought, borrowed its nomenclature, acknowledged Jesus as Saviour of the world, simulated its sacraments, pretended to be an esoteric revelation of Christ and His Apostles, flooded the world with apocryphal Gospels, and Acts, and Apocalypses, to substantiate its claim. As Christianity grew within and without the Roman Empire, Gnosticism spread as a fungus at its root, and claimed to be the only true form of Christianity, unfit, indeed, for the vulgar crowd, but set apart for the gifted and the elect. So rank was its poisonous growth that there seemed danger of its stifling Christianity altogether, and the earliest Fathers devoted their energies to uprooting it. Though in reality the spirit of Gnosticism is utterly alien to that of Christianity, it then seemed to the unwary merely a modification or refinement thereof. When domiciled on Greek soil, Gnosticism, slightly changing its barbarous and Semitic terminology and giving its "emanations" and "syzygies" Greek names, sounded somewhat like neo-Platonism, though it was strongly repudiated by Plotinus. In Egypt the national worship left its mark more on Gnostic practice than on its theories. In dealing with the origins of Gnosticism, one might be tempted to mention Manichæism, as a number of Gnostic ideas seem to be borrowed from Manichæism, where they are obviously at home. This, however, would hardly be correct. Manichæism, as historically connected with Mani, its founder, could not have arisen much earlier than A. D. 250, when Gnosticism was already in rapid decline. Manichæism, however, in many of its elements dates back far beyond its commonly accepted founder; but then it is a parallel development with the Gnosis, rather than one of its sources. Sometimes Manichæism is even classed as a form of Gnosticism and styled Parsee Gnosis, as distinguished from Syrian and Egyptian Gnosis. This classification, however, ignores the fact that the two systems, though they have the doctrine of the evil of matter in common, start from different principles, Manichæism from dualism, while Gnosticism, as an idealistic Pantheism, proceeds from the conception of matter as a gradual deterioration of the Godhead.

**DOCTRINES.**—Owing to the multiplicity and divergence of Gnostic theories, a detailed exposition in this article would be unsatisfactory and confusing and to a certain extent even misleading, since Gnosticism never possessed a nucleus of stable doctrine, or any sort of *depositum fidei* round which a number of varied developments and heresies or sects might be grouped; at most it had some leading ideas, which are more or less

clearly traceable in different schools. Moreover, a fair idea of Gnostic doctrines can be obtained from the accounts on leaders and phases of Gnostic thought (e. g. BASILIDES; VALENTINUS; MARCION; DOCTÆ; DEMETRGE). We shall here only indicate some main phases of thought, which can be regarded as keys and which, though not fitting all systems, will unlock most of the mysteries of the Gnosis.

(a) *Cosmogony.*—Gnosticism is thinly disguised Pantheism. In the beginning was the Depth; the Fulness of Being; the Not-Being God; the First Father, the Monad, the Man; the First Source, the unknown God (*βυθός πλήρωμα, οὐκ ὢν θεός, προπάτωρ, μόνως, ἀνθρώπος, προαρχή, ἄγνωστος θεός*), or by whatever other name it might be called. This undefined infinite Something, though it might be addressed by the title of *the Good God*, was not a personal Being; but, like Tad or Brahma of the Hindus, the "Great Unknown" of modern thought. The Unknown God, however, was in the beginning pure spirituality; matter as yet was not. This source of all being causes to emanate (*προβάλλει*) from itself a number of pure spirit forces. In the different systems these emanations are differently named, classified, and described, but the emanation theory itself is common to all forms of Gnosticism. In the Basilidian Gnosis they are called *sonshipes* (*υἱότητες*), in Valentinianism they form antithetic pairs or "syzygies" (*σύζυγοι*); Depth and Silence produce Mind and Truth; these produce Reason and Life, these again Man and State (*ἐκκλησία*). According to Marcus, they are numbers and sounds. These are the primary roots of the *Æons*. With bewildering fertility hierarchies of *Æons* are thus produced, sometimes to the number of thirty. These *Æons* belong to the purely ideal, noumenal, intelligible, or supersensible world; they are immaterial, they are hypostatic ideas. Together with the source from which they emanate they form the *πλήρωμα*. The transition from the immaterial to the material, from the noumenal to the sensible, is brought about by a flaw, or a passion, or a sin, in one of the *Æons*. According to Basilides, it is a flaw in the last sonship; according to others it is the passion of the female *Æon* Sophia; according to others the sin of the Great Archon, or *Æon*-Creator, of the Universe. The ultimate end of all Gnosis is *metanæa*, or repentance, the undoing of the sin of material existence and the return to the Pleroma.

(b) *Sophia-Myth.*—In the greater number of Gnostic systems an important rôle is played by the *Æon* Wisdom—Sophia or Achamoth (*חכמות*). In some sense she seems to represent the supreme female principle, as for instance in the Ptolemaic system, in which the mother of the seven heavens is called Achamoth, in the Valentinian system, in which *ἡ ἄνω Σοφία*, the Wisdom above, is distinguished from *ἡ κάτω Σοφία*, or Achamoth, the former being the female principle in the noumenal world, and in the Archontian system, where we find a "Lightsome Mother" (*ἡ μήτηρ ἡ φωτεινή*), and in which beyond the heavens of the Archons is *ἡ μήτηρ τῶν πάντων* and likewise in the Barbelognosis, where the female Barbelos is but the counterpart of the Unknown Father, which also occurs amongst the Ophites described by Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres.*, III, vii, 4). Moreover, the Eucharistic prayer in the Acts of Thomas (ch. l) seems addressed to this supreme female principle. W. Bousset's suggestion, that the Gnostic Sophia is nothing else than a disguise for the Dea Syra, the great goddess Istar, or Astarte, seems worthy of consideration. On the other hand, the *Æon* Sophia usually plays another rôle; she is *ἡ Προβούκεος* or "the Lustful One", once a virginal goddess, who by her fall from original purity is the cause of this sinful material world. One of the earliest forms of this myth is found in the Simonian Gnosis, in which Simon, the Great Power, finds Helena, who during ten years had been a prostitute in Tyre, but who is Simon's *ἐννοια*, or understanding, and whom

his followers worshipped under the form of Athena, the goddess of wisdom. According to Valentinus's system, as described by Hippolytus (Book VI, xxv-xxvi), Sophia is the youngest of the twenty-eight æons. Observing the multitude of æons and the power of begetting them, she hurries back into the depth of the Father, and seeks to emulate him by producing offspring without conjugal intercourse, but only projects an abortion, a formless substance. Upon this she is cast out of the Pleroma. According to the Valentinian system as described by Irenæus (op. cit., I) and Tertullian (Adv. Valent., ix), Sophia conceives a passion for the First Father himself, or rather, under pretext of love she seeks to know him, the Unknowable, and to comprehend his greatness. She would have suffered the consequence of her audacity by ultimate dissolution into the immensity of the Father, but for the Boundary Spirit. According to the Pistis Sophia (ch. xxix) Sophia, daughter of Barbelos, originally dwelt in the highest, or thirteenth heaven, but she is seduced by the demon Authades by means of a ray of light, which she mistook for an emanation from the First Father. Authades thus enticed her into Chaos below the twelve Æons, where she is imprisoned by evil powers. According to these ideas, matter is the fruit of the sin of Sophia; this, however, was but a Valentinian development; in the older speculations the existence of matter is tacitly presupposed as eternal with the Pleroma, and through her sin Sophia falls from the realm of light into the Chaos or realm of darkness. This original dualism, however, was overcome by the predominant spirit of Gnosticism, pantheistic emanationism. The Sophia myth is completely absent from the Basilidian and kindred systems. It is suggested, with great verisimilitude, that the Egyptian myth of Isis was the original source of the Gnostic "lower wisdom". In many systems this *Kérw Sophia* is sharply distinguished from the Higher Wisdom mentioned above; as, for instance, in the magic formula for the dead mentioned by Irenæus (op. cit., I, xxi, 5), in which the departed has to address the hostile archons thus: "I am a vessel more precious than the female who made you. If your mother ignores the source whence she is, I know myself, and I know whence I am and invoke the incorruptible Sophia, who is in the Father, the mother of your mother, who has neither father nor husband. A man-woman, born from a woman, has made you, not knowing her mother, but thinking herself alone. But I invoke her mother." This agrees with the system minutely described by Irenæus (op. cit., I, iv-v), where Sophia Achamoth, or Lower Wisdom, the daughter of Higher Wisdom, becomes the mother of the Demiurge; she being the Ogdoad, her son the Hebdomad, they form a counterpart of the heavenly Ogdoad in the Pleromata. This is evidently a clumsy attempt to fuse into one two systems radically different, the Basilidian and the Valentinian; the ignorance of the Great Archon, which is the central idea of Basilides, is here transferred to Sophia, and the hybrid system ends in bewildering confusion.

(c) *Soteriology*.—Gnostic salvation is not merely individual redemption of each human soul; it is a cosmic process. It is the return of all things to what they were before the flaw in the sphere of the Æons brought matter into existence and imprisoned some part of the Divine Light in the evil Hyle ("Τλη"). This setting free of the light sparks is the process of salvation; when all light shall have left Hyle, it will be burnt up, destroyed, or be a sort of everlasting hell for the Hylicoi. In Basilidianism it is the Third Filiation that is captive in matter, and is gradually being saved, now that the knowledge of its existence has been brought to the first Archon and then to the Second Archon, to each by his respective Son; and the news has been spread through the Hebdomad by Jesus the Son of Mary, who died to redeem the Third Filiation. In Valentinian-

ism the process is extraordinarily elaborate. When this world has been born from Sophia in consequence of her sin, Nous and Aletheia, two Æons, by command of the Father, produce two new Æons, Christ and the Holy Ghost; these restore order in the Pleroma, and in consequence all Æons together produce a new Æon, Jesus Logos, Soter, or Christ, whom they offer to the Father. Christ, the Son of Nous and Aletheia, has pity on the abortive substance born of Sophia and gives it essence and form. Whereupon Sophia tries to rise again to the Father, but in vain. Now the Æon Jesus-Soter is sent as second Saviour, he unites himself to the man Jesus, the son of Mary, at his baptism, and becomes the Saviour of men. Man is a creature of the Demiurge, a compound of soul, body, and spirit. His salvation consists in the return of his *πνεῦμα* or spirit to the Pleroma; or if he be only a Psychicist, not a full Gnostic, his soul (*ψυχή*) shall return to Achamoth. There is no resurrection of the body. (For further details and differences see VALENTINUS.)

In Marcionism, the most dualistic phase of Gnosticism, salvation consisted in the possession of the knowledge of the Good God and the rejection of the Demiurge. The Good God revealed himself in Jesus and appeared as man in Judea; to know him, and to become entirely free from the yoke of the World-Creator or God of the Old Testament, is the end of all salvation. The Gnostic Saviour, therefore, is entirely different from the Christian one. For (1) the Gnostic Saviour does not save. Gnosticism lacks the idea of atonement. There is no sin to be atoned for, except ignorance be that sin. Nor does the Saviour in any sense benefit the human race by vicarious sufferings. Nor, finally, does he immediately and actively affect any individual human soul by the power of grace or draw it to God. He was a teacher, he once brought into the world the truth, which alone can save. As a flame sets naphtha on fire, so the Saviour's light ignites predisposed souls moving down the stream of time. Of a real Saviour who with love human and Divine seeks out sinners to save them, Gnosticism knows nothing. The Gnostic Saviour (2) has no human nature, he is an æon, not a man; he only seemed a man, as the three Angels who visited Abraham seemed to be men. (For a detailed exposition see DOCTÆ.) The Æon Soter is brought into the strangest relation to Sophia: in some systems he is her brother, in others her son, in others again her spouse. He is sometimes identified with Christ, sometimes with Jesus; sometimes Christ and Jesus are the same æon, sometimes they are different; sometimes Christ and the Holy Ghost are identified. Gnosticism did its best to utilize the Christian concept of the Holy Ghost, but never quite succeeded. She made him the Horos, or Methorion Pneuma ("Ὅρος, Μεθόριον Πνεῦμα"), the Boundary-Spirit, the Sweet Odour of the Second Filiation, a companion æon with Christos, etc., etc. In some systems he is entirely left out.

(d) *Eschatology*.—It is the merit of recent scholarship to have proved that Gnostic eschatology, consisting in the soul's struggle with hostile archons in its attempt to reach the Pleroma, is simply the soul's ascent, in Babylonian astrology, through the realms of the seven planets to Anu. Origen (Contra Celsum, VI, xxxi), referring to the Ophitic system, gives us the names of the seven archons as Jaldabaoth, Jao, Sabaoth, Adoniaios, Astaphaios, Ailoaios, and Oraios, and tells us that Jaldabaoth is the planet Saturn. Astaphaios is beyond doubt the planet Venus, as there are gnostic gems with a female figure and the legend ΑΣΤΑΦΗ, which name is also used in magic spells as the name of a goddess. In the Mandæan system Adoniaios represents the Sun. Moreover, St. Irenæus tells us: "Sanctam Hebdomadem VII stellas, quas dicunt planetas, esse volunt." It is safe, therefore, to take the above seven Gnostic names as designating the seven stars, then considered planets, Jaldabaoth (יְרֵבֶהָת)—Child of Chaos?—Saturn, called "the Lion-

faced", *λεωτοειδής*) is the outermost, and therefore the chief ruler, and later on the Demiurge *par excellence*. Jao ( *Ιάω*, perhaps from *יהו* Jahu, Jahveh, but possibly also from the magic cry *Ιάω* in the mysteries) is Jupiter. Sabaoth ( *צבאות* ) the Old-Testament title—God of Hosts) was misunderstood; "of hosts" was thought a proper name, hence Jupiter Sabbas (*Jahve Sabaoth*) was Mars. Astaphaios (taken from magic tablets) was Venus. Adonaios ( *אדנאי*, Hebrew term for "the Lord", used of God; Adonis of the Syrians representing the Winter sun in the cosmic tragedy of Tanmiz) was the Sun; Ailaoios, or sometimes Ailoein ( *אילויים* Elohim, God), Mercury; Oraios ( *אוראיוס* Jarēah? or *אור* light?), the Moon. In the hellenized form of Gnosticism either all or some of these names are replaced by personified vices. Authadia ( *Αὐθάδεια* ), or Audacity, is the obvious description of Jaldabaoth, the presumptuous Demiurge, who is lionfaced as the Archon Authadia. Of the Archons Kakia, Zelos, Phthonos, Errinys, Epithymia, the last obviously represents Venus. The number seven is obtained by placing a proarchon or chief archon at the head. That these names are only a disguise for the Sancta Hebdomas is clear, for Sophia, the mother of them, retains the name of Ogdoas, Octonatio. Occasionally one meets with the Archon *Ἡσαδάω*, which is evidently the El Shaddai of the Bible ( *אל שדי* ), and he is described as the Archon "number four" ( *ἑτάρημος τέταρτος* ) and must represent the Sun. In the system of the Gnostics mentioned by Epiphanius we find, as the Seven Archons, Iao, Saklas, Seth, David, Eloiein, Elilaios, and Jaldabaoth (or no. 6 Jaldabaoth, no. 7 Sabaoth). Of these, Saklas is the chief demon of Manichæism; Elilaios is probably connected with En-lil, the Bel of Nippur, the ancient god of Babylonia. In this, as in several other systems, the traces of the planetary seven have become obscured, but hardly in any have they become totally effaced. What tended most to obliterate the sevenfold distinction was the identification of the God of the Jews, the Lawgiver, with Jaldabaoth and his designation as World-creator, whereas formerly the seven planets together ruled the world. This confusion, however, was suggested by the very fact that at least five of the seven archons bore Old-Testament names for God—El Shaddai, Adonai, Elohim, Jehovah, Sabaoth.

(e) *Doctrine of the Primeval Man*.—The speculations on Primeval Man ( *Πρωτόγονος*, Adam) occupy a prominent place in several Gnostic systems. According to the "Evangelium Mariæ", the Father is Prōt-anthrōpos; Barbelo became Prōt-anthrōpos. According to Irenæus (I. xxix, 3) the Æon Autogenes emits the true and perfect Anthrōpos, also called Adamas; he has a helpmate, "Perfect Knowledge", and receives an irresistible force, so that all things rest in him. Others say (Irenæus, I, xxx) there is a blessed and incorruptible and endless light in the power of Bythos ( *Βυθός* ); this is the Father of all things who is invoked as the First Man, who, with his Ennoia, emits "the Son of Man", or Deuteranthrōpos. According to Valentinus, Adam was created in the name of Anthrōpos and overawes the demons by the fear of the pre-existent man ( *τοῦ πρόπρωτος ἀνθρώπου* ). In the Valentinian syzygies and in the Marcosian system we meet in the fourth (originally the third) place Anthrōpos and Ecclesia. In the Pistis Sophia the Æon Jeû is called the First Man, he is the overseer of the Light, messenger of the First Precept, and constitutes the forces of the Heimarmene. In the Books of the Jeû this "Great Man" is the King of the Light-treasure, he is enthroned above all things and is the goal of all souls. According to the Naassenes, the Prōt-anthrōpos is the first element; the fundamental being before its differentiation into individuals. "The Son of Man" is the same being after it has been individualized into existing things and thus sunk into matter. The Gnostic Anthrōpos, therefore, or *Ἀδάμ*, as it is sometimes

called, is a cosmogonic element, pure mind as distinct from matter, mind conceived hypostatically as emanating from God and not yet darkened by contact with matter. This mind is considered as the reason of humanity, or humanity itself, as a personified idea, a category without corporeality, the human reason conceived as the World-Soul. This speculation about the Anthrōpos is completely developed in Manichæism, where, in fact, it is the basis of the whole system. God, in danger of the power of darkness, creates with the help of the Spirit, the five worlds, the twelve elements, and the Eternal Man, and makes him combat the darkness. But this Man is somehow overcome by evil and swallowed up by darkness. The present universe is in throes to deliver the captive Man from the powers of darkness. In the Clementine Homilies the cosmogonic Anthrōpos is strangely mixed up with the historical figure of the first man, Adam. Adam "was the true prophet, running through all ages, and hastening to rest"; "the Christ, who was from the beginning and is always, who was ever present to every generation, in a hidden manner indeed, yet ever present". In fact Adam was, to use Modernist language, the Godhead immanent in the world and ever manifesting itself to the inner consciousness of the elect. The same idea, somewhat modified, occurs in Hermetic literature, especially the "Poimandres". It is elaborated by Philo, who makes an ingenious distinction between the human being created first "after God's image and likeness" and the historic figures of Adam and Eve created afterwards. Adam *κατ' εἰκόνα* is: "Idea, Genus, Character, belonging to the world of Understanding, without body, neither male nor female; he is the Beginning, the Name of God, the Logos, immortal, incorruptible" (De opif. mund., 134-148; De conf. ling., 146). These ideas, in Talmudism, Philonism, Gnosticism, and Trismegistic literature, all come from one source, the late Mazdean development of the Gayomarthians, or worshippers of the Super-Man.

(f) *The Barbelo*.—This Gnostic figure, appearing in a number of systems, the Nicolaites, the "Gnostics" of Epiphanius, the Sethians, the system of the "Evangelium Mariæ" and that in Iren., I, xxix, 2 sq., remains to a certain extent an enigma. The name *βαρβηλώ*, *βαρβηλῶς*, *βαρβένος* has not been explained with certainty. In any case she represents the supreme female principle, is in fact the highest Godhead in its female aspect. Barbelo has most of the functions of the *ἄνω σοφία* as described above. So prominent was her place amongst some Gnostics that some schools were designated as Barbeliotæ, Barbelo worshippers or Barbelognostics. She is probably none other than the Light-Maiden of the Pistis Sophia, the *θυγατὴρ τοῦ φωτός* or simply the Maiden, *παρθένος*. In Epiphanius (Hær., xxvi, 1) and Philastrius (Hær., xxxiii) Parthenos (Barbelos) seems identical with Noria, who plays a great rôle as wife either of Noe or of Seth. The suggestion, that Noria is *נוריא*, "Maiden", *παρθένος*, Istar, Athena, Wisdom, Sophia, or Achamoth, seems worthy of consideration.

RITES.—We are not so well informed about the practical and ritual side of Gnosticism as we are about its doctrinal and theoretical side. However, St. Irenæus's account of the Marcosians, Hippolytus's account of the Elcesaites, the liturgical portions of the "Acta Thomæ", some passages in the Pseudo-Clementines, and above all Coptic Gnostic and Mandæan literature give us at least some insight into their liturgical practices.

(a) *Baptism*.—All Gnostic sects possessed this rite in some way; in Mandæism daily baptism is one of the great practices of the system. The formulæ used by Christian Gnostics seem to have varied widely from that enjoined by Christ. The Marcosians said: "In [eis] the name of the unknown Father of all, in [eis] the Truth, the Mother of all, in him, who came down on Jesus [eis τὸν κατελθόντα eis 'Ἰησοῦν]". The Elcesaites

said: "In [ἐν] the name of the great and highest God and in the name of his Son, the great King". In *Iren.* (I, xxi, 3) we find the formula: "In the name that was hidden from every divinity and lordship and truth, which [name] Jesus the Nazarene has put on in the regions of light" and several other formulæ, which were sometimes pronounced in Hebrew or Aramaic. The Mandæans said: "The name of the Life and the name of the Manda d'Haye is named over thee". In connexion with Baptism the *Sphragis* (Σφραγίς) was of great importance; in what the seal or sign consisted wherewith they were marked is not easy to say. There was also the tradition of a name either by utterance or by handing a tablet with some mystic word on it.


(b) *Confirmation*.—The anointing of the candidate with chrism, or odoriferous ointment, is a Gnostic rite which overshadows the importance of baptism. In the "Acta Thomæ", so some scholars maintain, it had completely replaced baptism, and was the sole sacrament of initiation. This however is not yet proven. The Marcosians went so far as to reject Christian baptism and to substitute a mixture of oil and water which they poured over the head of the candidate. By confirmation the Gnostics intended not so much to give the Holy Ghost as to seal the candidate against the attacks of the archons, or to drive them away by the sweet odour which is above all things (τῆς ὑπερ τοῦ ὅλου εὐωδίας). The balsam was somehow supposed to have flowed from the Tree of Life, and this tree was again mystically connected with the Cross; for the chrism is in the "Acta Thomæ" called "the hidden mystery in which the Cross is shown to us".

(c) *The Eucharist*.—It is remarkable that so little is known of the Gnostic substitute for the Eucharist. In a number of passages we read of the breaking of the bread, but in what this consisted is not easy to determine. The use of salt in this rite seems to have been important (Clem., *Hom.* xiv), for we read distinctly how St. Peter broke the bread of the Eucharist and "putting salt thereon, he gave first to the mother and then to us". There is furthermore a great likelihood, though no certainty, that the Eucharist referred to in the "Acta Thomæ" was merely a breaking of bread without the use of the cup. This point is strongly controverted, but the contrary can hardly be proven. It is beyond doubt that the Gnostics often substituted water for the wine (Acta Thomæ, Baptism of Mygdonia, ch. cxi). What formulæ of consecration was used we do not know, but the bread was certainly signed with the Cross. It is to be noted that the Gnostics called the Eucharist by Christian sacrificial terms—προσφορά, "oblation", *Θυσία* (II Bk. of *Jeû*, 45). In the Coptic Books (*Pistis Sophia*, 142; II *Jeû*, 45-47) we find a long description of some apparently Eucharistic ceremonies carried out by Jesus Himself. In these fire and incense, two flasks, and also two cups,

one with water, the other with wine, and branches of the vine are used. Christ crowns the Apostles with olive wreaths, begs Melchisedech to come and change wine into water for baptism, puts herbs in the Apostles' mouths and hands. Whether these actions in some sense reflect the ritual of Gnosticism, or are only imaginations of the author, cannot be decided. The Gnostics seem also to have used oil sacramentally for the healing of the sick, and even the dead were anointed by them to be rendered safe and invisible in their transit through the realms of the archons.

(d) *The Nymphôn*.—They possessed a special Gnostic sacrament of the bridechamber (νυμφών) in which, through some symbolical actions, their souls were wedded to their angels in the Pleroma. Details of its rites are not as yet known. Tertullian no doubt alluded to them in the words "Eleusinia fecerunt lenocinia".

(e) *The Magic Vowels*.—An extraordinary prominence is given to the utterance of the vowels: αἰωνίως. The Saviour and His disciples are supposed in the midst of their sentences to have broken out in an interminable gibberish of only vowels; magic spells have come down to us consisting of vowels by the fourscore; on amulets the seven vowels, repeated according to all sorts of artifices, form a very common inscription. Within the last few years these Gnostic vowels, so long a mystery, have been the object of careful study by Ruelle, Poirée, and Leclercq, and it may be considered proven that each vowel represents one of the seven planets, or archons; that the seven together represent the Universe, but without consonants they represent the Ideal and Infinite not yet imprisoned and limited by matter; that they represent a musical scale, probably like the Gregorian 1 tone re-re, or d, e, f, g, a, b, c, and many a Gnostic sheet of vowels is in fact a sheet of music. But research on this subject has only just begun. Among the Gnostics the Ophites were particularly fond of representing their cosmogonic speculations by diagrams, circles within circles, squares, and parallel lines, and other mathematical figures combined, with names



AN OPHITE DIAGRAM

written within them. How far these sacred diagrams were used as symbols in their liturgy, we do not know.

**SCHOOLS OF GNOSTICISM.**—Gnosticism possessed no central authority for either doctrine or discipline; considered as a whole it had no organization similar to the vast organization of the Catholic Church. It was but a large conglomeration of sects, of which Marcionism alone attempted in some way to rival the constitution of the Church, and even Marcionism had no unity. No other classification of these sects is possible than that according to their main trend of thought. We can therefore distinguish: (a) Syrian or Semitic; (b) Hellenistic or Alexandrian; (c) dualistic; (d) antinomian Gnostics.

(a) *The Syrian School*.—This school represents the oldest phase of Gnosticism, as Western Asia was the

birthplace of the movement. Dositeus, Simon Magus, Menander, Cerinthus, Cerdo, Saturninus Justin, the Bardesanites, Severians, Ebionites, Encratites, Ophites, Naassenes, the Gnostics of the "Acts of Thomas", the Sethians, the Peratæ, the Cainites may be said to belong to this school. The more fantastic elements and elaborate genealogies and syzygies of æons of the later Gnosis are still absent in these systems. The terminology is some barbarous form of Semitic; Egypt is the symbolic name for the soul's land of bondage. The opposition between the good God and the World-Creator is not eternal or cosmogonic, though there is strong ethical opposition to Jehovah the God of the Jews. He is the last of the seven angels who fashioned this world out of eternally pre-existent matter. The demiurgic angels, attempting to create man, created but a miserable worm, to which the Good God, however, gave the spark of divine life. The rule of the god of the Jews must pass away, for the good God calls us to his own immediate service through Christ his Son. We obey the Supreme Deity by abstaining from flesh meat and marriage, and by leading an ascetic life. Such was the system of Saturninus of Antioch, who taught during the reign of Hadrian (c. A. D. 120). The Naassenes (from *Nahas* נחש, the Hebrew for serpent) were worshippers of the serpent as a symbol of wisdom, which the God of the Jews tried to hide from men. The Ophites (ὄφιοι, from ὄφis, serpent), who, when transplanted on Alexandrian soil, supplied the main ideas of Valentinianism, became one of the most widely spread sects of Gnosticism. Though not strictly serpent-worshippers, they recognized the serpent as symbol of the supreme emanation, Achamoth or Divine Wisdom. They were styled Gnostics *par excellence*. The Sethians saw in Seth the father of all spiritual (πνευματικοί) men; in Cain and Abel the father of psychic (ψυχικοί) and hylic (ὕλικοί) men. According to the Peratæ there exists a trinity of Father, Son, and Hylē (Matter). The Son is the Cosmic Serpent, who freed Eve from the power of the ruler of Hylē. The universe they symbolized by a triangle enclosed in a circle. The number three is the key to all mysteries. There are three supreme principles: the not-generated, the self-generated, the generated. There are three logoi, or gods; the Saviour has a threefold nature, threefold body, threefold power, etc. They are called Peratæ (περάται) because they have "crossed over" out of Egypt, through the Red Sea of generation. They are the true Hebrews, in fact (עברי, to cross over). The Peratæ were founded by Euphrates and Celbes (Acembes?) and Ademes. This Euphrates, whose name is perhaps connected with the name Peratæ itself, is said to be the founder of the Ophites mentioned by Celsus about A. D. 175. The Cainites were so called because they venerated Cain, and Esau, and the Sodomites, and Core, and Judas, because they had all resisted the god of the Jews.

(b) *The Hellenistic or Alexandrian School.*—These systems were more abstract, and philosophical, and self-consistent than the Syrian. The Semitic nomenclature was almost entirely replaced by Greek names. The cosmogonic problem had outgrown all proportions, the ethical side was less prominent, asceticism less strictly enforced. The two great thinkers of this school were Basilides and Valentinus. Though born at Antioch, in Syria, Basilides founded his school at Alexandria (c. A. D. 130), and was followed by his son Isidorus. His system was the most consistent and sober emanationism that Gnosticism ever produced. His school never spread so widely as the next to be mentioned, but in Spain it survived for several centuries. Valentinus, who taught first at Alexandria and then at Rome (c. A. D. 160), elaborated a system of sexual duality in the process of emanation; a long series of male and female pairs of personified ideas is employed to bridge over the distance from the unknown God to

this present world. His system is more confused than Basilidianism, especially as it is disturbed by the intrusion of the figure or figures of *Zōfōta* in the cosmogonic process. Being Syrian Ophitism in Egyptian guise, it can claim to be the truest representative of the Gnostic spirit. The *reductio ad absurdum* of these unbridled speculations can be seen in the Pistis Sophia, in which light-maidens, paralementores, spheres, Heimarmene, thirteen æons, light-treasures, realms of the midst, realms of the right and of the left, Jaldabaoth, Adamas, Michael, Gabriel, Christ, the Saviour, and mysteries without number whirl past and return like witches in a dance. The impression created on the same reader can only be fitly described in the words of "Jabberwocky": "gyre and gimble on the wabe". We learn from Hippolytus (Adv. Hær., IV, xxxv), Tertullian (Adv. Valent., iv), and Clemens Alex. (Exc. ex Theod., title) that there were two main schools of Valentinianism, the Italian and the Anatolian or Asiatic. In the Italian school were teachers of note: Secundus, who divided the Ogdoad within the Pleroma into two tetrads, Right and Left; Epiphaneus, who described this Tetrads as Monotes, Henotes, Monas, and To Hen; and possibly Colorbasus, unless his name be a misreading of *Kol Arba* כל ארבע "All Four". But the most important were Ptolemy and Heracleon. Ptolemy is especially known to fame by his letter to Flora, a noble lady who had written to him as Roman Presbyter (Texte u. Unters., N. S., XIII, Anal. z. alt. Gesch. d. Chr.) to explain the meaning of the Old Testament. This Ptolemy split up the names and numbers of the æons into personified substances outside the deity, as Tertullian relates. He was given to Biblical studies, and was a man of unbridled imagination. Clemens Alex. (Strom., IV, ix, 73) calls Heracleon the most eminent teacher of the Valentinian school. Origen devotes a large part of his commentary on St. John to combating Heracleon's commentary on the same Evangelist. Heracleon called the source of all being Anthropos, instead of Bythos, and rejected the immortality of the soul—meaning, probably, the merely psychic element. He apparently stood nearer to the Catholic Church than Ptolemy and was a man of better judgment. Tertullian mentions two other names (Valent., iv), Theotimus and (De Carne Christi, xvii) Alexander. The Anatolian school had as a prominent teacher Axionicus (Tertull., Adv. Valent., iv; Hipp., Adv. Hær., VI, 30) who had his *collegium* at Antioch about A. D. 220, "the master's most faithful disciple". Theodotus is only known to us from the fragment of his writings preserved by Clement of Alexandria. Marcus the Conjuror's system, an elaborate speculation with ciphers and numbers, is given by Irenæus (I, 11–12) and also by Hippolytus (VI, 42). Irenæus's account of Marcus was repudiated by the Marcosians, but Hippolytus asserts that they did so without reason. Marcus was probably an Egyptian and a contemporary of Irenæus. A system not unlike that of the Marcosians was worked out by Monoimus the Arabian, to whom Hippolytus devotes chapters v to viii of Book VIII, and who is mentioned only by Theodoret besides him. Hippolytus is right in calling these two Gnostics inferior imitations of Pythagoras rather than Christians. According to the Epistles of Julian the Apostate, Valentinian *collegia* existed in Asia Minor up to his own times (d. 363).

(c) *The Dualistic School.*—Some dualism was indeed congenital with Gnosticism, yet but rarely did it overcome the main tendency of Gnosticism, i. e. Pantheism. This, however, was certainly the case in the system of Marcion, who distinguished between the God of the New Testament and the God of the Old Testament, as between two eternal principles, the first being Good, ἀγαθός; the second merely δίκαιος, or just; yet even Marcion did not carry this system to its ultimate consequences. He may be considered rather as a forerunner of Mani than a pure Gnostic. Three of his



disciples, Potitus, Basilicus, and Lucanus, are mentioned by Eusebius as being true to their master's dualism (H. E., V, xiii), but Apelles, his chief disciple, though he went farther than his master in rejecting the Old-Testament Scriptures, returned to monotheism by considering the Inspirer of Old-Testament prophecies to be not a god, but an evil angel. On the other hand, Syneros and Prepon, also his disciples, postulated three first principles. A somewhat different dualism was taught by Hermogenes in the beginning of the second century at Carthage. The opponent of the good God was not the God of the Jews, but Eternal Matter, the source of all evil. This Gnostic was combated by Theophilus of Antioch and Tertullian.

(d) *The Antinomian School*.—As the moral law was given by the God of the Jews, and opposition to the God of the Jews was a duty, the breaking of the moral law to spite its giver was considered a solemn obligation. Such a sect, called the Nicolaites, existed in Apostolic times, their principle, according to Origen, was *παράχρησθαι τῇ σαρκί*. Carpocrates, whom Tertullian (*De animâ*, xxxv) calls a magician and a fornicator, was a contemporary of Basilides. One could only escape the cosmic powers through discharging one's obligations to them by infamous conduct. To disregard all law and sink oneself into the Monad by remembering one's pre-existence in the Cosmic Unit—such was the Gnosis of Carpocrates. His son Epiphanius followed his father's doctrine so closely that he died in consequence of his sins at the age of seventeen. Antinomian views were further maintained by the Prodicians and Antitactæ. No more ghastly instance of insane immorality can be found than the one mentioned in *Pistis Sophia* itself as practised by some Gnostics. St. Justin (*Apol.*, I, xxvi), Irenæus (*I*, xxv, 3), and Eusebius (*H. E.*, IV, vii) make it clear that "the reputation of these men brought infamy upon the whole race of Christians".

*LITERATURE*.—The Gnostics developed an astounding literary activity, which produced a quantity of writings far surpassing the contemporary output of Catholic literature. They were most prolific in the sphere of fiction, as it is safe to say that three-fourths of the early Christian romances about Christ and His disciples emanated from Gnostic circles. Besides these—often crude and clumsy—romances they possessed what may be called "theosophic" treatises and revelations of a highly mystical character. These are best described as a stupefying roar of bombast occasionally interrupted by a few words of real sublimity. Taine remarks with justice: "Anyone who reads the teachings of the Gnostics breathes in an atmosphere of fever and fancies himself in a hospital, amongst delirious patients, who are lost in gazing at their own teeming thought and who fix their lustrous eyes on empty space" (*Essais de crit. et d'histoire*, Paris, 1904). Gnostic literature, therefore, possesses little or no intrinsic value, however great its value for history and psychology. It is of unparalleled importance in the study of the surroundings in which Christianity first arose. The bulk of it is unfortunately no longer extant. With the exception of some Coptic translations and some expurgated or Catholicized Syriac versions, we possess only a number of fragments of what once must have formed a large library. Most of this literature will be found catalogued under the names of Gnostic authors in the articles *BASILIDES*; *BARDESANES*; *CERINTHUS*; *MARCION*; *SIMON MAGUS*; *PROTEMY*; *VALENTINUS*. We shall enumerate in the following paragraphs only anonymous Gnostic works and such writings as are not attributed to any of the above authors.

The Nicolaites possessed "some books under the name of Jaldabaoth", a book called "Nôria" (the mythical wife of Noë), a prophecy of Barcabbas, who was a soothsayer among the Basilidians, a "Gospel of the Consummation", and a kind of apocalypse called

"the Gospel of Eva" (*Epiph.*, Adv. Hær., xxv, xxvi; Philastr., 33). The Ophites possessed "thousands" of apocrypha, as Epiphanius tells us; among these he specially mentions: "Questions of Mary, great and small" (some of these questions are perhaps extant in the *Pistis Sophia*); also many books under the name of "Seth", "Revelations of Adam", Apocryphal Gospels attributed to Apostles; an Apocalypse of Elias, and a book called "Genna Marias". Of these writings some revelations of Adam and Seth, eight in number, are probably extant in an Armenian translation, published in the Mechitarist collection of Old-Testament apocrypha (Venice, 1896). See Preuschen, "Die apocryph. Gnost. Adamschr." (Giessen, 1900). The Cainites possessed a "Gospel of Judas", an "Ascension of Paul" (*ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου*), and some other book, of which we do not know the title, but which, according to Epiphanius, was full of wickedness. The Prodicians, according to Clem. Alex., possessed apocrypha under the name of Zoroaster (*Strom.*, I, xv, 69). The Antinomians had an apocryphon "full of audacity and wickedness" (*Strom.*, III, iv, 29; Origen, "In Matth.", xxviii). The Naassenes had a book out of which Hippolytus largely quotes, but of which we do not know the title. It contained a commentary on Bible texts, hymns, and psalms. The Peratæ possessed a similar book. The Sethians possessed a "Paraphrasis Seth", consisting of seven books, explanatory of their system, a book called *Ἀλλογενεῖς*, or "Foreigners", an "Apocalypse of Adam", a book attributed to Moses, and others. The Archontians possessed a large and small book entitled "Symphonia"; this is possibly extant in Pitra's "Analecta Sacra" (Paris, 1888). The Gnostics attacked by Plotinus possessed apocrypha attributed to Zoroaster, Zostrian, Nictheus, Allogenes (the Sethian Book "Allogeneis"?), and others.

In addition to these writings the following apocrypha are evidently of Gnostic authorship: (1) "The Gospel of the Twelve".—This is first referred to by Origen (*Hom.* i, in Luc.), is identical with the Gospel of the Ebionites, and is also called the "Gospel according to Matthew", because in it Christ refers to St. Matthew in the second person, and the author speaks of the other Apostles and himself as "we". This Gospel was written before A. D. 200, and has no connexion with the so-called Hebrew St. Matthew or the Gospel according to the Hebrews. (2) "The Gospel according to the Egyptians", i. e. Christian countryfolk of Egypt, not Alexandrians. It was written about A. D. 150 and referred to by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.*, III, ix, 63; xiii, 93) and Origen (*Hom.* i, in Luc.), and was largely used in non-Catholic circles. Only small fragments are extant in Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* and *Excerpt. ex Theod.*). Some people have referred the Oxyrhynchus "Logia" and the Strasburg Coptic papyri to this Gospel, but this is a mere guess. (3) "The Gospel of Peter", written about A. D. 140 in Antioch (see *ДОСЕТЪ*). About another Petrine Gospel, see description of the Ahmin Codex. (4) A "Gospel of Matthias" written about A. D. 125, used in Basilidian circles (see *BASILIDES*). (5) A "Gospel of Philip" and a "Gospel of Thomas". According to the *Pistis Sophia*, the three Apostles Matthew [read Matthias], Thomas, and Philip received a Divine commission to report all Christ's revelations after His Resurrection. The Gospel of Thomas must have been of considerable length (1300 lines); part of it, in an expurgated recension, is possibly extant in the once popular, but vulgar and foolish, "Stories of the Infancy of Our Lord by Thomas, an Israelite philosopher", of which two Greek, a Latin, a Syriac, and a Slavonic version exist. (6) "Acts of Peter" (*Ἱεράξις Πέτρου*), written about A. D. 165. Large fragments of this Gnostic production have been preserved to us in the original Greek and also in a Latin translation under the title of "Martyrdom of the Holy Apostle Peter", to which the Latin adds, "a Lino episcopo conscriptum". Greater

portions of this apocryphon are translated in the so-called "Actus Petri cum Simone", and likewise in Sahidic and Slavonic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions. These fragments have been gathered by Lipsius and Bonnet in "Acta apostolorum apocr." (Leipzig, 1891), I. Though these recensions of the "Acts of Peter" have been somewhat Catholicized, their Gnostic character is unmistakable, and they are of value for Gnostic symbolism. (7) Closely connected with the "Acts of Peter" are the "Acts of Andrew" and the "Acts of John", which three have perhaps one and the same author, a certain Leucius Charinus, and were written before A. D. 200. They have come down to us in a number of Catholic recensions and in different versions. For the Acts of Andrew see Bonnet, "Acta", as above (1898), II, 1, pp. 1-127; for "Acts of John", *ibid.*, pp. 151-216. To find the primitive Gnostic form in the bewildering variety and multiplicity of fragments and modifications is still a task for scholars. (8) Of paramount importance for the understanding of Gnosticism are the "Acts of Thomas", as they have been preserved in their entirety and contain the earliest Gnostic ritual, poetry, and speculation. They exist in two recensions, the Greek and the Syriac. It seems most likely, though not certain, that the original was Syriac; it is suggested that they were written about A. D. 232, when the relics of St. Thomas were translated to Edessa. Of the greatest value are the two prayers of Consecration, the "Ode to Wisdom" and the "Hymn of the Soul", which are inserted in the Syriac narrative, and which are wanting in the Greek Acts, though independent Greek texts of these passages are extant (Syriac with English translation by W. Wright, "Apocr. Acts of the Apost.", London, 1871). The "Hymn to the Soul" has been translated many times into English, especially, by A. Bevan, "Texts and Studies", Cambridge, 1897; cf. F. Burkitt in "Journal of Theological Studies" (Oxford, 1900). The most complete edition of the Greek Acts is by M. Bonnet in "Acta", as above, II, 2 (Leipzig, 1903; see BARDESANES). The Acts, though written in the service of Gnosticism, and full of the weirdest adventures, are not entirely without an historical background.

There are a number of other apocrypha in which scholars have claimed to find traces of Gnostic authorship, but these traces are mostly vague and unsatisfactory. In connexion with these undoubtedly Gnostic apocrypha mention must be made of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies. It is true that these are more often classed under Judaistic than under strictly Gnostic literature, but their affinity to Gnostic speculations is at least at first sight so close and their connexion with the Book of Elxai (cf. ELCESAITES) so generally recognized that they cannot be omitted in a list of Gnostic writings. If the theory maintained by Dom Chapman in "The Date of the Clementines" (*Zeitschrift f. N. Test. Wiss.*, 1908) and in the article CLEMENTINES in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA be correct, and consequently Pseudo-Clemens be a crypto-Arian who wrote A. D. 330, the "Homilies" might still have at least some value in the study of Gnosticism. But Dom Chapman's theory, though ingenious, is too daring and as yet too unsupported, to justify the omission of the "Homilies" in this place.

A great, if not the greatest, part of Gnostic literature, which has been saved from the general wreck of Gnostic writings, is preserved to us in three Coptic codices, commonly called the Askew, the Bruce, and the Akhmim Codex. The Askew Codex, of the fifth or sixth century, contains the lengthy treatise "Pistis Sophia", i. e. Faith-Wisdom. This is a work in four books, written between A. D. 250 and 300; the fourth book, however, is an adaptation of an earlier work. The first two books describe the fall of the Æon Sophia and her salvation by the Æon Soter; the last two books describe the origin of sin and evil and the

need of Gnostic repentance. In fact the whole is a treatise on repentance, as the last two books only apply in practice the example of penance set by Sophia. The work consists of a number of questions and answers between Christ and His male and female disciples in which five "Odes of Solomon", followed by mystical adaptations of the same, are inserted. As the questioning is mostly done by Mary, the Pistis Sophia is probably identical with the "Questions of Mary" mentioned above. The codex also contains extracts from the "Book of the Saviour". The dreary monotony of these writings can only be realized by those who have read them. An English translation of the Latin translation of the Coptic, which itself is a translation of the Greek, was made by G. R. S. Mead (London, 1896). The Bruce papyrus is of about the same date as the Askew vellum codex and contains two treatises: (a) the two books of Jeû, the first speculative and cosmogonic, the second practical, viz., the overcoming of the hostile world powers and the securing of salvation by the practice of certain rites, this latter book is styled "Of the Great Logos according to the mystery". (b) A treatise with unknown title, as the first and the last pages are lost. This work is of a purely speculative character and of great antiquity, written between A. D. 150 and 200 in Sethian or Archontian circles, and containing a reference to the prophets Marsanes, Nikotheus, and Phosilampes. No complete English translations of these treatises exist; some passages, however, are translated in the aforesaid G. R. S. Mead's "Fragments of a Faith Forgotten". Both the Bruce and Askew Codices have been translated into German by C. Schmidt (1892) in "Texte u. Unters." and (1901) in the Berlin "Greek Fathers". A Latin translation exists of the "Pistis Sophia" by Schwartz and Petermann (Berlin, 1851) and a French one of the Bruce Codex by Amélineau (Paris, 1890). The Akhmim Codex of the fifth century, found in 1896, and now in the Egyptian Museum at Berlin, contains (a) a "Gospel of Mary", called in the subscriptions "An Apocryphon of John"; this Gospel must be of the highest antiquity, as St. Irenæus, about A. D. 170, made use of it in his description of the Barbelo-Gnostics; (b) a "Sophia Jesu Christi", containing revelations of Christ after His Resurrection; (c) a "Praxis Petri", containing a fantastic relation of the miracle worked on Peter's daughter. The study of Gnosticism is seriously retarded by the entirely unaccountable delay in the publication of these treatises; for these thirteen years past we possess only the brief account of this codex published in the "Sitzungsber. d. k. preuss. Acad." (Berlin, 1896), pp. 839-847.

This account of Gnostic literature would be incomplete without reference to a treatise commonly published amongst the works of Clement of Alexandria and called "Excerpta ex Theodoto". It consists of a number of Gnostic extracts made by Clement for his own use with the idea of future refutation; and, with Clement's notes and remarks on the same, form a very confusing anthology. See O. Bibeliuss, "Studien zur Gesch. der Valent." in "Zeitschr. f. N. Test. Wiss." (Giessen, 1908).

Oriental non-Christian Gnosticism has left us the sacred books of the Mandæans, viz., (a) the "Genzâ rabâ" or "Great Treasure", a large collection of miscellaneous treatises of different date, some as late, probably, as the ninth, some as early, perhaps, as the third century. The Genzâ was translated into Latin, by Norberg (Copenhagen, 1817), and the most important treatises into German, by W. Brandt (Leipzig, 1892). (b) Kolasta, Hymns and Instructions on baptism and the journey of the soul, published in Mandæan by J. Euting (Stuttgart, 1867). (c) Drâshê d' Jahya, a biography of John the Baptist "ab utero usque ad tumulum"—as Abraham Echellensis puts it—not published. Alexandrian non-Christian Gnosticism is perceptible in Trismegistic literature, published in Eng-

lish translation by G. R. S. Mead (London and Benares, 1902, three volumes). Specifically Jewish Gnosticism left no literature, but Gnostic speculations have an echo in several Jewish works, such as the Book of Enoch, the Zohar, the Talmudic treatise Chagiga XV. See Gfrörer, "Philo", Vol. I, and Karppe, "Études sur. or e. nat. d. Zohar" (Paris, 1901).

REFUTATION OF GNOSTICISM.—From the first Gnosticism met with the most determined opposition from the Catholic Church. The last words of the aged St. Paul in his First Epistle to Timothy are usually taken as referring to Gnosticism, which is described as "profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called (*ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*)—the antitheses of so-called Gnosis" which some professing have erred concerning the faith". Most probably St. Paul's use of the terms *pleroma*, the *æon* of this world, the *archon* of the power of the air, in Ephesians and Colossians, was suggested by the abuse of these terms by the Gnostics. Other allusions to Gnosticism in the New Testament are possible, but cannot be proven, such as Tit., iii, 9; I Tim., iv, 3; I John, iv, 1-3. The first anti-Gnostic writer was St. Justin Martyr (d. c. 165). His "Syntagma" (*Σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων αἰρέσεων*), long thought lost, is substantially contained in the "Libellus adv. omn. hæreses", usually attached to Tertullian's "De Præscriptione"; such at least is the thesis of J. Kunze (1894) which is largely accepted. Of St. Justin's anti-Gnostic treatise on the Resurrection (*Περὶ ἀναστάσεως*) considerable fragments are extant in Methodius' "Dialogue on the Resurrection" and in St. John Damascene's "Sacra Parallela". St. Justin's "Compendium against Marcion", quoted by St. Irenæus (IV, vi, 2; V, xxvi, 2), is possibly identical with his "Syntagma". Immediately after St. Justin, Miltiades, a Christian philosopher of Asia Minor, is mentioned by Tertullian and Hippolytus (Adv. Valent., v, and Eus., H. E., V., xxviii, 4) as having combated the Gnostics and especially the Valentinians. His writings are lost. Theophilus of Antioch (d. c. 185) wrote against the heresy of Hermogenes, and also an excellent treatise against Marcion (*κατὰ Μαρκίονος Ἀδύος*. Eus., H. E., IV, xxiv). The book against Marcion is probably extant in the "Dialogus de rectâ in Deum fide" of Pseudo-Origen. For Agrippa Castor see BASILIDES. Hegesippus, a Palestinian, travelled by way of Corinth to Rome, where he arrived under Anicetus (155-166), to ascertain the sound and orthodox faith from Apostolic tradition. He met many bishops on his way, who all taught the same faith and in Rome he made a list of the popes from Peter to Anicetus. In consequence he wrote five books of Memoirs (*Τρομνήματα*) "in a most simple style, giving the true tradition of Apostolic doctrine", becoming "a champion of the truth against the godless heresies" (Eus., H. E., IV, vii sqq., xxi sqq.). Of this work only a few fragments remain, and these are historical rather than theological. Rhodon, a disciple of Tatian, Philip, Bishop of Gortyna in Crete, and a certain Modestus wrote against Marcion, but their writings are lost. Irenæus (Adv. Hær., I, xv, 6) and Epiphanius (xxxiv, 11) quote a short poem against the Oriental Valentinians and the conjuror Marcus by "an aged" but unknown author; and Zachæus, Bishop of Cæsarea, is said to have written against the Valentinians and especially Ptolemy.

Beyond all comparison most important is the great anti-Gnostic work of St. Irenæus, *Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*, usually called "Adversus Hæreses". It consists of five books, evidently not written at one time; the first three books about A. D. 180, the last two about a dozen years later. The greater part of the first book has come down to us in the original Greek, the rest in a very ancient and anxiously close Latin translation, and some fragments in Syriac. St. Irenæus knew the Gnostics from personal intercourse and from their own writings and gives minute

descriptions of their systems, especially of the Valentinians and Barbelo-Gnostics. A good test of how St. Irenæus employed his Gnostic sources can be made by comparing the newly found "Evangelium Mariæ" with Adv. Hær., I, xxix. Numerous attempts to discredit Irenæus as a witness have proved failures (see IRENÆUS, SAINT). Besides his great work, Irenæus wrote an open letter to the Roman priest Florinus, who thought of joining the Valentinians; and when the unfortunate priest had apostatized, and had become a Gnostic, Irenæus wrote on his account a treatise "On the Ogdoad", and also a letter to Pope Victor, begging him to use his authority against him. Only a few passages of these writings are extant. Eusebius (H. E., IV, xxiii, 4) mentions a letter of Dionysius of Corinth (c. 170) to the Nicomedians, in which he attacks the heresy of Marcion. The letter is not extant. Clement of Alexandria (d. c. 215) only indirectly combated Gnosticism by defending the true Christian Gnosis, especially in "Pædagogos", Bk. I, "Stromateis", Bk. II, III, V, and in the so-called eighth book or "Excerpta ex Theodoto". Origen devoted no work exclusively to the refutation of Gnosticism but his four books "On First Principles" (*Περὶ ἀρχῶν*), written about the year 230, and preserved to us only in some Greek fragments and a free Latin translation by Rufinus, is practically a refutation of Gnostic dualism, Docetism, and Emanationism. About the year 300 an unknown Syrian author, sometimes erroneously identified with Origen, and often called by the literary pseudonym Adamantius, or "The Man of Steel", wrote a long dialogue of which the title is lost, but which is usually designated by the words, "De rectâ in Deum fide". This dialogue, usually divided into five books, contains discussions with representatives of two sects of Marcionism, of Valentinianism, and of Bardesanism. The writer plagiarizes extensively from Theophilus of Antioch and Methodius of Olympus, especially the latter's anti-Gnostic dialogue "On Free Will" (*Περὶ τοῦ ἀβέβουλου*).

The greatest anti-Gnostic controversialist of the early Christian Church is Tertullian (b. 160), who practically devoted his life to combating this dreadful sum of all heresies. We need but mention the titles of his anti-Gnostic works: "De Præscriptione hæreticorum"; "Adversus Marcionem"; a book "Adversus Valentinianos"; "Scorpiace"; "De Carne Christi"; "De Resurrectione Carnis"; and finally "Adversus Praxeam". A storehouse of information rather than a refutation is the great work of Hippolytus, written some time after A. D. 234, once called "Philosophoumena" and ascribed to Origen, but since the discovery of Books IV-X, in 1842, known by the name of its true author and its true title, "Refutation of All Heresies" (*κατὰ πασῶν αἰρέσεων ἔλεγχος*). The publication of the Athos Codex by E. Miller (Oxford, 1851) revolutionized the study of Gnosticism and rendered works published previous to that date antiquated and almost worthless. To students of Gnosticism this work is as indispensable as that of St. Irenæus. There is an English translation by J. Macmahon in "The Ante-Nicene Library" (Edinburgh, 1868). Hippolytus tried to prove that all Gnosticism was derived from heathen philosophy; his speculations may be disregarded, but, as he was in possession of a great number of Gnostic writings from which he quotes, his information is priceless. As he wrote nearly fifty years after St. Irenæus, whose disciple he had been, he describes a later development of Gnosis than the Bishop of Lyons. Besides his greater work, Hippolytus wrote, many years previously (before 217), a small compendium against all heresies, giving a list of the same, thirty-two in number, from Dositheus to Noetus; also a treatise against Marcion.

As, from the beginning of the fourth century, Gnosticism was in rapid decline, there was less need of champions of orthodoxy, hence there is a long interval

between Adamantius's dialogue and St. Epiphanius's "Panarion", begun in the year 374. St. Epiphanius, who in his youth was brought into closest contact with Gnostic sects in Egypt, and especially the Phibionists, and perhaps even, as some hold, belonged to this sect himself, is still a first-class authority. With marvellous industry he gathered information on all sides, but his injudicious and too credulous acceptance of many details can hardly be excused. Philastrius of Brescia, a few years later (383), gave to the Latin Church what St. Epiphanius had given to the Greek. He counted and described no fewer than one hundred and twenty-eight heresies, but took the word in a somewhat wide and vague sense. Though dependent on the "Synagoga" of Hippolytus, his account is entirely independent of that of Epiphanius. Another Latin writer, who probably lived in the middle of the fifth century in Southern Gaul, and who is probably identical with Arnobius the Younger, left a work, commonly called "Prædestinatus", consisting of three books, in the first of which he describes ninety heresies from Simon Magus to the Prædestinarians. This work unfortunately contains many doubtful and fabulous statements. Some time after the Council of Chalcedon (451) Theodoret wrote a "Compendium of Heretical Fables" which is of considerable value for the history of Gnosticism, because it gives in a very concise and objective way the history of the heresies since the time of Simon Magus. St. Augustine's book "De Hæresibus" (written about 428) is too dependent on Philastrius and Epiphanius to be of much value. Amongst anti-Gnostic writers we must finally mention the neo-Platonist Plotinus (d. A. D. 270), who wrote a treatise "Against the Gnostics". These were evidently scholars who frequented his *collegia*, but whose Oriental and fantastic pessimism was irreconcilable with Plotinus's views.

**CONCLUSION.**—The attempt to picture Gnosticism as a mighty movement of the human mind towards the noblest and highest truth, a movement in some way parallel to that of Christianity, has completely failed. It has been abandoned by recent unprejudiced scholars such as W. Bousset and O. Gruppe, and it is to be regretted that it should have been renewed by an English writer, G. R. S. Mead, in "Fragments of a Faith Forgotten", an unscholarly and misleading work, which in English-speaking countries may retard the sober and true appreciation of Gnosticism as it was in historical fact. Gnosticism was not an advance, it was a retrogression. It was born amidst the last throes of expiring cults and civilizations in Western Asia and Egypt. Though hellenized, these countries remained Oriental and Semitic to the core. This Oriental spirit—Attis of Asia Minor, Istar of Babylonia, Isis of Egypt, with the astrological and cosmogonic lore of the Asiatic world—first sore beset by Ahuramazda in the East, and then overwhelmed by the Divine greatness of Jesus Christ in the West, called a truce by the fusion of both Parseeism and Christianity with itself. It tried to do for the East what Neo-Platonism tried to do for the West. During at least two centuries it was a real danger to Christianity, though not so great as some modern writers would make us believe, as if the merest breath might have changed the fortunes of Gnostic, as against orthodox, Christianity. Similar things are said of Mithraism and neo-Platonism as against the religion of Jesus Christ. But these sayings have more piquancy than objective truth. Christianity survived, and not Gnosticism, because the former was the fittest—immeasurably, nay infinitely, so. Gnosticism died not by chance, but because it lacked vital power within itself; and no amount of theosophistic literature, flooding English and German markets, can give life to that which perished from intrinsic and essential defects. It is striking that the two earliest champions of Christianity against Gnosticism—Hegesippus and Irenæus—brought out so

clearly the method of warfare which alone was possible, but which also alone sufficed to secure the victory in the conflict, a method which Tertullian some years later scientifically explained in his "De Præscriptione". Both Hegesippus and Irenæus proved that Gnostic doctrines did not belong to that deposit of faith which was taught by the true succession of bishops in the primary sees of Christendom; both in triumphant conclusion drew up a list of the Bishops of Rome, from Peter to the Roman bishop of their day; as Gnosticism was not taught by that Church with which the Christians everywhere must agree, it stood self-condemned. A just verdict on the Gnostics is that of O. Gruppe (Ausführungen, p. 162): the circumstances of the period gave them a certain importance. But a living force they never were, either in general history or in the history of Christendom. Gnosticism deserves attention as showing what mental dispositions Christianity found in existence, what obstacles it had to overcome to maintain its own life; but "means of mental progress it never was."

DE JONG, *Das antike Mysterienwesen* (Leipzig, 1909); DIBELIUS, *Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinerianer in Zeits. N.-T. Wissensch.* (Giessen, 1908-09); BOUSSET, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1907), I, xi; GRUPPE, *Griech. Mythologie u. Religionsgeschichte* (2 vols., 1907); WENDLAND, *Hellenistisch-rom. Kultur* (Leipzig, 1907), 161 sqq.; BUONAUTI, *Lo Gnosticismo* (Rome, 1907); LECLEERCQ in *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.* (Paris, 1907), 1268-83; 3003 sqq.; 514 sqq.; IDEM, *L'Espagne Chrétienne* (Paris, 1905); MEAD, *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten* (London and Benares, 1906); IDEM, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes* (3 vols., London, 1906); BEESON, *Hegemonius. Acta Archæol.* (Berlin, 1906); BISCHOFF, *Im Reiche der Gnosis* (Leipzig, 1906); PEITHMANN, *Christl. Geheimlehre* (A Gnostic Catechism—Leipzig, 1906); SCHMIDT, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften* (Leipzig, 1905), I; IDEM, *Plotin's Stellung z. Gn. in Texte u. Unters.* (Leipzig, 1901); IDEM, *Ein vorrenaesch. gn. Originalwerk in Prussian Acad. of Sciences* (Berlin, 1896), 837; DE FAYE, *Introduction à l'étude du Gnosticisme* (Paris, 1903); IDEM in *Revue de l'hist. d. Rel.* (1902); FOAKES-JACKSON, *Christian Difficulties in the Second and Third Cent.* (Hulsean Lectures, 1902-3); RUELLLE ET POIRÉE, *Le chant gnostico-magique* (Solesmes, 1901); LIECHTENHAHN, *Untersuchungen zur Kopt.-gnost. Lit.* (Göttingen, 1901); IDEM, *Apocryph. Litter. d. Gnostiker in Zeits. f. Wissensch. Theol.* XLIV, 236-352; BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altchristl. Lit.* (Freiburg, 1902), I, 315-346; 386-459; 481-495; BRANDT, *Mandäische Schriften* (Göttingen, 1883); *Die Mandäische Religion* (Leipzig, 1889); KESSLER, *Jeder Gnosis u. alt-bab. Religion in Report of the Fifth Congress of Orientalists* (Berlin, 1882); ID., *MANT* (Leipzig, 1889); I., WOBBERMIN, *Religionsgesch. Studien* (Leipzig, 1896); KING, *The Gnostics and their Remains* (London, 1887); JOEL, *Blick in die Religionsgesch. Anfang 2ten Jahrh.* (Breslau, 1880), I, 103 sqq.; MANSEL, *The Gnostic Heresies of the first and second centuries* (London, 1875); LIPSJUS, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius* (Vienna, 1865); *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte* (Leipzig, 1875); IDEM, *Pistis Sophia in Dict. of Christ. Biogr.* (London, 1887); STÄBELIN, *Die Gnostischen Quellen Hippolyts* (Leipzig, 1890); MATTER, *Histoire critique du Gnosticisme* (revised ed., 3 vols., Paris, 1843); HARVEY, *S. Renai Libri V* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1857); KÖSTLIN, *Das Gnostische System des Buches Pistis Sophia in Theol. Jahrb.* (1854); HEINRICI, *Die Valentinianische Gnosis u. die H. Schrift* (Berlin, 1871); ZARN, *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, I, 718-61.

The best collection of Greek Gnostic fragments is in STIEREN, *Irenæus*, I, 899-971 (Leipzig, 1848). See also KENNEDY, *Buddhist Gnosticism: The System of Basilides in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London, 1902); WAITZ, *Pseudo-Tertull. Gedicht Adv. Marcion* (Darmstadt, 1901); PREUSCHEN, *Apoc. Gnost. Adamschriften aus d. Armen.* (Geissen, 1900); BURKITT, *The Hymn of Bardaisan rendered into English* (London, 1899); FRIEDLANDER, *Der vorchristl. jüd. Gnosticismus* (Göttingen, 1898); ANZ, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung der Gnosis* (Leipzig, 1897); REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres* (Leipzig, 1904), vii; AMÉLINEAU, *Le nouveau traité gnostique de Turin*, 1890; IDEM, *Notice sur le Papyrus Gnostique Bruce* (Paris, 1891); IDEM, *Essai sur le Gnosticisme égyptien* (Paris, 1887); IDEM, *Pistis Sophia. Ouvrage Gnostique de Valentin* (Paris, 1895); IDEM, *Les traités gnostiques d'Oxford in Revue de l'hist. d. Religions* (Paris, 1890), 1-72; HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur* (Leipzig, 1893), I, 143 sqq.; 662 sqq.; II, 1, 537-40 and passim; IDEM, *History of Dogma* (London, 1894), I, 222-65; IDEM, *Zur Quellenkritik der Gesch. des Gnostiz* (Leipzig, 1873); IDEM in *Zeitschr. f. historisch. Theol.* (1874); HILGENFELD, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums* (Leipzig, 1884); IDEM, *Judenthum und Christenthum* (Leipzig, 1886); IDEM, *Der Gnostizismus in Zeitschr. f. Wissensch. Theol.* (1890); KUNZE, *De historia gnosticismi fontibus* (Leipzig, 1894); ANICH, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in S. Einfluss a. d. Christenth.* (1894); HÖNIG, *Die Ophiten* (Berlin, 1889).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

GOA, ARCHDIOCESE OF (GOANENSIS), PATRIARCHATE OF THE EAST INDIES, the chief see of the Portuguese


dominions in the East; metropolitan to the present province of Goa, which comprises as suffragans the Sees of Cochin, Mylapore, and Damão (or Damaun) in India, Macao in China, and Mozambique in East Africa. The archbishop, who resides at Panjim, or New Goa, has the honorary titles of Primate of the East and (from 1886) Patriarch of the East Indies. He enjoys the privilege of presiding over all national councils of the East Indies, which must ordinarily be held at Goa (Concordat of 1886 between the Holy See and Portugal, art. 2). The patronage of the see and of its suffragans belongs to the Crown of Portugal.

**FOUNDATION AND HISTORY.**—The history of the Portuguese conquests in India dates from the arrival of Vasco da Gama in 1498, followed by the acquisition of Cranganore in 1500, Cochin in 1506, Goa in 1510, Chaul in 1512, Calicut in 1513, Damão in 1531, Bombay, Salsette, and Bassein in 1534, Diu in 1535, etc. From the year 1500, missionaries of the different orders (Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, Augustinians, etc.) flocked out with the conquerors, and began at once to build churches along the coast districts wherever the Portuguese power made itself felt. In 1534 Goa was created an episcopal see suffragan to Funchal in the Madeiras, with a jurisdiction extending potentially over all past and future conquests from the Cape of Good Hope to China; in 1557 it was made an independent archbishopric, and its first suffragan sees were erected at Cochin and Malacca. In 1576 the suffragan See of Macao (China) was added; and in 1588, that of Funai in Japan. In 1600 another suffragan see was erected at Angamale (transferred to Cranganore in 1605) for the sake of the newly-united Thomas Christians (see, under **EASTERN CHURCHES**, *Malabar Christians*, V, 234, and *Uniat Church of Malabar*, V, 236); while in 1606 a sixth suffragan see was established at San Thomé, Mylapore, near the modern Madras. In 1612 the prelate of Mozambique was added, and in 1690 two other sees at Peking and Nanking in China. By the Bulls establishing these sees the right of nomination was conferred in perpetuity on the King of Portugal, under the titles of foundation and endowment.

The limits between the various sees of India were defined by a papal Bull in 1616. The suffragan sees comprised roughly the south of the peninsula and the east coast, as far as Burma inclusive, the rest of India remaining potentially under the jurisdiction of the archdiocese; and this potential jurisdiction was actually exercised even outside Portuguese dominions wherever the Faith was extended by Portuguese missionaries. Missionary work progressed on a large scale and with great success along the western coasts, chiefly at Chaul, Bombay, Salsette, Bassein, Damão, and Diu; and on the eastern coasts at San Thomé of Mylapore, and as far as Bengal etc. In the southern districts the Jesuit mission in Madura was the most famous. It extended to the Kistna river, with a number of outlying stations beyond it. The mission of Cochin, on the Malabar Coast, was also one of the most fruitful. Several missions were also established in the interior northwards, e. g., that of Agra and Lahore in 1570 and that of Tibet in 1624. Still, even with these efforts, the greater part even of the coast line was by no means fully worked, and many vast tracts of the interior northwards were practically untouched.

The decline of Portuguese power in the seventeenth century, followed as it was by a decline in the supply of missionaries, etc., soon put limits to the extension of missionary work; and it was sometimes with difficulty that the results actually achieved could be kept up. Consequently, about this time the Holy See began, through the Congregation of Propaganda, to send out missionaries independently of Portugal—appointing vicars Apostolic over several districts (The Great Mogul, 1637; Verapoly, 1657; Burma, 1722; Karnatic and Madura, after the suppression of the Jesuits in

1773; Tibet, 1826; Bengal, Madras, and Ceylon, 1834, and others later). In certain places where these vicars Apostolic came into contact with the Portuguese clergy, there arose a conflict of jurisdiction. This was particularly the case in Bombay, which had been ceded to the British in 1661. Here the Portuguese clergy were at first allowed to remain in charge of the churches; but in 1720, on the ground that they caused disaffection among the people against the British power, they were expelled from the island, and the Vicar of the Great Mogul, with his Carmelite missionaries, was invited to take their place. The Holy See, in authorizing this arrangement, did not deny or abrogate the ordinary jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa, but merely intended to make a temporary provision till such time as the British Government should allow the Portuguese clergy to return. (See **BOMBAY, ARCHDIOCESE OF**). Efforts were made from time to time on the part of the Goan party to recover their place, and this ultimately, through a division of the churches in 1794, gave rise to the existence of two rival jurisdictions in Bombay—*Padroado* and *Propaganda*. The Holy See had for a long time been dissatisfied with the general situation, and especially with the opposition shown to the vicars Apostolic by the Goan prelates and clergy. After the revolution of 1834 in Portugal, the expulsion or abolition of the religious orders, and the severing of diplomatic relations with the Vatican came the famous Brief "*Multa praeclare*", on 24 April, 1838, provisionally withdrawing jurisdiction from the three suffragan sees of Cochin, Cranganore, and Mylapore, and assigning their territories to the nearest vicars Apostolic—at the same time implicitly, or at least by subsequent interpretation and enactments, restricting the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of Goa to actual Portuguese territory. This Brief was, however, rejected by the Goan party as spurious or at least surreptitious, since they contended that even the Holy See could not rightly legislate in this manner without the consent of the King of Portugal, as was declared in the original Bulls of foundation, etc. The principles underlying this dispute fall outside the scope of the present article, which is concerned solely with the main historical facts. The resistance which followed, both in Bombay and in other parts of India, has uniformly been called the "*Goan or Indo-Portuguese Schism*" by writers outside the *Padroado* party; and the term *schism* occurs frequently in the pronouncements of the Holy See; but the *Padroadists* themselves have always resented this title, on the ground that the fault lay with the Holy See misinformed by the vicars Apostolic, and that they were only contending for their canonical and natural rights, etc. In 1857 a concordat was entered into which gave peace for a time; but a final settlement was not arrived at till 1886, when a further concordat was drawn up, and a Bull ("*Humanæ Salutis Auctor*", 1 Sept., 1886) issued, by which the suspended



SHRINE OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER  
Church of the Bom Jesus, Goa



jurisdiction of Cochin and Mylapore was restored, and a third suffragan diocese (that of Damão) added—all in British territory; and after subsequent adjustments the present delimitations were agreed to. At the same time the Indian hierarchy was established, and the whole of the country divided into provinces, dioceses, and prefectures Apostolic.

In the following *List of Prelates of the See of Goa*, dates still under dispute are given in parentheses:



CATHEDRAL OF ST. CATHERINE, GOA

João Afonso d'Albuquerque, 1538–1553; Gaspar de Leão Pereira, 1560–1567, and again 1574–1576; Henrique de Tavora, transferred from Cochin, 1578–1581; João Vicente da Fonseca, 1580–1586 (1581–1587); Matheus de Medina, transferred from Cochin, 1588–1592; Aleixo de Menezes, 1595–1610 (1612); Christovam de Sá e Lisboa, from the Bishopric of Malacca (1610) 1616–1622; Sebastião de S. Pedro, from the Bishopric of Mylapore (1623) 1625–1629; Manoel Telles de Brito, 1631 (died on voyage); Francisco dos Martyres, 1636–1652; Christovão da Silveira, 1671 or 1672 (died on voyage); Antonio de Brandão, 1675–1678; Manoel de Souza e Menezes, 1681–1684; Alberto de Silva, 1687–1688; Pedro de Silva, from the Bishopric of Cochin, 1689–1691; Agostino da Annuniação, 1691–1713; Sebastião d'Andrade Pessanha, 1716–1721; Ignacio de Santa Thereza, 1721–1739; Eugenio Trigueros, 1741, from the Bishopric of Macao (died on voyage); Lourenço de Santa Maria e Mello, 1744–1750; Antonio Taveira de Neiva Brum e Silveira, 1750–1775; Francisco de Assumpção e Brito, 1775–1780; Manoel de Santa Catharina, transferred from Cochin (1780) 1784–1812; Manoel de São Gualdino, 1812–1831; José Maria de Silva Torres, 1844–1849; João Chrysostome d'Amorim e Pessoa, 1863–1869 (1874); Ayres de Ornellas Vasconsellos, 1875–1880; Antonio Sebastião Valente (first patriarch) 1882–1908. The present prelate, Mathæus d'Oliveira Xavier, transferred from Cochin, took possession of his see 1 July, 1909.


During the vacancies (some of which extended to 6, 7, 13, and one even to 23 years) the see was, according to the rules laid down by Gregory XIII in 1562 and Leo XII in 1826, administered by the Bishop of Cochin, or, failing him, by the Bishop of Mylapore; and failing both, sometimes by some prelate from elsewhere, sometimes by a coadjutor or vicar capitular, as circumstances allowed.

*Synods.*—The first and second provincial synods were presided over by Dom Gaspar de Leão Pereira in 1567 and 1575 respectively; the third, in 1585, by Dom Vicente da Fonseca; the fourth, in 1592, by Dom Matheus de Medina; the fifth, in 1606, by Dom Aleixo de Menezes. In these five councils 316 decrees were framed relating to ecclesiastical discipline (Fonseca, p. 67). In recent times one provincial council was held (1894) by Dom Antonio S. Valente, in which

seventy-nine decrees were framed. The special Synod of Diamper, held in 1599, had for its scope the reunion of the Thomas Christians, for whom the See of Angamale was established in the following year.

**THE CITY OF GOA.**—The city of Goa, originally a fortress in the hands first of the Hindus and then of the Mohammedans, was taken by Albuquerque in 1510. As soon as he became master of the place he built the first church—that of St. Catherine, who thus became the patron of the new city. This was the beginning of a vast series of churches, large and small, numbering over fifty, with convents, hospices, and other institutions attached, which made Goa one of the most interesting ecclesiastical cities in the world. The civil splendour was in keeping with the ecclesiastical. But the situation was an unfortunate one. Lying on a low stretch of coast-land, surrounded on two sides by shallow creeks and on the other two by miasmatic marshes, the place was soon found unhealthy to such a degree that, after several ravages by epidemics, it was gradually abandoned in favour of Panjim, five miles nearer the sea. The transfer of the government in 1759 soon led to the total desertion of the old city. In consequence the civil buildings gradually fell into decay or were demolished for the sake of building materials, and, especially after the expulsion of the religious orders in 1835, many churches and monasteries followed suit. In place of houses thick palm-groves gradually grew up, which now, with the exception of a few open spaces, occupy the whole area. The original city extended almost two miles from east to west along the river, and comprised three low hills crowned with religious edifices.

Most of the churches have disappeared, leaving nothing but a cross to mark their site. Others are in various stages of decay, while a few are kept in repair. The finest of those still standing are grouped about the great square: the cathedral (built 1571), in which alone the full liturgy is kept up by a body of resident canons, and adjoining which is an archiepiscopal palace; the Bom Jesus church (Jesuit, built c. 1586), containing the body of St. Francis Xavier incorrupt in a rich shrine; St. Cajetan's, built about 1655, belonging to the Theatines; the Franciscan church of St. Francis of Assisi, built on the site of a mosque, 1517–21; and finally the little chapel of St. Catherine, built in 1510.



PALACE OF THE PATRIARCH, PANJIM OR NEW GOA

Farther away, on the western hill, stand the great nunnery of St. Monica (1598), still in full repair, formerly occupied by a large community of native nuns—the only female religious in Goa; the Augustinian church and convent built in 1572, now in ruins; convent and church of St. John of God (1685), now partly in ruins; the Rosary church of the Dominicans, built before 1543; the viceregal chapel of St. Anthony, of about the same date. The last two are still in full repair. To the south are the ruins of the Jesuit



being secular clergy. Besides these there are 20 religious of the Hospitallers of St. Francis, who conduct a college for girls and an asylum at Panjim, and 10 Sisters of Charity of Canossa, who have under them an asylum and orphanage at Belgaum. There are several schools affiliated to the seminary at Mapuea and also 145 elementary schools. The total Catholic population in Portuguese territory is reckoned at 293,628 out of a total population of 365,291. In British territory the Catholic population is more scanty, numbering about 35,403. According to the *Madras Directory* for 1908 the totals for the archdiocese are as follows: 102 parishes and 22 missions, 129 churches and 336 chapels, 619 priests, 312 confraternities, and 306 pious associations; 3879 children attending schools, and a total Catholic population of 335,031.

The map of Goa, representing an area of about a mile and a half by one mile, which accompanies this article is based on those of Cottineau de Kloguen and Fonseca, modified by personal observations made in 1907. It claims to be a rough sketch only. The crosses represent objects of which no notable features remain.

*Bullarium Patronatus Portugallie*, Lisbon, 1868; JARRIC, *Thesaurus Rerum Indicarum* (1865), I, II; PAULINUS A.S. BARTHOLOMEU, *India Orientalis Christiana* (Rome, 1794); DE SOUZA, *O Oriente Conquistado* (Bombay, 1886); MAFFEI, *Historiarum Indicarum Lib.* XVIII (Cologne, 1593); NAZARETH, *Mitras Lusitanas no Oriente*, 2nd ed., (Lisbon, 1894); RATLIN, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae, cum Diamperianâ Synodo* (Rome, 1745); COTTINEAU DE KLOGUEN, *Historical Sketch of Goa* (Madras, 1831); FONSECA, *Historical and Archeological Sketch of the City of Goa* (Bombay, 1878); DE BRUSSEIERS, *Historia do Schisma Portuguez in India* (Lisbon, 1854); MÜLLBAUER, *Geschichte der katholischen Missionen in Ostindien* (Freiburg, 1852); *Constituições do Arcebispoado de Goa* (Lisbon, 1810); *Annuário da Archidiocese de Goa*, 1907; *Madras Catholic Directory* (1908). For relations to Bombay, *The Examiner* (Bombay, 1907-09), files.

ERNEST R. HULL.

**Goajira**, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.—Goajira, the most northern portion of South America, is a peninsula running into the Caribbean Sea. It was the subject of a dispute between Venezuela and Colombia in 1891, and on arbitration was awarded to the latter and joined to the State of Magdalena. The area of the peninsula is about 5500 square miles. The scenery of Goajira is very picturesque; the temperature in the plains is very high, but temperate in the mountains. There is a good supply of cabinet wood in the country, but not much trade. The inhabitants, who number 80,000 (50,000 Catholics), are mostly of Indian or mixed race. They are tall and well-made. Formerly they were very intractable, but the Capuchins, who are in charge of the Catholic missions, have had a great influence over them, and large numbers have been converted. The language spoken is an Indian dialect of the Arawak-Maypure group (see ARAWAKS). The chief towns are Paraguaipoa, Calabacito, Maricha, Marocaso, and Soldado. Goajira was erected by Pope Pius X, 17 January, 1905, into a vicariate Apostolic, dependent on the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. Mgr. Atanasio Maria Vincenzo Soler-Royo, O. F. M. Cap., was appointed to the vicariate, as titular Bishop of Citharizum, 18 April, 1907. At the present time there are 16 Capuchin priests, 10 lay-brothers, 7 secular priests, 26 religious of other congregations, 5 nuns, 9 residences, 20 churches and chapels, 7 schools (300 children), 1 college (50 students) in Goajira.

*Annuaire Pontifical*, 1908.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Goar**, SAINT, an anchorite of Aquitaine; b. about 585; d. near Oberwesel (Germany), 6 July, 649. He came of a distinguished family, and at an early age gave evidence of sound piety. Prayer was the constant occupation of his heart, and meditation on the truths of religion that of his mind. Having received Holy orders, and being thus enabled to act with more authority, he laboured to secure the salvation of a

great number of souls. But being above all solicitous for his own sanctification, he resolved to leave the world, and about 618 he took up his dwelling in a lonely place at the extremity of the Diocese of Trier and in the neighbourhood of the little town of Oberwesel. It was here that, near a little chapel which he built, he began to lead an existence completely detached from material and perishable things. Nevertheless it was impossible for him so to conceal himself that his reputation did not spread far and wide. Pilgrims flocked to him, thus furnishing him with occasions to exercise the duties of hospitality in their behalf and to give them good advice. Two of them denounced him to Rusticus, Bishop of Trier, as a hypocrite and fond of good living, and he was called upon by the bishop to defend himself. According to the legend, he did so with the help of a miracle which resulted in the bishop's confusion and in the manifestation of his unworthiness. King Sigebert III having learned of the occurrence summoned St. Goar to Metz and insisted that he should accept the episcopal see from which Rusticus had been driven. But the pious hermit was frightened by this offer, and asked time for reflection. On returning to his solitude he fell sick, and died before the burden of the episcopal dignity had been imposed upon him. A small church was dedicated to him, in 1768, in the little town on the banks of the Rhine which bears his name (St-Goar).

MABILLON, *Acta SS. ord. S. Bened.* (1669), II, 276-280; *Hist. litt. de la France* (1735), III, 501-502; BAILLET, *Vies des saints* (1701), III, 6 July.

LÉON CLUGNET.

**Goar**, JACQUES, Dominican and hellenist; b. at Paris, 1601; d. 23 September, 1653. He entered the convent of the Annunciation in the Rue St-Honore, 1619, and made his profession there 24 May, 1620. Although lector of philosophy and theology, he applied himself to the study of Greek, and was sent to the Orient by his superiors, that he might eventually render service to the Roman Church, through his knowledge of the ecclesiastical documents and the positive theology of the Greeks. He resided at Chios as missionary Apostolic and prior of the Convent of St. Sebastian (1613-39), and availed himself of his opportunities of travel to observe the various rites, to form the acquaintance of Orthodox scholars, and to study the points at issue between the Catholics and schismatics. About 1640 he returned to Rome bringing with him many manuscripts, some of which were valuable. Henceforth he was in communication with the most learned and celebrated Greeks, notably Leo Allatius, Basil Falasca, George Coresi, Pantaleon Ligadio, and others. In 1643 he returned to Paris and was made master of novices, but in November of that year went to Rome on business for the order. After his return to Paris (16 July, 1644) he devoted himself to putting in order the rich material he had brought from the East, which he had increased by visits to the libraries of France and Italy. Appointed vicar provincial in 1652, his health failed under so many labours, and he fell ill and died.

The most important work of Goar is his "Ευχολόγιον sive Rituale Græcorum complectens ritus et ordines divinæ liturgiæ" (Paris, 1667), a classic work for the study of Greek Liturgy; it is important for its original texts and for its learned commentaries; in the second edition (Venice, 1730) a number of errors were corrected. He also edited "Georgii Cedreni, compendium historiarum" (Paris, 1647); "Georgius Codinus, europalata, De officiis magnæ Ecclesiæ et aulæ Constantinopolitanæ" (Paris, 1648); "Georgii Monachi et S.P.N. Tarasii Chronographia ab Adamo usque ad Diocletianum"; "Nicephori patriarchæ Breviarium chronologicum" (Paris, 1652); "Theopanis Chronographia et Leonis grammatici Vitæ" (Paris, 1655). This edition of Theopanes was finished by F. Combeffis. Goar also left unfinished (in manuscript) a work

of the Greek canonist Blastares: "Collectio elementaris materialium omnium sacris et divinis canonibus contentarum a Matthæo Blastare elucubrata simul et compacta", and a work of Sylvester Syropulos. Finally we owe to Goar the "Historia universalis Joannis Zonaræ ad MSS. codices cognita" (Paris, 1687); it was continued and completed by Du Cange.

QUÉTIÉ and ÉCHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.* (Paris, 1721), II, 574-75; TOURON, *Hist. des hommes illustres de l'ordre de Saint Dominique* (Paris, 1746), V; THALHOFER, *Handbuch der kathol. Liturgik* (Freiburg, 1888), I, pt. I, 109 sq.

H. LECLERCQ.

**Gobat**, GEORGE, moral theologian; b. at Charmaillies, in the Diocese of Basle, now in the Department of the Doubs, France, 1 July, 1600; d. 23 March, 1679. He entered the Society of Jesus, 1 June, 1618. After teaching the humanities he was professor of sacred sciences at Fribourg, Switzerland (1631-41), and of moral theology at Halle (1641-44), at Munich (1644-47), rector at Halle (1647-51), professor of moral theology at Ratisbon (1651-54), rector at Fribourg (1654-56), professor of moral theology at Constance (1656-60), where he was also penitentiary of the cathedral, which post he retained until his death. Besides his "Disputationes in Aristotelem" (Fribourg, 1633-34) and the Latin translation, "Narratio historica eorum quæ Societas Jesu in Nova Francia fortiter egit et passa est anno 1648-49", from the French of Father Raguénau, S.J., there are mentioned smaller works on the Jubilee and on Indulgences and a collection of practical cases on the sacraments entitled "Alphabetum". Later these cases were republished under the title "Experientiæ Theologicæ sive experimentalis theologia" (Constance, 1670). The "Alphabetum quadruplex de voto, juramento, blasphemâ, superstitione" appeared at Constance in 1672. These works were several times republished in three volumes under the heading "Opera Moralia", for instance at Douai, 1701, the last edition being published at Venice, 1749.

Gobat follows the casuistic method, treating the different questions in a clear and simple style with solidity and erudition, applying them especially to existing conditions in Germany, conditions well known to him from the confessional and the numerous cases referred to him for settlement. He is, however, inclined to be too lenient. Several of his doctrines were later condemned by the Holy See, notably by Innocent XI in 1679, the year of Gobat's death. The Douai edition (1701) of the "Opera Moralia" drew from Mgr. Gui de Sèves de Rochechouart, Bishop of Arras, the censure of thirty-two propositions. The adversaries of the Jesuits in France, Germany and Holland eagerly seized the occasion for an attack on the "Jesuit moral", but several apologies were published to refute the malignant exaggerations contained in their attacks; among these defenders of P. Gobat were Father Daniel, S.J., who wrote "Apologie pour la doctrine des Jésuites" (Liège, 1703), and Chr. Rassler, S.J., author of "Vindiciæ Gobatianæ" (Ingolstadt, 1706).

DE BACKER and SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. des écrivains de la comp. de Jésus*; DOLLINGER and REUSCH, *Gesch. der Moralstreitigkeiten in der rom.-kath. Kirche* (Nordlingen, 1889), I, 292 sqq.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, s. v.; *Kirchenlexicon*, s. v.; *Kirchliches Handlexicon*, s. v.

J. SALSMAINS.

**Gobban Saer**, regarded in traditional lore as the greatest Irish architect of the seventh century, and popularly canonized as St. Gobban; b. at Turvey, near Malahide, Co. Dublin, about 560. He was employed by many Irish saints to build churches, oratories, and bell-towers, and he is alluded to in an eighth-century Irish poem, now in a monastery in Carinthia. So wonderful are the stories told of this great master-builder that many writers have gone so far as to regard him as a mythical personage, but he undoubtedly must be classed as an historical figure. He was much

in advance of his time as an architect, and received commissions all over Ireland. In the "Life of St. Abban" it is prophetically said that "the fame of Gobban as a builder in wood as well as stone would exist in Ireland to the end of time." Certain it is that even at the present day innumerable stories in the Irish tongue are still current of the Gobban Saer, or Gobban the Builder. He lived into the first half of the seventh century, or even later, according to some writers, but he laboured as late as 645.

COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ* (Louvain, 1645); O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, VI (Dublin, s. d.); HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1902); JOYCE, *Social History of Ancient Ireland*, II (London, 1903); PETRIE, *Origin of the Round Towers of Ireland*, 2nd ed. (Dublin, 1845).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Gobelinus**, PERSON (PERSONA); b. in 1358; d. 17 November, 1421. He was a Westphalian and was known as an historian and an ardent reformer of monastic life in his native land. He received his first schooling at Paderborn. It may be that he came originally from this city; it is certain that he was from the neighbourhood. As a young man he went to Italy, where he studied theology and canon law, becoming a cleric of the papal court, and later an official of the papal exchequer. This was in 1384, under Urban VI, of whom he was ever a loyal adherent. This position ceased to be agreeable when the Great Schism came to disturb the Roman court. He resigned, was ordained priest at Ancona in 1386, and returned to his native land. Papal influence secured for him a benefice from the church of the Holy Trinity, and later the pastorate of St. Pancratius at Paderborn. He now attended the University of Erfurt, which he entered during the incumbency of its first rector (1392-1394). We glean from this that he was still pursuing his scientific studies. Wilhelm von Berg, who had been chosen Bishop of Paderborn (1400-1415), selected Gobelinus for his court chaplain and induced him to enter his service. The latter availed himself of his position to labour for the further uplifting of religious life and particularly for the restoration of discipline in the cloisters, which had drifted into an habitual disregard of their rules. The monastery of nuns at Boddeken, near Paderborn, where the abbess alone remained, was changed into a convent for men, and given over to the Augustinians. Not content with this, he undertook in spite of great difficulties, to reform the Benedictine Abbey of Abdinghof, at Paderborn. But the opponents of his policy resisted in every way the interference of the bishop, who transferred to Bielefeld that branch of the diocesan administration of which Gobelinus was a part. The latter had already in 1405 given up his parish church at Paderborn, owing to certain differences with the municipal authorities. The bishop appointed him dean of the collegiate church of Bielefeld. The Archbishop of Cologne, Dietrich von Mörs, who in 1415 received the See of Paderborn, gave the dean authority to reform the religious life, not only in the monastery of Bielefeld, but also in other institutions, a mission which Gobelinus duly fulfilled.

But old age and illness undermined the strength of this zealous divine. He resigned in 1418 and once more betook himself to the monastery of Böödeken. He did not don the monk's habit, but spent the remaining years of his life in the quiet of monastic solitude.

Gobelinus was also an historian. He wrote a history of the world entitled: "Cosmidromius, hoc est Chronicon universale complectens res ecclesiæ et reipublicæ". This work he brought down to the year 1418; from the year 1347 it is valuable as being an original source of information. The author accomplished his task with scrupulous care. The "Cosmidromius" was selected by Scheffer-Boichorst as his basis and starting-point when he set out to restore the "Annales Patherbrun-

nenses", lost annals of the twelfth century which had been looked upon as an authority in its particular field. Another work of Gobelius was his "Vita Meinulphi", a biography of St. Meinolf, a canon of the cathedral chapter of Paderborn in the first half of the ninth century, and the founder of the Boddenen monastery. The Cosmidromius of Gobelius was first published by Meibom (Frankfort, 1599) in the "Scriptores rerum Germanicarum"; Max Jansen prepared a new edition (Munster, 1900). The "Vita Meinulphi" may be found in the "Acta SS." of the Bollandists, Oct., III, 216 sqq.

ROSENKRANZ, *Gobelius Persona, ein biographischer Versuch in Zeitschr. für westfälische Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, VI (Munster, 1843), 1-36; BAYER, *Gobelius Persona*, Part I: *Leben und Zeitalter Gobelius* (Leipzig, 1874); HAGEMANN, *Ueber die Quellen des Gobelius Persona*, Part I (Soden, 1874); GUBEL, *Wilhelm von Ravensburg und Gobelius Persona* (Bielefeld, 1877); SCHEFFER-BOICHOSE, *Annales Patherbrunnenses* (Innsbruck, 1870); JANSEN, *Das Todesjahr des Gobelius Persona in Historisches Jahrbuch* (1902), 78-80; LOFFLER, *Gobelius Persona Vita Meinulphi* (ibid., 1904), 190-192.

J. P. KIRSCH.

**God** (A.S. *God*; Germ. *Gott*; akin to Persian *khoda*; Hindu *khoda*). (1) the proper name of the one Supreme and Infinite Personal Being, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, to whom man owes obedience and worship; (2) the common or generic name of the several supposed beings to whom, in polytheistic religions, Divine attributes are ascribed and Divine worship rendered; (3) the name sometimes applied to an idol as the image or dwelling-place of a god. The root-meaning of the name (from Gothic root *gheu*; Skt. *hū* or *hu*, "to invoke or to sacrifice to") is either "the one invoked" or "the one sacrificed to" (see Murray, "New Dict. of the Engl. Language", s. v.). From different Indo-Germanic roots (*div*, "to shine", "give light"; *thes* in *thessasthai*, "to implore") come the Indo-Iranian *deva*, Skt. *dyaus* (gen. *divas*), Lat. *deus*, Gr. *θεός*, Irish and Gaelic, *dia*, all of which are generic names; also Gr. *Zeús* (gen. *Διός*), Lat. *Jupiter* (*jov-pater*), Old Teut. *Tiu* or *Tiw* (surviving in Tuesday), Lat. *Janus*, *Diana*, and other proper names of pagan deities. The common name most widely used in Semitic occurs as 'el in Hebr., 'ilu in Babylonian, 'ilah in Arabic, etc.; and though scholars are not agreed on the point, the root-meaning most probably is "the strong or mighty one".

**SCOPE AND PLAN OF TREATMENT.**—For ethnic conceptions of Deity the reader is referred to the article under that title. The present article is concerned exclusively with the God (I) of monotheistic philosophy and (II) of Old- and New-Testament theology, i. e. with the one true God as He can be known by the light of unaided reason and as He is actually known, much more perfectly than reason could know Him, by His free revelation of Himself in the Jewish and Christian religions. It is necessary up to a certain point to observe the distinction here implied between philosophical and theological Theism—between the God of reason and of Revelation. For it is clear that, if the acceptance of Christianity is to be justified as a reasonable act of faith, the human mind must be capable of knowing naturally that a God exists who is free to reveal Himself supernaturally, in such wise that men may be rationally certain that He has done so through the ministry of Jesus Christ. In other words philosophical Theism as such ought to furnish the rational data which are implied in the possibility of revelation and the credibility of the Christian system; but more than this it need not undertake to do. Now all these data—in so far as they relate strictly to Theism—are contained in the comprehensive truth of the self-existence of a free and intelligent First Cause and Moral Ruler, a personal God, distinct from but immanent in the universe, which is subject to His infinite power and wisdom; and we shall, therefore, confine our strictly philosophical treatment of the subject to the discussion of this fundamental truth. A good deal more than this is usually included in the

systematic philosophy of Theism as developed by Christian, and more especially by Catholic, writers, but in accordance with our present scope, which is theological as well as philosophical, it will be more convenient to adopt the combined viewpoint of philosopher and theologian in treating many questions which might be treated separately from either point of view. In doing so, moreover, we are but following the line along which theistic doctrine has been developed. It is a fact that no adequate system of rational Theism and of natural religion has ever been developed and maintained independently of Revelation, and it would be a mistake to infer from the admitted capacity of the human mind to arrive at a true knowledge of God as the Creator and Ruler of the universe that the systematic Theism of Christian philosophers is *de facto* the product of unaided reason. It is legitimate for the philosopher, while retaining the strictly rational viewpoint, to improve and perfect his philosophy in the reflected light of Revelation, and Christian philosophers have used this advantage freely.

I. THE GOD OF PHILOSOPHY.—A. *Existence of God.*

—(1) The Problem stated.—Had the Theist merely to face a blank Atheistic denial of God's existence his task would be comparatively a light one. Formal dogmatic Atheism is self-refuting, and has never *de facto* won the reasoned assent of any considerable number of men (see ATHEISM). Nor can Polytheism (q. v.), however easily it may take hold of the popular imagination, ever satisfy the mind of a philosopher. But there are several varieties of what may be described as virtual Atheism which cannot be dismissed so summarily. There is the agnosticism, for instance, of Herbert Spencer, which, while admitting the rational necessity of postulating the Absolute or Unconditioned behind the relative and conditioned objects of our knowledge, declares that Absolute to be altogether unknowable, to be in fact the Unknowable, about which without being guilty of contradiction we can predicate nothing at all, except perhaps that It exists; and there are other types of Agnosticism (q. v.). Then again there is Pantheism (q. v.) in an almost endless variety of forms, all of which, however, may be logically reduced to the three following types: (a) the purely materialistic, which, making matter the only reality, would explain life by mechanics and chemistry, reduce abstract thought to the level of an organic process, deny any higher ultimate moral value to the Ten Commandments than to Newton's law of gravitation, and, finally, identify God Himself with the universe thus interpreted (see MATERIALISM; MONISM); (b) the purely idealistic, which, choosing the contrary alternative, would make mind the only reality, convert the material universe into an idea, and identify God with this all-embracing mind or idea, conceived as eternally evolving itself into passing phases or expressions of being and attaining self-consciousness in the souls of men; and (c) the combined materialistic-idealistic, which tries to steer a middle course and, without sacrificing mind to matter or matter to mind, would conceive the existing universe, with which God is identified, as some sort of "double-faced" single entity. Thus to accomplish even the beginning of his task the Theist has to show, against Agnostics, that the knowledge of God attainable by rational inference, however inadequate and imperfect it may be, is as true and valid, as far as it goes, as any other piece of knowledge we possess; and against Pantheists that the God of reason is a supra-mundane personal God distinct both from matter and from the finite human mind—that neither we ourselves nor the earth we tread upon enter into the constitution of His being.

But passing from views that are formally anti-Theistic, it is found that among Theists themselves certain differences exist which tend to complicate the problem, and increase the difficulty of stating it briefly and clearly. Some of these differences are



briefly and clearly. Some of these differences are merely formal and accidental and do not affect the substance of the theistic thesis, but others are of substantial importance, as, for instance, whether we can validly establish the truth of God's existence by the same kind of rational inference (e. g. from effect to cause) as we employ in other departments of knowledge, or whether, in order to justify our belief in this truth, we must not rather rely on some transcendental principle or axiom, superior and antecedent to dialectical reasoning; or on immediate intuition; or on some moral, sentimental, emotional, or æsthetic instinct or perception, which is voluntary rather than intellectual. Kant denied in the name of "pure reason" the inferential validity of the classical theistic proofs, while in the name of "practical reason" he postulated God's existence as an implicate of the moral law; and Kant's method has been followed or imitated by many Theists—by some who fully agree with him in rejecting the classical arguments; by others, who, without going so far, believe in the apologetical expediency of trying to persuade rather than convince men to be Theists. A moderate reaction against the too rigidly mathematical intellectualism of Descartes was to be welcomed, but the Kantian reaction by its excesses has injured the cause of Theism and helped forward the cause of anti-theistic philosophy. Herbert Spencer, as is well known, borrowed most of his arguments for Agnosticism from Hamilton and Mansel, who had popularized Kantian criticism in England; while in trying to improve on Kant's reconstructive transcendentalism his German disciples (Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) drifted into Pantheism. Kant also helped to prepare the way for the total disparagement of human reason in relation to religious truth, which constitutes the negative side of Traditionalism (q. v.), while the appeal of that system on the positive side to the common consent and tradition of mankind as the chief or sole criterion of truth and more especially of religious truth—its authority as a criterion being traced ultimately to a positive Divine revelation—is, like Kant's refuge in practical reason, merely an illogical attempt to escape from Agnosticism. Again, though Ontologism (q. v.), e. g. that of Malebranche (d. 1715), is older than Kant, its revival in the nineteenth century (by Gioberti, Rosmini, and others) has been inspired to some extent by Kantian influences. This system maintains that we have naturally some immediate consciousness, however dim at first, or some intuitive knowledge of God—not indeed that we see Him in His essence face to face, but that we know Him in His relation to creatures by the same act of cognition, according to Rosmini, as we become conscious of being in general, and therefore that the truth of His existence is as much a datum of philosophy as is the abstract idea of being. Finally, the philosophy of Modernism (q. v.), about which there has recently been such a stir, is a somewhat complex medley of these various systems and tendencies; its main features as a system are, negatively, a thoroughgoing intellectual Agnosticism, and, positively, the assertion of an immediate sense or experience of God as immanent in the life of the soul—an experience which is at first only subconscious, but which, when the requisite moral dispositions are present, becomes an object of conscious certainty.

Now all these varying types of Theism, in so far as they are opposed to the classical and traditional type, may be reduced to one or other of the two following propositions: (a) that we have naturally an immediate consciousness or intuition of God's existence and may therefore dispense with any attempt to prove this truth inferentially; (b) that, though we do not know this truth intuitively and cannot prove it inferentially in such a way as to satisfy the speculative reason, we can, nevertheless, and must conscientiously believe it on other than strictly intellectual

grounds. But an appeal to experience, not to mention other objections, is sufficient to negative the first proposition; and the second, which, as history has already made clear, is an illogical compromise with Agnosticism, is best refuted by a simple statement of the theistic proofs. It is not the proofs that are found to be fallacious but the criticism which rejects them. It is true of course—and no Theist denies it—that for the proper intellectual appreciation of theistic proofs moral dispositions are required, and that moral consciousness, the æsthetic faculty, and whatever other powers or capacities belong to man's spiritual nature, constitute or supply so many data on which to base inferential proofs. But this is very different from holding that we possess any faculty or power which assures us of God's existence and which is independent of, and superior to, the intellectual laws that regulate our assent to truth in general; that in the religious sphere we can transcend those laws without confessing our belief in God to be irrational. <sup>2</sup>It is also true that a mere barren intellectual assent to the truth of God's existence—and such an assent is conceivable—falls very far short of what religious assent ought to be; that what is taught in revealed religion about the worthlessness of faith uninformed by charity has its counterpart in natural religion; and that practical Theism, if it pretends to be adequate, must appeal not merely to the intellect but to the heart and conscience of mankind and be capable of winning the total allegiance of rational creatures. <sup>3</sup>But here again we meet with exaggeration and confusion on the part of those Theists who would substitute for intellectual assent something that does not exclude but presupposes it, and is only required to complement it. The truth and pertinency of these observations will be made clear by the following summary of the classical arguments for God's existence.

(2) Theistic Proofs.—The arguments for God's existence are variously classified and entitled by different writers, but all agree in recognizing the distinction between a priori, or deductive, and a posteriori, or inductive, reasoning in this connexion. And while all admit the validity and sufficiency of the latter method, opinion is divided in regard to the former. Some maintain that a valid a priori proof (usually called the ontological) is available; others deny this *in toto*; while some others maintain an attitude of compromise or neutrality. This difference, it should be observed, applies only to the question of proving God's actual existence, for, His self-existence being admitted, it is necessary to employ a priori or deductive inference in order to arrive at a knowledge of His nature and attributes; and as it is impossible to develop the arguments for His existence without some working notion of His nature, it is necessary to some extent to anticipate the deductive stage and combine the a priori with the a posteriori method. But no strictly a priori conclusion need be more than hypothetically assumed at this stage.

(a) A Posteriori Proofs.—St. Thomas (I, Q. ii, a. 3; Cont. Gent., I, xiii) and after him many scholastic writers advance the five following arguments to prove the existence of God. (i) Motion, i. e. the passing from power to act, as it takes place in the universe, implies a first unmoved Mover (*primum movens immobile*), who is God; else we should postulate an infinite series of movers, which is inconceivable. (ii) For the same reason efficient causes, as we see them operating in this world, imply the existence of a First Cause that is uncaused, i. e. that possesses in itself the sufficient reason for its existence; and this is God. (iii) The fact that contingent beings exist, i. e. beings whose non-existence is recognized as possible, implies the existence of a necessary being, who is God. (iv) The graduated perfections of being actually existing in the universe can be understood only by comparison with an absolute standard that is also actual, i. e. an in-

finitely perfect Being such as God. (v) The wonderful order or evidence of intelligent design which the universe exhibits implies the existence of a supra-mundane Designer, who is no other than God Himself. To these many Theists add other arguments, drawn, e. g. (vi) from the common consent of mankind (usually described by Catholic writers as the *moral* argument), (vii) from the internal witness of conscience to the supremacy of the moral law, and, therefore, to the existence of a supreme Lawgiver (this may be called the *ethical* argument, or (viii) from the existence and perception of beauty in the universe (the *aesthetical* argument). One might go on, indeed, almost indefinitely multiplying and distinguishing arguments; but to do so would only lead to confusion. The various arguments mentioned—and the same is true of others that might be added—are not in reality distinct and independent arguments, but only so many partial statements of one and the same general argument, which is perhaps best described as the cosmological. This argument assumes the validity of the principle of causality or sufficient reason and, stated in its most comprehensive form, amounts to this: that it is impossible according to the laws of human thought to give any ultimate rational explanation of the phenomena of external experience and of internal consciousness—in other words to synthesize the data which the actual universe as a whole supplies (and this is the recognized aim of philosophy)—unless by admitting the existence of a self-sufficient and self-explanatory cause or ground of being and activity, to which all these phenomena may be ultimately referred. It is, therefore, mainly a question of method and expediency what particular points one may select from the multitude available to illustrate and enforce the general a posteriori argument. For our purpose it will suffice to state as briefly as possible (i) the general argument proving the self-existence of a First Cause, (ii) the special arguments proving the existence of an intelligent Designer and (iii) of a Supreme Moral Ruler, and (iv) the confirmatory argument from the general consent of mankind.

(i) We must start by assuming the objective certainty and validity of the principle of causality or sufficient reason—an assumption upon which the value of the physical sciences and of human knowledge generally is based. To question its objective certainty, as did Kant, and represent it as a mere mental a priori, or possessing only subjective validity, would open the door to subjectivism and universal scepticism. It is impossible to prove the principle of causality, just as it is impossible to prove the principle of contradiction; but it is not difficult to see that if the former is denied the latter may also be denied and the whole process of human reasoning declared fallacious. The principle states that whatever exists or happens must have a sufficient reason for its existence or occurrence either in itself or in something else; in other words that whatever does not exist of absolute necessity—whatever is not self-existent—cannot exist without a proportionate cause external to itself; and if this principle is valid when employed by the scientist to explain the phenomena of physics it must be equally valid when employed by the philosopher for the ultimate explanation of the universe as a whole. In the universe we observe that certain things are effects, i. e. they depend for their existence on other things, and these again on others; but, however far back we may extend this series of effects and dependent causes, we must, if human reason is to be satisfied, come ultimately to a cause that is not itself an effect, in other words to an uncaused cause or self-existent being which is the ground and cause of all being. And this conclusion, as thus stated, is virtually admitted by Agnostics and Pantheists, all of whom are obliged to speak of an eternal something underlying the phenomenal universe, whether this something be the

"Unknown", or the "Absolute", or the "Unconscious", or "Matter" itself, or the "Ego", or the "Idea", or being, or the "Will"; these are so many substitutes for the uncaused cause or self-existent being of Theism. What anti-Theists refuse to admit is not the existence of a First Cause in an indeterminate sense, but the existence of an intelligent and free First Cause, a personal God, distinct from the material universe and the human mind. But the very same reason that compels us to postulate a First Cause at all requires that this cause should be a free and intelligent being. The spiritual world of intellect and free will must be recognized by the sane philosopher to be as real as the world of matter; man knows that he has a spiritual nature and performs spiritual acts as clearly and as certainly as he knows that he has eyes to see with and ears to hear with; and the phenomena of man's spiritual nature can only be explained in one way—by attributing spirituality, i. e. intelligence and free will, to the First Cause, in other words by recognizing a personal God. For the cause in all cases must be proportionate to the effect, i. e. must contain somehow in itself every perfection of being that is realized in the effect.

The cogency of this argument becomes more apparent if account be taken of the fact, recognized by modern scientists, that the human species had its origin at a comparatively late period in the history of the actual universe. There was a time when neither man nor any other living thing inhabited this globe of ours; and without pressing the point regarding the origin of life itself from inanimate matter or the evolution of man's body from lower organic types, it may be maintained with absolute confidence that no explanation of the origin of man's soul can be made out on evolutionary lines, and that recourse must be had to the creative power of a spiritual or personal First Cause. It might also be urged, as an inference from the physical theories commonly accepted by present-day scientists, that the actual organization of the material universe had a definite beginning in time. If it be true that the goal towards which physical evolution is tending is the uniform distribution of heat and other forms of energy, it would follow clearly that the existing process has not been going on from eternity; else the goal would have been reached long ago. And if the process had a beginning how did it originate? If the primal mass was inert and uniform, it is impossible to conceive how motion and differentiation were introduced except from without, while if these are held to be coeval with matter, the cosmic process, which *ex hypothesi* is temporal, would be eternal, unless it be granted that matter itself had a definite beginning in time.

But the argument, strictly speaking, is conclusive even if it be granted that the world may have existed from eternity, in the sense, that is, that, no matter how far back one may go, no point of time can be reached at which created being was not already in existence. In this sense Aristotle held matter to be eternal and St. Thomas, while denying the fact, admitted the possibility of its being so. But such relative eternity is nothing more in reality than infinite or indefinite temporal duration and is altogether different from the eternity we attribute to God. Hence to admit that the world might possibly be eternal in this sense implies no denial of the essentially finite and contingent character of its existence. On the contrary it helps to emphasize this truth, for the same relation of dependence upon a self-existing cause which is implied in the contingency of any single being is implied a fortiori in the existence of an infinite series of such beings, supposing such a series to be possible.

Nor can it be maintained with Pantheists that the world, whether of matter or of mind or of both, contains within itself the sufficient reason of its own existence. A self-existing world would exist of ab-

solute necessity and would be infinite in every kind of perfection; but of nothing are we more certain than that the world as we know it, in its totality as well as in its parts, realizes only finite degrees of perfection. It is a mere contradiction in terms, however much one may try to cover up and conceal the contradiction by an ambiguous and confusing use of language, to predicate infinity of matter or of the human mind, and one or the other or both must be held by the Pantheist to be infinite. In other words the distinction between the finite and the infinite must be abolished and the principle of contradiction denied. This criticism applies to every variety of Pantheism strictly so called, while crude, materialistic Pantheism involves so many additional and more obvious absurdities that hardly any philosopher deserving of the name will be found to maintain it in our day. On the other hand, as regards idealistic Pantheism, which enjoys a considerable vogue in our day, it is to be observed in the first place that in many cases this is a tendency rather than a formal doctrine, that it is in fact nothing more than a confused and perverted form of Theism, based especially upon an exaggerated and one-sided view of Divine immanence (see below, iii). And this confusion works to the advantage of Pantheism by enabling it to make a specious appeal to the very arguments which justify Theism. Indeed the whole strength of the pantheistic position as against Atheism lies in what it holds in common with Theism; while, on the other hand, its weakness as a world theory becomes evident as soon as it diverges from or contradicts Theism. Whereas Theism, for example, safeguards such primary truths as the reality of human personality, freedom, and moral responsibility, Pantheism is obliged to sacrifice all these, to deny the existence of evil, whether physical or moral, to destroy the rational basis of religion, and, under pretence of making man his own God, to rob him of nearly all his plain, common-sense convictions and of all his highest incentives to good conduct. The philosophy which leads to such results cannot but be radically unsound.

(ii) The special argument based on the existence of order or design in the universe (also called the *teleological* argument) proves immediately the existence of a supramundane mind of vast intelligence, and ultimately the existence of God. This argument is capable of being developed at great length, but it must be stated here very briefly. It has always been a favourite argument both with philosophers and with popular apologists of Theism; and though, during the earlier excesses of enthusiasm for or against Darwinianism, it was often asserted or admitted that the evolutionary hypothesis had overthrown the teleological argument, it is now recognized that the very opposite is true, and that the evidences of design which the universe exhibits are not less but more impressive when viewed from the evolutionary standpoint. To begin with particular examples of adaptation which may be appealed to in countless number—the eye, for instance, as an organ of sight is a conspicuous embodiment of intelligent purpose—and not less but more so when viewed as the product of an evolutionary process rather than the immediate handiwork of the Creator. There is no option in such cases between the hypothesis of a directing intelligence and that of blind chance, and the absurdity of supposing that the eye originated suddenly by a single blind chance is augmented a thousand-fold by suggesting that it may be the product of a progressive series of such chances. “Natural selection”, “survival of the fittest”, and similar terms merely describe certain phases in the supposed process of evolution without helping in the least to explain it; and as opposed to teleology they mean nothing more than blind chance. The eye is only one of the countless examples of adaptation to particular ends discernible in every part of the universe, inorganic as well as organic;

for the atom as well as the cell contributes to the evidence available. Nor is the argument weakened by our inability in many cases to explain the particular purpose of certain structures or organisms. Our knowledge of nature is too limited to be made the measure of nature's entire design, while as against our ignorance of some particular purposes we are entitled to maintain the presumption that if intelligence is *anywhere* apparent it is dominant *everywhere*. Moreover, in our search for particular instances of design we must not overlook the evidence supplied by the harmonious unity of nature as a whole. The universe as we know it is a cosmos, a vastly complex system of correlated and interdependent parts, each subject to particular laws, and all together subject to a common law or a combination of laws, as the result of which the pursuit of particular ends is made to contribute in a marvellous way to the attainment of a common purpose; and it is simply inconceivable that this cosmic unity should be the product of chance or accident. If it be objected that there is another side to the picture, that the universe abounds in imperfections—maladjustments, failures, seemingly purposeless waste—the reply is not far to seek. For it is not maintained that the existing world is the best possible, and it is only on the supposition of its being so that the imperfections referred to would be excluded. Admitting without exaggerating their reality—admitting, that is, the existence of physical evil—there still remains a large balance on the side of order and harmony, and to account for this there is required not only an intelligent mind but one that is good and benevolent, though so far as this special argument goes this mind might conceivably be finite. To prove the infinity of the world's Designer it is necessary to fall back on the general argument already explained and on the deductive argument to be explained below by which infinity is inferred from self-existence. Finally, by way of direct reply to the problem suggested by the objection, it is to be observed that, to appreciate fully the evidence for design, we must, in addition to particular instances of adaptation and to the cosmic unity observable in the world of to-day, consider the historical continuity of nature throughout indefinite ages in the past and indefinite ages to come. We do not and cannot comprehend the full scope of nature's design, for it is not a static universe we have to study but a universe that is progressively unfolding itself and moving towards the fulfilment of an ultimate purpose under the guidance of a master mind. And towards that purpose the imperfect as well as the perfect—apparent evil and discord as well as obvious good order—may contribute in ways which we can but dimly discern. The well-balanced philosopher, who realizes his own limitations in the presence of nature's Designer, so far from claiming that every detail of that Designer's purpose should at present be plain to his inferior intelligence, will be content to await the final solution of enigmas which the hereafter promises to furnish.

(iii) To Newman and others the argument from conscience, or the sense of moral responsibility, has seemed the most intimately persuasive of all the arguments for God's existence, while to it alone Kant allowed an absolute value. But this is not an independent argument, although, properly understood, it serves to emphasize a point in the general a posteriori proof which is calculated to appeal with particular force to many minds. It is not that conscience, as such, contains a direct revelation or intuition of God as the author of the moral law, but that, taking man's sense of moral responsibility as a phenomenon to be explained, no ultimate explanation can be given except by supposing the existence of a Superior and Law-giver whom man is bound to obey. And just as the argument from design brings out prominently the attribute of intelligence, so the argument from con-

science brings out the attribute of holiness in the First Cause and self-existent Personal Being with whom we must ultimately identify the Designer and the Lawgiver.

iv) The confirmatory argument based on the consent of mankind may be stated briefly as follows: mankind, as a whole, has at all times and everywhere believed, and continues to believe, in the existence of some superior being or beings on whom the material world and man himself are dependent, and this fact cannot be accounted for except by admitting that this belief is true, or at least contains a germ of truth. It is admitted of course that Polytheism, Dualism, Pantheism, and other forms of error and superstition have mingled with and disfigured this universal belief of mankind, but this does not destroy the force of the argument we are considering. For at least the germinal truth, which consists in the recognition of some kind of deity, is common to every form of religion, and can, therefore, claim in its support the universal consent of mankind. And how can this consent be explained except as a result of the perception by the minds of men of the evidence for the existence of deity? It is too large a subject to be entered upon here—the discussion of the various theories that have been advanced to account in some other way for the origin and universality of religion; but it may safely be said that, abstracting from revelation, which need not be discussed at this stage, no other theory will stand the test of criticism. And, assuming that this is the best explanation philosophy has to offer, it may further be maintained that this consent of mankind tells ultimately in favour of Theism. For it is clear from history that religion is liable to degenerate, and has in many instances degenerated instead of progressing; and, even if it be impossible to prove conclusively that Monotheism was the primitive historical religion, there is, nevertheless, a good deal of positive evidence adducible in support of this contention. And, if this be the true reading of history, it is permissible to interpret the universality of religion as witnessing implicitly to the original truth, which, however much obscured it may have become in many cases, could never be entirely obliterated. But, even if the history of religion is to read as a record of progressive development, one ought in all fairness, in accordance with a well-recognized principle, to seek its true meaning and significance not at the lowest but at the highest point of development; and it cannot be denied that Theism, in the strict sense, is the ultimate form which religion naturally tends to assume.

If there have been, and are to-day, atheistic philosophers who oppose the common belief of mankind, these are comparatively few and their dissent only serves to emphasize more strongly the consent of normal humanity. Their existence is an abnormality to be accounted for as such things usually are. Could it be claimed on their behalf, individually or collectively, that in ability, education, character, or life they excel the infinitely larger number of cultured men who adhere on conviction to what the race at large has believed, then indeed it might be admitted that their opposition would be somewhat formidable. But no such claim can be made; on the contrary, if a comparison were called for, it would be easy to make out an overwhelming case for the other side. Or again, if it were true that the progress of knowledge had brought to light any new and serious difficulties against religion, there would, especially in view of the modern vogue of Agnosticism, be some reason for alarm as to the soundness of the traditional belief. But so far is this from being the case that in the words of Professor Huxley—an unsuspected witness—"not a solitary problem presents itself to the philosophical Theist at the present day which has not existed from the time that philosophers began to think out the logical grounds and the logical consequences of The-

ism" ("Life and Letters of Ch. Darwin", by F. Darwin, II, p. 203). Substantially the same arguments as are used to-day were employed by old-time sceptical Atheists in the effort to overthrow man's belief in the existence of the Divine, and the fact that this belief has withstood repeated assaults during so many ages in the past is the best guarantee of its permanency in the future. It is too firmly implanted in the depths of man's soul for little surface storms to uproot it.

(b) A Priori or Ontological Argument.—This argument undertakes to deduce the existence of God from the idea of Him as the Infinite which is present to the human mind; but, as already stated, theistic philosophers are not agreed as to the logical validity of this deduction. As stated by St. Anselm the argument runs thus: The idea of God as the Infinite means the greatest Being that can be thought of; but unless actual existence outside the mind is included in this idea God would not be the greatest conceivable Being, since a Being that exists both in the mind as an object of thought and outside the mind or objectively would be greater than a Being that exists in the mind only; therefore God exists not only in the mind but outside of it. Descartes states the argument in a slightly different way as follows: Whatever is contained in a clear and distinct idea of a thing must be predicated of that thing; but a clear and distinct idea of an absolutely perfect Being contains the notion of actual existence; therefore, since we have the idea of an absolutely perfect Being, such a Being must really exist. To mention a third form of statement, Leibniz would put the argument thus: God is at least possible since the concept of Him as the Infinite implies no contradiction; but if He is possible He must exist, because the concept of Him involves existence. In St. Anselm's own day this argument was objected to by Gaunilo, who maintained, as a *reductio ad absurdum*, that were it valid one could prove by means of it the actual existence somewhere of an ideal island far surpassing in riches and delights the fabled Isles of the Blessed. But this criticism, however smart it may seem, is clearly unsound, for it overlooks the fact that the argument is not intended to apply to finite ideals, but only to the strictly infinite; and if it is admitted that we possess a true idea of the infinite, and that this idea is not self-contradictory, it does not seem possible to find any flaw in the argument. Actual existence is certainly included in any true concept of the Infinite, and the person who admits that he has a concept of an Infinite Being cannot deny that he conceives it as actually existing. But the difficulty is with regard to this preliminary admission, which if challenged, as it is in fact challenged by Agnostics, requires to be justified by recurring to the a posteriori argument, i. e. to the inference by way of causality from contingency to self-existence, and thence by way of deduction to infinity. Hence the great majority of scholastic philosophers have rejected the ontological argument as propounded by St. Anselm and Descartes, nor as put forward by Leibniz does it escape the difficulty that has been stated.

B. Nature and Fundamental Attributes of God.—Having established by inductive inference the self-existence of a personal First Cause, distinct from matter and from the human mind, we now proceed by deductive analysis to examine the nature and attributes of this Being to the extent required by our limited philosophical scope. We will treat accordingly of (1) the infinity, (2) unity or unicity, and (3) simplicity of God, adding (4) some remarks on Divine personality.

(1) Infinity of God.—(a) When we say that God is infinite we mean that He is unlimited in every kind of perfection, or that every conceivable perfection belongs to Him in the highest conceivable way. In a different sense we sometimes speak, for instance, of

infinite time or space, meaning thereby time of such indefinite duration or space of such indefinite extension that we cannot assign any fixed limit to one or the other; and care should be taken not to confound these two essentially different meanings of the term. Time and space being made up of parts in duration or extension are essentially finite by comparison with God's infinity. Now we assert that God is infinitely perfect in the sense explained, and that His infinity is deducible from His self-existence. For a self-existent being, if limited at all, could be limited only by itself; to be limited by another would imply causal dependence on that other, which the very notion of self-existence excludes. But the self-existing cannot be conceived as limiting itself, in the sense of curtailing its perfection of being, without ceasing to be self-existing. Whatever it is, it is necessarily; its own essence is the sole reason or explanation of its existence, so that its manner of existence must be as unchangeable as its essence, and to suggest the possibility of an increase or diminution of perfection would be to suggest the absurdity of a changeable essence. It only remains, then, to say that whatever perfection is compatible with its essence is actually realized in a self-existing being; but as there is no conceivable perfection as such, i. e. no expression of positive being as such, that is not compatible with the essence of the self-existent, it follows that the self-existent must be infinite in all perfection. For self-existence itself is absolute positive being, and positive being cannot contradict, and cannot therefore limit, positive being.

(b) This general, and admittedly very abstract, conclusion, as well as the reasoning which supports it, will be rendered more intelligible by a brief specific illustration of what it involves.

(i) When in speaking of the Infinite we attribute all conceivable perfections to Him we must not forget that the predicates we employ to describe perfections derive their meaning and connotation in the first instance from their application to finite beings; and on reflection it is seen that we must distinguish between different kinds of perfections, and that we cannot without palpable contradiction attribute all the perfections of creatures in the same way to God. Some perfections are such that, even in the abstract, they necessarily imply or connote finiteness of being or imperfection; while some others do not of themselves necessarily connote imperfection. To the first class belong all material perfections—extension, sensibility, and the like—and certain spiritual perfections such as rationality (as distinct from simple intelligence); to the second class belong such perfections as being, truth, goodness, intelligence, wisdom, justice, holiness, etc. Now while it cannot be said that God is infinitely extended, or that He feels or reasons in an infinite way, it can be said that He is infinitely good, intelligent, wise, just, holy, etc.; in other words, while perfections of the second class are attributed to God *formally*, i. e. without any change in the proper meaning of the predicates which express them, those of the first class can only be attributed to Him *eminently* and *equivalently*, i. e. whatever positive being they express belongs to God as their cause in a much higher and more excellent way than to the creatures in which they formally exist. By means of this important distinction, which Agnostics reject or neglect, we are able to think and to speak of the Infinite without being guilty of contradiction, and the fact that men generally—even Agnostics themselves when off their guard—recognize and utilize the distinction is the best proof that it is pertinent and well founded. Ultimately it is only another way of saying that, given an infinite cause and finite effects, whatever pure perfection is discovered in the effects must first exist in the cause (*via affirmationis*), and at the same time that whatever imperfection is discovered in the effects must be excluded from the cause (*via negationis* vel

*exclusionis*). These two principles do not contradict, but only balance and correct one another.

(ii) Yet sometimes men are led by a natural tendency to think and speak of God as if He were a magnified creature, more especially a magnified man; and this is known as anthropomorphism. Thus God is said to see or hear, as if He had physical organs, or to be angry or sorry, as if subject to human passions; and this perfectly legitimate and more or less unavoidable use of *metaphor* is often quite unfairly alleged to prove that the strictly Infinite is unthinkable and unknowable, and that it is really a finite, anthropomorphic God that men worship. But whatever truth there may be in this charge as applied to Polytheistic religions, or even to the Theistic beliefs of rude and uncultured minds, it is untrue and unjust when directed against philosophical Theism. The same reasons that justify and recommend the use of metaphorical language in other connexions justify and recommend it here, but no Theist of average intelligence ever thinks of understanding literally the metaphors he applies, or hears applied by others, to God, any more than he means to speak literally when he calls a brave man a lion, or a cunning one a fox.

(iii) Finally it should be observed that, while predicating pure perfections literally both of God and of creatures, it is always understood that these predicates are true in an infinitely higher sense of God than of creatures, and that there is no thought of co-ordinating or classifying God with creatures. This is technically expressed by saying that all our knowledge of God is *analogical*, and that all predicates applied to God and to creatures are used analogically, not univocally (see ANALOGY). I may look at a portrait or at its living original, and say of either with literal truth: that is a beautiful face. And this is an example of analogical predication. Beauty is literally and truly realized both in the portrait and its living original, and retains its proper meaning as applied to either; there is sufficient likeness or analogy to justify literal predication, but there is not that perfect likeness or identity between painted and living beauty which univocal predication would imply. And similarly in the case of God and creatures. What we contemplate directly is the portrait of Him painted, so to speak, by Himself on the canvas of the universe and exhibiting in a finite degree various perfections, which, without losing their proper meaning for us, are seen to be capable of being realized in an infinite degree; and our reason compels us to infer that they must be and are so realized in Him who is their ultimate cause.

Hence we admit, in conclusion, that our knowledge of the Infinite is *inadequate*, and necessarily so since our minds are only finite. But this is very different from the Agnostic contention that the Infinite is altogether unknowable, and that the statements of Theists regarding the nature and attributes of God are so many plain contradictions. It is only by ignoring the well-recognized rules of predication that have just been explained, and consequently by misunderstanding and misrepresenting the Theistic position, that Agnostics succeed in giving an air of superficial plausibility to their own philosophy of blank negation. Anyone who understands those rules, and has learned to think clearly, and trusts his own reason and common sense, will find it easy to meet and refute Agnostic arguments, most of which, in principle, have been anticipated in what precedes. Only one general observation need be made here, viz.: that the principles to which the Agnostic philosopher must appeal in his attempt to invalidate religious knowledge would, if consistently applied, invalidate all human knowledge and lead to universal scepticism; and it is safe to say that, unless absolute scepticism becomes the philosophy of mankind, Agnosticism will never supplant religion.

(2) Unity or Unicity of God.—Obviously there can



be *only one* infinite being, only one God. Did several exist, none of them would really be infinite, for, to have plurality of natures at all, each should have some perfection not possessed by the others. This will be readily granted by every one who admits the infinity of God, and there is no need to delay in developing what is perfectly clear. It should be noted, however, that some Theistic philosophers prefer to deduce unicity from self-existence and infinity from both combined, and in a matter so very abstract it is not surprising that slight differences of opinion should arise. But we have followed what seems to us to be the simpler and clearer line of argument. The metaphysical argument by which unicity, as distinct from infinity, is deduced from self-existence seems to be very obscure, while on the other hand infinity, as distinct from unicity, seems to be clearly implied in self-existence *as such*. If the question, for example, be asked: Why may there not be several self-existing beings? The only satisfactory answer, as it seems to us, is this: Because a self-existent being as such is necessarily infinite, and there cannot be several infinities. The unity of God as the First Cause might also be inductively inferred from the unity of the universe as we know it; but as the suggestion might be made, and could not be disproved, that there may be another or even several universes, of which we have no knowledge, this argument would not be absolutely conclusive.

(3) *Simplicity of God*.—God is a simple being or substance excluding every kind of composition, physical or metaphysical. Physical or real composition is either substantial or accidental—substantial, if the being in question consists of two or more substantial principles, forming parts of a composite whole, as man for example, consists of body and soul; accidental, if the being in question, although simple in its substance (as is the human soul), is capable of possessing accidental perfections (like the actual thoughts and volition of man's soul) not necessarily identical with its substance. Now it is clear that an infinite being cannot be substantially composite, for this would mean that infinity is made up of the union or addition of finite parts—a plain contradiction in terms. Nor can accidental composition be attributed to the infinite, since even this would imply a capacity for increased perfection, which the very notion of the infinite excludes. There is not, therefore, and cannot be any physical or real composition in God.

Neither can there be that kind of composition which is known as metaphysical, and which results from "the union of diverse concepts referring to the same real thing in such a way that none of them by itself signifies either explicitly or even implicitly the whole reality signified by their combination". Thus every actual contingent being is a metaphysical compound of *essence* and *existence*, and man in particular, according to the definition, is a compound of animal and rational. Essence as such in relation to a contingent being merely implies its conceivableness or possibility, and abstracts from actual existence; existence as such must be added before we can speak of the being as actual. But this distinction, with the composition it implies, cannot be applied to the self-existent or infinite being in whom essence and existence are completely identified. We say of a contingent being that it *has* a certain nature or essence, but of the self-existent we say that it *is* its own nature or essence. There is no composition therefore of essence and existence—or of potentiality and actuality—in God; nor can the composition of genus and specific difference, implied for example in the definition of man as a rational animal, be attributed to Him. God cannot be classified or defined, as contingent beings are classified and defined; for there is no aspect of being in which He is *perfectly* similar to the finite, and consequently no genus in which He can be included. From which it

follows indeed that we cannot know God *adequately* in the way in which He knows Himself, but not, as the Agnostic contends, that our inadequate knowledge is not true as far as it goes. In speaking of a being who transcends the limitations of formal logical definition, our propositions are an expression of real truth, provided that what we state is in itself intelligible and not self-contradictory; and there is nothing unintelligible or contradictory in what Theists predicate of God. It is true that no single predicate is adequate or exhaustive as a description of His infinite perfection, and that we need to employ a multitude of predicates, as if at first sight infinity could be reached by multiplication. But at the same time we recognize that this is not so—being repugnant to the Divine simplicity—and that while truth, goodness, wisdom, holiness and other attributes, as we conceive and define them, express perfections that are formally distinct, yet as applied to God they are all ultimately identical in meaning and describe the same ultimate reality—the one infinitely perfect and simple being.

(4) *Divine Personality*.—When we say that God is a personal being we mean that He is intelligent and free and distinct from the created universe. Personality as such expresses perfection, and if human personality as such connotes imperfection, it must be remembered that, as in the case of similar predicates, this connotation is excluded when we attribute personality to God. It is principally by way of opposition to Pantheism that Divine personality is emphasized by the Theistic philosopher. Human personality, as we know it, is one of the primary data of consciousness, and it is one of those created perfections which must be realized formally (although only analogically) in the First Cause. But Pantheism would require us to deny the reality of any such perfection, whether in creatures or in the Creator, and this is one of the fundamental objections to any form of Pantheistic teaching. Regarding the mystery of the Trinity or three Divine Persons in God, which can be known only by revelation, it is enough to say here that properly understood the mystery contains no contradiction, but on the contrary adds much that is helpful to our inadequate knowledge of the infinite.

*C. Relation of God to the Universe*.—(1) *Essential Dependence of the Universe on God*; Creation and Conservation.—In developing the argument of the First Cause we have seen that the world is essentially dependent on God, and this dependence implies in the first place that God is the Creator of the world—the producer of its whole being or substance—and in the next place, supposing its production, that its continuance in being at every moment is due to His sustaining power. Creation (q. v.) means the total production of a being out of nothing, i. e. the bringing of a being into existence to replace absolute non-existence, and the relation of Creator is the only conceivable relation in which the Infinite can stand to the finite. Pantheistic theories, which would represent the varieties of being in the universe as so many determinations or emanations or phases of one and the selfsame eternal reality—Substance according to Spinoza, Pure Ego according to Fichte, the Absolute according to Schelling, the Pure Idea or Logical Concept according to Hegel—simply bristle with contradictions, and involve, as has been stated already, a denial of the distinction between the finite and the infinite. And the relation of Creator to created remains the same even though the possibility of eternal creation, in the sense already explained [see above A, (1), (a)], be admitted; the Infinite must be the producer of the finite even though it be impossible to fix a time at which production may not already have taken place. For certain knowledge of the fact that created being, and time itself, had a definite beginning in the past we can afford to rely on revelation, although, as already stated, science suggests the same fact.

It is also clear that if the universe depends on God for its production it must also depend on Him for its conservation or continuance in being; and this truth will perhaps be best presented by explaining the much-talked-of principle of Divine *immanence* as corrected and counterbalanced by the equally important principle of Divine *transcendence*.

(2) Divine Immanence and Transcendence.—To Deists (see DEISM) is attributed the view—or at least a tendency towards the view—that God, having created the universe, leaves it to pursue its own course according to fixed laws, and ceases, so to speak, to take any further interest in, or responsibility for, what may happen; and Divine immanence is urged, sometimes too strongly, in opposition to this view. God is immanent, or intimately present, in the universe because His power is required at every moment to sustain creatures in being and to concur with them in their activities. Conservation and concursus are, so to speak, continuations of creative activity, and imply an equally intimate relation of God towards creatures, or rather an equally intimate and unceasing dependence of creatures on God. Whatever creatures are, they are by virtue of God's conserving power; whatever they do, they do by virtue of God's concursus. It is not of course denied that creatures are true causes and produce real effects; but they are only secondary causes; their efficiency is always dependent and derived; God as the First Cause is an ever active co-operator in their actions. This is true even of the free acts of an intelligent creature like man; only it should be added in this case that Divine responsibility ceases at the point where sin or moral evil enters in. Since sin as such, however, is an imperfection, no limitation is thus imposed on God's supremacy.

But lest insistence on Divine immanence should degenerate into Pantheism—and there is a tendency in this direction on the part of many modern writers—it is important at the same time to emphasize the truth of God's transcendence, to recall, in other words, what has been stated several times already, that God is one simple and infinitely perfect personal Being whose nature and action in their proper character as Divine infinitely transcend all possible modes of the finite, and cannot, without contradiction, be formally identified with these.

(3) Possibility of the Supernatural.—From a study of nature we have inferred the existence of God and deduced certain fundamental truths regarding His nature and attributes, and His relation to the created universe. And from these it is easy to deduce a further important truth, with a brief mention of which we may fittingly conclude this section. However wonderful we may consider the universe to be, we recognize that neither in its substance nor in the laws by which its order is maintained, in so far as unaided reason can come to know them, does it exhaust God's infinite power or perfectly reveal His nature. If then it be suggested that, to supplement what philosophy teaches of Himself and His purposes, God may be willing to favour rational creatures with an immediate personal revelation, in which He aids the natural powers of reason by confirming what they already know, and by imparting to them much that they could not otherwise know, it will be seen at once that this suggestion contains no impossibility. All that is required to realize it is that God should be able to communicate directly with the created mind, and that men should be able to recognize with sufficient certainty that the communication is really Divine; and that both of these conditions are capable of being fulfilled no Theist can logically deny (see REVELATION; MIRACLES). This being so, it will follow further that knowledge so obtained, being guaranteed by the authority of Him who is infinite Truth, is the most certain and reliable knowledge we can possess; and

this is the knowledge we shall freely utilize in the following section of this article.

II. THE GOD OF REVELATION.—We assume here—what is elsewhere proved by Catholic apologists—that a supernatural revelation of Himself has *de facto* been given by God in the Jewish and Christian religions, and guaranteed by such evidence that men are reasonably bound to accept it; and we assume, further, that our authoritative sources for obtaining a knowledge of the contents of this revelation are the inspired Scriptures and the uninspired but infallible teaching of the Catholic Church. This does not of course mean that reason abdicates its office when authority takes control, for, besides the fact that submission to such authority is eminently rational, there is always an appeal back to reason itself against anything that would be self-contradictory or absurd. As a matter of fact, however, although there is mystery, there is no contradiction in what God has revealed about Himself. On the contrary reason is helped very much, instead of being hindered, in its effort to acquire a worthy knowledge of Him Who is infinite and therefore necessarily mysterious both in His own being and in His relations to creatures; but apart from the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, and the supernatural economy of salvation of which the Incarnation is the centre, there is scarcely an important truth about God and His relation to creatures that could not, absolutely speaking, be known by the light of reason alone.

In naming the Scriptures and Catholic teaching as sources, it is not intended to treat them separately and independently but in combination. Developed Catholic teaching has collected and systematized all important truths concerning God which may be gathered from the Scriptures, and we shall accordingly make this teaching our guide, referring back as occasion may require to Biblical sources. For the discussion of questions that are merely exegetical and critical the reader is referred to the article on God in standard dictionaries or encyclopedias of the Bible.

A. *Existence and Knowableness of God.*—(1) Neither in the Old or New Testament do we find any elaborate argumentation devoted to proving that God exists. This truth is rather taken for granted, as being something, for example, that only the fool will deny in his heart [Ps. xiii (xiv), 1; lli (liii), 1]; and argumentation, when resorted to, is directed chiefly against polytheism and idolatry. But in several passages we have a cursory appeal to some phase of the general cosmological argument: v. g. Ps. xviii (xix), 1; xciii (xciv), 5 sqq.; Is., xli, 26 sqq.; II Mach., vii, 28, etc.; and in some few others—Wis., xiii, 1–9; Rom., i, 18–20—the argument is presented in a philosophical way, and men who reason rightly are held to be inexcusable for failing to recognize and worship the one true God, the Author and Ruler of the universe.

These two latter texts merit more than passing attention. Wis., xiii, 1–9 reads: "But all men are vain, in whom there is not the knowledge of God: and who by these good things that are seen, could not understand him that is, neither by attending to the works have acknowledged who was the workman: but have imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the great water, or the sun and moon, to be the gods that rule the world. With whose beauty, if they, being delighted, took them to be gods: let them know how much the Lord of them is more beautiful than they: for the first author of beauty made all those things. Or if they admired their power and effects, let them understand by them, that he that made them, is mightier than they: for by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby. But yet as to these they are less to be blamed. For they perhaps err, seeking God, and desirous to find him. For being conversant among his works, they search: and they are persuaded that the

things are good which are seen. But then again they are not to be pardoned. For if they were able to know so much as to make a judgment of the world: how did they not more easily find out the Lord thereof?" Here it is clearly taught (a) that the phenomenal or contingent world—the things that are seen—requires a cause distinct from and greater than itself or any of its elements; (b) that this cause who is God is not unknowable, but is known with certainty not only to exist but to possess in Himself, in a higher degree, whatever beauty, strength, or other perfections are realized in His works; (c) that this conclusion is attainable by the right exercise of human reason, without reference to supernatural revelation, and that philosophers, therefore, who are able to interpret the world philosophically, are inexcusable for their ignorance of the true God, their failure, it is implied, being due rather to lack of good will than to the incapacity of the human mind.

Substantially the same doctrine is laid down more briefly by St. Paul in Rom., i, 18–20: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of those men that detain the truth of God in injustice: because that which is known of God is manifest in them. For God hath manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also, and divinity: so that they are inexcusable." It is to be observed that the pagans of whom St. Paul is speaking are not blamed for their ignorance of supernatural revelation and the Mosaic law, but for failing to preserve or for corrupting that knowledge of God and of man's duty towards Him which nature itself ought to have taught them. Indeed it is not pure ignorance as such they are blamed for, but that wilful shirking of truth which renders ignorance culpable. Even under the corruptions of paganism St. Paul recognized the indestructible permanency of germinal religious truth (cf. Rom., ii, 14, 15).

It is clear from these passages that Agnosticism and Pantheism are condemned by revelation, while the validity of the general proof of God's existence given above (I, Section A) is confirmed. It is also clear that the extreme form of Traditionalism (q. v.), which would hold that no certain knowledge of God's existence or nature is attainable by human reason without the aid of supernatural revelation, is condemned.

(2) And what the author of Wisdom and St. Paul, and after them the Fathers and theologians had constantly taught, has been solemnly defined by the Vatican Council. In the first place, as against Agnosticism and Traditionalism, the council teaches (cap. ii, De revelat.) "That God, the first cause (*principium*) and last end of all things, can, from created things, be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason" (Denz., 1785—old no. 1634); and in the corresponding canon (can. i, De revelat.) it anathematizes anyone who would say "that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot, through the things that are made, be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason" (Denz., 1806—old no. 1653). As against Agnosticism this definition needs no explanation. As against Traditionalism, it is to be observed that the definition is directed only against the extreme form of that theory, as held by Lamennais and others, according to which, taking human nature as it is, there would not, and could not, have been any true or certain knowledge of God, among men, had there not been at least a primitive supernatural revelation—in other words natural religion as such is an impossibility. There is no reference to milder forms of Traditionalism which hold social tradition and education to be necessary for the development of man's rational powers, and consequently deny, for example, that an individual cut off from human society from his infancy, and left entirely to himself, could ever attain a

certain knowledge of God, or any strictly rational knowledge at all. That is a psychological problem on which the council has nothing to say. Neither does it deny that even in case of the *homo socialis* a certain degree of education and culture may be required in order that he may, by independent reasoning, arrive at a knowledge of God; but it merely affirms the broad principle that by the proper use of their natural reasoning power, applied to the phenomena of the universe, men are able to know God with certainty.

In the next place, as against Pantheism, the council (cap. i, De Deo) teaches that God, "since He is one singular, altogether simple and incommutable spiritual substance, must be proclaimed to be really and essentially [*re et essentialiter*] distinct from the world, most happy in and by Himself, and ineffably above and beyond all things, actual or possible, besides Himself" (Denzinger, 1782—old no. 1631); and in the corresponding canons (ii–iv, De Deo) anathema is pronounced against anyone who would say "that nothing exists but matter"; or "that the substance or essence of God and of all things is one and the same"; or "that finite things both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the Divine substance; or that the Divine essence by a manifestation or evolution of itself becomes all things; or that God is universal or indefinite being, which by determining itself constitutes the universe of things distinguished into genera, species and individuals" (Denzinger, 1802–4—old no. 1648). These definitions are framed so as to cover and exclude every type of the pantheistic theory, and nobody will deny that they are in harmony with Scriptural teaching. The doctrine of creation, for example (see CREATION), than which none is more clearly taught or more frequently emphasized in Sacred Scripture, is radically opposed to Pantheism—creation as the sacred writers understand it being the voluntary act of a free agent bringing creatures into being out of nothingness.

(3) It will be observed that neither the Scriptural texts we have quoted nor the Vatican decrees say that God's existence can be *proved* or *demonstrated*; they merely affirm that it can be *known with certainty*. Now one may, if one wishes, insist on the distinction between what is *knowable* and what is *demonstrable*, but in the present connexion this distinction has little real import. It has never been claimed that God's existence can be proved mathematically, as a proposition in geometry is proved, and most Theists reject every form of the ontological or deductive proof. But if the term proof or demonstration may be, as it often is, applied to a posteriori or inductive inference, by means of which knowledge that is not innate or intuitive is acquired by the exercise of reason, then it cannot fairly be denied that Catholic teaching virtually asserts that God's existence can be *proved*. Certain knowledge of God is declared to be attainable "by the light of reason", i. e. of the reasoning faculty as such, *from or through* "the things that are made"; and this clearly implies an inferential process such as in other connexions men do not hesitate to call proof.

Hence it is fair to conclude that the Vatican Council, following Sacred Scripture, has virtually condemned the Scepticism which rejects the a posteriori proof [see above, A, (1)]. But it did not deal directly with Ontologism, although certain propositions of the Ontologists had already been condemned as unsafe (*tuto tradi non posse*) by a decree of the Holy Office, 18 Sept., 1861 (Denzinger, 1659 sq.—old no. 1516), and among the propositions of Rosmini subsequently condemned (14 Dec., 1887) several reassert the ontological principle (Denzinger, 1891 sq.—old no. 1736). This condemnation by the Holy Office is quite sufficient to discredit Ontologism, regarding which it is enough to say here (a) that, as already observed (I, A.), experience contradicts the assumption that the human mind has naturally or necessarily an immediate con-

sciousness or intuition of the Divine, (b) that such a theory obscures, and tends to do away with, the difference, on which St. Paul insists (I Cor., xiii, 12), between our earthly knowledge of God ("through a glass in a dark manner") and the vision of Him which the blessed in heaven enjoy ("face to face"), and seems irreconcilable with the Catholic doctrine, defined by the Council of Vienne, that, to be capable of the face to face or intuitive vision of God, the human intellect needs to be endowed with a special supernatural light, the *lumen gloriae*, and (c) finally that, in so far as it is clearly intelligible, the theory goes dangerously near to Pantheism.

In the decree "Lamentabili" (3 July, 1907) and the Encyclical "Pascendi" (7 Sept., 1907), issued by Pope Pius X, the Catholic position is once more reaffirmed and theological Agnosticism condemned. In its bearing on our subject this latest act of Church authority is merely a restatement of the teaching of St. Paul and of the Vatican Council and a reassertion of the principle which has been always maintained, that God must be naturally knowable if faith in Him and His revelation is to be reasonable; and if a concrete example be needed to show how, of logical necessity, the substance of Christianity vanishes into thin air once the agnostic principle is adopted, one has only to point the finger at Modernism. Rational theism is a necessary logical basis for revealed religion; and that the natural knowledge of God and natural religion, which Catholic teaching holds to be possible, are not necessarily the result of grace, i. e. of a supernatural aid given directly by God Himself, follows from the condemnation by Clement XI of one of the propositions of Quesnel (prop. 41) in which the contrary is asserted (Denzinger, 1391—old no. 1256).

B. *The Divine Nature and Attributes*.—(1) As we have already seen, reason teaches that God is one simple and infinitely perfect spiritual substance or nature, and Sacred Scripture and the Church teach the same. The creeds, for example, usually begin with a profession of faith in the one true God, Who is the Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, and is also, in the words of the Vatican Council, "omnipotent, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intellect and will and in every perfection" (Sess. III, cap. i, De Deo, in Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 1782—old no. 1631). The best way in which we can describe the Divine nature is to say that it is infinitely perfect, or that God is the infinitely perfect Being; but we must always remember that even *being* itself, the most abstract and universal term we possess, is predicated of God and of creatures not univocally or identically, but only analogically. But other predicates, which, as applied to creatures, express certain specific determinations of being, are also used of God—analogically, if in themselves they express pure or unmixed perfection, but only metaphorically if they necessarily connote imperfection. Now of such predicates as applied to creatures we distinguish between those that are used in the concrete to denote *being as such*, more or less determined (v. g., substance, spirit, etc.), and those that are used in the abstract or adjectively to denote *determinations, or qualities, or attributes* of being (v. g., good, goodness; intelligent, intelligence; etc.); and we find it useful to transfer this distinction to God, and to speak of the Divine *nature* or *essence* and Divine *attributes*, being careful at the same time, by insisting on Divine simplicity (see above I.), to avoid error or contradiction in its application. For, as applied to God, the distinction between nature and attributes, and between the attributes themselves, is merely logical and not real. The finite mind is not capable of comprehending the Infinite so as adequately to describe its essence by any single concept or term; but while using a multitude of terms, all of which are analogically true, we do not mean to imply that there is any kind of composition in God. Thus, as applied to creatures, good-

ness and justice, for example, are distinct from each other and from the nature or substance of the beings in whom they are found, and if finite limitations compel us to speak of such perfections in God as if they were similarly distinct, we know, nevertheless, and are ready, when needful, to explain, that this is not really so, but that all Divine attributes are really identical with one another and with the Divine essence.

(2) The Divine attributes or perfections which may thus logically be distinguished are very numerous, and it would be a needless task to attempt to enumerate them fully. But among them some are recognized as being of fundamental importance, and to these in particular is the term *attributes* applied and special notice devoted by theologians—though there is no rigid agreement as to the number or classification of such attributes. As good a classification as any other is that based on the analogy of *entitative* and *operative* perfections in creatures—the former qualifying nature or essence as such and abstracting from activity, the latter referring especially to the activity of the nature in question. Another distinction is often made between *physical*, and *moral* or *ethical*, attributes—the former of themselves abstracting from, while the latter directly express, moral perfection. But without labouring with the question of classification, it will suffice to notice separately those attributes of leading importance that have not been already explained. Nothing need be added to what has been said above concerning *self-existence*, *infinity*, *unity*, and *simplicity* (which belong to the entitative class); but *eternity*, *immensity*, and *immutability* (also of the entitative class), together with the active attributes, whether physical or moral, connected with the Divine *intellect* and *will*, call for some explanation here.

(a) *Eternity*.—By saying that God is eternal we mean that in essence, life, and action He is altogether beyond temporal limits and relations. He has neither beginning, nor end, nor duration by way of sequence or succession of moments. There is no past or future for God—but only an eternal present. If we say that He *was* or that He *acted*, or that He *will be* or *will act*, we mean in strictness that He *is* or that He *acts*; and this truth is well expressed by Christ when He says (John, viii, 58—A.V.): "Before Abraham *was*, I *am*." Eternity, therefore, as predicated of God, does not mean indefinite duration in time—a meaning in which the term is sometimes used in other connexions—but it means the total exclusion of the finiteness which time implies. We are obliged to use negative language in describing it, but in itself eternity is a positive perfection, and as such may be best defined in the words of Boethius as being "interminabilis vitæ tota simul et perfecta possessio", i. e. possession in full entirety and perfection of life without beginning, end, or succession.

The eternity of God is a corollary from His self-existence and infinity. Time being a measure of finite existence, the infinite must transcend it. God, it is true, coexists *with* time, as He coexists with creatures, but He does not exist *in* time, so as to be subject to temporal relations: His self-existence is timeless. Yet the positive perfection expressed by duration as such, i. e. persistency and permanency of being, belongs to God and is truly predicated of Him, as when He is spoken of, for example, as "Him that is, and that was, and that is to come" (Apoc., i, 4); but the strictly temporal connotation of such predicates must always be corrected by recalling the true notion of eternity.

(b) *Immensity* and *Ubiquity*, or *Omnipresence*.—Space, like time, is one of the measures of the finite, and as by the attribute of eternity we describe God's transcendence of all temporal limitations, so by the attribute of immensity we express His transcendent relation to space. There is this difference, however, to be noted between eternity and immensity, that the positive aspect of the latter is more easily realized by

us, and is sometimes spoken of, under the name of omnipresence, or ubiquity, as if it were a distinct attribute. Divine immensity means on the one hand that God is necessarily present everywhere in space as the immanent cause and sustainer of creatures, and on the other hand that He transcends the limitations of actual and possible space, and cannot be circumscribed or measured or divided by any spatial relations. To say that God is immense is only another way of saying that He is both immanent and transcendent in the sense already explained. As some one has metaphorically and paradoxically expressed it, "God's centre is everywhere, His circumference nowhere".

That God is not subject to spatial limitations follows from His infinite simplicity; and that He is truly present in every place or thing—that He is omnipresent or ubiquitous—follows from the fact that He is the cause and ground of all reality. According to our finite manner of thinking we conceive this presence of God in things spatial as being primarily a presence of power and operation—immediate Divine efficiency being required to sustain created beings in existence and to enable them to act; but, as every kind of Divine action *ad extra* is really identical with the Divine nature or essence, it follows that God is really present everywhere in creation not merely *per virtutem et operationem*, but *per essentiam*. In other words God Himself, or the Divine nature, is in immediate contact with, or immanent in, every creature—conserving it in being and enabling it to act. But while insisting on this truth we must, if we would avoid contradiction, reject every form of the pantheistic hypothesis. While emphasizing Divine immanence we must not overlook Divine transcendence.

There is no lack of Scriptural or ecclesiastical testimonies asserting God's immensity and ubiquity. It is enough to refer for example to Heb., i, 3; iv, 12, 13; Acts, xvii, 24, 27, 28; Eph., i, 23; Col., i, 16, 17; Ps. cxxxviii, 7-12; Job, xii, 10, etc.

(c) Immutability.—In God "there is no change, nor shadow of alteration" (James, i, 17); "They [i. e. "the works of thy hands"] shall perish, but thou shalt continue: and they shall all grow old as a garment. And as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the selfsame, and thy years shall not fail" (Heb., i, 10-12; Ps. ci, 26-28. Cf. Mal., iii, 6; Heb., xiii, 8). These are some of the Scriptural texts which clearly teach Divine immutability or unchangeableness, and this attribute is likewise emphasized in church teaching, as by the Council of Nicæa against the Arians, who attributed mutability to the Logos (Denzinger, 54—old No. 18), and by the Vatican Council in the definition quoted above.

That the Divine nature is essentially immutable, or incapable of any internal change, is an obvious corollary from Divine infinity. Changeableness implies the capacity for increase or diminution of perfection, that is, it implies finiteness and imperfection. But God is infinitely perfect and is necessarily what He is. It is true that some attributes by which certain aspects of Divine perfection are described are hypothetical or relative, in the sense that they presuppose the contingent fact of creation: omnipresence, for example, presupposes the actual existence of spatial beings. But it is obvious that the mutability implied in this belongs to creatures, and not to the Creator; and it is a strange confusion of thought that has led some modern Theists—even professing Christians—to maintain that such attributes can be laid aside by God, and that the Logos in becoming incarnate actually did lay them aside, or at least ceased from their active exercise. But as creation itself did not affect the immutability of God, so neither did the incarnation of a Divine Person; whatever change was involved in either case took place solely in the created nature.

(d) The so-called active Divine attributes are best treated in connexion with the Divine Intellect and

Will—the principles of Divine operation *ad extra*—to which they are all ultimately reducible.

(i) Divine Knowledge.—(a) That God is omniscient, or possesses the most perfect knowledge of all things, follows from His infinite perfection. In the first place He knows and comprehends Himself fully and adequately, and in the next place He knows all created objects and comprehends their finite and contingent mode of being. Hence He knows them individually or singularly in their finite multiplicity; knows everything possible as well as actual; knows what is bad as well as what is good. Everything, in a word, which to our finite minds signifies perfection and completeness of knowledge may be predicated of Divine omniscience, and it is further to be observed that it is on Himself alone that God depends for His knowledge. To make Him in any way dependent on creatures for knowledge of created objects would destroy His infinite perfection and supremacy. Hence it is in His eternal, unchangeable, comprehensive knowledge of Himself or of His own infinite being that God knows creatures and their acts, whether there is question of what is actual or merely possible. Indeed Divine knowledge itself is really identical with Divine essence, as are all the attributes and acts of God; but according to our finite modes of thought we feel the need of conceiving them distinctly and of representing the Divine essence as the medium or mirror in which the Divine intellect sees all truth. Moreover, although the act of Divine knowledge is infinitely simple in itself, we feel the need of further distinctions—not as regards the knowledge in itself, but as regards the multiplicity of finite objects which it embraces. Hence the universally recognized distinction between the knowledge of vision (*scientia visionis*) and that of simple intelligence (*simplicis intelligentiæ*), and the famous controversy regarding the *scientia media*. We shall briefly explain this distinction and the chief difficulties involved in this controversy.

(β) Distinctions in the Divine Knowledge.—In classifying the objects of Divine omniscience the most obvious and fundamental distinction is between things that actually exist at any time, and those that are merely possible. And it is in reference to these two classes of objects that the distinction is made between knowledge "of vision" and "of simple intelligence"—the former referring to things actual, and the latter to the merely possible. This distinction might appear at first sight to be absolutely comprehensive and adequate to the purpose for which we introduce distinctions at all; but some difficulty is felt once the question is raised of God's knowledge of the acts of creatures endowed with free will. That God knows infallibly and from eternity what, for example, a certain man, in the exercise of free will, will do or actually does in any given circumstances, and what he might or would actually have done in different circumstances, is beyond doubt—being a corollary from the eternal actuality of Divine knowledge. So to speak, God has not to wait on the contingent and temporal event of the man's free choice to know what the latter's action will be; He knows it from eternity. But the difficulty is: how, from our finite point of view, to interpret and explain the mysterious manner of God's knowledge of such events without at the same time sacrificing the free will of the creature.

The Dominican school has defended the view that the distinction between knowledge of "vision" and of "simple intelligence" is the only one we need or ought to employ in our effort to conceive and describe Divine omniscience, even in relation to the free acts of intelligent creatures. These acts, if they ever take place, are known or foreknown by God as if they were eternally actual—and this is admitted by all; otherwise they remain in the category of the merely possible—and this is what the Jesuit school denies, pointing for example to statements such as that of Christ re-



garding the people of Tyre and Sidon, who would have done penance had they received the same graces as the Jews (Matt., xi, 21). This school therefore maintains that to the actual as such and the purely possible we must add another category of objects, viz., hypothetical facts that may never become actual, but would become actual were certain conditions realized. The hypothetical truth of such facts, it is rightly contended, is more than mere possibility, yet less than actuality; and since God knows such facts in their hypothetical character there is good reason for introducing a distinction to cover them—and this is the *scientia media*. And it is clear that even acts that take place and as such fall finally under the knowledge of vision may be conceived as falling first under the knowledge of simple intelligence and then under the *scientia media*; the progressive formula would be: first, *it is possible* Peter would do so and so; second, Peter *would* do so and so, given certain conditions; third, Peter *will* do or *does* so and so.

Now, were it not for the differences that lie behind, there would probably be no objection raised to *scientia media*; but the distinction itself is only the prelude to the real problem. Admitting that God knows from eternity the future free acts of creatures, the question is how or in what way He knows them, or rather how we are to conceive and explain by analogy the manner of the divine foreknowledge, which in itself is beyond our powers of comprehension? It is admitted that God knows them first as objects of the knowledge of simple intelligence; but does he know them also as objects of the *scientia media*, i.e. hypothetically and independently of any decree of His will, determining their actuality, or does He know them only in and through such decrees? The Dominican contention is that God's knowledge of future free acts depends on the decrees of His free will which predetermine their actuality by means of the *præmotio physica*. God knows, for example, that Peter will do so and so, because He has decreed from eternity so to move Peter's free will that the latter will infallibly, although freely, co-operate with, or consent to, the Divine premotion. In the case of good acts there is a physical and intrinsic connexion between the motion given by God and the consent of Peter's will, while as regards morally bad acts, the immorality as such, which is a privation and not a positive entity, comes entirely from the created will.

The principal difficulties against this view are that in the first place it seems to do away with human free will, and in the next place to make God responsible for sin. Both consequences of course are denied by those who uphold it, but, making all due allowance for the mystery which shrouds the subject, it is difficult to see how the denial of free will is not logically involved in the theory of the *præmotio physica*, how the will can be said to consent freely to a motion which is conceived as predetermining consent; such explanations as are offered merely amount to the assertion that after all the human will is free. The other difficulty consists in the twofold fact that God is represented as giving the *præmotio physica* in the natural order for the act of will by which the sinner embraces evil, and that He withholds the supernatural *præmotio* or efficacious grace which is essentially required for the performance of a salutary act. The Jesuit school on the other hand—with whom probably a majority of independent theologians agree—utilizing the *scientia media* maintains that we ought to conceive God's knowledge of future free acts not as being dependent and consequent upon decrees of His will, but in its character as hypothetical knowledge or being antecedent to them. God knows in the *scientia media* what Peter would do if in given circumstances he were to receive a certain aid, and this before any absolute decree to give that aid is supposed. Thus there is no predetermination by the Divine of what the human

will freely chooses; it is not because God foreknows (having foredecreed) a certain free act that that act takes place, but God foreknows it in the first instance because as a matter of fact it is going to take place; He knows it as a hypothetical objective fact before it becomes an object of the *scientia visionis*—or rather this is how, in order to safeguard human liberty, we must conceive Him as knowing it. It was thus, for example, that Christ knew what would have been the results of His ministry among the people of Tyre and Sidon. But one must be careful to avoid implying that God's knowledge is in any way dependent on creatures, as if He had, so to speak, to await the actual event in time before knowing infallibly what a free creature may choose to do. From eternity He knows, but does not predetermine the creature's choice. And if it be asked how we can conceive this knowledge to exist antecedently to and independently of some act of the Divine will, on which all things contingent depend, we can only say that the objective truth expressed by the hypothetical facts in question is somehow reflected in the Divine Essence, which is the mirror of all truth, and that in knowing Himself God knows these things also. Whichever way we turn we are bound ultimately to encounter a mystery, and, when there is a question of choosing between a theory which refers the mystery to God Himself and one which only saves the truth of human freedom by making free-will itself a mystery, most theologians not unnaturally prefer the former alternative.

(ii) The Divine Will.—(a) The highest perfections of creatures are reducible to functions of intellect and will, and, as these perfections are realized analogically in God, we naturally pass from considering Divine knowledge or intelligence to the study of Divine volition. The object of intellect as such is the true; the object of will as such, the good. In the case of God it is evident that His own infinite goodness is the primary and necessary object of His will, created goodness being but a secondary and contingent object. This is what the inspired writer means when he says: "The Lord hath made all things for himself" (Prov., xvi, 4). The Divine will of course, like the Divine intellect, is really identical with the Divine Essence, but according to our finite modes of thought we are obliged to speak of them as if they were distinct; and, just as the Divine intellect cannot be dependent on created objects for its knowledge of them, neither can the Divine will be so dependent for its volition. Had no creature ever been created God would have been the same self-sufficient being that He is, the Divine will as an appetitive faculty being satisfied with the infinite goodness of the Divine Essence itself. This is what the Vatican Council means by speaking of God as "most happy in and by Himself"—not that He does not truly wish and love the goodness of creatures, which is a participation of His own, but that He has no need of creatures and is in no way dependent on them for His bliss.

(β) Hence it follows that God possesses the perfection of free will in an infinitely eminent degree. That is to say, without any change in Himself or in His eternal act of volition, He freely chooses whether or not creatures shall exist and what manner of existence shall be theirs, and this choice or determination is an exercise of that dominion which free will (liberty of indifference) essentially expresses. In itself free will is an absolute and positive perfection, and as such is most fully realized in God. Yet we are obliged to describe Divine liberty as we have done relatively to its effects in creation, and, by way of negation, we must exclude the imperfections associated with free will in creatures. These imperfections may be reduced to two, viz., potentiality and mutability as opposed to immutable pure act, and the power of choosing what is evil. Only the second need be noticed here.

(γ) When a free creature chooses what is evil, he does not choose it formally as such, but only *sub specie boni*, i. e., what his will really embraces is some aspect of goodness which he truly or falsely believes to be discoverable in the evil act. Moral evil ultimately consists in choosing some such fancied good which is known more or less clearly to be opposed to the Supreme Good, and it is obvious that only a finite being can be capable of such a choice. God necessarily loves Himself, who is the Supreme Good, and cannot wish anything that would be opposed to Himself. Yet He permits the sins of creatures, and it has always been considered one of the gravest problems of theism to explain why this is so. We cannot enter on the problem here, but must content ourselves with a few brief observations. First, however difficult, or even mysterious, may be the problem of moral evil for the theist, it is many times more difficult for every kind of anti-theist. Secondly, so far as we can judge, the possibility of moral defection seems to be a natural limitation of created free will, and can only be excluded supernaturally; and, even viewing the question from a purely rational standpoint, we are conscious on the whole that, whatever the final solution may be, it is better that God should have created free beings capable of sinning than that He should not have created free beings at all. Few men would resign the faculty of free will just to escape the danger of abusing it. Thirdly, some final solution, not at present apparent to our limited intelligence, may be expected on merely rational grounds from the infinite wisdom and justice of God, and supernatural revelation, which gives us glimpses of the Divine plan, goes a long way towards supplying a complete answer to the questions that most intimately concern us. The clearly perceived truth to be emphasized here is that sin is hateful to God and essentially opposed to His infinite holiness, and that the wilful discord which sin introduces into the harmony of the universe will somehow be set right in the end.

There is no need to delay in discussing mere physical as distinct from moral evil, and it is enough to remark that such evil is not merely permitted, but willed by God, not indeed in its character as evil, but as being, in such a universe as the present, a means towards good and in itself relatively good.

(δ) As distinctions are made in the Divine knowledge, so also in the Divine will, and one of these latter is of sufficient importance to deserve a passing notice here. This is the distinction between the *antecedent* and *consequent* will, and its principal application is to the question of man's salvation. God, according to St. Paul (I Tim., ii, 4), "will have all men to be saved", and this is explained to be an antecedent will; that is to say, abstracting from circumstances and conditions which may interfere with the fulfilment of God's will (e. g., sin on man's part, natural order in the universe, etc.), He has a sincere wish that all men should attain supernatural salvation, and this will is so far efficacious that He provides and intends the necessary means of salvation for all—sufficient actual graces for those who are capable of co-operating with them and the Sacrament of Baptism for infants. On the other hand the consequent will takes account of those circumstances and conditions and has reference to what God wills and executes in consequence of them. It is thus for example that He condemns the wicked to punishment after death and excludes unbaptized infants from the beatific vision.

(iii) Providence. Predestination. Reprobation.—Several attributes and several aspects of Divine activity partake both of an intellectual and a volitional character and must be treated from the combined point of view. Such are omnipotence, holiness, justice, blessedness, and so forth, but it is unnecessary to delay on such attributes which are self-explanatory. Some notice, on the other hand, must be devoted to

providence and to the particular aspects of providence which we call *predestination* and *reprobation*; and with a brief treatment of these which are elsewhere fully treated this article will be concluded.

(α) Providence may be defined as the scheme in the Divine mind by which all things treated are ordered and guided efficiently to a common end or purpose (*ratio perductionis rerum in finem in mente divinā existens*). It includes an act of intellect and an act of will, in other words knowledge and power. And that there is such a thing as Divine Providence by which the entire universe is ruled clearly follows from the fact that God is the author of all things and that order and purpose must characterize the action of an intelligent creator. Nor is any truth more insistently proclaimed in revelation. What the author of Wisdom (xiv, 3) says of a particular thing is applicable to the universe as a whole: "But thy providence, O Father, governeth it"; and no more beautiful illustration of the same truth has ever been given than that given by Christ Himself when He instances God's care for the birds of the air and the lilies of the field (Matt., vi, 25 sq.). But to rational creatures God's providential care is extended in a very special way, yet not so as to do away with the utility and efficacy of prayer, whether for temporal or spiritual favours (Matt., vii, 8), nor to disturb or override the efficiency of secondary causes. It is in and through secondary causes that providence ordinarily works, and no miracle as a rule is to be expected in answer to prayer.

(β) Predestination and reprobation are those special parts of Divine Providence which deal specially with man's salvation or damnation in the present supernatural order. Predestination is the foreknowledge on the part of God of those who will *de facto* be saved and the preparation and bestowal of the means by which salvation is obtained; while reprobation is the foreknowledge of those who will *de facto* be damned and the permission of this eventuality by God. In both cases an act of the intellect, infallible foreknowledge, and an act of the will are supposed; but whereas in predestination the antecedent and consequent will is the same, in reprobation God wills consequently what He does not antecedently will at all but only permits, viz., the eternal punishment of the sinner.

Many controversies have arisen on the subject of predestination and reprobation, into which we cannot enter here. But we shall briefly summarize the leading points on which Catholic theologians have agreed and the points on which they differ.

First, that predestination exists, i. e. that God knows from eternity with infallible certainty who will be saved and that He wills from eternity to give them the graces by which salvation will be secured, is obvious from reason and is taught by Christ Himself (John, x, 27), and by St. Paul (Rom., viii, 29, 30).

Second, while God has this infallible foreknowledge, we on our part cannot have an absolutely certain assurance that we are among the number of the predestined—unless indeed by means of a special Divine revelation such as we know from experience is rarely, if ever, given. This follows from the Tridentine condemnation of the teaching of the Reformers that we could and ought to believe with the certainty of faith in our own justification and election (Sess. VI, cap. ix, can. xiii–xv).

Third, the principal controverted point regarding predestination between Catholic theologians is concerned with its gratuity, and in order to understand the controversy it is necessary to distinguish between predestination *in intention*, i. e. as it is a mere act of knowledge and of purpose in the Divine mind, and *in execution*, i. e. as it means the actual bestowal of grace and of glory; and also between predestination in the *adequate* sense, as referring both to grace and to glory, and in the *inadequate* sense, as referring particularly to one's destination to glory, and abstracting

from the grace by which glory is obtained. Now, (1) speaking of predestination in execution, all Catholic theologians maintain in opposition to Calvinists that it is not entirely gratuitous, but in the case of adults depends partly on the free mercy of God and partly on human co-operation; the actual bestowal of glory is at least partly a reward of true merit. (2) Speaking of predestination in intention and in the adequate sense, Catholic theologians agree that it is gratuitous; so understood it includes the first grace which cannot be merited by man. (3) But if we speak of predestination in intention and in the inadequate sense, i. e. to glory in abstraction from grace, there is no longer unanimity of opinion. Most Thomists and several other theologians maintain that predestination in this sense is gratuitous, i. e. God first destines a man to glory antecedently to any foreseen merits, and consequently upon this decrees to give the efficacious grace by which it is obtained. Predestination to grace is the result of an entirely gratuitous predestination to glory, and with this is combined for those not included in the decree of election what is known as a negative reprobation. Other theologians maintain on the contrary that there is no such thing as negative reprobation, and that predestination to glory is not gratuitous but dependent on foreseen merits. The order of dependence, according to these theologians, is the same in predestination in intention as it is in predestination in execution, and as already stated the bestowal of glory only follows upon actual merit in the case of adults. These have been the two prevailing opinions followed for the most part in the schools, but a third opinion, which is a somewhat subtle *via media*, has been put forward by certain other theologians and defended with great skill by so recent an authority as Billot. The gist of this view is that while negative reprobation must be rejected, gratuitous election to glory *ante praevisa merita* must be retained, and an effort is made to prove that these two may be logically separated, a possibility overlooked by the advocates of the first two opinions. Without entering into details here, it is enough to observe that the success of this subtle expedient is very questionable.

Fourth, as regards reprobation, (1) all Catholic theologians are agreed that God foresees from eternity and permits the final defection of some, but that the decree of His will destining them to eternal damnation is not antecedent to but consequent upon foreknowledge of their sin and their death in the state of sin. The first part of this proposition is a simple corollary from Divine omniscience and supremacy, and the second part is directed against Calvinistic and Jansenistic teaching, according to which God expressly created some for the purpose of punishing them, or at least that subsequently to the fall of Adam, He leaves them in the state of damnation for the sake of exhibiting His wrath. Catholic teaching on this point echoes II Peter, iii, 9, according to which God does not wish that any should perish but that all should return to penance, and it is the teaching implied in Christ's own description of the sentence that is to be pronounced on the damned, condemnation being grounded not on the antecedent will of God, but on the actual demerits of men themselves (e. g. Matt., xxv, 41). (2) So-called negative reprobation, which is commonly defended by those who maintain election to glory antecedently to foreseen merits, means that simultaneously with the predestination of the elect God either positively excludes the damned from the decree of election to glory or at least fails to include them in it, without, however, destining them to positive punishment except consequently on their foreseen demerits. It is this last qualification that distinguishes the doctrine of negative reprobation from Calvinistic and Jansenistic teaching, leaving room, for instance, for a condition of perfect natural

happiness for those dying with only original sin on their souls. But, notwithstanding this difference, the doctrine ought to be rejected; for it is opposed very plainly to the teaching of St. Paul regarding the universality of God's will to save all (I Tim., ii, 4), and from a rational point of view it is difficult to reconcile with a worthy concept of Divine justice.

A pretty full bibliography of Theism (especially of modern non-Catholic works) will be found in BALDWIN, *Dict. of Philosophy*, III, 745-811. We will mention here only a few select works: (a) as good samples of patristic and medieval treatment, ST. AUGUSTINE, *C. Academicos* and *De Civitate Dei*; ST. ANSELM, *Monologium* and *Proslogium*; ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theol.*, I, Q. ii, and *C. Gentis*, I, xiii; (b) as valuable guides to patristic teaching: PETAVIUS and THOMASINUS, *De Dogmaticis Theologicis*; (c) as modern systematic treatises: FRÄNZELIN, *De Deo Uno* (3rd ed., Rome, 1883); BILLOT, *De Deo Uno et Trino* (1895), and other standard writers in Latin on dogmatic theology; PIAT, *De La Croissance en Dieu* (Paris, 1907); MICHELET, *Dieu et L'Agnosticisme Contemporain* (Paris, 1909); AVELING, *The God of Philosophy* (London, 1906); BOEDDER, *Natural Theology* (Stonyhurst Series, 2nd ed., 1906); DRISCOLL, *God* (2nd ed., New York); and among non-Catholics: FLINT, *Theism* (Edinburgh, 1877); MARTINEAU, *Study of Religion* (Bks. II and III); HALL, *The Being and Attributes of God* (London, 1909; this work is rich in bibliographical references). See also DEISM; THEISM; TRINITY; PREDESTINATION; PROVIDENCE; etc.

P. J. TONER.

**Godard** (GOTHARD, GODEHARD), SAINT, Bishop of Hildesheim in Lower Saxony; b. about the year 960, in a village of Upper Bavaria, near the Abbey of Altaich, in the Diocese of Passau; d. on 4 May, 1038; canonized by Innocent II in 1131. After a lengthy course of studies he received the Benedictine habit in 991. Having entered the Abbey of Altaich, his learning and sanctity speedily procured his elevation to the dignity of prior, and afterwards that of abbot, in the discharge of which sacred duties Godard went far towards enforcing rigorous observance of rule among those placed under his care. His special fitness in this department led to his being chosen to effect the work of reform in the Abbeys of Hersfeld, in Hesse; Tegernsee, in the Diocese of Freising; and Kremsmünster, in the Diocese of Passau. On the death of St. Bernard, Bishop of Hildesheim (1021), Godard was chosen to succeed him; but his modesty yielded only to the urgent admonitions of Emperor St. Henry II. His zeal and prudence kept up the high tradition of Godard's cloistered activity. The monastic observance was established, as far as possible, in his cathedral chapter. He built schools for the education of youth in which he always manifested an active interest; maintained a rigorous personal surveillance over his seminary; and fostered a strict observance of the liturgy whilst attending to the building and upkeep of churches. He also exercised a paternal care for the material needs of his people. Many churches in Germany honour Godard as patron and several bear his name. His letters which have come down to us exhibit a lofty spiritual tone throughout. Godard was buried in his cathedral. In 1132, the year following his canonization and the translation of his relics, the erection of a Benedictine monastery, under the patronage of St. Godard, was begun, and two altars were dedicated to him in the cathedral church.

MÜLLER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Gotthard*; WOLFFER, *Vita Godehardi, prior et posterior in Mon. Germ. Hist., Scriptores*, XI, 167 sq.; HUFFER, *Die Lebensbeschreibung der Bischöfe Bernward u. Godehard* (Berlin, 1858); SULZBECK, *Leben des hl. Gotthard* (Ratisbon, 1863); KRATZ, *Der Dom zu Hildesheim*, III (Hildesheim, 1840), 53 sq.; LUNTZEL, *Gesch. der Diocese u. Stadt Hildesheim*, I (Hildesheim, 1858), 195 sqq.; MABILLON, *Acta SS. Bened.* (1701), VI, i, 395-96.

P. J. MACAULEY.

**Godden** (true name TYLDEN), THOMAS, b. at Addington, Kent, 1624, d. in London, 1 Dec., 1688. His father, William Tylden, was able to provide a liberal education for his son and Thomas was sent first to a private school in Holburn, conducted by a Mr. Gill, and in his fifteenth year entered Queen's College, Oxford. The next year found him at St. John's

College, Cambridge, and in 1640 he was made a Billingsley scholar. He proceeded B.A. in 1641, but the influence of John Sergeant, with whom he became acquainted during his college course, had induced him to enter the Catholic Church, and in 1642 the two set out for the English College at Lisbon. In due course Godden was ordained, and so distinguished himself by his scholarship and controversial ability that in 1650 we find him lecturing on philosophy in the college. He rapidly ascended the ladder of academic distinction, and after being successively professor of theology, prefect of studies, and vice-president, succeeded Dr. Clayton as president of the college in 1655. Five years later he was thought worthy of the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and had established so general a reputation for eloquence and piety that the Princess Catherine of Braganza, about to become the bride of Charles II, brought Godden to England with her, as her private chaplain. He was well received in his native country and enjoyed every evidence of royal favour.

The disturbances caused by Oates' plot, however, affected Godden very seriously. The perjured Miles Prance, upon being examined on the murder of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, swore that Godden and his servant Lawrence Hill had been concerned in the crime, and that Godfrey's corpse had been concealed for a time in Godden's apartments. Public indignation was running too high against everything Catholic to hope for a sober and impartial investigation, and Godden managed to escape to the Continent, and took refuge in Paris. His lodgings in Somerset House were searched and Hill, despite the testimony of witnesses who swore that he was elsewhere at the time of the murder, was convicted and executed at Tyburn, 21 Feb., 1679. Later evidence, tending to show that Godden was in no way connected with Godfrey's death, altered popular feeling, and in the reign of James II, he returned to his former post as almoner to the queen dowager. From this time until his death he took a prominent part in the religious controversies in England, and in 1686, with Dr. Giffard, defended the doctrine of the Real Presence, before the king, against Dr. William Jane and Dr. Simon Patrick. He was buried under the royal chapel in Somerset House.

Godden's printed works are for the most part controversial and religious. They include "Catholicks no Idolaters; or a full Refutation of Dr. Stillingfleet's Unjust Charge of Idolatry against the Church of Rome" (London, 1671); "A Just Discharge to Dr. Stillingfleet's Unjust Charge of Idolatry against the Church of Rome. With a Discovery of the Vanity of his late Defence . . . By way of Dialogue between Eunomius, a Conformist and Catharinus, a non-Conformist" (Paris, 1677); "A Sermon of St. Peter, preached before the Queen Dowager . . . on 29 June, 1686" (London, 1686); "A Sermon on the Nativity of Our Lord, preached before the Queen Dowager . . . at Somerset House" (London, 1686). He also left a manuscript treatise on the Oath of Supremacy.

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II, 503; III, 307; PANZANI, *Memoirs*, p. 338; Wood, *Athena Oxon.*, IV, 93, 674; LUTTRELL, *Hist. Relation of State Affairs*, I, 391; *Cath. Mag.*, V, 621; VI, 59; *The Tablet*, 16 Feb., 1889, p. 257.

STANLEY J. QUINN.

**Godeau, ANTOINE**, bishop, poet, and exegete; b. at Dreux in the Diocese of Chartres, 1605; d. at Venice, 21 April, 1672. His facility in verse-writing early won the interest of a relative in Paris, M. Conrart, at whose house the elect of the literary world gathered to hear and discuss the productions of the young poet. The outcome of these meetings was the foundation of the French Academy, of which Godeau was one of the first members and the third to whose lot it fell to deliver the weekly address to that body. He was induced to settle in Paris, where he soon became a favourite at the Hôtel Rambouillet, rivalling in the

fecundity and ingenuity of his verse the most famous writers of his period. At that time to say of any work *c'est de Godeau* was to stamp it with the seal of approval. Perhaps best known among the works of his early days is his "Discours sur les œuvres de Malherbe" (1629), which shows some critical power and is valuable for the history of the French prose of the seventeenth century. After some time Godeau forsook the company of gallants and the pursuit of literature for its own sake to devote himself to the service of God, and in 1636 was named Bishop of Grasse by Richelieu, to whom he had dedicated his first religious composition, a poetical paraphrase of the Psalm "Benedicite omnia opera Domini". He proved a model prelate, irreproachable in life, zealous for the interests of his flock, and unwearied in upholding ecclesiastical discipline among his clergy, whom he assembled in synods and admonished in sermons and pastoral letters. By a Bull of Innocent X he was empowered to unite the Dioceses of Grasse and Vence under his administration, but seeing the dissatisfaction of the clergy of the latter diocese, he relinquished the former and established himself at Vence.

But Godeau by no means gave up his public and literary interests. In 1645 and 1655 he took a prominent part in the General Assembly of the French Clergy, and under the regency of Anne of Austria was deputy from the Estates of Provence. He turned his talent for versification to religious uses, his best known productions being a metrical version of the Psalms, poems on St. Paul, the Assumption, St. Eustace, Mary Magdalen, and one of 15,000 lines on the annals of the Church. The monotony and mechanical arrangement of the poems are relieved at intervals by passages remarkable for thought or expression, among others those lines embodied by Corneille in his "Polyeucte":—

Leur gloire tombe par terre,  
Et comme elle a l'éclat du verre,  
Elle en a la fragilité.

The Jesuit Father Vavasour published, in 1647, a satire on Godeau, "Antonius Godellus, episcopus Grassensis, an elogii Aureliani scriptor idoneus idemque utrum poeta", the verdict of which was echoed by Boileau in a letter to Maucroix.

The fame of Godeau's poetical works, however, has been quite overshadowed by that of his historical and exegetical works. His "Eloges des Evêques qui dans tous les siècles de l'Eglise ont fleuri en doctrine et en piété" (Paris, 1665) was republished in 1802 by M. Sauffret. His "Histoire de l'église depuis la naissance de Jésus Christ, jusqu' à la fin du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle" (Paris, 1633) was translated into Italian by Speroni and into German by Hyper and Groote (Augsburg, 1768-96), and is still cited. Of this work Alzog says that "although written in an attractive and popular style", it is "lacking in solid worth and original research" (*Manual of Universal History*, I, Dublin, 1900, 33). It is related that during the publication of this work the author chanced one day in a library to engage in conversation with the Oratorian, Père Le Cointe, who, ignorant of Godeau's identity, indicated some grave defects in the volumes which had already appeared, criticisms of which the author availed himself in correcting the work for a new edition. The same Père Le Cointe, later a staunch friend of Godeau's, while conceding to the complete work many excellencies, calls attention to its frequent inaccuracies and lack of critical balance. Minor writings of Godeau's include "Vie de M. de Cordes, conseiller au Châtelet" (1645) and "Eloges historiques des empereurs" (1667).

Among Godeau's works of a religious character are: "Prières, méditations" (Paris, 1643); "Avis à M. de Paris pour le culte du Saint-Sacrement dans les paroisses et de la façon de le porter aux malades" (1644); "Instructions et ordonnances synodales" (1644); "Vie de Saint Paul Apôtre" (1647); "La vie de saint Augustin" (1652); "La panégyrique de saint

Augustin" (1653); "La vie de saint Charles Borromée" (1657); "L'Eloge de saint François de Sales" (1663). His chief title to fame, however, rests on his work in Holy Scripture. His paraphrases of the following books: Romans (Paris, 1635); Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians (1632); Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon (1641); Hebrews (1637); the Canonical Epistles (1640), are still recommended as useful, the sense and connexion of ideas being brought out clearly by the insertion of the fewest possible words (Simon in "Hist. critique des principaux commentateurs du N. T.", c. lviij). His "Version expliquée du nouveau Testament" (1668) is something between a literal translation and a paraphrase. The greatest of all his works, according to Nicéron, is "La morale chrétienne pour l'instruction des Curez et des Prêtres du diocèse de Vence" (Paris, 1709), intended to combat the Casuists, a model of force, clearness, and revealing a precision rarely to be found in the other writings of the same author. In the Latin translation which appeared at Augsburg in 1774 under the title "Theologia moralis ex purissimis s. Scripturæ, patrum ac conciliorum fontibus derivata, notis theologicis illustrata" the arrangement of the matter is greatly improved.

Although opinions vary as to the importance of Bishop Godeau among his contemporaries, it would seem that too much stress is laid on his achievements as a poet which are not at all commensurate in value with his work as a prelate and an exegete. He was stricken with apoplexy and died in his episcopal city at the age of sixty-seven.

*Vie de Godeau in GODEAU, Eloges des Evêques (Metz, 1802), SPERONI DEGLI ALVAROTTI, Vita di A. Godeau, vescovo di Vence (Venice, 1761); SIMON, Histoire critique du Nouveau Testament (1693); DUPIN, Bibl. des auteurs ecclésiastiques du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1719); NICÉRON, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire (Paris, 1727-45); PELLISSON, Hist. de l'Académie française, I (Paris, 1743), 12, 95, 314, 896; RACINE, Abrégé de l'histoire eccl. (1748-56), XIII; SCHRÖDL in Kirchenlex., s. v.*

F. M. RUDGE.

**Godeberta, SAINT**, b. about the year 640, at Boves, a few leagues from Amiens, in France; d. about the beginning of the eighth century, at Noyon (Oise), the ancient Noviomagus. She was very carefully educated, her parents being of noble rank and attached to the court of King Clovis II. When the question of her marriage was being discussed in presence of the king, the saintly Bishop of Noyon, Eligius, as if by inspiration, presented Godeberta with a golden ring and expressed the hope that she might devote her life to the service of God. Godeberta, moved by the Holy Spirit and feeling her heart suddenly filled with Divine love, turned away from the bright prospects before her and refused the advantageous offers that had been made by her noble suitors. She declared her willingness to be the spouse of Christ and asked the holy prelate to allow her to assume the veil. In a short time all opposition to her wishes disappeared and she entered on her new life under the guidance of St. Eligius. The King of the Franks was so impressed by her conduct and her zeal that he made her a present of the small palace which he had at Noyon, together with a little chapel dedicated to St. George. Godeberta's example inspired a number of young women to follow in the same path, and she founded in her new home a convent, of which she became the superioress. Here she passed the remainder of her life in prayer and solitude, save when the call of charity or religion brought her forth among the people, many of whom were still sunk in the vices of paganism. She was remarkable in particular for the constant penances and fasts to which she subjected herself. She had a wonderful faith in the efficacy of that ancient practice of the early Christians—the sign of the cross, and it is recorded, that on one occasion, in 676, during the episcopacy of St. Mommelinus, when the town was threatened with total destruction by

fire, she made the sign of the cross over the flames, and the conflagration was forthwith extinguished. The exact year of her death is unknown, but it is said to have occurred on 11 June, on which day her feast is marked in the Proprium of Beauvais. In Noyon, however, by virtue of an indult, dated 2 April, 1857, it is kept on the fifth Sunday after Easter. The body of the saint was interred in the church of St. George, which was afterwards called by her name.

In 1168 Godeberta's body was solemnly translated from the ruined church where it had rested for over 450 years by Bishop Baudouin to the cathedral of Noyon. Providentially her relics have escaped the ravages of time and fire, and the malice of the irreligious. At the period of the Revolution a pious townsman secretly buried them near the cathedral. When the storm had passed they were recovered from their hiding-place and their authenticity being canonically established they were replaced in the church. A bell is still preserved which tradition avers to have been the one actually used by Godeberta in her convent. It is certainly very ancient and there seems no good reason, in particular from an archaeological point of view, for doubting the trustworthiness of the legend. In the treasury of the cathedral likewise may be seen a gold ring, said to have been that presented by St. Eligius to the saint. Mention is made in a record of the year 1167 of this relic having been then in the possession of the church of Noyon.

Unfortunately the most ancient documents we have giving details of Godeberta's life do not, in all probability, date back beyond the eleventh century, as the oldest "Vita", which, in truth, is rather a panegyric for her feast than a biography, is believed to have been composed by Radbodus, who became Bishop of Noyon in 1067. In those days, too, the aim of such writers was the edification rather than the instruction of the faithful, so we find in this life the usual wonders related in such pious works of that period with but few historic facts. It is certain, however, that St. Godeberta was looked upon as a protector in the time of plagues and catastrophes and we have every reason to hold that this practice was justified by the results that followed her solemn invocation. In 1866 a violent outbreak of typhoid fever occurred in Noyon, decimating the town. On 23 May in that year, one of the leading citizens, whose child had just been stricken down, approached the curé of the church and recalling the favours that had been granted in ages past to the clients of the saint, earnestly asked that the shrine containing her relics should be exposed and a novena of intercession begun. This was done the following day, and forthwith the scourge ceased; it was officially certified that not another case of typhoid occurred. In thanksgiving, a solemn procession took place under the guidance of the bishop, Mgr Gignoux, a few weeks later, the relics of St. Godeberta being carried triumphantly through the town. A beautiful statue of the saint, in the cathedral of Noyon, which was blessed by the bishop on 25 February, 1867, perpetuated the memory of this wonderful event.

*Acta SS.*, April, II, 31-2; LAFFINEUR, *Vie de Sainte Godeberte, vierge et patronne de Noyon* (Noyon, 1856); DE MONTIGNY, *La vie de la bienheureuse vierge sainte Godeberte, patronne et titulaire de la ville de Noyon* (Paris, 1630); GUÉRIN, *Les petits bolandistes*, IV (Paris, 1880), 339-43; CORBIET, *Hagiographie d'Amiens*, II (1870), 550-69.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Godegrand, SAINT**. See CHRODEGANG, SAINT.

**Godelina (GODELIVA)**, SAINT, b. at Hondeforte-lez-Boulogne, c. 1049; d. at Ghistelles, 6 July, 1070. The youngest of the three children born to Hemfrid, seigneur of Wierre-Effroy, and his wife Ogina, Godelina was accustomed as a child to exercises of piety and was soon distinguished for a solidity of virtue extraordinary for one of her years. The poor flocked from all sides to the young girl, whose desires to satisfy



their necessities often involved her in difficulties with her father's steward and even with her pious father himself. By her eighteenth year the fame of her beauty and admirable qualities had spread far and wide through Artois and even into Flanders, and many suitors presented themselves; but, the decision being left with Godelina, she persisted in the resolution she had made of renouncing the world for the cloister. One of the young noblemen, Bertolf of Ghisteltes, determined to leave nothing undone, invoked the influence of her father's suzerain, Eustache II, Count of Boulogne, whose representations proved successful. After the wedding Bertolf and his bride set out for Ghisteltes, where, however, Godelina found a bitter and unrelenting enemy in Bertolf's mother, who induced her son to forsake his wife on the very day of their arrival, and immured Godelina in a narrow cell, with barely enough nourishment to support life. Even this, however, the saint contrived to share with the poor. Under the influence of his mother, Bertolf spread abroad foul calumnies about his bride. After some time Godelina managed to escape to the home of her father, who roused the Bishop of Tournai and Soissons and the Count of Flanders to threaten Bertolf with the terrors of Church and State. Seemingly repentant, he promised to restore his wife to her rightful position, but her return to Ghisteltes was the signal for a renewal of persecution in an aggravated form. After about a year Bertolf, again feigning sorrow, easily effected a reconciliation, but only to avoid the suspicion of the crime he was meditating. During his absence two of his servants at his direction strangled Godelina causing it to appear that she had died a natural death. Bertolf soon contracted a second marriage, but the daughter born to him was blind from birth. Her miraculous recovery of sight through the intercession of St. Godelina so affected her father that, now truly converted, he journeyed to Rome to obtain absolution for his crime, undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and finally entered the monastery of St-Winoc at Bergues, where he expiated his sins by a life of severe penance. At his desire his daughter erected at Ghisteltes a Benedictine monastery dedicated to St. Godelina, which she entered as a religious. Devotion to St. Godelina dates from 1084, when her body was exhumed by the Bishop of Tournai and Noyon, and her relics, recognized at various times by ecclesiastical authority, are to be found in various cities of Belgium.

DESTOMBES, *Vies des saints des diocèses de Cambrai et d'Arras*; DE BAECKER, *La légende de S. Godelieve in Annales de la société d'émulation de Bruges* (1849); *Acta SS.*, 6 July.

F. M. RUDGE.

**Godet des Marais**, PAUL, Bishop of Chartres, France; b. at Taley, near Blois, 1647; d. at Chartres, 1709. He studied at Saint-Sulpice, took the doctorate of theology at the Sorbonne, was ordained, and became (1677) superior of the "Séminaire des Trente-Trois". Louis XIV nominated him (1690) to the See of Chartres, but owing to difficulties between France and the Holy See the papal confirmation came only on 21 Jan., 1692. As spiritual director of Mme de Maintenon, for whom he wrote "Lettres de direction", Godet used his influence to have Mme Guyon removed from Saint-Cyr. A staunch opponent of Quietism, he signed with Noailles and Bossuet the famous "Declaratio" condemning Fénelon's "Maximes des saints" (1697), and wrote (1698) several *ordonnances*, or pastoral letters, against the pseudo-mystical theories of Molinos, Fénelon, and Mme Guyon. He also did much to destroy Jansenism in France, refuted the *cas de conscience* (1703), commanded obedience to the papal constitution of Clement XI (1705), and severely censured Juénin's "Institutions théologiques" (1708). His zeal and charity, as well as his orthodoxy, were set forth in an epitaph written by his successor, Monstiers de Méruville.

FISQUET in *La France Pontificale* (Paris, s. d.), s. v. *Chartres*; PÉRENÈS in FELLER, *Bug Univ.*, s. v. (Paris, 1842); BAUSSET, *Vie de Fénelon* (Paris, 1856); SAINT-SIMON, *Mémoires*.

J. F. SOLLIER.

**Godfather.** See SPONSOR.

**Godfrey of Bouillon**, Duke of Lower Lorraine and first King of Jerusalem, son of Eustache II, Count of Boulogne, and of Ida, daughter of Godfrey the Bearded, Duke of Lower Lorraine; b. probably at Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1060; d. at Jerusalem, 18 July, 1100 (according to a thirteenth-century chronicler, he was born at Baisy, in Brabant; see Haigneré, *Mémoires lus à la Sorbonne*, Paris, 1868, 213). The history of his early years has been distorted by legend, according to which he slew with his own hand the anti-king Rodolphe at the battle of Moelsen (1080), and was the first to enter Rome after it had been besieged by Henry IV (1084). What appears certain is that he was chosen to succeed his uncle Godfrey the Hunchback, Duke of Lower Lorraine, who was assassinated in 1076. But Henry IV took Lorraine, leaving to Godfrey only the marquessate of Antwerp. As a vassal of the German Empire Godfrey took sides with the army of Henry IV in the War of the Investitures and followed the emperor on his expedition to Italy against Gregory VII (1080-1084). In the interval he was compelled to return in order to defend his possessions which had been attacked by the Count of Namur, and about 1089 Henry IV restored to him the legacy of Godfrey the Hunchback by creating him Duke of Lower Lorraine. The new duke's authority was extremely weak when opposed to the feudal power which had developed in the vicinity. At this time the whole north of France was aroused by the letter of Urban II, who besought the nobility of Flanders to go on the Crusade. Godfrey was among the first to take the cross, together with his two brothers, Eustache and Baldwin (1096). To procure resources he sold or pledged many of his estates. Many nobles at once arrayed themselves under his banner, and about 15 August, 1096, he departed at the head of 10,000 knights and 30,000 foot soldiers. His army was composed of Walloons and Flemings. "Born at the frontier of the two nations and himself speaking both languages", he served as the link between them, and by his authority appeased the quarrels provoked by their national self-esteem (Otto of Freisingen, *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, XX, 250).

The crusaders reached the valley of the Danube and in September, 1096, arrived at Tollenburch (Tulin, west of Vienna), on the frontier of Hungary, where they learned of the disaster which had befallen the followers of Peter the Hermit. Before entering Hungary Godfrey negotiated with King Coloman for a free passage through his dominions. He himself met the king, who welcomed him warmly, but took Godfrey's brother Baldwin as a hostage, together with his wife. During the march through Hungary (October, 1096) the strictest discipline prevailed among the crusaders, to whom the inhabitants furnished provisions in abundance. After crossing the Save, the army entered the territory of the Byzantine Empire. At Belgrade Godfrey received a letter from the Emperor Alexius I (Comnenus), promising him assistance if the crusaders would refrain from violence. At Nish and at Sterniz (Sofia), they found abundant provisions and presents from the emperor. After a halt of eight days at Philippopolis (26 Nov.-3 Dec.) the army approached Adrianople (8 December) and marched towards the Hellespont. Here occurred the first conflict between the crusaders and the imperial government. According to Albert of Aix, Godfrey, learning that the emperor held in captivity Hugues, a prince of France, demanded the latter's freedom, and on the emperor's refusal pillaged the neighbourhood of Salabria (Selymbria). As a matter of fact, the French prince was not a prisoner, but Godfrey and his army arrived before Constantinople (23 Dec., 1096) in a hostile

rnood, and closely watched by the imperial troops. Warned against the emperor, Godfrey kept away from the imperial palace.

However, during the Christmas festivities, he consented to cross the Golden Horn, and went into camp at Pera (29 Dec.). The chief desire of Alexius was to prevent the junction of Godfrey's army with that of Bohemond, leader of the Normans of Italy; Alexius had hoped to induce Godfrey to swear fealty to him and then to remove his army to Asia. Throughout the winter Godfrey resisted the imperial demands. At last, 2 April, 1097 (the date given by Anna Comnena is preferable to 13 January given by Albert of Aix; see Chalandon, "Alexis Comnène", 179), on the approach of Bohemond, the emperor decided to act, and cut off the supplies of the crusaders. Several combats ensued, and, despite the contrary assertion of Albert of Aix, Godfrey must have been defeated. Anna Comnena states that he then consented to do homage to the emperor, promising to restore him any former imperial possessions which he might wrest from the infidels. Some days later the Lorraine army was conveyed to Pelekan on the Gulf of Nicomedia, and at the end of April all the leaders of the crusade were reunited. Godfrey appears to have acted as peacemaker, and he induced Raymond IV, of St-Gilles, Count of Toulouse, to swear fealty to the emperor. Far from directing the crusade, he appears to have taken an obscure part in the council of leaders. He took part in the siege of Nicæa and the battle of Dorylæum (1 July, 1097).

During the crossing of Asia Minor he was seriously wounded while hunting. At the siege of Antioch he consented to obey the orders of Bohemond, and after the capture of the city he had to give up the castle which his followers had taken (July, 1098). On the way to Jerusalem, while others quarrelled, Godfrey marched towards Edessa, where his brother, Baldwin, had just established himself. He returned from this expedition in October, 1098, and before entering Antioch, with only twelve knights, put to flight one hundred and fifty Turks. According to the tradition repeated by Guibert de Nogent (*Gesta*, VII, 11), he had, with a stroke of the sword, hewn a Turkish horseman through the middle so that his body fell in two equal halves. Having returned to Antioch, he took part, together with Robert Courte-Heuse, Duke of Normandy, in the council of arbitration assembled to reconcile Bohemond and Raymond of St-Gilles. After 23 November, 1098, a number of the crusaders left Antioch with Raymond, but Godfrey of Bouillon and Robert, Count of Flanders, began to march on Jerusalem only at the end of February, 1099. After besieging Gibeil they rejoined the main army before Arka (12 March), were at Tripoli (13 May), Beirut (19 May), Cæsarea (30 May), and reached Jerusalem on 7 June.

Godfrey and his army took an active part in the siege of the Holy City. His camp was pitched to the westward. On 15 July, 1099, about nine in the morning, Godfrey and his brother Eustache placed a movable tower against the walls and were the first to enter the city. During the ensuing massacre of Mussulmans, Godfrey, thinking only of his vow, stripped himself of his arms, and, barefooted and in his undergarments, made the round of the ramparts, and then went to pray at the Holy Sepulchre. The crusaders were soon intent on providing a king for the new conquest. Several bishops offered the crown to Raymond of St-Gilles, who refused, declaring "that the title of king seemed to him out of place in that city" (Raimond de Aguilers, *Hist. Occid. des Crois.*, III, 301). Robert Courte-Heuse being urged declined in like manner. All refused to accept the burden which the new royalty must prove. Finally, Godfrey, being unanimously elected, accepted "for the love of Christ" (22 July). According to the chronicles of those times, he refused to wear the crown "through

respect for Him who had been crowned in that place with the Crown of Thorns". Indeed, he seems never to have borne the title of king (which only appears under his successor), and to have been content with that of *Duke and Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre*.

It may be that he acted in this manner through respect for the clergy, who regarded the new conquest as the property of all Christendom, and some of whom were averse to the election of a king (Raimond de Aguilers, *Hist. Occid. Crois.*, III, 295). Godfrey seems to have always considered himself the protector of the Church. Not only did he make so many donations that William of Tyre despairs of enumerating them, not only did he cede a fourth of Jaffa (Joppa), the city of Jerusalem, and the tower of David to the patriarch Dambert, but he consented, as did Bohemond, to receive investiture from the patriarch (William of Tyre, *Historia*, IX, XV). Godfrey displayed great energy in meeting the many difficulties which threatened the new State, but he was destined to succumb to sickness. On 12 August, 1099, having rallied the crusading forces, he gained a victory at Ascalon, thus preserving Palestine from the Egyptian invasion.

Assisted by the Pisans, he rebuilt the city of Jaffa, which became a port of arrival for crusaders. He signed a treaty of alliance with the Venetian fleet, agreeing to besiege Acre, but was attacked by the plague at Cæsarea, 10 June. After a short stay at the hospital which he had founded at Jaffa, he returned to Jerusalem, where he died on 18 July, having named his brother Baldwin as his successor. He was buried in the church of the Holy Sepulchre.

The tomb of Godfrey was destroyed in 1808, but at that time a large sword, said to have been his, was still shown. Legend soon laid claim to him; in the contemporary accounts of the First Crusade (*Gesta Francorum*, Raimond de Aguilers, Foucher de Chartres, Anna Comnena, etc.), he is portrayed as the perfect type of a Christian knight. Tall of stature, with pleasing countenance, and with so courteous a manner "that he seemed more a monk than a knight" (Robert the Monk, *Hist. Occid. Crois.*, III, 731), in the hour of danger he showed admirable courage. As a zealous Christian, he was among the first to take the cross, accomplished his vow without the slightest deviation, and at great personal cost accepted the defence of the new conquest. Such is Godfrey as he appears in actual history. In the chronicle of Albert of Aix (d. 1120, edit. *Hist. Occid. Crois.*, IV), the author already exhibits a tendency to put the figure of Godfrey in the foreground and to attribute to him, to a certain extent, the direction of the crusade. Albert of Aix and Guibert de Nogent attribute to Godfrey exploits of an epic character (Guibert de Nogent, *Gesta*, VII, 11). When, in the thirteenth century, Jean d'Belin and Philip of Novara edited the "Assises" of Jerusalem, they referred to Godfrey as a law-making king, and attributed to him a code, the "Letters of the Holy Sepulchre", which never existed. Indeed, at that time, and perhaps as early as the twelfth century, Godfrey of Bouillon had become, like Roland and Arthur, a hero of the *chansons de geste*. The *trouvères* provided him with a mythical origin, making him a descendant of the legendary "Knight of the Swan", whose feats he is made to repeat, and, after relating the events of his childhood, continued his adventures to the taking of Jerusalem. Under Philip Augustus, Graindor of Douai reconstructed the works of a certain Richard the Pilgrim, and composed a complete history of this crusade: (1) "Elioxe", ed. Todd (Baltimore, 1889); (2) "Beatrix", ed. Hippeau (Paris, 1868); (3) "Antioche", ed. P. Paris (Paris, 1848); (4) "Jérusalem", ed. Hippeau (Paris, 1868); see L. Gautier, "Bibliographie des chansons de gestes" (Paris, 1897). In the fourteenth century, all these poems were collected

under the title of "Roman du chevalier au Cygne" (ed. de Reiffenberg, Brussels, 1846-59).

BREYSSIG, *Gottfried von Bouillon vor dem Kreuzzuge in West-deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst*, XVII; HAGENMEYER, *Chronologie de la première croisade* (Paris, 1902); IDEM, *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri pertinentes* (Innsbruck, 1901); PIÉRENNE, *Histoire de Belgique* (Brussels, 1901), I; VÉTAULT, *Godefroy de Bouillon* (Tours, 1874); BEYER, *Vita Godfridi Bulionis* (Marburg, 1874); CHALANDON, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Comnène* (Paris, 1900); DODU, *Histoire des institutions monarchiques dans le royaume latin de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1894); CONDER, *The Kingdom of Jerusalem* (London, 1897); ROHRICHT, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem* (Innsbruck, 1898); PIGEONNEAU, *Le cycle de la croisade et la famille de Bouillon* (Paris, 1877).

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

**Godfrey of Fontaines** (GODEFRIDUS DE FONTIBUS, DOCTOR VENERANDUS), a scholastic philosopher and theologian; born near Liège within the first half of the thirteenth century, he became a canon of his native diocese, and also of Paris and Cologne, and was elected, in 1300, to the See of Tournai, which he declined. He taught theology at the University of Paris during the last quarter of the century, was a *Magister*, or doctor, of theology and a member of the Sorbonne, to which he left a valuable collection of MSS. He is the author of a notable collection of disputations, "XIV Quodlibeta", which show him to have been not merely a distinguished theologian and philosopher, but also a canonist, jurist, moralist, and controversialist, who took an active part in the various ecclesiastical, doctrinal, and disciplinary disputes that stirred Paris at that period. In regard to the privileges of the mendicant orders, Godfrey opposed St. Thomas, but for the Angelic Doctor's teaching he professed a sincere admiration. The bold "innovations" of Thomism were just then on their trial; they were condemned by Tempier, Archbishop of Paris (1277), and opposed by Peckham and many others. Godfrey was a staunch supporter of Thomism, yet sufficiently original to differ in many things from the master's views, e. g., the principle of individuation, and the distinction between essence and existence in material things.

The "XIV Quodlibeta" of Godfrey, extensively studied and multiplied in MS. form in the medieval schools, are at present in course of being published for the first time. A critical edition of the first four of them has already appeared in the series "Les Philosophes Belges, Textes et Etudes" (II, "Les quatre premiers Quodlibets de Godefroid de Fontaines", by de Wulf and Pelzer, Louvain, 1904). The remaining Quodlibeta (V-XIV) will form vols. III and IV of the same series; vol. V is to contain studies on Godfrey by de Wulf, de Munynck, and Van Roel.

DE WULF, *Etudes sur la vie les œuvres et l'influence de Godefroid de Fontaines* (Louvain and Paris, 1904); IDEM, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* (Louvain, 2nd ed., 1905); IDEM, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique dans les Pays-Bas, etc.* (Louvain and Paris, 1895); TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903).

P. COFFEY.

**Godfrey of Viterbo**, German writer of the twelfth century. Nothing is known as to the place or date of his birth, but he received his education at Bamberg, whither he was taken by Lothair in 1133. At an early age he displayed great activity as one of the clergy at the court of Conrad III and later of Frederick I, accompanying the latter on many of his campaigns, and frequently fulfilling for him diplomatic missions. As a reward for his services at Court, lands were bestowed on him in fief at Viterbo, probably in 1169. During his forty years as notary and chaplain to the Emperor Frederick, he displayed a multifarious activity at Court. Among the personages there he was particularly attracted towards the youthful Henry VI. He lived much in Italy, spending his last days at Viterbo. The year of his death has not been ascertained. In the politico-ecclesiastical conflicts of his time he sided with the emperor, without, however, declaring himself inimical to the pope. He blames Pope Alexander's predecessor, Hadrian, for the

schism, inasmuch as the latter had allied himself with the Greeks and Normans against the emperor.

His works were for the most part composed during his journeys. About 1183 he compiled for the use of schools his "Speculum regum", a history of the world beginning with the deluge, intended to reconcile the Romans with the Germans. His metrical account of the achievements of Frederick (Gesta Friderici), extending to 1181, is a separate work, which, though not free from confusion, contains some valuable information. His "Memoria Saculorum" is a history of the world written partly in prose and partly in verse, and was completed in 1185. In the same year he began work on his "Pantheon", a history of the world which enjoyed an unmerited fame during the Middle Ages. The author, delighting as he does in fables, has gathered much material for the history of folk-lore. His works—some of them only in extracts—are to be found in the "Monumenta Germaniae historica: Scriptores", XVII.

ULMANN, *Gottfried von Viterbo, dissertation* (Göttingen, 1863); WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im M. A.* (6th ed., Berlin, 1894), II, 290 sqq.

FRANZ KAMPERS.

Godinez. See WADING, MICHAEL.

Godmother. See SPONSOR.

**Godric**, the name of two Abbots of Croyland, GODRIC I, 870-941. He was the successor of the Abbot Theodore, who had been slain by the Danes. The heathen had sacked and destroyed the abbey, desecrating the shrines and driving out the monks. On their return they unanimously elected Godric abbot, in spite of his reluctance. Soon after his election, at the request of the prior of Ancarig, Godric went with his monks to clear away the ruins of Medehamsted Abbey (Peterborough), to bury the corpses of its abbot and eighty monks, whom the Danes had murdered, and to erect a memorial near their grave. Evil times fell on Croyland during his abbacy. Beorred, King of Mercia, under pretext of driving out the Danes, seized the lands and possessions of all the monasteries in his dominions, among which was Croyland. Beorred died in 874, and was succeeded by one of his servants, Ceolwulf, who demanded a thousand pounds from the Abbey of Croyland, and reduced it to such poverty, that the monks were forced to sell nearly all their plate. So poor did the house become that none would join it, and, at Godric's death in 941, only five of its monks were left.

GODRIC II, 1005-18, was no less unfortunate than his namesake. King Ethelred the Redeless first exacted from it large sums of money, and in the fourth year of Godric's rule the Danish jarl, Turkil, arrived with a fleet, demanded a ransom, and ravaged the manors of the abbey. In 1013 the Danish king, Sweyn, devastated the neighbouring country. Croyland, which was luckily isolated by floods, became the refuge of monks, secular priests, and layfolk, whose support was a heavy burden on the resources of the abbey. Sweyn extorted two large ransoms within three months, while the king's officers threatened to complete its ruin because it supported the Danes. In despair Godric and his monks engaged as protector Leofwin, brother of Leofric, Earl of Leicester, who, in return for a grant of lands, protected them till his death in 1017. The same year the accession of Cnut brought peace to England, and some relief to Croyland. Godric was buried in the chapter-house of his abbey.

*Ingulf Croylandensis Historia in Rerum Anglicarum Veterum Tom. I.* ed. FULMAN (Oxford, 1684); WILLIS, *History of the Mixed Parliamentary Abbeys*, I, 75-6 (London, 1718); DEEDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, ed. CALEY AND ELLIS, (London, 1846), II, 91-2, 95.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Goethals. See HENRY OF GHENT.

**Goetz**, MARIE JOSEPHINE, second superior-general of the Society of the Sacred Heart, daughter of Joseph Goetz of Strasburg and Marie Anne Wagner; b. 7 March, 1817; d. 4 January, 1874; her parents dying

early, her education was left to the care of an aunt who sent her to school at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Besançon. At first her silent, observant, and distant attitude showed that she felt herself out of tune with her surroundings, but in the second year she threw herself into school life and carried all before her in lessons and play. At the age of seventeen she entered the novitiate of the Sacred Heart at Montet and took her first vows in 1837. In 1842 she was entrusted with the charge of the school at Besançon, which was going through a difficult phase. Her judicious management showed what might be expected of her in the future, and immediately after profession in 1847 she was appointed mistress of novices at Conflans. She continued in this charge, to which was afterwards added the government of the house as superior, until 1864, when she was named vicar-general. The failing strength of the foundress made it necessary for her to have some one at hand, to whom she could communicate her views for the future. She found a full understanding of them in Mother Josephine Goetz, who was elected superior-general in 1865 after the death of Blessed Madeleine Sophie Barat.

Mother Goetz governed as superior-general for nine years. Her work was principally one of consolidation and development of what had been established or projected by the foundress. She established a training school at Conflans to prepare the young religious for their duties as teachers, and entrusted to a small committee the revision and adaptation of the curriculum of studies to the growing needs of the order. During the Franco-Prussian war and the time of the siege and Commune in Paris, Reverend Mother Goetz was obliged to withdraw to Laval, that communications with her religious might not be cut off. She employed the enforced leisure of those months in collating and revising the summaries of decrees and decisions of the general congregations of the Society of the Sacred Heart. Reverend Mother Goetz made visitations of the houses then existing in Europe, as far as time and health permitted—but her strength rapidly failed and she died from a stroke of paralysis, after a few days' illness. The marking features of her personality were breadth of view and rapid intuition that appeared unerring as an instinct, directness of intention and strength of purpose which lay concealed under a timid exterior, but astonished by their force when circumstances called for prompt decision and action—and a characteristic grace of humility which seemed to be her distinguishing supernatural gift.

J. STUART.

**Goffe** (or **GOUGH**), **STEPHEN**, Oratorian; b. 1605; d. at Paris, Christmas Day, 1681. He was the son of Stephen Goffe, Protestant rector of Stanmer in Sussex, and was educated at Merton College, Oxford, becoming M. A. in 1627. He took orders and became chaplain to Colonel Vere's regiment in the Low Countries. Subsequently the Earl of St. Alban's obtained his appointment as one of the chaplains to Charles I, in which capacity he was created D. D. in 1636. He was often employed in secret negotiations in France, Flanders, and Holland. During the Civil War he was arrested and charged with attempting to rescue the king, then a prisoner at Hampton Court. After the execution of the king (whose death-warrant was signed by Stephen's brother William), he went to France, where he became a Catholic. Dodd and other Catholics have disproved the story that the Sorbonne admitted the validity of his Anglican orders. He became an Oratorian on 14 Jan., 1651, at Notre-Dame-des Vertues near Paris, where he became superior in 1655. Here he helped English exiles, both Protestants and Catholics, using his influence with Queen Henrietta Maria on their behalf; and on her appointment he acted as tutor to the young Duke of Monmouth. He was a learned man and maintained a

correspondence with Vossius and other scholars. Some of his letters were printed by Colomesius in 1690, and others, still in manuscript, are in the British Museum (Addit. MS. 6394).

Dodd, *Church History* (Brussels, 1737-41), III, 305; CLARENDON, *History of the Rebellion* (1702-04); LINGARD, *History of England* (London, 1849), VIII, 191; BISCOPE, *Question of Anglican Orders Discussed* (London, 1873); GILLLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. He is also referred to in a scurrilous Parliamentary libel published in 1646 under the title *The Lord George Digby's Cabinet and Dr. Goff's negotiations*.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Goffine**, (or **GOFFINÉ**), **LEONARD**; b. at Cologne, or according to some, at Broich, 6 December, 1648; d. 11 August, 1719. At the age of nineteen he entered the Norbertine Abbey of Steinfeld, in the Eifel district of Germany, and commenced his two years novitiate in July, 1667. Having made his solemn profession on 16 July, 1669, he was sent for his course of philosophy and theology to the Norbertine college at Cologne. Ordained priest on Ember Saturday before Christmas, 1676, Goffine was sent to Dunwald to assist the priests who were charged with the direction of the parish and the convent of Norbertine canonesses. In the same capacity he was afterwards sent to Ellen, where there was also a convent of Norbertine nuns. Goffine remained four years in each of these places, being recalled by the abbot, 26 February, 1680, to fill the office of novice master in the abbey. He was next given charge of the parish of Clarholz, which was incorporated with the Norbertine Abbey of the same name, in the Diocese of Osnabrück, for owing to the dearth of priests due to the Lutheran heresy and the Thirty Years War, abbots and bishops were obliged to have recourse to other dioceses and religious orders to fill the vacancies.

Goffine remained at Clarholz five years (1680-85), and was sent thence to Niederehe, a priory which the Abbey of Steinfeld possessed in the Archdiocese of Trier. He remained in Niederehe but a very short time, being sent in 1685 to assist the clergy of St. Lambert's at Coesfeld, in the Diocese of Munster. He left Coesfeld in 1691, when, at the urgent request of the Archbishop of Trier, he undertook the charge of the parishes, first of Wehr (1691-94), then of Rheinböllen (1694-96), and afterwards of Oberstein on the Nahe, from December, 1696, until his death in 1719. While parish priest of Oberstein he had also to attend the Catholics living at Weiersbach, in the Diocese of Mayence. The inhabitants of Oberstein were mostly Protestants, and at times Goffine had much annoyance to bear from them. Animated with apostolic zeal, Goffine was all things to all men, and, as Dr. Joseph Prickartz, president of the Norbertine college at Cologne, wrote, in a sketch of his life, "Goffine was a truly apostolic pastor, filled with an untiring zeal for souls, who edified everyone by his word and by his example. The purity of his life, the integrity of his morals, the fervour of his sermons, the pleasing style of his writings, commanded the respect of even the enemies of his religion. From the rudest and most forward of these he had often to endure the bitterest insults, but at these he showed himself the more cheerful, since by them he became the more conformable to those who had the happiness to suffer insults for the name of Jesus". This is a character sketch of the saintly priest, not only during the twenty-three years he worked at Oberstein, but even from the day of his ordination to the priesthood.

In the month of July, 1719, he returned to the Abbey of Steinfeld in order to be present at the feast of St. Norbert (July 11), and to follow the spiritual exercises during the octave. On the Sunday during the octave he preached the panegyric of the holy founder, and on 16 July he celebrated the golden jubilee of his own religious profession.

After the octave he returned to Oberstein, and less than a month later he rendered his well-tried soul to

God. Goffine himself states that he had taken St. Norbert, the founder of his order, as his model, "because St. Norbert cared and worked so much for the salvation of souls." Observing that so many had gone astray through ignorance of Catholic doctrine, he was most anxious and always ready to instruct the people, both old and young, for whose benefit he wrote and published no fewer than ten books. While he was at Coesfeld he wrote his well-known work, "Handpostille oder Christkatholische Unterweisungen auf alle Sonn und Feyer-tagen des ganzen Jahrs" (brief commentaries in the form of question and answer on the Proper of the Mass, principally on the Epistle and Gospel of the day). This book was ready in 1687, and in 1688 it received the imprimatur of the Vicar-General of Munster, and in 1690 the approbation of Rev. William Heimbach, Norbertine prior of Meer, and of Rev. John Dirking, Rector of the Jesuit college of Hildesheim. The first edition, printed at Mayence in 1690, was soon exhausted, and a second edition was printed at Cologne in 1692. Since then other editions have appeared at short intervals, and it is said that hardly any book, with the exception of the "Imitation of Christ" by Thomas à Kempis, has had as many editions and translations as Goffine's "Handpostille". As far as can be ascertained translations have been made into Moravian, Bohemian, Hungarian, English, French, Italian, and Flemish.

A writer in "Le Magasin Catholique Illustré", says of the worth of this book: "How many souls has this book not saved and preserved from error, during the last two centuries that it has been known in Germany? Here is an instance: Wherever in this classical land of Protestantism this book has become popular, the door was shut to heresy. Goffine's instructions, the like of which we have nothing in France, gives the dogmatic, moral, and liturgical teaching of the Church," etc. As Father Hattler, S.J., writes: "The child reads from it, for father and mother; the bride is presented with it on the day of her wedding; it is given to the emigrant when he leaves his country for the New World." Goffine also published the following books: (1) "Auslegung der Regel des heiligen Augustinus" (Cologne, 1692); (2) "Trostbuch in Trübsalen" (Cologne); (3) "Cibus animæ matutinalis, etc." (Cologne, 1705); (4) "Sermons for the whole year", 2 vols. (Nuremberg, 1705); (5) "Erklärung des Katechismi Petri Canisii" (Cologne, 1712); (6) "Die Lehre Christi" (Cologne, 1715); (7) "Kleiner Kinder-katechismus" (Cologne, 1717); (8) "Der Wachter des göttlichen Worts" (Cologne, 1718); (9) "Præxæ Sacre seu modus explicandi cæremonias per annum" (Frankfort, 1719).

LIENHARDT, *Spiritus Litterarius Norbert*. (Augsburg, 1771); HARTZHEIM, *Bibliothec. Colon.* (Cologne, 1747), 222; RASZMANN, *Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften Münsterländischer Schriftsteller* (Münster, 1886), 127-8; HUNDHAUSEN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HATTLER, pref. Ger. ed. (Ratisbon, 1891); *Magasin Catholique Illustré*, 1856, 74-75; BÄRSCH, *Das Pramon. Monchskloster* (Steinfeld, 1857), 23-24; GOOVAERTS, *Dict. Biobibl. de l'Ordre de Prémontré*, s. v. F. M. GEUDENS.

**Gog and Magog.**—Names, respectively, of a king and of his supposed kingdom, mentioned several times in chapters xxxviii and xxxix of the Book of Ezechiel, and once in the Apocalypse (xx, 7). In the first passage of Ezechiel we read the command of Yahweh to the prophet: "Son of man, set thy face against Gog the land of Magog . . . and prophesy of him . . . Behold, I come against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of [שַׂנַּי, Vulg. caput, Sept. Πῶς] Mosoch and Thubal" (xxxviii, 2, 3). A similar command is found also at the beginning of chapter xxxix. These two chapters contain repeated reference to Gog and Magog, but they furnish only vague and uncertain indications as to the identity of the ruler or the location of the country. In chapter xxxviii Gog is represented (verses 5 and 6) as being accompanied in his invasion of the land of Israel by the Persians, Ethiopians, and Libyans, Gomer, and . . . the house of Thogorma; and in verse

15 we read: "And thou shalt come out of thy place from the northern parts". From the number and variety of the peoples mentioned in this connection some writers have inferred that the name Gog may be only a generic appellation, or figure, used in Ezechiel to designate the host of the enemies of Israel, and in the Apocalypse to denote the multitude of the foes of the Church. Others conjecture that it may be a local title expressing the royal dignity, such, for instance, as the name Pharaoh in Egypt. But it seems more probable that both names are historical; and by some scholars Gog is identified with the Lydian king called by the Greeks Gyges, who appears as Gu-gu on the Assyrian inscriptions. If this be true, Magog should be identified with Lydia. On the other hand, as Mosoch and Thubal were nations belonging to Asia Minor, it would seem from the text of Ezechiel that Magog must be in that part of the world. Finally, others with Josephus identify Magog with Scythia, but in antiquity this name was used to designate vaguely any northern population.

LEGENDRE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.: VIGOUROUX, *Manuel Biblique*, 10th ed. (Paris, 1896), II, 748; SAYCE in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

**Golden Calf.**—An object of worship among the Hebrews, mention of which occurs principally in Ex., xxxii, where the story of the molten calf of Aaron is narrated, and in III Kings, xii (cf. II Par., xi), in connexion with the policy of Jeroboam after the schism of the ten tribes. Various reasons make it probable that the rendering "calf" is not to be taken in a strict sense, for the Hebrew term *סֵבַע* has a wider signification, and it is likely that in the present case it stands for a young bullock just arrived at maturity. Waiving all critical discussion as to the sources embodied in Ex., xxxii, the main features of the present narrative are as follows: Becoming impatient at Moses' long delay on the mount, the people ask Aaron to make them a god (אֱלֹהִים) or gods to go before them. He yields to their solicitations, and, making use of the golden earrings of the women and children, he causes a "molten calf" or bull to be fashioned. Shortly after its construction Moses returns, and, moved to wrath and indignation, destroys the idol, reducing it to dust and throwing it into the brook from which the Israelites are made to drink. After the schism of the ten tribes, Jeroboam, fearing that the regular pilgrimages of the people of the northern kingdom to Jerusalem would endanger their political allegiance to himself, resorted to the natural expedient of furnishing them with a substitute for the sanctuary of the Temple (III Kings, xii); and he set up two golden calves, one in Bethel and the other in Dan. As to their construction information is lacking, but it is likely that they were life-sized bull figures constructed after the fashion of the one mentioned above. It seems also probable that they were intended as symbols of Yahweh, for, thus considered, they would be more effective in attracting the pious Israelites who were accustomed to go to Jerusalem.

Most writers have accepted the view of Philo and the early Fathers, who regarded the worship of the golden calves as borrowed from the Egyptians, and in favour of this opinion is the fact that both Aaron and Jeroboam had sojourned in Egypt shortly before constructing their respective idols; this view, however, has its difficulties, among which is the improbability of an Egyptian deity being set up as the god "who brought Israel out of the land of Egypt". Hence, some recent scholars are inclined to seek the origin of the Hebrew bull worship in the conditions and surroundings of the Israelites as an agricultural people, for whom the bull was naturally an appropriate symbol of strength and vital energy.

KENNEDY in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Calf*; GIGOT, *Outlines of Jewish History*, 72, 243.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.



**Golden Legend.** See JACOPO DE VORAGINE.

**Golden Number.** See EPOCH.

**Golden Rose**, a precious and sacred ornament made of pure gold by skilled artificers, which the popes have been accustomed for centuries to bless each year, and occasionally confer upon illustrious churches and sanctuaries as a token of special reverence and devotion, upon Catholic kings or queens, princes or princesses, renowned generals or other distinguished personages, upon governments or cities conspicuous for their Catholic spirit and loyalty to the Holy See, as a mark of esteem and paternal affection. The significations of the rose and *Lætare Sunday* (fourth of Lent), the day on which it is blessed, so blend that the Sunday is oftentimes called *Rose Sunday*, and rose-coloured vestments, altar and throne and chapel draperies (signs of hope and joy) are substituted for the penitential purple during the solemn function. The Church on this Sunday bids her children who have been so far engaged in prayer, fasting and other penitential works, as also in serious meditation upon the malice of sin and the terrible punishment exacted on account of it, to look up and beyond Calvary and see in the first rays of the Easter sun, the risen Christ, Who brings them redemption, and "Rejoice". The golden flower and its shining splendour show forth Christ and His Kingly Majesty, Who is heralded by the prophet as "the flower of the field and the lily of the valleys"; its fragrance shows the sweet odour of Christ which should be widely diffused by His faithful followers (Pope Leo XIII, *Acta*, vol. VI, 104); and the thorns and red tint tell of His Passion according to *Isaias* (lxiii, 2): "Why then is thy apparel red, and thy garments like theirs that tread in the wine-press?"

Among the many mystical significations, as set forth in the papal diplomas accompanying the gift, as also in sermons of the popes in conferring it, the following of Innocent III is worthy of note: As *Lætare Sunday*, the day set apart for the function, represents love after hate, joy after sorrow, and fullness after hunger, so does the rose designate by its colour, odour, and taste, love, joy, and satiety respectively. Adverting to the spiritual resemblance, he continues that the rose is the flower spoken of by *Isaias* (xi, 1), "there shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root". Prior to the pontificate of Sixtus IV (1471-84) it consisted of a simple and single rose made of pure gold and slightly tinted with red. For greater embellishment, yet still retaining the mystical meaning, a ruby placed in the heart of the rose, and afterwards many precious gems set in the petals, were used instead of the red colouring of the gold. Pope Sixtus IV substituted in place of the single rose a thorny branch with leaves and many roses (a half-score and sometimes more), the largest of which sprang from the top of the branch and the smaller ones clustered naturally around it. In the centre of the principal rose was a tiny cup with a perforated cover, into which the pope, when he blessed the rose, poured the musk and balsam. The whole ornament was of pure gold. The Sixtine design has been maintained; but it has varied as to decoration, size, weight, and value. Originally it was little over six inches in height, and was easily carried in the left hand of the pope, whilst with his right he blessed the multitude through which he passed in procession from the church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme (in Rome) to the Lateran Palace. Afterwards, and especially when a vase and large pedestal became part of the ornament, it required a robust cleric to carry it, who preceded the papal cross in the procession. The rose sent to Amelia of Brunswick, wife of Joseph I, afterwards emperor, by Innocent XI, weighed twenty pounds of gold. In height it was almost eighteen inches, and in form a bouquet; from the stem sprang

three different branches which after many natural windings came together at the top, and supported the largest and principal rose in the midst of a beautiful cluster of leaves. The vase whence rises the shapely and elegant flower, as also the pedestal supporting the vase, varied as to material, weight, and form. In the beginning they were made of gold; but afterward of silver heavily gilt with gold. The pedestal was either triangular, quadrangular, or octangular, and was richly ornamented with various decorations and *bassorilievos*. In addition to the customary inscription, the coat of arms of the pope who had the ornament made, and that of him who blessed and conferred it, were engraved on the pedestal. Their value varied according to the munificence of the pontiffs or the economical circumstances of the times. Father Baldassari, S.J. (*De Rosa Mediana*, p. 190) says that the rose conferred about the year 1650 cost five hundred dollars. The two roses sent by Alexander VII were valued at eight and twelve hundred dollars respectively. Clement IX sent the Queen of France one costing twelve hundred dollars, the gold alone used weighing eight pounds. The workmanship on this rose was exceedingly fine, for which the artificer received three hundred dollars. Innocent IX caused eight and one-half pounds of gold to be formed into a rose, which was further embellished with many sapphires, costing in all fourteen hundred dollars. In the nineteenth century not a few of the roses cost two thousand dollars and more. The skill and workmanship of the papal artificers are something truly wonderful.

The custom of giving the rose supplanted the ancient practice of sending to Catholic rulers the Golden Keys from St. Peter's Confessional, a custom introduced either by St. Gregory II (716) or St. Gregory III (740). A certain analogy exists between the rose and the keys, inasmuch as both are of pure gold blessed and bestowed by the Vicar of Christ upon illustrious children of the Church, and further, both partake somewhat of the nature of a reliquary—the rose containing musk and balsam, the keys filings from the Chair of St. Peter.

The exact date of the institution of the rose is unknown. According to some it is anterior to Charlemagne (742-814), according to others it had its origin at the end of the twelfth century. It is certain, however, that it antedates the year 1050, since Pope Leo IX (1051) speaks of the rose as of an ancient institution at his time. The blessing of the rose was not coeval with its institution. It was introduced to render the ceremony more solemn and induce greater reverence for it on the part of the recipient. According to Cardinal Petra (*Comment. in Constit. Apostolicas*, III, 2, col. 1), Pope Innocent IV (1245-54) was the first to bless it. Innocent III (1198-1216) and Alexander III (1159-81) and Leo IX (1049-55) have each strenuous defenders of their respective claims to the authorship of the ceremony. Of the last it is said that he (A. D. 1051) imposed upon the monastery (nuns) of Bamberg in Franconia, then subject to the pope, the obligation of furnishing each year the Golden Rose to be blessed and carried by the pope on *Lætare Sunday* (Theop. Raynaud, *De rosa mediana a pontifice consecrata*, IV, 413). Pope Benedict XIV attests that the ceremony of blessing had its origin in the beginning of the fifteenth or at the end of the fourteenth century. Catalanus, papal master of ceremonies, is of opinion that the use of musk and balsam was coeval with the institution, but the blessing with prayers, incense, and holy water had its inception later on, yet earlier than the pontificate of Julius II (1503-13). The pope blesses the rose every year, but it is not always a new and different rose; the old one is used until it has been given away.

Originally the rose was blessed in the Hall of Vestments (sacristy) in the palace where the pope was; but the solemn Mass and the donation of the rose took

place in the Church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme (a figure, according to Pope Innocent III, of the heavenly Jerusalem), and this was the practice until the popes removed to Avignon. The blessing was followed by a solemn Mass sung either by the pope himself or the first cardinal-priest; in the former case the rose was placed on a veil of rose-coloured silk richly embroidered with gold; in the latter the pope held the rose in his hand, unless when he knelt, or at the Introit, Confiteor, Elevation, and the singing of "Laudemus in Domino". Returning processionally to the Lateran Palace, he carried the rose in his hand, and arriving at the door of the palace, he gave to the Prefect of Rome who had led his horse by the bridle and had aided him to dismount, the rose as a recompense for acts of respect and homage. Prior to 1305 the rose was given in Rome to no outsider, except the emperor and to him only on the day of his coronation. Whilst residing at Avignon (1305-1375) the popes, unable to make visits to the Roman churches and basilicas, performed many of their sacred functions, among them the blessing of the rose, in the private chapel of their palace (whence the origin of the Cappella Pontificia). On their return to Rome they (Sixtus V excepted) retained the custom thus begun.

The blessing of the rose now takes place in the Hall of Vestments (*camera dei paramenti*) and the solemn Mass in the papal chapel. The rose is placed on a table with lighted candles, and the pope, vested in alb and rose-coloured stole and cope with precious mitre on his head, begins the ceremony with the usual versicles and the following beautiful and expressive prayer: "O God! by Whose word and power all things have been created, by Whose will all things are directed, we humbly beseech Thy Majesty, Who art the joy and gladness of all the faithful, that Thou wouldst deign in Thy fatherly love to bless and sanctify this rose, most delightful in odour and appearance, which we this day carry in sign of spiritual joy, in order that the people consecrated by Thee and delivered from the yoke of Babylonian slavery through the favour of Thine only-begotten Son, Who is the glory and exultation of the people of Israel and of that Jerusalem which is our Heavenly mother, may with sincere hearts show forth their joy. Wherefore, O Lord, on this day, when the Church exults in Thy name and manifests her joy by this sign [the rose], confer upon us through her true and perfect joy and accepting her devotion of to-day; do Thou remit sin, strengthen faith, increase piety, protect her in Thy mercy, drive away all things adverse to her and make her ways safe and prosperous, so that Thy Church, as the fruit of good works, may unite in giving forth the perfume of the ointment of that flower sprung from the root of Jesse and which is the mystical flower of the field and lily of the valleys, and remain happy without end in eternal glory together with all the saints." The prayer finished, the pope puts incense (handed by the cardinal-deacon) into the censer and incenses the balsam and then the musk, and afterwards pours the balsam and powdered musk into the tiny cup in the heart of the principal rose. He then incenses the rose and sprinkles it with holy water. It is then given to the youngest cleric of the Camera, who carries it in front of the pope to the chapel, where it is placed on the altar at the foot of the cross upon a richly embroidered silk veil, where it remains during the Mass sung by the first cardinal-priest. After the Mass, the rose is carried in procession before the pope to the sacristy, where it is carefully put away in a place set apart for it, until bestowed upon some worthy personage.

The custom initiated at Avignon of conferring the rose upon the most deserving prince present at the papal court was continued in Rome when the popes returned from Avignon. The recipient of the rose from the hands of the pope, after the solemn function, was accompanied by the College of Cardinals from the

papal palace to his residence. From the beginning of the seventeenth century the rose was sent only to queens, princesses, and eminent noblemen; to emperors, kings, and princes were given a sword as a more suitable gift. It is true, however, that if a Catholic emperor, king, or some great prince were present in Rome on Lætare Sunday, he would be presented with the rose if he were deserving. The office of carrying and conferring the rose upon those living outside of Rome was given by the pope to cardinal legates *a latere*, nuncios, inter-nuncios, and Apostolic legates. In 1895 a new office, called "Bearer of the Golden Rose", was instituted, and assigned to a secret chamberlain of sword and cloak *participante*.

Among the principal churches to which the rose has been presented are St. Peter's (five roses), St. John Lateran (four roses—according to some two of the four were given to the basilica proper and two to the chapel called *Sancta Sanctorum*), St. Mary Major (two roses), St. Mary sopra Minerva (one rose), and St. Anthony of the Portuguese (one rose). It was also presented to the Archconfraternity of Gonfalone. All these roses have been lost. Among the many recipients of the gift, the following are noteworthy: Falcone, Count of Angers, who received it from Urban II (1096), Alfonso VII, King of Castile (Eugene III; 1148); Louis VII of France (Alexander III; 1163); Louis I of Hungary (Clement VI; 1348); Joanna I, Queen of Naples (1368); Emperor Sigismund (Eugene IV; 1435); Henry VI of England (Eugene IV; 1444); Casimir IV, King of Poland (Nicholas V; 1448); Emperor Frederick III and his wife Empress Eleonora, who were crowned on Lætare Sunday (1452) and received the Golden Rose next day from Nicholas V; Charles VII of France (Callistus III; 1457); James III of Scotland (Innocent VIII; 1486); Isabella I, Queen of Spain (Alexander VI; 1493); Alexander I of Poland (Julius II; 1505); Emanuel I of Portugal (Julius II; 1506); Henry VIII of England, who received one from Pope Julius II, one from Leo X, and one from Clement VII in year 1524; Frederick, Duke of Mantua (Paul III; 1537), because of his kindness towards the Fathers of the Council of Trent; Mary, Queen of England, daughter of Henry VIII (Paul IV; 1555); Henry of Anjou, King of Poland (Clement VIII; 1592); Margaret of Austria, Queen of Spain, on the day she was married to Philip III by proxy in presence of Pope Clement VIII (1598); Henrietta Maria, Queen of England, at Amiens (Urban VIII; 1625); Maria of Austria, Queen of Hungary (Urban VIII; 1630); Maria Theresa, Queen of France (1668), for her infant son, the Dauphin, for whom Pope Alexander VII was god-father; Eleonora, Queen of Poland (Clement X; 1671); Mary Casimir, wife of John III, King of Poland, Saviour of Vienna (Innocent XI; 1684); Amelia of Brunswick, empress (Innocent XII; 1699); Maria Louisa Gabriele of Savoy, Queen of Spain (Clement XI; 1701); Francesco Loredano, Doge of Venice (Clement XIII; 1759); Maria Christina, Archduchess of Austria (Pius VI; 1776); Maria Theresa, widowed Queen of Sardinia (Leo XII; 1825); Maria Anna, Queen of Hungary, afterwards empress (Gregory XVI; 1832); Maria II, Queen of Portugal (Gregory XVI; 1842); Maria Pia of Portugal, on the day of her baptism (Pius IX, her godfather, 1849); Isabella II of Spain (Pius IX; 1868); Maria Christina, Queen Regent of Spain (Leo XIII; 1886); Isabella, Princess Imperial of Brazil, then Regent of the Empire (Leo XIII; 1880); Marie Amélie, Queen of Portugal (Leo XIII; 1892); and, lastly, Marie Henriette, Queen of the Belgians (Leo XIII; 1893).

GIORIO, *Lezioni di Diplomasia Ecclesiastica* (Rome, 1899), Pt. I, Lib. I, Cap. iv, Art. IV, n. 287 sq.; ANDRÉ-WAGNER, *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique*, III, 370; BARRY, *The Sacramentals* (Cincinnati, 1858), 108 sqq.

P. M. J. ROCK.

Golden Spur, ORDER OF. See MILITARY ORDERS.

**Goldoni, CARLO**, dramatist; b. at Venice, 25 Feb., 1707; d. at Paris, 6 Jan., 1793. Goldoni is especially notable for the reform which he wrought in the Italian theatre by substituting for the drama of improvisation (*commedia dell' arte*) a fully elaborated character play inspired by the works of Molière, and yet replete with a realism due to his own keen observation of contemporary life in Italy. The story of his life has been told with much detail in the autobiographical "Mémoires", which he wrote in French in 1787. This work is important also for the account which it gives of the vicissitudes attending his attempts to improve the dramatic repertory of his day, and of his eventual success despite the opposition of Chiari and Gozzi.

Born in Venice, he accompanied his father in his peregrinations to various Italian cities, among them Perugia and Rimini, where he practised as a physician. The boy was intended at first for his father's profession, but he early indicated his real tastes by running away from Rimini with a theatrical troupe. Later we find him at Venice studying law, and ere long he is seen occupying at Chioggia the post of assistant to the registrar or clerk of the criminal court. By this time he had begun the composition of plays. He finally took his degree in law and settled in Venice, practising as an advocate and continuing his literary work. But he did not remain at rest long. Associated with the diplomatic service for brief periods, he sojourned in Milan and in Genoa, and then for one reason or another shifted his domicile hither and thither in Northern Italy, making his longest stay in Pisa, where for five years he devoted himself to legal pursuits. In 1746 he received the appointment of dramatic poet to the theatre S. Angelo at Venice, and in the following year betook himself to his native city. In his new position he wrote many comedies which were performed successfully, and in 1752 he accepted a similar appointment to the Venetian theatre of San Luca, for which he provided additional pieces. All the while warfare was being waged against him by the partisans of the inartistic "Commedia dell' arte", and finally, although he had gained the day, he determined from sheer weariness to accept the offer made him in 1761 of the place of poet to the Théâtre Italien at Paris. Honourable though his post was, he never felt really happy in it, and when the time of his contract was finished, he meditated an instant return to his native land. This purpose he did not carry out, for an appointment as Italian tutor to the daughters of Louis XV induced him to remain in France. A pension was assigned to him, and it was paid to him regularly up to the year 1792. He died the next year on the day before that on which, at the recommendation of Joseph Chénier, the Convention restored his pension.

During his residence in the French capital, Goldoni produced two important comedies in French, the "Bourru bienfaisant" (which he himself translated into Italian), and the "Avare fastueux". Goldoni's dramatic pieces are about 150 in number. They fall readily into three groups: those written entirely in the Venetian dialect, of which there are about eleven; those written partly in dialect, which form the largest part; and those written wholly in pure Italian, of which some are in prose and some in Martellian verse. The earlier among them, the tragedies, tragi-comedies and melodramas are almost negligible; his fame rests on the comedies picturing the customs of his time. Notable among these are "La locandiera", "Un curioso accidente", "Il Bugiardo", "Pamela", "La bottega di caffè", "I Rusteghi", and "Il Burbero benefico" (the Italian form of the play performed at Paris in 1771). These and a few others still live on the Italian stage. His "Lettere", published in a collection at Bologna in 1880, contain interesting matter which adds to the information conveyed in the "Mémoires". The plays are given in the two Venice editions—1788-95 in 44 vols., and 1817-22 in 46 vols.

LEE, *The Eighteenth Century in Italy*; HOWELLS, *Preface to J. Black's translation of the Mémoires*; LORNER, *Carlo Goldoni e le sue Memorie in Archivio Veneto*, XXII-XXIV; RABANY, *De Goldoni italica scena correctore* (Paris, 1893); MARTINI, *Carlo Goldoni in La Vita italiana nel Settecento* (Milan, 1896).

J. D. M. FORD.

**Goldwell, THOMAS**, Bishop of St. Asaph, the last survivor of the ancient hierarchy of England; b. probably at the family manor of Goldwell, in the parish of Great Chart, near Ashford, Kent, between 1501 and 1515; d. in Rome, 3 April, 1585. He was a member of a Kentish family of ancient lineage, long seated at Goldwell; and was educated at All Souls College, Oxford, where he graduated M.A. in 1531, and B.D. in 1534. While at Oxford he attained more eminence in mathematics, astronomy, and kindred sciences, than in divinity or the humanities, a point worth remembering in view of his future career. He stood out firmly against the innovations in religion brought about by Henry VIII. At an early date he became intimate with Reginald, afterwards Cardinal, Pole, a friendship which proved to be a lasting one, and which had considerable influence on Goldwell's subsequent career. Soon after 1535, when the king had begun his drastic measures of ecclesiastical spoliation, Goldwell became Pole's chaplain and joined him in exile, being included in the same Act of Attainder "for casting off his duty to the King, and submitting to the Bishop of Rome". He reached Rome in 1538, and shortly afterwards he was appointed *camerarius* of the English Hospital of the Holy Trinity. In 1547 he became a novice in the Theatine House of St. Paul, at Naples. On the death of Paul III, Pole, now a cardinal, asked and obtained permission for Goldwell to accompany him to Rome, and thus he was present at the long conclave of 1549-50 in the capacity of Pole's personal attendant. After the election of Julius III, Goldwell returned to Naples, and made his profession as a Theatine. In 1553, while Edward VI was still reigning, an Act of General Pardon was passed, from which Goldwell had the signal honour of being specially excepted by name, along with Pole and some others. On the accession of Mary I there came an all too brief spell of prosperity for English Catholics. Pole, now papal legate, returned to England with Goldwell in his train, and the latter was soon nominated to the See of St. Asaph in North Wales (1555). While still only bishop-designate, he was sent to Rome (2 July, 1555) to make a report on the state of religion in England to Paul IV.

While at Rome, on this occasion, he was probably consecrated bishop; and he returned to England at the end of the year. In 1556 he assisted at the consecration of Pole to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. He was then for some time actively engaged in the affairs of his Diocese of St. Asaph. He issued numerous injunctions to his clergy, prohibiting married priests from saying Mass, and forbade the use of churches as poor-schools. He revived the pilgrimages to the miraculous well of St. Winefride, at Holywell, and obtained from the pope a renewal of the indulgences for pilgrims to that shrine. He also examined the heretic John Philpot, which fact is chronicled in no friendly way by Foxe ("Acts and Monuments", ed. Townsend, VII, 620). It was about this time proposed, though without his knowledge or consent, to make him ambassador to the court of Rome, and to translate him to the See of Oxford; letters of credence to Paul IV had been actually made out; and on 5 Nov., 1558, he received the custody of the temporalities of the See of Oxford, Thomas Wood having received that of St. Asaph four days previously. But the death of Queen Mary on 17 November terminated all these arrangements. Just at this juncture Goldwell was at the deathbed of Cardinal Pole, to whom he gave the last sacraments.

The accession of Elizabeth was, of course, the signal

for the final attack of Protestantism upon the ancient Faith. Goldwell strenuously resisted as far as in him lay. It is interesting to note by what dishonourable and underhand methods the queen's party put it out of his power to make his protest in a constitutional manner. It was alleged that, by his nomination to Oxford, he was no longer Bishop of St. Asaph; but that, as he had not done homage to the queen for Oxford, he was not yet bishop of that see. Accordingly, he did not receive the summons to Parliament which was undoubtedly his legal due. In May, 1559, however, he was summoned before the queen with the other bishops, and all of them were expelled from their sees for their refusal to take the oath of supremacy. He then resolved to leave the country, for, as he afterwards stated, he was not allowed to perform a bishop's office, say Mass, or administer the sacraments, as long as he remained in England.

Although the ports were being watched for him, he succeeded in making his escape. It was obviously impossible for him to have carried off the register and records of his see under such circumstances. This charge, however, has been maliciously made against him. He then became an active Catholic exile. He started at once for Rome, but was detained at Louvain by sickness. He refused the offer of an Italian bishopric, preferring to devote himself to his order (the Theatines) and to the conversion of England. In 1561 he was made superior of his old convent at Naples, and also warden of the English Hospital at Rome. He was the only English bishop at the Council of Trent, where he was treated with marked respect. He was there engaged in the revision of the Breviary and the Missal; and also urged the council to excommunicate Queen Elizabeth. His mere presence at Trent was a cause of such excessive annoyance to Elizabeth that she wrote the following extraordinary farrago of falsehood to her German envoy Mundt: "We think it may be that one Goldwell, a very simple and fond man, having in our late sister's time been named to a small bishopric in Wales called St. Asaph, *though never thereto admitted*, flying out of the realm upon our sister's death, is gone to Rome as a renegade, and there using the name of a bishop, *without order or title*, is perhaps gone *in the train of some Cardinal* to Trent, and so it is likely the speech hath arisen of a bishop of England being there." In 1563 Goldwell was vicar-general to the Archbishop of Milan, St. Charles Borromeo. In 1567 he was made vicar of the cardinal archpriest in the Lateran, and in 1574 the Cardinal Vicar Savelli made him his vicegerent; he thus became, so to speak, the "working" bishop of Rome. Hall, an English traveller in 1568, said that Goldwell was the only English Catholic in Rome who was courteous to him. In 1580, in spite of his advanced age, he set out for England at the head of the mission which included Campion and Persons, but he was taken ill at Reims and obliged to return to Rome. One of the last acts of his long and strenuous career was to serve on the Congregation for the Revision of the Roman Martyrology, in 1582. On the death of the Bishop of Lincoln, in 1584, Goldwell became the sole survivor of the ancient English hierarchy. He died the next year, and was buried at St. Sylvester's. A portrait of him exists at the English College, Rome.

Knox. *The last survivor of the ancient English Hierarchy*, Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph (London, 1876); Tour in Dict. Nat. Biog., s. v.; GILLOW, *Biog. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; THOMAS, *History of the Diocese of St. Asaph* (1874), 84, 201; BLISS, *Wood's Athen. Oxoni.*, II; BRADY, *Episcopal Succession*, I, II, III; BOCCATELLA, *Life of Pole*.

C. F. WEMYSS BROWN.

**Golgotha.** See CALVARY, MOUNT.

**Goliath.** See DAVID.

**Gómara** (or GÓMORA), FRANCISCO LOPEZ DE, b. at Seville, Spain, in 1510; studied at the University of Alcalá, was ordained priest, made a journey to Rome,

and upon his return in 1540, entered the service of Hernándo Cortés as private and domestic chaplain. He accompanied Cortés on the Algerian expedition, and, after the death of his patron, it is known that he was at Valladolid in 1556 or 1557, after which he is supposed to have retired to his native city of Seville, where he probably died. With the information given him by the conqueror and other persons who had returned from the New World (he himself cites Gonzalo de Tapia and Gonzalo de Umbria) he wrote his "Hispania Victrix; First and Second Parts of the General History of the Indies, with the whole discovery and notable things that have happened since they were acquired until the year 1551, with the conquest of Mexico and New Spain", a work published at Saragossa in the year 1552. It was translated into French by Martin Fumée and published at Paris in 1578; Augustin Gravalz translated it into Italian and published it at Venice in 1560; lastly, Juan Bautista de San Anton Chimalpain Quanhalehuatzin translated it into Mexican. The author relates in the first part, which is dedicated "To Don Carlos, Emperor of Romans, King of Spain, Lord of the Indies and New World", the whole discovery and conquest of the Antilles, Peru (up to the pacification effected by Gasca), Chile and Central America, also the voyage of Magellan and the discovery of the Moluccas. In the second part he tells of the conquest of Mexico, and it is dedicated "To the Very Illustrious Lord Don Martin Cortés, Marques del Valle"—the son and heir of the conqueror.

Whether through the desire to aggrandize his patron, or through relying on the first-hand information which the latter gave him (it is to be noted that Gómara was never in America), or from malice, or for some other reason, Gómara fell into serious errors and in many instances sinned gravely against historical truth. It was perhaps for this reason that Prince Philip (afterwards Philip II), in a decree issued at Valladolid, 17 November, 1553, ordered all the copies of his work that could be found to be gathered in and imposed a penalty of 200,000 *maravedis* on anyone who should reprint it. This prohibition was removed in 1727 through the efforts of Don Andreas Gonzalez Barcia, who included Gómara's work in his collection of early historians of the New World (*Colección de historiadores primitivos de las Indias Occidentales*). The "Verdadera historia de la Conquista de Nueva España" (True History of the Conquest of New Spain) of Bernal Diaz del Castillo, a companion of Hernándo Cortés, was written to refute Gómara. The latter's style is concise and agreeable, the narrative running on rapidly and gracefully, all of which has had the effect of attracting readers to the work. Among other works of his which have remained unpublished are "Batallas de mar de nuestros tiempos" (Contemporary Naval Battles) and "Historia de Harruc y Harradin Barbarroja".

*Biblioteca de autores españoles, XXII, Historiadores de Indias*, I (Madrid, 1852); *Biblioteca historica de la Iberia*, II, *Crónica de Gómara*, I (Mexico, 1870); *Diccionario enciclopédico Hispano Americano*, XII; LEÓN, *Historia general de México* (Mexico, 1902).

CAMILLUS CRIVELLI.

**Gomes De Amorim**, FRANCISCO, Portuguese poet, dramatist, and novelist; b. at Avelomar, near Oporto, 13 August, 1827; d. 4 November, 1891. His parents were respectable but so poor that Francisco had to leave school at the age of ten, when he went to Brazil and obtained a situation in a business house at Pará. After some time he found an opportunity to study the manners and dialects of the Indian tribes of the Amazon forests. He returned to Portugal in his twentieth year, and two years later, under the influence of the revolutionary ideas of 1848, he composed the poems, "A liberdade", "A queda da Hungria" and "Gariibaldi". Sympathizing as he did with the principles

of romanticism, he, like so many other young writers, fell under the spell of Almeida Garrett, and, to help him to carry out his plan of establishing a national drama, he began to write plays. The first, "Ghigi" (1852), was performed at Lisbon with signal success. It was followed by a long series of dramas, among which the best known are, "Ódio de raça", "Aleijões sociaes", "Figados de tigre", "A proibição", "A viuva", "A abnegação", and "Os herdeiros do milionário". For several years prior to 1851, in order to make a living, he worked in a hatter's establishment, but in that year he was appointed to a government post, and found leisure to compose his dramas, poems, and romances. In 1859 he was made librarian to the Minister of Marine.

His lyric fame was firmly fixed by the appearance in 1858 of two collections of poems, the "Cantos matutinos" and the "Ephemeris". As a novelist, he made himself favourably known by "Os selvagens" (1875) and its sequel, "O remorso vivo" (1876), by the "Amor da patria" (1879), which is partly an historical novel and partly a romance of the sea, by the "Muita parra e pouca uva" (1879) and by many others. In some of the novels, as in several of the plays, he draws upon his knowledge of Brazilian life. His admiration for his friend, Almeida Garrett, who had constantly encouraged him in his literary endeavours, led him to compose his great work, "Garrett, Memórias biográficas" (Lisbon, 1881), which not only deals with the public and private life of the greatest modern poet and orator of the country, but is also a history of Portugal from 1799 till 1854.

See his complete works (Lisbon, 1866 and sqq.); and cf. REINHARDTSTÖTTNER, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen* (Berlin, 1887).

J. D. M. FORD.

**Gomorra.** See SODOM AND GOMORRHA.

**Gondulphus** (GUNDULFUS), the name of three saints, of whom one was Bishop of Tongres (Maastricht), the second Bishop of Metz, while the third is known as Gondulphus of Berry. We possess little information concerning any of the three, and the slight idea of each afforded us by the documents of the Middle Ages is reduced to the following.

I. GONDULPHUS OF METZ is the one concerning whom our information is most reliable. His feast is celebrated on 6 September. As bishop, Gondulphus succeeded Angilram, him who caused Paul the Deacon to write the "Liber de episcopis Mettensibus", and who died probably in 791. At the death of Angilram there was a vacancy in the episcopal See of Metz, which was terminated by the accession of Gondulphus. The "Annales S. Vincentii Mettenses" give the date as 819. But, as it is known, on the other hand, that since the time of Bishop Chrodegang episcopal ordination took place on Sunday, the date of the consecration of Bishop Gondulphus must be set down as 28 (?) December, 816. The old episcopal catalogue of the church of Metz informs us that Gondulphus occupied the see of this church for six years, eight months, and seven days, and that he died on the 7th of the Ides of September, which would be the sixth of that month, in the year 823. He was buried in the monastery of Gorze, where his relics are still honoured on 6 September. It is impossible to quote in this respect any special patronage, and with regard to his episcopal career, apart from the details furnished here, there exists no information.

II. GONDULPHUS OF TONGRES, or, as he is commonly called, GONDULPHUS OF MAASTRICHT, because his predecessor, Bishop Monulphus, transferred the seat of the bishopric from Tongres to Maastricht, which thenceforth was the actual residence of the bishops of Tongres. However, the official title of the Bishop of Tongres, *episcopus Tungrorum*, was retained until the eleventh century, even when the episcopal see had been transferred from Maastricht to Liège. Bishop

Gondulphus is a somewhat enigmatic figure; indeed, one is inclined to question whether he be not identical with Monulphus. But the two saints must nevertheless be distinguished. Monulphus must have occupied the See of Tongres until the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century, while at the Council of Paris in 614 the presence is discovered of a Bishop of Maastricht named Betulphus. Gondulphus, then, probably comes between Monulphus and Betulphus, at least if this Betulphus must not be identified with Gondulphus on the grounds that the case is analogous to that of the episcopal list of Mainz, where Bertulfus and Crotoldus must be reckoned identical. Furthermore, the episcopal lists of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, whose value is, however, not very great, ignore Betulphus, and make Gondulphus the immediate successor of Monulphus. The biographies of Gondulphus, which are handed down to us from the Middle Ages, are merely an extract from the "Vita Servatii" of the priest Jocundus. They are quite without value and are full of legends. If they are to be believed, Gondulphus endeavoured to rebuild the town of Tongres, which had been destroyed by the barbarian invasions. But heaven opposed his scheme, and miraculously manifested its desire to the saint. Furious wolves fell upon the pagan colonists of this region, and devoured them before the eyes of the horrified bishop. Thus has legend quite obscured the authentic history of St. Gondulphus, the fact of his episcopacy at Maastricht being the only one that is authentic. According to local tradition he occupied the episcopal see for seven years and died about 607. This last statement does not tally with his presence at Paris in 614, if he is to be considered identical with the Betulphus who assisted at that council. In any case he was buried in the nave of the church of Saint-Servais at Maastricht, which had been magnificently restored by his predecessor, St. Monulphus.

The bodies of Monulphus and Gondulphus were solemnly exhumed in 1039 by the Bishops Nithard of Liège and Gérard of Cambrai. An epitaph commemorating this event was afterwards misinterpreted, and gave rise to a legend according to which the two saints arose from their tomb in 1039 in order to assist at the dedication of the church of Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle), and at the conclusion of the ceremony returned to their tomb to resume their eternal sleep. Together with St. Monulphus, St. Gondulphus is secondary patron of the city and church of Maastricht. His feast is kept on 16 July. The commemoration of the exhumation of 1039 is celebrated on 10 August.

III. SAINT GONDULPHUS (or Gondon) of Berry, who is honoured with the title of bishop, is a person of whom history gives a still more legendary account than of his namesake of Maastricht. According to the biography in which he is comparatively lately treated by a monk of Berry, he was Archbishop of Milan in the seventh century. Not succeeding in appeasing the troubles which had arisen in his church, he resolved to submit to the inevitable, and retired to Berry with a number of his disciples. It is not known, however, that any Archbishop of Milan had to deal with these conditions. It is true that it has been thought that Gondulphus lived at the time of the Milanese schism regarding the affair of the Three Chapters, that he was consecrated in 555, but that he was never received as bishop in his diocese. These are merely hypotheses, and in fact it must be said that the history of the St. Gondulphus who is honoured in Berry is unknown.

The attestation of his cult in Berry appears late among the additions to the martyrology of Usuard; it is cited in the Breviary of Bourges in 1625. He is the patron of St-Gondon, near Gien. His feast is kept on 17 June.

ST. GONDULPHUS OF METZ.—*Nomina pontificum Mettensis sedis et ordo in Mon. Germ. Hist., Script., II, 269; Annales S. Vincentii Mettenses, ibid., III, 156; Gesta episcoporum Mettensium, ibid., X, 541; Acta SS., September, II, 782-84; BONNELL, Die*



*Anfänge des karolingischen Hauses* (Berlin, 1866), 185-191; DOERING, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte des Bistums Metz* (Innsbruck, 1887). ST. GONDULPHUS OF TONGRES.—*Vita Gondulphi* in *Acta SS.*, July, IV, 163 sqq.; *Mon. Germ. Hist., Script.*, XIII, 290; *Acta SS.*, 28; GHEBQUIÈRE, *Acta SS. Belg.*, II, 250 sqq.; *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*, s. v.; FRIEDRICH, *Dre uederichte Concilien aus der Merovingerzeit*, 16-51; IDEM, *Kirchen-gesch. Deutschlands*, II, 320; MONCHAMP, *Le distique de l'église Saint-Servais à Maestricht: Excitus hac arca Monulphus aqueusque dicato* || *Gondulphus tempo se reddidit uterque ierarcha* in *Bulletin de la classe des Lettres de l'Académie royale de Belgique*, 1900, 771-96; MOLANUS, *Natales sanctorum Belgii*, 160; VAN DER ESSEN, *Étude critique et littéraire sur les Vies des saints mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique* (Louvain, 1907), 167-8. ST. GONDULPHUS OF BERRY.—*Acta SS.*, June, III, 379; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, VI, 520-1. Consult also MIGNE, *Dict. hagiographique* (Paris, 1850), s. vv. *Gondolf*, *Gondolphe*, *Gondon*.

L. VAN DER ESSEN.

**Gonet**, JEAN BAPTISTE, theologian; b. about 1616 at Béziers, in the province of Languedoc; d. there 24 Jan., 1681. From his early boyhood he was devout and fond of study. He received his primary education in his native place, and there at the age of seventeen entered the Order of St. Dominic. After his religious profession he was sent to the University of Bordeaux, where with unusual ability he devoted himself to the study of philosophy and theology, winning all honours in the customary examinations before advancement. Having received the doctorate, he was appointed to the chair of scholastic theology in the university, in which capacity he proved himself a brilliant theologian and an exceptionally gifted teacher. In 1671 he was elected provincial of his province; on the expiration of his term of office, he resumed the professorship of theology, holding it till 1678, when ill-health obliged him to return to his native place. As a theologian and academic disputant Gonet ranks among the most prominent figures of his time. An ardent defender and exponent of the teaching of St. Thomas and an illustrious representative of Neo-Thomism, he set forth the traditional teaching of his school with astonishing clearness and skill, if with some bitterness against the representatives of different views. He lived at a time when theological discussion was rife, when men, weary of treading beaten paths, had set themselves to constructing systems of their own. His zeal, however, for the integrity of Thomistic teaching, and his bitter aversion from doctrinal novelty sometimes carried him beyond the teaching of his master, and led him to adopt opinions on certain questions of theology, especially those dealing with predestination and reprobation, which were rejected by many learned theologians of his own school. In 1669 he published a work on the morality of human acts, the purpose of which was to defend the Thomistic doctrine at once against what he calls the laxities of the modern casuists, and the rigorism of the Jansenists. In this treatise he defends the probabilism of his school, and in the heat of the controversy is unsparing in his denunciations of the doctrine of probabilism. His principal work is the "*Clypeus theologiae thomisticae contra novos ejus impugnatores*" (16 vols., Bordeaux, 1659-69). From 1669 to 1681 no less than nine editions of this work appeared; the latest is that of Paris, 1875. Shortly before his death he published his "*Manuale thomistarum*", which is an abridgment of his larger work.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Scriptores O. Fr.*, II, 693; HURTER, *Nomenclator*; SCHWANE, *Dogmengesch. der neueren zeit* (Freiburg im Br., 1890), 28, 199, 217, 240, 314, 377, 379.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

**Gong.** See ALTAR, sub-title ALTAR-BELL.

**Gonnelieu**, JÉRÔME DE, theologian, ascetical writer, and preacher, b. at Soissons, 8 Sept., 1640; d. at Paris, 28 Feb., 1715. At the age of seventeen he entered the Society of Jesus (4 Oct., 1657). Till the year 1674, when he pronounced his final vows, his services were requisitioned in various capacities, his work as a teacher being particularly efficient and valuable. From this date his abilities were long and actively di-

rected towards the ministry of the pulpit, and many, attracted by the piety and learning of his discourse, looked to him as spiritual consoler and adviser. He attained to considerable reputation as a sacred orator, the qualifications which he possessed in this way being altogether exceptional and peculiar; he had, particularly, in a marked degree, the faculty of conveying spiritual thoughts of the loftiest and noblest import in a form that was readily assimilable by the people. His duties, of whatever order, were discharged with thoroughness and a laudable spirit of self-sacrifice; the zeal and earnestness which he always displayed in the cause of religion entitle Gonnelieu to a very high place among the evangelical workers of that time who laboured most to promote the spiritual advancement of men. Towards the latter end of his life he gave himself up almost exclusively to literary activity; and the renown which he acquired in this department was no less deserved than the celebrity with which his preaching was attended. The following is a list of his works: "Exercice de la vie spirituelle" (Paris, 1701); "De la Présence de Dieu qui renferme tous les principes de la vie intérieure" (Paris, 1703, 1709; Marseilles, 1827); "Méthode de bien prier" (Paris, 1710, 1769); "Pratique de la vie intérieure", etc. (Paris, 1710); "Instruction sur la Confession et la Communion" (Paris, 1710; printed with preceding work in Paris edition of 1713); "Sermon de Notre Seigneur à ses apôtres après la Cène, avec des réflexions" (Paris, 1712); "Nouvelle retraite de huit jours à l'usage des personnes du monde et du cloître" (Paris, 1736).

To the above almost all the bibliographies add another work, of which the full title is "L'Imitation de Jesus-Christ, Traduction nouvelle: Avec une Pratique, et une Prière à la fin de chaque Chapitre" (Par le R. P. de Gonnelieu, de la Compagnie de Jésus, Paris and Nancy, 1712); but the great majority of the bibliographies, too, if apparently somewhat arbitrarily, deny that the *Traduction* (translation), as distinct from the *secours* (helps) at the end of each chapter, is by de Gonnelieu. The opinion of the negative critics seems to be based mainly on the statement of Calmet (op. cit. below) that "the translation is by Jean-Baptiste Cusson [printer at Nancy], and the rest by P. Gonnelieu". The most approved form of this theory is that which attributes the rendering, as made originally, to Jean Cusson, printer at Paris and clerk to the parliament, who, in his version published in 1673, had availed himself largely of the celebrated translation by Sacy. Jean-Baptiste Cusson, a man of culture and fine literary sense, after thoroughly revising and improving his father's work, had issued the amended version at Nancy in 1712. Hence, author of a notice on the principal French translations of the "Imitation" (*Journal des curés*, Sept., 1810), substantially maintained this view; so, also, Barbier and Brunet (op. cit. below). The "*Journal des Sçavans*" (Aug., 1713), on the other hand, in a review written within one year after the publication of the work, whilst praising the zeal and piety of the translator, says expressly that the version is by P. Gonnelieu; and adds that "Sieur Cusson (one time printer to the Journal) has enriched this first edition by many copper-plates". The testimony of the "*Mémoires de Trévoux*" (see below) for August, 1713, is almost identical with the preceding; and in the same notice it is stated that "the name of P. de Gonnelieu was a 'préjugé infailible' in favour of the excellence of the work". Finally, if it be argued, with those who deny the Gonnelieu authorship of the rendering, that the title of the "*Traduction*" is misleading, is it not more natural to assume that the Abbot of Senones, in his "*Histoire des hommes illustres*", written almost fifty years after the appearance of the version, was deceived by the ambiguity, than to assert such error on the part of those who were on terms of intimate relationship with Cusson, the printer, and Gonnelieu, the presumptive author?

*Journal des Scavans* (Amsterdam, 1713), LIV, 181-82, *Mémoires pour l'Histoire des Sciences et des beaux Arts* (Trévoux, 1713), Art. cxvii, LI, 1403-04; CALMET, *Bibliothèque Lorraine* (Nancy, 1751), 318; BARBIER, *Dictionnaire des Anonymes*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1823), II, 160, 163 sqq.; BRUNET, *Manuel du Libraire* (Paris, 1862), III, 426; PATOUILLET, *Dictionnaire des livres jansénistes* (1752), preface.

P. J. MACAULEY.

**Gonsalo García, SAINT.** See GARCÍA, GONSALO, SAINT.

**Gonzaga, ERCOLE (HERCULES)**, cardinal; b. at Mantua, 23 November, 1505; d. 2 March, 1563. He was the son of the Marquess Francesco, and nephew of Cardinal Sigismondo Gonzaga (1469-1525). He studied philosophy at Bologna under Pomponazzi, and later took up theology. In 1520, or as some say, 1525, his uncle Sigismondo renounced in his favour the See of Mantua; in 1527 his mother Isabella brought him back from Rome the insignia of the cardinalate. Notwithstanding his youth, he showed great zeal for church reform, especially in his own diocese; and in this he received help and encouragement from his friend Cardinal Giberti, Bishop of Verona. His mode of life was stainless and a manuscript work of his, "*Vitæ Christianæ institutio*", bears witness to his piety. He published a Latin catechism for the use of the priests of his diocese and built the diocesan seminary, thus carrying out reforms urged by the Council of Trent, as his friends Contarini, Giberti, Caraffa, and other bishops had done or were doing, even before the council had assembled. His charity was unbounded, and many young men of talent and genius had their university expenses paid by him. The popes employed him on many embassies, e. g. to Charles V in 1530. Because of his prudence and his business-like methods, he was a favourite with the popes, with Charles V, and Ferdinand I, and with the Kings of France, Francis I and Henry II. From 1540 to 1556 he was guardian to the young sons of his brother Federico II who had died, and in their name he governed the Duchy of Mantua. The elder of the boys, Francesco, died in 1550 and was succeeded by his brother Guglielmo. In the conclave of 1559 it was thought he would certainly be made pope; but the cardinals would not choose as pope a scion of a ruling house. In 1561 Pius IV named him legate to the Council of Trent, for which he had from the beginning laboured by every means at his command, moral and material. In its early stages, owing to the fact that not a few considered he was in favour of Communion under both kinds, he met with many difficulties, and interested motives were attributed to him. Nothing but the express wish of the pope could have persuaded him to remain at his post, and the energy he displayed was unwearied. He contracted fever at Trent, where he died, attended by Father Lainez. His benefactions to the Jesuit college at Mantua and to the Monte di Pietà were very great, and his letters are invaluable to the historian of that period.

CIACONIUS, *Vitæ Pontificum* (Rome, 1677); CATALANI, *Vita del Card. Gonzaga* (Mantua, 1564); PASTOR, *Gesch. der Päpste*, V. U. BENIGNI.

**Gonzaga, SCIPIONE**, cardinal; b. at Mantua, 11 November, 1542; d. at San Martino, 11 January, 1593. He belonged to the family of the Dukes of Sabbioneta, passed his youth under the care of Cardinal Ercole (Hercules) Gonzaga, and made rapid progress in Greek and Latin studies. At Bologna, and later at Padua, he studied mathematics and philosophy, and, in the latter city, founded the Accademia degli Etere, or Academy of the Ethereals. Throughout his life he patronized literature and men of letters, among the latter being Tasso, who sought his advice concerning his "*Gerusalemme Liberata*", and Guarino, who dedicated to him his "*Pastor Fido*". Having finished his theological studies he went to Rome, became *cameriere segreto* to Pius IV, and was ordained priest. In the early years of the reign of Gregory XIII Gon-

zaga had a serious lawsuit with the Duke of Mantua over some property, but they were soon reconciled. Through the Guise party, whose cause he had aided, he became Bishop of Mende in France, but Charles, Duke of Guise, pleaded unsuccessfully with Gregory XIII to have him made cardinal. Sixtus V, immediately on his elevation, appointed him Patriarch of Jerusalem, and in 1587, at the request of the Duke of Mantua, raised him to the cardinalate. Sixtus also made constant use of his services in the execution of his policies, domestic and foreign. Cardinal Gonzaga was a friend of Saint Charles Borromeo and Saint Philip Neri, and his cousin Saint Aloysius Gonzaga owed him the eventual consent of his father to his entering the Society of Jesus. For a time Cardinal Gonzaga was governor of the Marquessate of Monferato in the name of the Marquess Vincenzo. The three books of his "*Commentarii*", written in polished Latin, are an important source of information for the history of his cardinalate. He was buried in the church of St. Sebastian at Rome. His "*Commentarii*" were edited at Rome in 1791 by Marotti.

CARDELLA, *Memorie storiche de' Cardinali* (Rome, 1792), 273. U. BENIGNI.

**González de Santalla, THYRSUS**, theologian and thirteenth general of the Society of Jesus; b. at Arganda, Spain, 18 January, 1624; d. at Rome, 27 October, 1705. He entered the Society of Jesus 3 March, 1643, and taught philosophy and theology at Salamanca from 1655 to 1665 and from 1676 to 1687, the intervening years having been devoted to preaching. When about to set out for Africa to convert the Mussulmans in 1687, he was sent as elector to the thirteenth general congregation, by which he was chosen general, 6 July, 1687. As an ardent adversary of probabilism González had frequently asked his superiors to have some Jesuit write against the doctrine. He himself had composed a work in which he defended probabiliorism, assigning, however, an exaggerated importance to the subjective estimation of the degree of probability. The general revisors of the Society unanimously rendered an unfavourable opinion on the work, and accordingly, in 1674, Father-General Oliva refused permission for its publication. González received encouragement from Innocent XI, who had become pope in 1676, and by his order the Holy Office issued a decree, in 1680, ordering the superiors of the Society to allow their subjects to defend probabiliorism, a permission that had never been denied. As general of the Society, González thought himself obliged to fight probabilism among his subjects. In 1691, he had printed at Dillingen a modified edition of his former work, but, owing to the efforts of his assistants, this book was never published. Innocent XII ordered a new examination of it to be made, and with many corrections it finally appeared, in 1694, under the title "*Fundamentum theologiæ moralis—de recto usu opinionum probabilium*" at Rome (three editions), Antwerp, Dillingen, Paris, Cologne, etc., and again at Antwerp, in 1695. Migne has reproduced it in his "*Cursus Theologiæ*", XI. Bossuet said that nothing more formidable had ever been written against probabilism, and St. Alphonsus Liguori found in it an exaggeration of rigorist tendencies.

We also have from the pen of González some apologetical works: "*Selectarum disputationum tomi quatuor*" (Salamanca, 1680), in which are found chapters against the Thomists, Jansenius, and some doctors of Louvain; treatises on the Immaculate Conception, and on papal infallibility. This last, directed against the Assembly of the Clergy of France in 1682, and printed by order of Innocent XI, was afterwards suppressed by Alexander VIII, who feared new difficulties with the French court. This work appeared, in résumé only, at Barcelona, in 1691.

DE BACKER and SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. des écrivains de la*

*comp. de Jésus*; CONCINA, *Apparatus ad theologiam christianam* (Rome, 1751), II; *Vindiciae societatis Jesu ejusque doctrinae purgatae* (Venice, 1769); DOLLINGER and REUSCH, *Gesch. der Moralstreitigkeiten in der roem. kath. Kirche* (Nordlingen, 1889), I, 130-273; II, 49-219; HURTER, *Nomenclator*; MATIGNON, *Études religieuses* (Paris, 1886); PATCZZI, *Lettereologico-morali*, VI (Trent, 1756); REUSCH, *Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn, 1885), pp. 506-10; *Preussische Jahrbücher* (Berlin, 1888), *Eine Krisis im Jesuitenorden*; STRIEBER in *Kirchenzeit*; BIRLMAYER in *Kirchl. Handl.*. For controversies about the decree of Innocent XI on probabilism see chiefly BRÜCKER, *Études religieuses*, 1901-02, who quotes the official communication of the only authentic text given by the Holy Office in 1902. TER HAAR, *Innocenti XI de Probabilismo decreti historia et vindicia* (Tournay and Paris, 1904); LEHMKEHL, *Probabilismus vindicatus* (Freiburg, 1906); see also, ARNDT in *Analecta Eccl.*, 1902; CATHEIN in *Theol. prakt. Quartalschrift*, 1905; FRANZ in *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.*, 1905; MANDOSNET in *Revue Thomiste*, 1901-2.

J. SALESMANS.

**Gonzalo de Berceo**, Spanish poet, active between 1220 and 1242. Born in the closing years of the twelfth century, he appears to be the earliest Castilian author known to us by name. He became a priest and passed the whole of his life in or near the monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla. His compositions extend to more than 13,000 verses (Alexandrines), arranged in monorhymed quatrains (*cuaderna vía*), and, at least in so far as the truly authentic are concerned, are religious and hagiographical in their nature. They are made up of lives of Spanish saints: "La vida de Santo Domingo de Silos", "La vida de San Millán", "La vida de Santa Oria"; of poems celebrating the Blessed Virgin: "Los Milagros de Nuestra Señora", "Los Loores de Nuestra Señora", "El duelo de la Virgen"; and of other pious and didactic works: "El sacrificio de la Misa", "Los signos del juicio", and perhaps some hymns. In all these compositions he manifests but little originality, abiding, wherever possible, by Latin sources that were doubtless in the monastic library. His manner and style, however, are decidedly interesting, because they evince his desire to appeal to all the lay reading public of Castile in his time. He writes, as he tells us, in the vernacular, so that he may be read by the common man; and he intentionally adopts the methods of the popular minstrel in order to reach more quickly the popular heart. In spite of his diffuseness, he can interest us to-day, and his quaint humour, heavy though it may be at times, has no little charm. If we are to believe the ascription contained in one of the two manuscripts of the old Spanish poem on Alexander the Great ("Libro de Alexandre") we must credit him with that secular work also; but scholars are not too prone to regard the ascription as correct.

Editions of his verse in SÁNCHEZ, *Colección de poesías castellanas anteriores al siglo XV* (Madrid, 1779-90), II; in the *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, LVII; and, for the *Santo Domingo in the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, fasc. 149, ed. FITZGERALD. See also LANCHEZAS, *Gramática y vocabulario de G. de Berceo* (Madrid, 1903); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Literature*.

J. D. M. FORD.

**Good** is one of those primary ideas which cannot be strictly defined. In order to fix its philosophical significance we may begin by observing that the word is employed firstly as an adjective, and secondly as a substantive. This distinction which is clearly marked in French by the two different terms, *bon* and *le bien*, may be preserved in English by prefixing an article to the term when it is employed substantively. We call a tool or instrument good, if it serves the purpose for which it is intended. That is to say, it is good because it is an efficient means to obtain a desired result. The result, in turn, may be desired for itself, or it may be sought as a means to some ulterior end. If it is sought for itself, it is or it is estimated by us to be a good, and therefore desirable on its own account. When we take some step to obtain it, it is the end of our action. The series of means and ends either stretches out indefinitely, or it must terminate in some desired object or objects which are ends in

themselves. Again we sometimes call a thing good because it possesses completely, or in a high degree, the perfections proper to its nature, as a good painting, good respiration. Sometimes too, things are termed good because they are of a nature to produce something desirable; that is, they are good causally. Finally, we speak of good conduct, a good man, a good intention, and here the adjective has for us a sense different from any of the foregoing, unless, indeed, we are utilitarian philosophers, to whom morally good is but another term for useful.

Now in all these locutions the word conveys directly or indirectly the idea of desirability. The merely useful is desired for the end towards which it is employed; the end is desired on its own account. The latter is conceived as possessing some character, quality, power, which renders it an object of desire. Two questions now arise: (1) What is it which, in the nature or being of any object, constitutes it desirable? Or, in more technical phrase, what, metaphysically speaking, constitutes the good or goodness in a thing, absolutely considered? (2) What is the relationship existing between the good thus absolutely constituted and the subject to which it is desirable? Or, what is implied by good, relatively considered? These two questions may be combined in one: "What is the good in the ontological order?" In exposing the reply to this question we shall come across the moral good, and the ethical aspect of the problem, which shall be treated in the second place.

**I. ONTOLOGICAL.**—In Greek philosophy no topic receives more attention than the nature of the good. The speculations of Plato and Aristotle, especially, have had a notable influence on Christian thought; they were adopted, in eclectic fashion, by the early Fathers, who combined many of the ancient philosophic ideas with revealed truth, by correcting some and amplifying others. The synthesis was carried on by the earlier Scholastics, and took definitive form from the hand of St. Thomas. Some of his predecessors, as well as some of his followers, disagree with him on a few minor points, most of which, however, are of a character too subtle to call for attention in this article. We shall, therefore, present the doctrine of St. Thomas in outline as the approved teaching of our schools.

**Plato.**—According to Plato, in the objective order corresponding to our thought, there are two different worlds: the world of things, and the incomparably higher, nobler world of ideas, which transcends the world of things. The objects corresponding directly to our universal concepts are not things, but ideas. The objective idea is not indwelling in the essences of those things which fall within the scope of our corresponding universal concept, but the thing borrows or derives something from the idea. While the being or existence proper to the world of things is imperfect, unstable, essentially transitory, and therefore not truly deserving of the name of being, which implies permanence, ideas on the contrary are incorruptible, unchangeable, and truly existence. Now, among ideas the noblest and highest is the idea *good*: it is the supreme and sovereign idea. Whatever things possess goodness have it only because they participate in, or draw from, the Sovereign Good. Their goodness, then, is something distinct from, and added to, their proper essences or being. What, in Plato's mind, is the nature of this participation we need not explain further than that he makes it consist in this, that the thing is a copy or imitation of the idea. This sovereign idea, the Good, is identical with God. It is not a synthesis of all other ideas but is unique, transcendent, and individual. Whether Plato held that other ideas exist in God as in their proper dwelling-place is not quite clear. Aristotle so interpreted Plato; and it is very likely that Aristotle was better qualified to understand Plato's meaning than were subsequent

philosophers who have disputed his interpretation. The Supreme Good imparts to the intellect the power to perceive, and gives intelligibility to the intelligible. It is, therefore, the source of truth. God, the essential and supreme Good, can impart nothing that is not good. This view leads to the inference that the origin of evil lies beyond the control of God. The theory leans, therefore, to dualism, and its influence may be traced through the early Gnostic and Manichaean heresies, and, in a minor degree, in the doctrines of the Priscillianists and Albigenses.

*Aristotle.*—Starting from the Platonic definition, good is that which all desire, Aristotle, rejecting the Platonic doctrine of a transcendent world of ideas, holds that the good and being are identical; good is not something added to being, it is being. Everything that is, is good because it is; the quantity, if one may use the word loosely, of being or existence which a thing possesses, is at the same time its stock of goodness. A diminution or an increase of its being is a diminution or increase of its goodness. Being and the good are, then, objectively the same; every being is good, every good is being. Our concepts, being and good, differ formally: the first simply denotes existence; the second, existence as a perfection, or the power of contributing to the perfection of a being. It follows from this that evil is not being at all; it is, on the contrary, the privation of being. Again, while being, viewed as the object of tendency, appetite, or will, gives rise to the concept *good*, so, when considered as the proper object of the intellect, it is represented under the concept *true* or *truth*, and it is the beautiful, inasmuch as the knowledge of it is attended by that particular pleasurable emotion which we call æsthetic. As God is the fullness of being, so, therefore, the supreme, infinite Being is also the Supreme Good from which all creatures derive their being and goodness.

*Neo-Platonism.*—The neo-Platonists perpetuated the Platonic theory, mixed with Aristotelian, Judaic, and other Oriental ideas. Plotinus introduced the doctrine of a triple hypostasis, i. e. the one, the intelligence, and the universal soul, above the world of changing being. The good is identical with the one, and is above being, which is multiple. The intelligence is ordained to good; but, incapable of grasping it in its entirety, it breaks it up into parts, which constitute the essences. These essences by becoming united with a material principle constitute things. The Pseudo-Dionysius propagated the Platonic influence in his work "De Nominibus Divinis", the doctrine of which is based on the Scriptures. God is supereminently being—"I am who am"—but in Him the good is anterior to being, and the ineffable name of God is above all His other names. The good is more universal than being, for it embraces the material principle which does not possess any being of its own. The bond which unites beings among themselves and to the Supreme Being is love, which has for its object the good. The trend of the Pseudo-Dionysius is away from the dualism which admits a principle of evil, but on the other hand, it inclines towards pantheism.

*The Fathers.*—The Fathers, in general, treated the question of good from the standpoint of hermeneutics rather than from the philosophic. Their chief concern is to affirm that God is the Supreme Good, that He is the creator of all that exists, that creatures derive their goodness from Him, while they are distinct from Him; and that there is no supreme independent principle of evil. St. Augustine, however (De Natura Boni, P. L., XLIII), examines the topic fully and in great detail. Some of his expressions seem tinged with the Platonic notion that good is antecedent to being; but elsewhere he makes the good and being in God fundamentally identical. Boethius distinguishes a double goodness in things created: first, that which in them is one with their being; second, an accidental

goodness added to their nature by God. In God these two elements of good, the essential and the accidental, are but one, since there are no accidents in God.

*Scholastic Doctrine.*—St. Thomas starts from the Aristotelean principle that being and the good are objectively one. Being conceived as desirable is the good. The good differs from the true in this, that, while both are objectively nothing else than being, the good is being considered as the object of appetite, desire, and will, the true is being as the object of the intellect. God, the Supreme Being and the source of all other being, is consequently the Supreme Good, and the goodness of creatures results from the diffusion of His goodness. In a creature, considered as a subject having existence, we distinguish several elements of the goodness which it possesses. (a) Its existence or being, which is the ground of all the other elements. (b) Its powers, activities, and capacities. These are the complement of the first, and they serve it to pursue and appropriate whatever is requisite for and contributory to sustaining its existence, and developing that existence into the fullness of perfection proper to it. (c) Each perfection that is acquired is a further measure of existence for it, hence a good. (d) The totality of these various elements, forming its total good subjectively, that is, its entire being in a state of normal perfection according to its kind, is its good complete. This is the sense of the axiom: *omne ens est bonum sibi* (every being is a good unto itself). The privation of any of its powers or due perfections is an evil for it, as, for instance, blindness, the loss of the power of sight, is an evil for an animal. Hence evil is not something positive and does not exist in itself; as the axiom expresses it, *malum in bono fundatur* (evil has its base in good).

Let us pass now to good in the relative sense. Every being has a natural tendency to continue and to develop itself. This tendency brings its activities into play; each power has its proper object, and a *conatus* pushing it to action. The end to which action is directed is something that is of a nature to contribute, when obtained, to the well-being or perfection of the subject. For this reason it is needed, pursued, desired, and, because of its desirability, is designated good. For example, the plant for its existence and development requires light, air, heat, moisture, nutriment. It has various organs adapted to appropriate these things, which are good for it, and, when by the exercise of these functions it acquires and appropriates them, it reaches its perfection and runs its course in nature. Now if we look into the cosmos, we perceive that the innumerable varieties of being in it are bound together in an indescribably complex system of mutual action and interaction, as they obey the laws of their nature. One class contributes to the other in that orderly relationship which constitutes the harmony of the universe. True—to change the metaphor—with our limited powers of observation we are unable to follow the innumerable threads of this mighty network, but we trace them in sufficiently large and varied sweeps to warrant the induction that everything is good for some other thing, that everything has its proper end in the great whole. *Omne ens est bonum alteri*. Since this orderly correlation of things is necessary to them in order that they may obtain from one another the help which they need, it too is good for them. This order is also a good in itself, because it is a created reflection of the unity and harmony of the Divine being and goodness. When we consider the Supreme Being as the efficient cause, conservator, and director of this majestic order, we reach the conception of Divine Providence. And then arises the question, what is the end towards which this Providence directs the universe? The end again is the good, i. e. God Himself. Not indeed that, as in the case of creatures, He may derive any advantage or perfection from the world, but that it, by participating in His

goodness, may manifest it. This manifestation is what we understand by the expression, "giving glory to God". God is the Alpha and the Omega of the good; the source from which it flows, the end to which it returns. "I am the Beginning and I am the End." It must be remembered that, throughout the treatment of this subject, the term *good*, like all other terms which we predicate of God and of creatures, is used not univocally but analogically when referred to God. (See ANALOGY.)

The defined doctrine on the good, ontologically considered, is formulated by the Council of the Vatican (Sess. III, Const. de Fide Catholica, Cap. i): "This one, only, true God, of His own goodness and almighty power, not for the increase of His own happiness, not to acquire but to manifest His perfection by the blessings which He bestows on creatures, with absolute freedom of counsel created from the beginning of time both the spiritual and the corporeal creature, to wit, the angelic and the mundane; and afterwards the human creature." In Canon iv we read: "If anyone shall say that finite things, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the Divine substance; or that the Divine essence, by the manifestation and evolution of itself, becomes all things; or lastly, that God is universal or indefinite being, which by determining itself constitutes the universality of things distinct according to genera, species, and individuals, let him be anathema."

II. ETHICAL.—The moral good is not a kind distinct from the good viewed ontologically; it is one form of perfection proper to human life, but, because of its excellence and supreme practical importance, it demands special treatment with reference to its own distinctive character which differentiates it from all other goods and perfections of man. It is again, in Greek philosophy, that we find the principles which have supplied the school with a basis for rational speculations, controlled and supplemented by revelation.

Plato.—The supreme good of man is, as we have seen, the idea *good*, identical with God. By union with God man attains his highest subjective good, which is happiness. This assimilation is effected by knowledge and love; the means to achieve it is to preserve in the soul a due harmony throughout its various parts in subordination to the intellect which is the highest faculty. The establishment of this harmony brings man to a participation in the Divine unity; and through this union man attains to happiness, which remains even though he suffers pain and the privation of perishable goods. To regulate our actions harmoniously we stand in need of true knowledge, i. e. wisdom. The highest duty of man, therefore, is to obtain wisdom, which leads to God.

Aristotle.—The end of man, his highest subjective good, is happiness or well-being. Happiness is not pleasure; for pleasure is a feeling consequent upon action, while happiness is a state of activity. Happiness consists in perfect action, i. e. the actual exercise by man of his faculties—especially of his highest faculty, the speculative intellect—in perfect correspondence with the norm which his nature itself prescribes. Action may deviate from this norm either by excess or defect. The golden mean is to be preserved, and in this consists virtue. The various faculties, higher and lower, are regulated by their respective virtues to carry on their activities in due order. Pleasure follows action duly performed, even the highest form of activity, i. e. speculative contemplation of truth; but, as has been noted, happiness consists in the very operation itself. A life of contemplation, however, cannot be enjoyed unless a man possesses enough goods of the lower orders to relieve him from the toils and the cares of life. Hence happiness is beyond the reach of many. It is to be observed therefore that, while both Plato and Aristotle, as well as the Scholastics, hold that happiness is the end of man, their con-

ception of happiness is quite different from the hedonistic idea of happiness as presented in English utilitarianism. For the utilitarian happiness is the sum total of pleasurable feelings, from whatever source they may be derived. On the other hand, in our sense, happiness—*eudaimonia*, *beatitudo*—is a distinct state or condition of consciousness accompanying and dependent on the realization in conduct of one definite good or perfection, the nature of which is objectively fixed and not dependent on our individual preferences. (See UTILITARIANISM.)

Hedonists.—The supreme good of man according to Aristippus is pleasure or the enjoyment of the moment, and pleasure is essentially gentle motion. Pleasure can never be bad, and the primary form of it is bodily pleasure. But, in order to secure the maximum of pleasure, prudent self-control is necessary; and this is virtue. Epicurus held that pleasure is the chief good; but pleasure is rest, not motion; and the highest form of pleasure is freedom from pain and the absence of all desires or needs that we cannot satisfy. Hence an important means towards happiness is the control of our desires, and the extinction of those that we cannot gratify, which is brought about by virtue. (See CYRENAIC SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY; HEDONISM; HAPPINESS.)

The Stoics.—Everything in the universe is regulated by law. Man's highest good, or happiness, is to conform his conduct to universal law, which is Divine in its origin. To pursue this end is virtue. Virtue is to be cultivated in scorn of consequences, whether pleasurable or painful. The Stoic principle, "duty for duty's sake alone", reappears in Kant, with the modification that the norm of right action is not to be regarded as imposed by a Divine will; its original source is the human mind, or the free spirit itself.

St. Thomas.—The radical difference which distinguishes the nobler forms of ancient ethics from Christian ethics is that, whereas the former identifies virtuous life with happiness, that is, with the possession and enjoyment of the highest good, the Christian conception is that a virtuous life, while it is, indeed, the proximate end and good of man, is not, in itself, his ultimate end and supreme good. A life of virtue, the moral good, leads him to the acquisition of an ulterior and ultimate end. Furthermore the happiness, which in an imperfect measure attends the virtuous life, may be accompanied with pain, sorrow, and the privation of terrestrial goods; complete happiness (*beatitudo*) is not to be found in earthly existence, but in the life to come, and will consist in union with God, the Supreme Good.

(A) The Proximate End and Good (*Bonum Morale*).—Like all creatures involved in the cosmic system, man requires and seeks for the conservation and perfection of his being a variety of things and conditions, all of which are, therefore, good for him. A composite being, partly corporeal and partly spiritual, he possesses two sets of tendencies and appetites. Rational, he employs contrivance in order to obtain goods not immediately within his reach. That he may attain the perfection of this highly complex nature, he must observe an order in the pursuit of different kinds of goods, lest the enjoyment of a good of lower value may cause him to lose or forfeit a higher one, in which case the former would be no true benefit to him at all. Besides, with a hierarchy of activities, capacities, and needs, he is a unity, an individual, a person; hence there exists for him a good in which all his other goods focus in harmonious correlation; and they are to be viewed and valued through the medium of this paramount good, not merely in isolated relation to their respective corresponding appetites.

There are, then, several divisions of good: (a) corporeal good is whatever contributes to the perfection of the purely animal nature; (b) spiritual good is that which perfects the spiritual faculty—knowledge, truth; (c)



useful good is that which is desired merely as a means to something else; the delectable or pleasurable good is any good regarded merely in the light of the pleasure it produces. The moral good (*bonum honestum*) consists in the due ordering of free action or conduct according to the norm of reason, the highest faculty, to which it is to conform. This is the good which determines the true valuation of all other goods sought by the activities which make up conduct. Any lower good acquired to the detriment of this one is really but a loss (*bonum apparens*). While all other kinds of good may, in turn, be viewed as means, the moral good is good as an end and is not a mere means to other goods. The pleasurable, though not in the order of things an independent end in itself, may be deliberately chosen as an end of action, or object of pursuit. Now let us apply these distinctions. Good being the object of any tendency, man has as many kinds of goods as he has appetites, needs, and faculties. The normal exercise of his powers and the acquisition thereby of any good is followed by satisfaction, which, when it reaches a certain degree of intensity, is the feeling of pleasure. He may and sometimes does pursue things not on account of their intrinsic worth, but simply that he may obtain pleasure from them. On the other hand, he may seek a good on account of its intrinsic power to satisfy a need or to contribute to the perfection of his nature in some respect. This may be illustrated in the case of food; for as the old adage has it, "the wise man eats to live, the epicure lives to eat".

The faculty which is distinctively human is reason; man lives as a man properly speaking, when all his activities are directed by reason according to the law which reason reads in his very nature. This conformity of conduct to reason's dictates is the highest natural perfection that his activities can possess; it is what is meant by rectitude of conduct, righteousness, or the moral good. "Those actions", says St. Thomas, "are good which are conformable to reason. Those are bad which are contrary to reason" (I-II, Q. xviii, a. 5). "The proximate rule of free action is reason, the remote is the eternal law, that is, the Divine Nature" (Ibid., Q. xxi, a. 1; Q. xix, a. 4). The motive impelling us to seek the moral good is not self-interest, but the intrinsic worth of righteousness. Why does a just man pay his debts? Ask him and he will reply, perhaps, in the first instance, "Because it is my duty". But ask him further: "Why do you fulfil this duty?" He will answer: "Because it is right to do so". When other goods are pursued in violation of the rational order, action is deprived of its due moral perfection, and, therefore, becomes wrong or bad, though it may retain all its other ontological goodness. The good which is the object of such an action, although it retains its particular relative goodness with regard to the want which it serves, is not a good for the whole personality. For example, if, on a day when flesh meat is forbidden, a man dines on roast-beef, the food is just as good physically as it would be on any other day, but this goodness is outweighed, because his action is a violation of reason which dictates that he ought to obey the command of lawful authority.

While the moral good is fixed by the Author of nature, yet, because man is endowed with free will or the power of electing which good he shall make the goal of action, he can, if he pleases, ignore the dictates of right reason and seek his other goods in a disorderly manner. He may pursue pleasure, riches, fame, or any other desirable end, though his conscience—that is, his reason—tells him that the means which he takes to satisfy his desire is wrong. He thereby frustrates his rational nature and deprives himself of his highest perfection. He cannot change the law of things, and this privation of his highest good is the immediate essential punishment incurred by his violation of the

moral law. Another punishment is that the loss is attended, generally speaking, by that peculiar painful feeling called remorse; but this effect may cease to be perceived when the moral impulses of reason have been habitually disregarded.

In order that an action may possess in an essential degree—no action is absolutely perfect—its moral perfection, it must be in conformity with the law in three respects: (a) The action, considered under the character by which it ranks as an element of conduct, must be good. The physical act of giving another person money may be either an act of justice, when one pays a debt, or it may be an act of mercy or benevolence, as it is if one gives the money to relieve distress. Both of these actions possess the fundamental element of goodness (*bonum ex objecto*). (b) The motive, if there is a motive beyond the immediate object of the act, must also be good. If one pays a man some money that one owes him with the purpose, indeed, of paying one's debt, but also with the ulterior purpose of enabling him to carry out a plot to murder one's enemy, the end is bad, and the action is thereby vitiated. The end which is the motive must also be good (*bonum ex fine*). Thus, an action, otherwise good, is spoiled if directed to an immoral end; conversely, however, an action which in its fundamental character is bad is not rendered good by directing it to a good end. The end does not justify the means. (c) The circumstances under which the action is performed should be in entire conformity with reason, otherwise it lacks something of moral completeness, though it may not be thereby rendered totally immoral. We frequently say that something which a person has done was right enough in itself, but he did not do it in the proper place or season. This triple goodness is expressed in the axiom: *bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocumque defectu* ("An action is good when good in every respect; it is wrong when wrong in any respect").

(B) The Ultimate Good—God—Beatitude.—The perfection of life, then, is to realize the moral good. But now arises the question: "Is life its own end?" Or, in other words: "What is the ultimate end appointed for man?" To answer this question we must consider the good first under the aspect of end. "We not alone act", says St. Thomas, "for an immediate end, but all our actions converge towards an ultimate end or good, otherwise the entire series would be aimless". The test by which we may determine whether any object of pursuit is the ultimate end is: "Does it satisfy all desire?" If it does not, it is not adequate to complete man's perfection and establish him in the possession of his highest good and consequent happiness. Here St. Thomas, following St. Augustine, examines the various objects of human desire—pleasure, riches, power, fame, etc.—and rejects them all as inadequate. What then is the highest good, the ultimate end? St. Thomas appeals to Revelation which teaches that in the life to come the righteous shall possess and enjoy God Himself in endless fruition. The argument is summed up in the well-known words of St. Augustine: "Thou hast made us, O Lord, for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee." The moral condition necessary to this future consummation is that our wills be here conformed to the Divine will as expressed in the moral law and in His revealed positive law. Thus the attainment of the proximate good in this life leads to the possession of the Supreme Good in the next. Another condition indispensable is that our actions be vivified by Divine grace (see GRACE). What precisely will be the act by which the soul will apprehend the Sovereign Good is a disputed question among theologians. The Thomist theory is that it will be an act of the intellect, while the Scotist opinion is that it will be an act of the will. However this may be, one thing is dogmatically certain: the soul in this assimilation shall not lose

its selfhood, nor be absorbed according to the pantheistic sense in the Divine Substance.

A word or two may be added upon a point which owing to the prevalence of Kantian ideas is of actual importance. As we have seen, the moral good and the supreme good are ends in themselves; they are not means, nor are they to be pursued merely as means to pleasure or agreeable feeling. But may we make the agreeable any part of our motive? Kant answers in the negative; for to allow this to enter into our motive is to vitiate the only moral motive, "right for right's sake", by self-interest. This theory does not pay due regard to the order of things. The pleasurable feeling attendant upon action, in the order of nature, established by God, served as a motive to action, and its function is to guarantee that actions necessary to welfare shall not be neglected. Why, then, should it be unlawful to aim at an end which God has attached to the good? Similarly as the attainment of our supreme good will be the cause of everlasting happiness, we may reasonably make this accompanying end the motive of our action, provided that we do not make it the sole or predominant motive.

In conclusion, we may now state in a word the central idea of our doctrine. God as Infinite Being is Infinite Good; creatures are good because they derive their measure of being from Him. This participation manifests His goodness, or glorifies God, which is the end for which He created man. The rational creature is destined to be united to God as the Supreme End and Good in a special manner. In order that he may attain to this consummation, it is necessary that in this life, by conforming his conduct to conscience, the interpreter of the moral law, he realizes in himself the righteousness which is the true perfection of his nature. Thus God is the Supreme Good, as principle and as end. "I am the beginning and I am the end."

ST. THOMAS, *S. Theol.*, I-I, Q. v, vi, xiv, xvii, lxi; I-II, v, xviii-xx, xcvi; IDEM, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, tr. RICKABY, *God and His Creatures* (London, 1905), II, xxi; III, i-xi, lxxxi, xcvi; ST. AUGUSTINE, *De Natura Boni*. IDEM, *De Doctrina Christiana*; IDEM, *De Civitate Dei*; PLATO, *Republic*, IV-X; IDEM, *Phædo*, 64 sq.; IDEM, *Theætetus*; ARISTOTLE, *Metaphysics*, I, II, IV, VI; IDEM, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I, i-iv; IX; X; BOUQUILLON, *Theologia Fundamental*, lib. I; lib. III, tract. i; lib. IV; all textbooks of Scholastic philosophy—good is treated in ontology and in ethics; RICKABY, *Moral Philosophy* (London, 1901); MIVART, *On Truth*, sect. iii, iv (London, 1889); TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston and London, 1903), passim; JANET and SEAILLES, *History of the Problems of Philosophy*, ed. JONES (London and New York, 1902), II, i, ii; FARGES, *La Liberté et le Devoir*, pt. II, § iii; McDONALD, *The Principles of Moral Science*, bk. I, chs. i-vi, xi; HARPER, *The Metaphysics of the School* (London, 1884), vol. I, bk. II, ch. iv.

JAMES J. FOX.

**Good, THE HIGHEST.**—We always act with a view to some good. "The good is the object which all pursue, and for the sake of which they always act", says Plato (*Republic*, I, vi). His disciple Aristotle repeats the same idea in other words when he declares (*Ethics*, I, i) that the good is "that which all aim at". This definition is, as St. Thomas observes, a posteriori. Yet, if appetibility does not constitute goodness, still it is our only means of identifying it; in practice, the good is the desirable. But experience soon teaches that all desires cannot be satisfied, that they are conflicting, and that some goods must be foregone in order to secure others. Hence the necessity of weighing the relative value of goods, of classifying them, and of ascertaining which of them must be procured even at the loss of others. The result is the division of goods into two great classes, the physical and the moral, happiness and virtue. Within either class it is comparatively easy to determine the relation of particular good things to one another, but it has proved far more difficult to fix the relative excellence of the two classes of virtue and happiness. Still the question is of supreme importance, since in it the reason and final destiny of our life is involved. As Cicero says (*De Finibus*, v, 6), "Summum autem bonum si ignoratur,

vivendi rationem ignorari necesse est." If happiness and virtue are mutually exclusive, we have to choose between the two, and this choice is a momentous one. But their incompatibility may be only on the surface. Indeed the hope is ever recurring that the sovereign good includes both, and that there is some way of reconciling them.

It has been the task of moralists to sift the conditions on which this may be done. (1) Some would reduce virtue to happiness; (2) others teach that happiness is to be found in virtue; (3) but, as both these solutions are ever found to be in contradiction with the facts of life, the consequent vacillations of opinion can be traced throughout the history of philosophy. In the main, they can be classified under three heads, according as one or the other predominates, or both are made to blend: viz.: (1) Eudæmonism or Utilitarianism, when the highest good is identified with happiness; (2) Rational Deontology, when the highest good is identified with virtue or duty; (3) Rational Eudæmonism, or tempered Deontology, when both virtue and happiness are combined in the highest good.

**I. EUDÆMONISM.** (a) Socrates (469-399 B. C.), the father of systematic Ethics, taught that happiness is the end of man; that it consists, not in external goods—signs of the uncertain favours of fortune, or of the gods (*εὐτυχία*)—but in a rational joy, which implies the renunciation of common delights (*εὐπαΐδία*). He did not, however, carry this doctrine of moderation to the degree of asceticism, but rather insisted on the cultivation of the mind as being of greater importance. Knowledge is the only virtue, ignorance the only vice. Yet, from the Dialogues of Xenophon, it is seen that he descends to the common morality of Utilitarianism.

(b) This latter phase of Socratic teaching was adopted by Aristippus of Cyrene (435-356 B. C.), who as representative of the Hedonistic School among the ancients, and holding, on the one hand, with Socrates that knowledge is virtue, and, on the other, with Protagoras, that we can know only our sensations, and not that which causes them, concluded that that which produces in us the most pleasant feelings is the highest good. Culture and virtue are desirable only as a means to this end. As pleasure is conditioned by organic states, it can be produced only by motion, which, to be pleasant, must needs be gentle; hence according to the Cyrenaics, it is not the mere absence of pain, but a transient emotion which makes man happy and constitutes his highest good.

(c) Aristotle (384-322 B. C.) admits with Socrates and the ancient philosophers generally, that the highest good is to be identified with the highest happiness; and, in determining in what this highest happiness consists, he agrees with the Cyrenaics that it is not mere passing enjoyment, but action (*ἐν τῷ ζῆν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν*, *Eth. Nic.*, IX, ix, 5). Still it is not any and every kind of activity that man may find agreeable which constitutes this supreme happiness, but that which is proper to him (*οὐκείον ἔργον*—*οὐκεία ἀρετή*, *Ibid.*, I, vii, 15). This cannot be merely the life which he shares with the plants and animals, or the sensibility, which he enjoys in common with the brutes, but thought, which is the distinctive characteristic of man. Moreover, as it is in the sphere of activity proper to each living being that its peculiar excellence is to be sought, it follows that man's rational activity (*ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια μετὰ λόγου*, *Ibid.*, I, vii, 15) is at the same time honourable and virtuous (*ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια κατ' ἀρετήν*, loc. cit.). Since, however, there are several such activities, it must be the noblest and most perfect of these. This is none other than speculative thought, or that which has to do with the contemplation of "honourable and divine subjects" (*καλῶν καὶ θείων*, *Ibid.*, X, vii, 10), because this belongs to the noblest faculty and tends to the noblest object; because it is the most continuous the most pleasant, the most self-sufficing (*Ibid.*, I, x, 8).

In thus defining human happiness, Aristotle does not aim at determining which good is absolutely supreme, but only that which relatively is the highest for man in his present condition—the highest attainable in this life (*τὸ πάντων ἀκρότατον τῶν πρακτῶν ἀγαθῶν*, Ibid., I, iv, 16). Though Aristotle thus makes happiness and the highest good to consist in virtuous action, yet he does not exclude pleasure, but holds that pleasure in its keenest form springs from virtue. Pleasure completes an action, is added to it, as “to youth its bloom” (*ὅλον τοῖς ἀκμαίοις ἡ ὥρα*, Ibid., X, iv, 8). Since, therefore, Aristotle places man's highest good in his perfection, which is identical with his happiness and carries with it pleasure, he is rightly accounted a Eudæmonist, though of a nobler sort.

(d) Epicurus (circa 340–270 B. C.), whilst accepting in substance the Hedonism of the Cyrenaics, does not admit with them that the highest good lies in the pleasure of motion (*ἡδονή ἐν κινήσει*), but rather in the pleasure of rest (*ἡδονή κατασκευαστική*); not in the *voluptas in motu* but in the *stabilitas voluptatis*, says Cicero (*De Finibus*, II, v, 3)—that state of deep peace and perfect contentment in which we feel secure against all the storms of life (*ἀταραξία*). To attain this is the paramount problem of Epicurus's philosophy, to which his empirical logic (canonics) and his theory of nature (the materialism of Democritus) are merely preliminaries. Thus the whole of his philosophy is constructed with a view to his Ethics, for which it prepares the way and which completes it.

In holding that the pleasures of the mind are preferable to voluptuousness, inasmuch as they endure, while those of the senses pass with the moment that gives them birth, he is not consistent, seeing that his materialism reduces all the operations of the mind to mere sensations. Finally, as virtue is according to him the tact which impels the wise man to do whatever contributes to his welfare, and makes him avoid the contrary, it cannot be the highest good, but only a means of realizing it. By his materialism Epicurus paved the way for modern Utilitarianism, which has assumed two forms, viz.:

(e) Individual Utilitarianism, which places man's highest good in his greatest personal welfare and pleasure. This is identical with the Greek Hedonism, and was revived in the eighteenth century by the Encyclopedists, De la Mettrie (1709–1751), Helvetius (1715–1771), Diderot (1713–1784), and De Volney (1757–1820). It was also advocated by the Sensists, Hartley (1704–1757), Priestley (1733–1804) and Hume (1711–1776); and in the nineteenth century by the German Materialists, Vogt (1817–1895), Moleschott (1822–1893), and Büchner (1824–1899);

(f) Social Utilitarianism, which is mainly of English origin. In its earliest stage, with Richard Cumberland (1632–1718), and Anthony Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1718), it still retained a somewhat subjective character, and placed the highest good in the practice of social benevolence. With Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), it becomes wholly objective. The highest good, so they say, cannot be the happiness of the individual, but the happiness of the many, “the greatest happiness of the greatest number”. Stated in these terms, the proposition is merely a truism. That in general, the happiness of a community is superior to the happiness of one of its members, is obvious; but, when it comes to be a personal affair, the individual is no longer a part of the whole, but one party pitted against others, and it is by no means evident, from the positivistic point of view, that his personal happiness is not for him the highest good.

(g) This passage from self to non-self, from the individual to the community, Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) attempted to derive from the evolutionary principle of “the survival of the fittest”. Those individuals have evidently a better chance to survive

who oppose their enemies as a body, and therefore who live in societies (flocks, herds, human associations); and therefore, again, the social instincts are destined to survive and grow stronger, while the individualistic ones cannot but disappear. The highest good here is not the happiness of the individual, not even the happiness of the present generation, but the sum total of the conditions which make possible the survival and the constant progress of mankind at large. Hence in a system of elaborate synthetic philosophy Spencer discusses at great length the laws of life and those conditions of psychology and social existence from which, as from a prearranged premise, he gathers “The Data of Ethics”, or Ethics emancipated from the notion of divine legislation.

II. DEONTOLOGISM.—Under this head may be classed systems which place the highest human good in the conformity of conduct with reason. It assumes an exaggerated or tempered form, according as it excludes or admits regard for human perfection and happiness as one of the elements of morality.

(a) Plato, in common with Socrates and the minor Socratic schools, holds that happiness is the supreme and ultimate object of human endeavour, and that this happiness is identical with the highest good. But when he comes to determine in what this good or happiness consists, he does so in accordance with the presuppositions of his philosophical system. The soul in its true essence is declared to be an incorporeal spirit destined for the intuition of the Idea; hence its ultimate end and supreme good is to be attained by withdrawing from the life of sense and retiring into pure contemplation of the Idea, which is identical with God. Man must, therefore, rise to God and find his chief good in Him. This may be considered the highest good in the objective order, and is found inculcated in those passages of this philosopher's writings in which the solution of the supreme problem of life is sought in flight from sensuality (cf. *Theæt.*, 176, A; *Phædo*, 64, E; *Republic*, VII, 519, C sqq., apud Zeller, pp. 435–444). But inasmuch as this is practically unattainable in this life, man is told that the highest good here is to be found in making himself like God, and that this is to be brought about by the knowledge and the enthusiastic love of God, as the Supreme Good. In the knowledge, therefore, and love of God as the Supreme Good consists man's highest good in the subjective order. This is brought out in those passages in which even sensuous beauty is described as worthy of love, and external activity, sensible pleasure, is included among the component elements of the highest good (cf. *Republic*, X, 603, E sqq.; *Phil.*, 28, A sqq.; *Tim.*, 59, C).

(b) The Stoic school was founded by Zeno of Citium (350–258 B. C.). According to its followers, the highest purpose (good) of human life is not to be found in contemplation (*θεωρία*), as Plato would have it, but in action. To live according to nature (*ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ἔχειν*) was their supreme rule of conduct. By this they did not mean that individual nature of man, but the eternal and divine law which manifests itself in nature as the measure to which all things in the universe should conform their action. For man to live according to nature, therefore, means to conform his will to the divine will, and in this consists virtue. Virtue alone is good in the highest sense of the word, and virtue alone is sufficient for happiness. As this law imposes itself through reason, the system is rightly called rational Deontology.

(c) Kant agrees with the Stoics in placing the essence of the highest good in virtue, and not in happiness. Yet he thinks our conception of it is incomplete unless it is made to include happiness as well. The highest good may mean either the Supreme (*supremum*) or the Complete (*consummatum*). The Supreme is a condition which is itself unconditioned, or is not subordinate to anything else (*originarium*). The

Complete, again, is a whole which is not itself a part of a larger whole of the same kind (perfectissimum). Virtue, or that disposition to act in conformity with the moral law, is not dependent on happiness, but itself makes man worthy of happiness. It is, therefore, the highest good, the supreme condition of whatever can be regarded as desirable. But it is not the whole, nor the supreme good, which finite rational beings crave; the complete good includes happiness. Hence the highest conceivable good must consist in the union of virtue and happiness proportioned to morality.

This is what Kant means by the whole or complete good. Of its two elements, virtue, having no higher condition and being itself the condition of happiness, is the supreme good. Happiness, however, while it is agreeable to the person who possesses it, is not good in itself and in all respects; it is good only under the condition that a man's conduct is in conformity with the moral law. This is why Kant was wont to say that "nothing can be called good without qualification, but good will"; and since the best it can do in this life is to strive after holiness, the struggle between the desire to obey and the impulse to transgress must continue for ever, making the highest good in this life unattainable.

III. RATIONAL EUDÆMONISM OR TEMPERED DEONTOLOGISM.—Christian Philosophers, in dealing with the problem of the highest good, have necessarily kept in view the teachings of Faith; still they base their solution of it on motives of reason. Their system is neither strictly deontologico-rational, nor yet altogether eudæmonistic, but a consistent blending of both. The ultimate end of man is to be placed in perfect rational activity, in ultimate perfection, and in happiness, not as in three different things, but as in one and the self-same, since the three conceptions are resolvable into one another, and each of them denotes a goal of human tendency, a limit beyond which no desire remains to be satisfied. Though they differ somewhat in their several ways of formulating it, at bottom they all agree: (1) that in the blissful possession of God is to be found the rightful object of reason (man's deontologico-rational end), and of free will (his eudæmonistic end); (2) that this eudæmonistic end—the perfect satisfaction of the will in the possession of God—is not merely an accidental result of the former, but is the positive determination of God, the author of our nature; (3) that this eudæmonistic end may not be intended by the will for its own sake, to the exclusion of the deontologico-rational end, which, by its nature, it presupposes, and to which it is subordinated.

It is St. Thomas Aquinas who best harmonized this system with revelation. His teaching may be summarized thus: (a) man's highest happiness does not consist in pleasure, but in action, since, in the nature of things, action is not for pleasure, but pleasure for action. This activity, on which man's happiness rests, must, on the one hand, be the noblest and highest of which his nature is capable, and, on the other, it must be directed toward the noblest and the highest object.

(b) This noblest and highest object of human activity is not that of the will, which merely follows upon and is conditioned by knowledge; it must rather be knowledge itself. Consequently, the highest happiness of man consists in the knowledge of the highest truth, which is God. With the knowledge of God must, of course, be joined the love of God; but this love is not the essential element of perfect happiness; it is merely a necessary complement of it (*Summa Theol.*, I-II, Q. iii, a. 2, c; *Con. Gen.*, III, xxv, xxvi).

(c) Since the knowledge of God can be acquired in three ways—by demonstration, by faith, and by intuition—the further question arises: which of these three kinds of knowledge is the foundation of man's highest happiness? Not knowledge by demonstration, for happiness must be something universal and

attainable by all men, whereas only a few can arrive at this knowledge by demonstration; neither can knowledge by faith be a basis for perfect happiness, seeing that this consists chiefly in the activity of the intellect, whilst in faith the will claims for itself the principal part, inasmuch as the will must here determine the intellect to give its assent. Consequently happiness can consist only in the intuitive knowledge of God; and since this is attainable only in the next life, it follows that the ultimate destiny of man—and hence his highest good—reaches beyond time into eternity. It must be everlasting, otherwise it would not be perfect (*Con. Gent.*, III, xxxviii, sqq.).

(d) This end is not merely a subjective one which the reason imposes upon itself. Just because it is an activity, it involves relation to some external object. The intellect essentially represents a truth distinct from itself, as the act of the will is an inclination towards some good not identical with itself. The truth to be represented, therefore, and the good to be attained or possessed, are objects to which happiness refers as to further ends, just as the image has reference to a model and motion to a goal. Truth, therefore, and good are objective ends to which formal happiness corresponds as a subjective end. The absolutely ultimate end, therefore, is in the objective order, beyond which nothing remains to be known and desired, and which, when it is known and possessed, gives rest to the rational faculties. This can be nothing else than the infinite truth and the infinite good, which is God. Hence the system is not a purely deontologico-rational one, constituting the reason a law to itself, the observance of which law would be the highest good.

(e) Still less is it purely eudæmonistic, since the ultimate end and highest good does not coincide with subjective happiness as Hedonism teaches, but with the object of the highest acts of contemplation and love. This object is God, not merely as beatifying us, but as the Absolute Truth and Goodness, infinitely perfect in itself.

UEBERWEG, *History of Philosophy* (New York, 1872); TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903); STORCKL-FINLAY, *History of Philosophy* (Dublin, 1903); KANT, *Critique of Practical Reason*, ed. ABBOTT (London, 1898); ZELLER, *Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics*, II (London, 1897); IDEM, *Plato and the Older Academy* (London, 1888); JANET and SÉAILLES, *History of the Problems of Philosophy*, II (London, 1902); BYWATER, *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea* (Oxford, 1894); MING, *Data of Modern Ethics Examined* (New York, 1894); MEYER, *Institutiones Juris Naturalis*, I (Freiburg in Br., 1885); S. THOMAS Aquinatis *Summa Theologica*; *Summa contra Gentiles*; *Suarez, De Ultimo Fine Hominis*.

M. F. DINNEEN.

**Good Faith**, a phrase employed to designate the mental and moral state of honest, even if objectively unfounded, conviction as to the truth or falsehood of a proposition or body of opinion, or as to the rectitude or depravity of a line of conduct. One who is in this condition, so far as the violation of positive law, or even, in certain junctures, of the natural law, is concerned, is said to labour under an invincible error, and hence to be guiltless. This consideration is often invoked in behalf of those who are outside of the visible affiliation of the Catholic Church. It is not unfrequently applied to determine the degree of right or obligation prevailing in the various forms of human engagements, such as contracts, etc. In the matter of prescription it is held to be an indispensable requirement whether there be question of acquiring dominion or freeing oneself from a burden. Likewise, in deciding the duty incumbent upon one who finds himself in possession of another's property, cognizance is taken of the good faith with which perchance the holding has been begun and accompanied. Finally, if a person, although actually in the state of mortal sin, were in good faith to come to Holy Communion, such a one, according to the judgment of many theologians, would receive sanctifying grace. The reason alleged by

them, although not regarded by other moralists as convincing, is that good faith saves the communicant from the conscious interposition of any obstacle to the productive activity of the Sacrament.

SLATER, *Manual of Moral Theology* (New York, 1908); RICKABY, *Aquinas Ethics* (London, 1896); BALLERINI, *Opus Theologicum Morale* (Prato, 1898).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

**Good Friday**, called *Feria VI in Parasceve* in the Roman Missal, ἡ ἁγία καὶ μεγάλη παρασκευή (the Holy and Great Friday) in the Greek Liturgy, *Holy Friday* in the Romance Languages, *Charfreitag* (Sorrowful Friday) in German, is the English designation of Friday in Holy Week, that is, the Friday on which the Church keeps the anniversary of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Parasceve, the Latin equivalent of παρασκευή, preparation (i. e. the preparation that was made on the sixth day for the Sabbath; see Mark, xv, 42) came by metonymy to signify the day on which the preparation was made; but while the Greeks retained this use of the word as applied to every Friday, the Latins confined its application to the one Friday. Irenæus and Tertullian speak of Good Friday as the day of the Pasch; but later writers distinguish between the Πάσχα στανυρώσιμον (the passage to death), and the Πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον (the passage to life, i. e. the Resurrection). At present the word *Pasch* is used exclusively in the latter sense (see Nilles, II, 253; also Kirchenlex., s. v. "Charfreitag"). The two Paschs are the oldest feasts in the calendar (Baumer, vol. I). From the earliest times the Christians kept every Friday as a fast day (Duchesne, 228) and every Sunday as a feast day (Duchesne, 47); and the obvious reasons for those usages explain why Easter is the Sunday *par excellence*, and why the Friday which marks the anniversary of Christ's Death came to be called the Great or the Holy or the Good Friday. The origin of the term *Good* is not clear. Some say it is from "God's Friday" (*Gottes Freitag*), so Hampson (op. cit. below); others maintain that it is from the German *Gute Freitag*, and not specially English. Sometimes, too, the day was called *Long Friday* by the Anglo-Saxons; so to-day in Denmark.

There is, perhaps, no office in the whole liturgy so peculiar, so interesting, so composite, so dramatic as the office and ceremonial of Good Friday. About the vigil office, which in early times commenced at midnight in the Roman, and at 3 a.m. in the Gallican Church, it will suffice to remark that, for 400 years past, it has been anticipated by five or six hours, but retains those peculiar features of mourning which mark the evening offices of the preceding and following day, all three being known as the *Tenebræ* (q. v.). The morning office is in three distinct parts. The first part consists of three lessons from Sacred Scripture (two chants and a prayer being interposed) which are followed by a long series of prayers for various intentions; the second part includes the ceremony of unveiling and adoring the Cross, accompanied by the chanting of the *Impropria*; the third part is known as the Mass of the Presanctified, which is preceded by a procession and followed by vespers. Each of these parts will be briefly noticed here. The Hour of *None* being finished, the celebrant and ministers, clothed in black vestments, come to the altar and prostrate themselves for a short time in prayer. In the meantime, the acolytes spread a single cloth on the denuded altar. No lights are used. When the celebrant and ministers ascend the altar, a lector takes his place on the epistle side, and reads a lesson from Osee, vi. This is followed by a tract sung by the choir. Next comes a prayer sung by the celebrant, which is followed by another lesson from Exodus, xii, chanted by the subdeacon. This is followed by another tract (Ps. cxxxix), at the close of which the third lesson, viz. the Passion according to St. John, is sung by the deacons or recited from a bare pulpit—"dicitur passio super

nudum pulpitem". When this is finished, the celebrant sings a long series of prayers for different intentions, viz. for the Church, pope, bishop of the diocese, for the different orders in the Church, for the Roman Emperor (now omitted outside the dominions of Austria), for catechumens . . . . The above order of lessons, chants, and prayers for Good Friday is found in our earliest Roman Ordines, dating from about A. D. 800. It represents, according to Duchesne (234), "the exact order of the ancient Synaxes without a liturgy", i. e. the order of the earliest Christian prayer meetings, at which, however, the liturgy proper, i. e. the Mass, was not celebrated. This kind of meeting for worship was derived from the Jewish Synagogue service, and consisted of lessons, chants, and prayers. In the course of time, as early perhaps as A. D. 150 (see Cabrol's "Origines Liturgiques," 137), the celebration of the Eucharist was combined with this purely eucharistical service to form one solemn act of Christian worship, which came to be called the Mass. It is to be noted that the Mass is still in two distinct parts, the first consisting of lessons, prayers, and chants; and the second being the celebration of the Eucharist (including the Offertory, Canon, and Communion). While the Judica, Introit, and the Gloria in Excelsis have been added to this first part of the Mass and the long series of prayers omitted from it, the oldest order of the Synaxis, or meeting without Mass, has been retained in the Good Friday service. The form of the prayers deserves to be noticed. Each prayer is in three parts. (a) The celebrant invites the congregation to pray for a specified intention. (b) The deacon then says "Let us kneel" (Flectamus genua); then the people were supposed to pray for a time kneeling in silence, but at present immediately after the invitation to kneel the subdeacon invites them to stand up (Levate). (c) The celebrant collects, as it were, all their prayers, and voices them aloud. The modern collect is the representative of this old solemn form of prayer. The first part is reduced to the Oremus, the second part has disappeared, and the third part remains in its entirety and has come to be called the collect. It is curious to note in these very old Good Friday prayers that the second part is omitted in the prayers for the Jews, owing, it is said, to their having insulted Christ by bending the knee in mockery before Him. These prayers were not peculiar to Good Friday in the early ages (they were said on Spy Wednesday as late as the eighth century); their retention here, it is thought, was inspired by the idea that the Church should pray for all classes of men on the day that Christ died for all. Duchesne (172) is of opinion that the Oremus now said in every Mass before the Offertory, which is not a prayer, remains to show where this old series of prayers was once said in all Masses.

The dramatic unveiling and adoration of the Cross, which was introduced into the Latin Liturgy in the seventh or eighth century, had its origin in the Church of Jerusalem. The "Peregrinatio Sylviæ" (the real name is Etheria) contains a description of the ceremony as it took place in Jerusalem towards the close of the fourth century. "Then a chair is placed for the Bishop in Golgotha behind the Cross . . . a table covered with a linen cloth is placed before him; the Deacons stand around the table, and a silver-gilt casket is brought in which is the wood of the holy Cross. The casket is opened and (the wood) is taken out, and both the wood of the Cross and the Title are placed upon the table. Now, when it has been put upon the table, the Bishop, as he sits, holds the extremities of the sacred wood firmly in his hands, while the Deacons who stand around guard it. It is guarded thus because the custom is that the people, both faithful and catechumens, come one by one and, bowing down at the table, kiss the sacred wood and pass on" (Duchesne, tr. McClure, 564). Our present ceremony



is an obvious development of this, the manner of worshipping the true Cross on Good Friday observed at Jerusalem. A veiled image of the Crucifix is gradually exposed to view, while the celebrant, accompanied by his assistants, sings three times the "Ecce lignum Crucis", etc. (Behold the wood of the Cross on which hung the salvation of the world), to which the choir answers, each time, "Venite adoremus" (Come let us adore). During the singing of this response the whole assembly (except the celebrant) kneel in adoration. When the Cross is completely unveiled the celebrant carries it to the foot of the altar, and places it in a cushion prepared for it. He then takes off his shoes and approaches the Cross (genuflecting three times on the way) and kisses it. The deacon and subdeacon also divest themselves of their shoes (the deacon and subdeacon may take off their shoes, if that be the custom of the place, S.C.R., n. 2769, ad X, q. 5), and act in like manner. For an account of the peculiarly impressive ceremony known as the "Creeping to the Cross", which was once observed in England, see article CROSS (vol. IV, p. 537). The clergy two and two follow, while one or two priests vested in surplice and black stole take other crosses and present them to the faithful present to be kissed. During this ceremony the choir sings what are called the Improperia, the Trisagion (in Greek as well as Latin), if time permits the hymn *Crux fidelis* . . . (Oh, Cross, our hope . . .). The Improperia are a series of reproaches supposed to be addressed by Christ to the Jews. They are not found in the old Roman Ordines. Duchesne (249) detects, he thinks, a Gallican ring in them; while Martène (III, 136) has found some of them alternating with the Trisagion in ninth century Gallican documents. They appear in a Roman Ordo, for the first time, in the fourteenth century, but the retention of the Trisagion in Greek goes to show that it had found a place in the Roman Good Friday service before the Photian schism (ninth century). A non-Catholic may say that this is all very dramatic and interesting, but allege a grave deordination in the act of adoration of the Cross on bended knees. Is not adoration due to God alone? The answer may be found in our smallest catechism. The act in question is not intended as an expression of absolute supreme worship (*λατρεία*) which, of course, is due to God alone. The essential note of the ceremony is reverence (*προσκύνησις*) which has a relative character, and which may be best explained in the words of the Pseudo-Alcuin: "Proster-nimur corpore ante crucem, mente ante Dominum. Veneramur crucem, per quam redempti sumus, et illum deprecamur, qui redemit" (While we bend down in body before the cross we bend down in spirit before God. While we reverence the cross as the instrument of our redemption, we pray to Him who redeemed us). It may be urged: why sing "Behold the wood of the Cross", in unveiling the image of the Cross? The reason is obvious. The ceremony originally had immediate connexion with the True Cross, which was found by St. Helena in Jerusalem about the year A. D. 326 (see Gilmartin's "History of the Church", I, 157). Churches which procured a relic of the True Cross might imitate this ceremony to the letter, but other churches had to be content with an image, which in this particular ceremony represents the wood of the True Cross.

As might be expected, the ceremony of the unveiling and adoration of the Cross gave rise to peculiar usages in particular Churches. After describing the adoration and kissing of the Cross in the Anglo-Saxon Church, Rock (The Church of Our Fathers, IV, 103) goes on to say: "Though not insisted on for general observance, there was a rubric that allowed a rite, at this part of the office, to be followed, which may be called *The Burial of the Rood*. At the hind part of the altar . . . there was made a kind of sepulchre, hung all about with a curtain. Inside this recess . . . the

cross, after the ceremony of kissing it had been done, was carried by its two deacons, who had, however, first wrapped it up in a linen cloth or winding-sheet. As they bore their burden along, they sang certain anthems till they reached this spot, and there they left the cross; and it lay thus entombed till Easter morn, watched all that while by two, three, or more monks, who chanted psalms through day and night. When the Burial was completed the deacon and subdeacon came from the sacristy with the reserved host. Then followed *The Mass of the Pre-sanctified*." A somewhat similar ceremony (called the *Ἀποκαθάρσις*) is still observed in the Greek Church. An image of Christ, laid on a bier, is carried through the streets with a kind of funeral pomp, and is offered to those present to be worshipped and kissed (see Nilles, II, 242). To return to the Roman Rite, when the ceremony of adoring and kissing the Cross is concluded, the Cross is placed aloft on the altar between lighted candles, a procession is formed which proceeds to the chapel of repose, where the second sacred host consecrated in yesterday's Mass has since lain entombed in a gorgeously decorated urn and surrounded by lights and flowers. This urn represents the sepulchre of Christ (decree of S.C.R., n. 3933, ad I). The Most Holy Sacrament is now carried back to the altar in solemn procession, during which is sung the hymn "Vexilla Regis prodeunt" (The standards of the King advance). Arrived in the sanctuary the clergy go to their places retaining lighted candles, while the celebrant and his ministers ascend the altar and celebrate what is called the Mass of the Presanctified. This is not a Mass in the strict sense of the word, as there is no consecration of the sacred species. The host which was consecrated in yesterday's Mass (hence the word *presanctified*) is placed on the altar, incensed, elevated ("that it may be seen by the people"), and consumed by the celebrant. It is substantially the Communion part of the Mass, beginning with the "Pater noster" which marks the end of the Canon. From the very earliest times it was the custom not to celebrate the Mass proper on Good Friday (see Nilles, II, 252, note iii). Speaking about this ceremony Duchesne (249) says, "It is merely the Communion separated from the liturgical celebration of the Eucharist properly so called. The details of the ceremony are not found earlier than in books of the eighth or ninth century, but the service must belong to a much earlier period. At the time when synaxes without liturgy were frequent, the 'Mass of the Presanctified' must have been frequent also. In the Greek Church it was celebrated every day in Lent except on Saturdays and Sundays, but in the Latin Church it was confined to Good Friday." At present the celebrant alone communicates, but it appears from the old Roman Ordines that formerly all present communicated (Martène, III, 367). The omission of the Mass proper marks in the mind of the Church the deep sorrow with which she keeps the anniversary of the Sacrifice of Calvary. Good Friday is a feast of grief. A black fast, black vestments, a denuded altar, the slow and solemn chanting of the sufferings of Christ, prayers for all those for whom He died, the unveiling and reverencing of the Crucifix, these take the place of the usual festal liturgy; while the lights in the chapel of repose and the Mass of the Presanctified remind her children that Christ is with them behind this veil of mourning. The Mass of the Presanctified is followed by the recital of vespers, and the removal of the linen cloth from the altar ("Vespers are recited without chant and the altar is denuded").

The rubrics of the Roman Missal prescribe no further ceremonial for this day, but there are laudable customs in different churches which are allowed. For example, the custom (where it exists) of carrying in procession a statue of Our Lady of Sorrows is expressly permitted by decrees of the S. Cong. of Rites (n. 2375, and n. 2682); also the custom (where it exists) of

exposing a relic of the Holy Cross on the high altar (n. 2887), and the custom of carrying such a relic in procession within the walls of the church, not, however, during the usual ceremonies (n. 3466), are expressly permitted. Rock (op. cit., IV, 279, 280) notes, with interesting detail, a custom followed at one time in England of submitting voluntarily to the rod of penance on Good Friday.

*Roman Missal, Decreta Authentica* of S. C. of Rites (Rome, 1901), NILLES, *Kalendarium Manuale* (Innsbruck, 1897), II, 253 sqq.; DUCHESNE, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, tr. McCLEURE (London, 1904); BAUMER, *History of the Roman Breviary*, ed. BRON (Paris, 1905); GUÉRANGER, *L'année Liturgique* (Paris, 1904); PUNKES in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Charfreitag*, ROCK, *The Church of Our Fathers* (London, 1905); CABROL, *Origines Liturgiques* (Paris, 1906); MARTENE, *De antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus* (Antwerp, 1763); MURRAY, *New Oxford Dict.*, s. v. *Friday*; HAMPSON, *Medii Ævi Kalendarium* (London, 1841), I, 186-200.

T. P. GILMARTIN.

**Good Hope, EASTERN VICARIATE OF THE CAPE OF**, was established in 1847, when the Vicariate of the Cape of Good Hope was divided into Eastern and Western. Later the Eastern Vicariate was subdivided three times. As now constituted, it is bounded on the north by the Orange River, on the west by the civil districts (included in the vicariate) of Hopetown, Richmond, Murraysburg, Britstown, Jansenville, Humansdorp, Aberdeen, and Uitenhage; on the south by the Indian Ocean; on the east by the western boundary of Tembuland, Griqualand East, and the southwestern boundary of Basutoland.

On 27 December, 1847, Dr. Devereux was consecrated, in Cape Town, Bishop of Paneas and first Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern Vicariate, by Dr. Griffith, under whom he had worked for nine years. Through the Dhanis family of Belgium the new vicar Apostolic received the first considerable funds to start work. But his life was spent in the turmoil of Kafir wars, and was a struggle with poverty and the dearth of priests. His successor, Dr. Moran, had been curate of Irishtown, Dublin, and arrived in the colony in November, 1856. He was a man of great energy, and a strenuous opponent of the grant of responsible government. The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda appointed him first Bishop of Dunedin, New Zealand, in 1870. Next year, the Rev. J. D. Ricards was consecrated bishop at Grahamstown, with the title *in partibus* of Retimo, by the Vicar Apostolic of Natal, Dr. Allard. Dr. Ricards had already spent twenty-two years in the country and, whether as a writer, or lecturer, or pastor, had left his mark in the land. He founded the "Cape Colonist", a paper which did a unique work in its day by its fearless advocacy of purity in public life and sane views on the native problems. Several of the bishop's larger controversial works are still read and highly appreciated. In 1880 he brought to South Africa the first contingent of Trappists, who were to teach the natives not only the Christian faith, but the much needed lesson of work. The expansion of this order (since transferred to the Natal Vicariate) has been remarkable. About two years before Dr. Ricards's death a coadjutor was appointed in the person of Dr. Strobino, who, however,


became a hopeless invalid soon after the death of Dr. Ricards. Dr. Strobino was succeeded in 1896 by his coadjutor, the Rt. Rev. Hugh MacSherry, formerly administrator of Dundalk in Ireland, who had been consecrated a few months before.

There are 74 churches, chapels, and stations in the Eastern Vicariate, served by 52 priests, of whom 18 belong to the Society of Jesus, and two are Trappists. There are 44 schools, mission and private, two orphanages, and one nursing home. The number of men not in Holy orders belonging to religious institutes is 37—Marists, de la Salle Brothers, and Jesuits. There are 331 religious women—Dominicans, Sisters of Nazareth, of the Holy Cross, of the Little Company of Mary, of the Assumption. The Catholic population is more than 13,000, of whom only a few hundred are natives.

THEAL, *South Africa* (4th ed., London, 1899); CAMPBELL, *British South Africa* (London, 1897); *Statesman's Year Book* (London, 1909); *Cath. Directory of B. S. A.* (Cape Town, 1909).

SIDNEY R. WELCH.

**Good Hope, WESTERN VICARIATE OF THE CAPE OF.**—The Western vicariate and the Central prefecture,



PARLIAMENT AND TABLE MOUNTAIN, CAPE TOWN

although different in name, are virtually one. From 1874 to 1882 the Central prefecture was under the charge of the Missionary Fathers of Lyons; on their withdrawal, part of it was committed to the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, and became the Orange River prefecture; the rest was incorporated in the Western vicariate. This now has an area of 82,757 square miles. It is bounded on the north by the Olifants River, on the east by the Roggeveldt Mountains and the Gouritz River, on

the south and west by the sea. The islands of St. Helena and Ascension are included in this vicariate. Bartolomeu Dias first planted the cross on South African soil at Croix Island, Algoa Bay, in 1486; and the Cape soon became a place of frequent call for Portuguese ships. From the well-known habits of this people we may conjecture that Mass was thenceforth celebrated frequently on these shores. The great missionary work of the Portuguese on the Zambesi did not extend to the Cape. The first Dutch governor, van Riebeeck, arrived at the Cape in 1652; but under his regime and that of his successors, the public profession of the Catholic faith was forbidden. A new spirit animated the Dutch high commissioner, de Mist, who, in terms of the Treaty of Amiens, took possession of the Cape, after a brief British occupation. Under very slight restrictions he issued an edict of religious toleration.

The first English governor reversed these measures, and later Lord Charles Somerset showed bitter hostility to Catholics. But through the good offices of Bishop Poynter of the English Midland District, the government agreed to salary a Catholic pastor for the Cape. On New Year's Day, 1820, Bishop Slater, Vicar Apostolic of Mauritius (which vicariate included the Cape), installed Father Scully in Cape Town. For the next eighteen years the ecclesiastical history of the colony is one of pitiful squabbles between pastors and people, with a short truce in the time of a Dutch priest named Wagenaar. On 6 June, 1837, Gregory XVI formed the Cape of Good Hope into a vicariate

separate from Mauritius. In August following, Patrick Raymond Griffith, O.P., was consecrated Bishop of Paleopolis, in the church of St. Andrew, Dublin; and on 20 April, 1838, he set foot in Cape Town with Fathers Burke and Corcoran. After his first visitation, which was made chiefly in the labouring ox-wagon, and extended as far as Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown, he estimated the Catholic population of the country at 500. Worse than the paucity of numbers, were the lax morality and poor Catholic spirit of so many. A first painful duty of the bishop was to depose a body of churchwardens, who claimed to act as a board of directors of the vicariate. Some seceded, but this prompt action restored peace and Catholic order. In 1851 he completed the fine church which is still the cathedral of Cape Town. At his death in 1862 his flock was united and no longer ashamed of their faith, several schools and churches having been established throughout the vicariate.

Dr. Grimley was appointed coadjutor to the first vicar Apostolic in 1861, and succeeded him in 1862.

He brought out the Dominican Sisters and Marist Brothers; and died in 1871, just after his return from the Vatican Council. The name which is connected with the greatest progress of the Western vicariate is that of the Right Rev. John Leonard, D.D., who was curate at Blanchardstown, Dublin, when appointed to succeed Dr. Grimley. Nearly all the works recorded in the next paragraph were accomplished during his episcopate of thirty-five years. He was succeeded in 1907, the year of his death, by the Right Rev. John Rooney, who had been his coadjutor for twenty-one years.


There are 33 priests in the Western vicariate, of whom three are regulars (Salesians). Out of 153 religious, 28 are Marist Brothers and Salesians; the rest are nuns—Dominicans, Sisters of Nazareth, and Sisters of the Holy Cross. There are 19 churches, 10 convents, an orphanage, an industrial school and 29 elementary schools. The only organ of Catholic opinion in South Africa is the *Catholic Magazine* for South Africa, founded in 1891 by Rev. Dr. Kolbe, now edited by the present writer. The Catholic population of the vicariate is over 8000—mostly of European descent.

*THEAL, History of South Africa* (London, 1903); *WILMOT, Life of Dr. Ricards* (Cape Town, 1908); *South African Catholic Magazine*, passim; *Catholic Directory of British South Africa* (Cape Town, annually); *RICARDS, The Catholic Church and the Kafir*.

SIDNEY R. WELCH.

**Goodman, GODFREY**; b. at Ruthin, Denbighshire, 28 February, 1582-3; d. at Westminster, 19 January, 1656. He was Anglican Bishop of Gloucester, and passed all his public life in the Protestant Church. His religious sympathies, however, inclined him to the old Faith, and when misfortune and ruin overtook him, late in life, he entered its fold. He was the son of Godfrey Goodman and his wife, Jane Croxton, landed gentry living in Wales. In 1593 he was sent to Westminster School, where he remained seven years under the protection of his uncle, Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster. He was an earnest student

and when only seventeen won a scholarship in Trinity College, Cambridge. He graduated there in 1604 and was ordained at Bangor, Wales, shortly after. His first appointment was to the rectory of Stapleford Abbots, Essex, in 1606. From this time ecclesiastical dignities and lucrative emoluments fell rapidly to his share. He was made successively prebend of Westminster 1607, rector of West Ilsley, Berks, 1616, rector of Kennerton, Gloucester, canon of Windsor, 1617, Dean of Rochester, 1620-1, and finally Bishop of Gloucester, 1624-5. In addition he held two livings in Wales, at Llandysil and Llanarmon. Even when he was a bishop, he was allowed to retain most of these appointments. He became one of the Court preachers and was chaplain to Queen Anne, wife of James I. His leaning towards Catholicity made enemies for him at Windsor and he was reprimanded by the king on two occasions for the views he put forward in his Court sermons. A few years later he was severely blamed for having erected a crucifix at Windsor and used altar-cloths worked with a cross in his own cathedral at Gloucester, and further for having suspended a minister who insisted on preaching "that all who die papists go inevitably to hell". It is likely that at this time doubts were arising in his mind about the legitimacy of the separation from Rome, and he sought the society of the Catholic priests who were in hiding throughout the country. He was frequently at variance with Archbishop Laud, and in 1640 refused on conscientious grounds to sign the seventeen Articles drawn up by him. He



CAPE TOWN AND DEVIL'S PEAK, FROM SIGNAL HILL

was thereupon arrested, but after five weeks in prison he overcame his scruples. This, however, availed him little, as he was soon impeached by Parliament along with Laud and the ten other signatories of the Articles and was sent to prison for four months. In 1643 his episcopal palace was pillaged by the parliamentarian soldiers and in a year or two he was stripped of all his emoluments. He withdrew now from public life to his small Welsh estate in Carnarvon. It was at this time too, most likely, that he was converted. About 1650 he came to London, and gave himself up to study and research; he was befriended by some Catholic royalists and lived in close connexion with them till his death in 1656. Father Davenport, O.S.F., former chaplain to Queen Henrietta, was his confessor and attended him in his last illness. By his will, in which he made a profession of his Catholic Faith, he left most of his property to Ruthin his native town; his manuscripts and books, however, were given to Trinity College, Cambridge. His contemporaries describe him as being a hospitable, quiet man, and lavish in his charity to the poor.

His principal works are: (1) "The Fall of Man, or the Corruption of Nature proved by the light of his Natural Reason" (1616); (2) An account of his sufferings, 1650; (3) "The two mysteries of the Christian Religion, the Trinity and the Incarnation, explicated" (1653); (4) "Arguments and animadversions on Dr. George Hakewill's Apology"; (5) "The Creatures praying God" (1622); (6) "The Court of King James the First by Sir A. W. reviewed".

GILLOW, *Dict. Cath. Biog.*, s. v.; FULLER, *The History of the*

*Worthies of England*; MAYOR in *Communications of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, ii, 113; *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXXVIII; LINGARD, *History of England*, VII (Dublin, 1878), 257, see also LEE, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

**Goodman, JOHN**, VENERABLE, priest and martyr; b. in the Diocese of Bangor, Wales, 1590; d. 1642. He was educated at Oxford, and was ordained a Protestant minister, but abandoning heresy, he crossed over to Paris, where he was received into the Church by Mr. Richard Ireland. Admitted to Douai College, 12 February, 1621, he continued his studies there until 1624, when he proceeded to St-Omer, in order to enter the Society of Jesus. Finding, however, that this was not his vocation, he was ordained a secular priest and sent on the English mission. He worked with unremitting zeal for some years, was twice apprehended and twice released. Once more a prisoner in 1641, he was brought to trial and condemned to death, but at the queen's intercession was reprieved. When this act of clemency on the part of Charles I excited the anger of Parliament, Goodman, with great magnanimity, protested his unwillingness to be a cause of dissension between Charles and his subjects, and begged that he might be sacrificed to appease the popular displeasure. This heroic act of generosity made a considerable sensation, and probably suggested to Wentworth, Lord Strafford, the idea of doing the same. Goodman, however, was left to languish in Newgate, but the hardships soon put an end to his life on Good Friday, 1642, not 1645, as is sometimes said.

CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* (London, 1878), II, 79; *The Prisoners of Newgate's Condemnation* (London, 1642); GILLOW, *Etbl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; *State Papers, Dom. Chas. I.*, 1635, ccviii, nn. 66, 66, 1.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Good Samaritan, SISTERS OF THE**, a congregation of Tertiaries Regular of St. Benedict, established 2 February, 1857, at Sydney, Australia. In 1859 a second community was established at Windsor, and thereafter frequent foundations were made, so that now in the Archdiocese of Sydney alone there are 21 houses, with 202 members, and in all Australia 29 communities and 268 members. In the Archdiocese of Sydney the sisters conduct 14 superior schools, with an attendance of about 700. In the Archdiocese of Adelaide they founded a convent at Gawler in 1902, and in the Archdiocese of Melbourne a house at Northcote (1904) and a high school at South Yarra. In the Diocese of Port Augusta, where they established a house in 1890, they have charge of a boarding school and a day school; in the Diocese of Rockhampton also they have a boarding school, founded in 1890; and in the Vicariate Apostolic of Cooktown a day school, established in 1903. At Tempe, Arncliffe, in the Archdiocese of Sydney, the Sisters of the Good Samaritan have established St. Magdalen's Retreat, a home for penitent women of all creeds. It is supported entirely by voluntary contributions and the labour of the inmates, who number (1909) about 130, and are encouraged to remain at least two years in the institution.

*Australasian Catholic Directory* (1909); HEIMBUCHER, *Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1907).

F. M. RUDGE.

**Good Shepherd, OUR LADY OF CHARITY OF THE**.—The aim of this institute is to provide a shelter for girls and women of dissolute habits, who wish to do penance for their iniquities and to lead a truly christian life. Not only voluntary penitents, but also those consigned by civil or parental authority are admitted. Many of these penitents desire to remain for life; they are admitted to take vows, and form the class of "magdalens", under the direction of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. They are an austere contemplative community, and follow the Rule of the Third Order of

Mount Carmel. Prayer, penance and manual labour are their principal occupations. Many of these "magdalens" frequently rise to an eminent degree of sanctity. Besides girls and women of this class, the order also admits children who have been secured from danger, before they have fallen or been stained by serious crime. They are instructed in habits of industry and self-respect and in all the duties they owe to themselves and to society. The "penitents", "magdalens" and "preservates" form perfectly distinct classes, completely segregated from one another.

The Good Shepherd is a cloistered order and follows the Rule of St. Augustine. The constitutions are borrowed in great part from those given by St. Francis of Sales to the Visitation Sisters, but are modified to suit the nature of this work. Besides the three ordinary vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd take a fourth vow, namely, to work for the conversion and instruction of "penitents",—a vow which makes this order one of the most beautiful creations of Christian charity. The vows are renewed every year, for five years, before becoming perpetual. The order is composed of choir sisters, and lay or "converse" sisters. The choir sisters recite every day the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin. The habit is white, with white scapulars, reminding them of the innocence of the life they should lead. The choir sisters wear a black veil; the "converse" sisters a white veil. Around their necks, they wear a silver heart, on one side of which is engraved an image of "The Good Shepherd", and on the other, the Blessed Virgin, holding the Divine Infant, between a branch of roses and a branch of lilies. The heart represents that of the sister, consecrated to Mary and to her Divine Son, and the roses and lilies are symbolical of the virtues of charity and purity. The order is dedicated in an especial manner to the Holy Heart of Mary and to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which are its two patrons. Besides the choir sisters and the "converse" sisters, the order also admits "Tourière" Sisters, who attend to the door and perform necessary duties outside the cloister. Their habit is black, and they take only the three ordinary vows.

The Institute of the Good Shepherd is a branch of "Our Lady of Charity of the Refuge", founded by Blessed John Eudes, at Caen, France, in 1641, and approved by Alexander VII, 2 January, 1666, its constitutions being approved by Benedict XIV, in 1741. The order as primitively organized by Blessed John Eudes still exists in a flourishing state, under the first title of "Our Lady of Charity of the Refuge", and counts about thirty-nine houses and about 1893 sisters. The distinction between the primitive order and its branch, the Institute of "Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd", consists mainly in the administration. According to the custom of his time, the Blessed John Eudes ordained that "Our Lady of the Refuge" should have no mother-house, but that every house founded by this order should be a distinct community, having its own administration, and being united to the other houses only by bonds of fraternal charity.

Among the noble women who entered the ranks of the Sisters of the Refuge in the nineteenth century, was one whose name will be long remembered, Mother Mary Euphrasia Pelletier. She was born in the island of Noirmoutier, of pious parents, on 31 July, 1796, and received in baptism the name of Rose Virginia. She entered the community of "The Refuge" of Tours, in 1814, and made her profession in 1816, taking the name of Mary St. Euphrasia. She became first mistress of the "penitents", a short time after her profession, and about eight years later was made superior of the house of Tours. Desirous of extending the benefits of her order to the very extremities of the earth, she clearly saw that a central government, a mother-house, should be established. The house of

Angers, which she had founded, seemed destined by God for grand designs. He would decide, by the voice of His pontiff. Like many of God's elect, she was treated by her adversaries as an innovator, an ambitious person, impatient of authority. Only after incessant labours and formidable opposition did her cause triumph. The Brief in approval of the mother-house at Angers was signed 3 April, 1835, and published by Gregory XVI. The official title of the institute was henceforth "Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers". It is directly subject to the Holy See, and Cardinal Odescalchi was its first cardinal-protector. Angers is authorized to send its sisters to the extremities of the earth. Mother Euphrasia heartily devoted herself to the work entrusted to her. She had been accused of ambition, of innovation, and of disobedience. Her sole ambition was to extend God's kingdom, and to offer the benefits of her institute to the whole world. Her innovations, in harmony with the spirit of the Gospel, with the fourth vow of her order, were approved by the Church, and gave in thirty-three years one hundred and ten soul-saving institutions to the Church and to society. Her institutions were all founded in obedience to the requests of ecclesiastical authorities in every part of the world. Thirty-three years she was mother-general of the Good Shepherd, and at her death, 29 April, 1868, she left 2067 professed sisters, 384 novices, 309 Tourière sisters, 962 "magdalens", 6372 "penitents", and 8483 children of various classes. Angers had seen great changes since 1829, when Mother Euphrasia had come with five sisters to found the house. Within thirty-three years one hundred and ten convents had been founded, sixteen provinces established, in France, Belgium, Holland, Rome, Italy, Germany, Austria, England, Scotland, Ireland, Asia, Africa, the United States and Chili. Under her successor, Mother Mary St. Peter Coudenrove, in twenty-four years, eighty-five houses were founded, and thirteen new provinces established, making eleven in Europe, two in Africa, nine in North America, five in South America and one in Oceania.

The cause of beatification of Mother Euphrasia was inscribed by the postulator of the cause, 17 Nov., 1886. The preliminary examination terminated in 1890. Leo XIII received supplications from numerous cardinals, archbishops, bishops, several cathedral chapters, rectors of colleges and universities, hundreds of priests, and many noble families, begging him to dispense from the ordinary ten years' interval required before the continuation of the cause. On 11 Dec., 1897, Leo XIII declared her "Venerable", to the great joy of the whole world, and to the honour and glory of all the convents of the Good Shepherd.

The order is still increasing every year. In 1901, it counted 232 houses, 24 provinces, 7044 sisters, with 43,159 subjects under their care.

This order glories also in the name of Mother Mary of the Divine Heart, who has been compared to the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque. The consecration of the universe to the Sacred Heart, 9 June, 1899, which Leo XIII referred to as the greatest act of his pontificate, was brought about by her suggestion. She died on the eve of the consecration (8 June, 1899), at Porto, Portugal, and already preparations are being made for her beatification.

BOULAY, *Vie du Père Eudes* (Paris, 1905); ORY, *Les origines de Notre Dame de Charité* (Abbeville, 1891); PAQUIER, *La vénérable Mère Marie de St. Euphrasie Pelletier* (Angers, 1893); PORTAIS, *Vie de la R. Mère Marie de St. Euphrasie Pelletier* (Paris, 1894); CHASLE, *Sœur Marie du Divin Cœur* (Paris, 1905; tr., New York).

CHARLES LEBRUN.

**Good Works.** See MERIT.

GOOSSENS, PIERRE-LAMBERT, Cardinal, Archbishop of Mechlin (Belgium), b. at Perck, near Vilvorde, 18 July, 1827; d. at Mechlin 25 January, 1906.

After teaching at Bruel College at Mechlin, he be-

came, in 1856, curate at the cathedral and secretary of the archbishop, and, in April, 1878, vicar-general of Cardinal Dechamps. Meanwhile he had been appointed (1860) an honorary canon of the metropolitan chapter. In 1880 he was made a Roman prelate, and 24 June, 1883, was consecrated at Mechlin coadjutor-bishop to Mgr. Gravez, whom he succeeded as Bishop of Namur 16 July following. Eight months later (24 March, 1884) he became Archbishop of Mechlin, and on 24 May, 1889, he was created Cardinal-Priest of the Title of Santa-Croce in Gerusalemme. Succeeding to the See of Mechlin just when the Belgian Catholics were about to depose the Masonic government which had oppressed them since 1879, he did much to perpetuate the strong hold on political power which the Catholic party has since possessed. In order to promote thorough Christian sentiments among the workmen of the great industrial centres of his diocese, also in distant country places, he provided for them greater church facilities, caused many new churches to be built, and created eighty-six parishes. In twenty-two years he founded in his diocese 840 primary schools, with an attendance of 120,000 children. He also multiplied high schools for girls and for boys, opened normal and professional schools, and founded ten colleges for the teaching of humanities. Tireless in promoting the economical interests of the working classes, he organized and presided over two general congresses and five district congresses in which the social question was the chief topic of discussion. On public occasions his manner was noble and stately, yet in his dealings with priests and people he was always amiable and unaffected, and had the secret of enlisting sacrifice and devotion. To kindness he joined prudence and discretion and was thus able to avoid conflicts with the State authorities. A talented writer, his style bore the impression of the masterpieces of French pulpit eloquence, of which he was an assiduous reader.

In his "Charges and Pastoral Letters" (five volumes) and his "Occasional Addresses" accuracy of ideas, delicacy of feeling, literary tact, and purity of diction are always predominant characteristics. Though not himself a savant, he was alive to scientific needs, and greatly encouraged scientific progress in the University of Louvain, of which he was the chief patron. He reorganized the archives of his archdiocese, and encouraged historical research among his clergy by requiring each parish priest to furnish him with an historical monograph on his parish.

His published works are: "Collectio Epistolarum pastoralium, decretorum, aliorumque documentorum" (5 vols., Mechlin, 1889-1906); "Discours sur la question sociale" (Mechlin, 1894); "Choix de conférences, discours et allocutions" (Mechlin, 1906).

MERCIER, *Oraison funèbre de Son Eminence, P.-L. Goossens* (Louvain, 1906); LAENEN, *Les archevêques de Malines qui furent tenus de la papauté romaine en La Vie diocésaine* (1907), I, 193-202; *Relationes Status Archiepiscop. Mechlinensis omnis Chr. 1895, 1898, et 1902* in GOOSSENS, *Collectio Epistolarum*; MUYLDERMANS, *Levensschets van Z. E. Kardinaal Goossens* (in preparation).

P. LADEUZE.

**Gordian** (Lat. GORDIANUS).—There were three Roman emperors of this name, who reigned between A. D. 237-44, and all of whom met with violent deaths. The first, Marcus Antonius Africanus Gordianus, descended on the father's side from the Gracchi and on the mother's from Trajan, was chosen emperor in Africa in opposition to the usurper Maximin, and the choice was confirmed by the Senate. On account of his advanced age, his son was associated with him in the purple. Their reign lasted only thirty-six days, the son being slain in battle by Maximin's lieutenant, Capellianus, and the father putting an end to his own life (July, 237). M. Antonius Gordianus Pius, the grandson of the elder and nephew of the younger Gor-



dian, a boy of thirteen, was appointed to the dignity of Caesar under the joint-emperors Maximus and Balbinus. These latter were massacred in 238 by the Praetorian guards, and the youthful Gordian became sole emperor. After being for a time under the control of his mother's eunuchs, he married the daughter of Mithreus, his teacher of rhetoric. Mithreus proved to be a capable politician and general, and stirred up his young charge to march in person against the Persians. At first the expedition met with success, but the death of Mithreus put an end to Gordian's prosperity. His soldiers mutinied, at the instigation of Philip, the successor of Mithreus, and slew him (244). Under the Gordians the Church enjoyed peace. Their rival, Maximin, had been a fierce persecutor of the Christians; hence they naturally cultivated the goodwill of those who had every reason to oppose his rule.

GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London, 1815), ch. vii. ALLARD, *Le christianisme et l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1898), ch. iii.

T. B. SCANNELL.

**Gordianus and Epimachus**, SAINTS, Martyrs, suffered under Julian the Apostate, 362, commemorated on 10 May. Gordianus was a judge, but was so moved by the sanctity and sufferings of the saintly priest, Januarius, that he embraced Christianity with many of his household. Being accused before his successor, or as some say before the prefect of the city, Apronianus, he was cruelly tortured and finally beheaded. His body was carried off by the Christians, and laid in a crypt on the Latin Way beside the body of St. Epimachus, who had been recently interred there. The two saints gave their name to the cemetery, and have ever since been joined together in the veneration of the Church. There is another Gordianus who suffered martyrdom (place uncertain) with two companions, and is commemorated on 17 September (Acta SS., XLV, 483); and a third, commemorated on 13 Sept., who with several companions was martyred in Pontus or Galatia (Acta SS., XLIV, 55).

There are also several martyrs named Epimachus, and, owing to the meagreness of the information possessed concerning them, less careful writers have confounded them greatly, while the greater hagiologists are unable to agree as to their number or identity. The Bollandists mention five saints of this name: (1) A martyr commemorated by the Greeks on 6 July (Acta SS., XXIX, 280); (2) Epimachus and Azirianus, martyrs venerated by the Copts and Abyssinians on 31 Oct. (Acta SS., LXI, 684); (3) Epimachus of Pelusium in Egypt, venerated by the Greeks on 31 Oct. (Acta SS., LXI, 704); (4) Epimachus and Alexander, martyred at Alexandria in the persecution of Decius, commemorated in the Latin Church on 12 Dec.; (5) Epimachus, whose body, with that of St. Gordianus, is honoured at Rome on 10 May. Most of the great writers have denied the existence of an Epimachus martyred at Rome, and account for the relics honoured there by asserting that the body of the Alexandrian Epimachus was transported thither shortly before the martyrdom of St. Gordianus. Remi de Buck, the learned Bollandist, however, maintains that the evidence for the Roman Epimachus is too strong to be doubted, while he rejects the pretended translation of the relics of Epimachus of Alexandria.

Acta SS., XV, 549; DE BUCK, *De Variis SS. Epimachis in Acta SS.*, LXI, 706.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Gordon**, ANDREW, Benedictine monk, physicist; b. 15 June, 1712, at Cofforach in Forfarshire, Scotland; d. 22 August, 1751, at Erfurt, in Saxony. Having travelled extensively on the Continent, Gordon became a Benedictine and in 1737 was appointed professor of natural philosophy in the University of Erfurt. He soon acquired considerable reputation by

his works on electricity, among which were his "Phænomena electricitatis exposita" (1744); "Philosophia utilis et jucunda" (1745); "Physica experimentalis elementa" (1751-52). For the sulphur ball of von Guericke (1671) and the glass globe of Newton (some say Hauksbee), Gordon substituted a glass cylinder which made an efficient frictional machine. Two other inventions of the Benedictine physicist are noteworthy. The first is the light metallic star supported on a sharp pivot with the pointed ends bent at right angles to the rays and commonly called the electrical whirl; the second is the beautiful device known as the electric chimes. Though these inventions are described in all textbooks of electricity, the name of Gordon is never mentioned, though both inventions are fully described by him in his "Versuch einer Erklärung der Electricität" (Erfurt, 1745). Franklin, who is usually credited with the latter invention, simply adopted the "German chimes" (described by Watson in his famous "Sequel", 1746) to serve as an electrical annunciator in connexion with his experimental (lightning) rod of 1752. The "whirl" is of special interest because it was an electrostatic reaction motor, the earliest of its kind; while the second derives its theoretical importance from its being the first instance that we have of the application of what has come to be called "electric convection".

PRIESTLEY, *History of Electricity* (1775); *Electrical World* (New York, 2 Jan., 1909); COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. BROTHER POTAMIAN.

**Gordon**, WILLIAM. See LEEDS, DIOCESE OF.

**Gordon Riots.**—This agitation, so called from the head and spirit of the movement, Lord George Gordon, convulsed the metropolis of England from 2 June till 9 June, 1780. The first English Catholic Relief Act of 1778 (18 George III, c. 60) was not due to any strong feeling in favour of Catholics. Of those mainly responsible for the measure, some were ashamed of the brutal intolerance of former days, some feared that the declaration of American independence might result in an Irish rebellion. The majority had been slow to act, and there was also a noisy minority, which filled the House with protest, while the bill was being debated, and, when it had become law, strove earnestly to prevent a like measure from being brought forward in the legislation for Scotland. To effect this a "Protestant Association" was formed which organized demonstrations of the mob against the Catholics at Perth and Edinburgh, where on 2 February, 1779, the chapel-houses in Chalmer's Close, near Leith Wynd, and in Blackfriars Wynd were burned. Nor was peace restored until the Lord Provost weakly promised that no Catholic relief bill for Scotland should be introduced. Though some compensation for the damage done was afterwards ordered by the Government, the Association had gained such a victory that it was encouraged to found branches in England, in order to work for the repeal of the Relief Bill already passed there, as also for the repeal of the Canada or Quebec bill, which granted freedom to Canadian Catholics.

The president of both Scottish and English Associations was Lord George Gordon, third son of the third Duke of Gordon, the first Protestant head of the house. Lord George was eccentric, and unrestrained both in his fanaticism and in his passions; so much so that the *mot*, originally formed for Sir Fleetwood Shepherd, was adapted to him by Wilkes, "Nulla displicuit meretrix præter Babylonicam" (R. Bisset, "George III", III, 167). This hero of the Protestant Association resolved on a great demonstration. He procured a petition for the repeal of the Relief Bill, signed by 30,000 to 40,000 names, carried it to the House of Commons, 2 June, 1780, in a huge procession, said in the excitement of the time to have numbered 20,000 or even 40,000 men, all wearing blue cockades, and carrying blue flags with the legend: NO POPERY. In

the House Lord George demanded an immediate vote, while his followers were pressing into the lobbies and maltreating all members whom they regarded as hostile to the repeal. The motion was postponed, however, and when evening fell attacks were made on the best known embassy chapels, the Sardinian chapel, near Lincoln's Inn Fields, and the Bavarian chapel in Warwick Street. The method of attack was more or less the same on all occasions. First the windows were broken, then the doors forced, the house sacked and the furniture thrown out and burned in the street, thereby setting fire to the whole building. Warwick Street chapel was eventually saved by soldiers, who also arrested some bystanders. Two or three of these upon examination "appeared to be Catholics, but of excellent characters", against whom "as no material circumstances appeared, it was thought they would get off" ("Public Advertiser". 6 June, 1780). The

undisputed master of the situation. All shops were closed, money was exacted from passers by, and every one put on the blue cockade, and chalked No POPERY on his door. The Catholics suffered much, but unpopular Protestants suffered no less. The house of Lord Chief Justice Mansfield was sacked and burned, so were those of the justices, and even of the witnesses who had given evidence against the rioters. The prisons of Newgate and Clerkenwell were fired, and all the prisoners released. Next day the same fate befell the prisons of the King's Bench, the Fleet, and the Marshalsea. In other prisons, as the Poultry, all prisoners were discharged to prevent further disturbance. The large distillery in Holborn of Mr. Langdale, a Catholic, was burned, and all the stores of spirits wasted or drunk. The bridges across the Thames were seized; the Bank of England was twice attacked, and only saved by soldiers. On Wednesday night



GORDON RIOTS—BURNING OF NEWGATE PRISON  
Contemporary Print of Alexander Hogg, British Museum

prisoners, presumably mere spectators, were remanded for trial to Newgate, whence they "got off" on the following Tuesday without any further investigations. Some disingenuous Protestants, however, have pretended that the burning of the chapels was really due to Catholics (cf. "Barnaby Rudge", lxxvii, end).

By Saturday morning there was a lull. On Sunday afternoon, however, there was a recrudescence of violence, the temporary repairs at the embassy chapels were torn down and burned, Moorfields chapel house was sacked, and several neighbouring houses gutted, and their furniture burned. Worse would have followed but for the timely arrival of the soldiers. Next day, Monday, the Privy Council met at St. James's; but so little was the Government moved by the many misfortunes of the Catholics, so little did it foresee the future, that no adequate measures were adopted to suppress disorder, though in the city the blue cockades were asserting their power with ever growing boldness. On Tuesday, 6 June, Parliament again met; and again the mob pressed in, preventing the progress of business, and handling roughly all who displeased them. Lord North himself, the prime minister, only escaped that evening by putting his coach-horses to the gallop, having lost his hat in the fray, which was thereupon torn up, and the pieces distributed as trophies among the crowd. The mob was henceforth

thirty-six different conflagrations might be counted from London Bridge. Fortunately the air was still, and the flames did not spread, or the consequences would have been terrible, for the mob had injured the fire-pumps and thrown the hoses into the burning buildings.

The delay in dealing with the mob violence was due to many causes. There had never been a tumult of this nature before, and there was no special force to cope with it. The police of the city in those days consisted but of a few dozen watchmen and constables. Of the magistrates some were infatuated for the Protestant Association, some were cowards, nearly all were of opinion that the Riot Act must be read an hour before the military could be called upon to interfere. At last King George himself (it had been thought prudent for him to retire from the royal apartments to more protected buildings in the rear of St. James's) summoned a council on Wednesday evening and active measures were ordered, and carried out that very night. Infantry and cavalry attacked the crowd wherever it made head, firing into their ranks, and charging them with sword and bayonet. Though the darkness and intricacies of the streets enabled the rioters to maintain themselves for a while, no serious resistance was, or could be, offered. By Thursday evening all organized disturbance was over, but

210 had been killed in the streets, 75 died in hospital, and 173 were severely wounded. Of the prisoners taken, 52 were convicted, and of these between 20 and 30 executed. Lord George's trial, fortunately for him, had to be adjourned for some months. By then men's minds were cooler; he was admirably defended by the great advocate Thomas, afterwards Lord, Erskine, and acquitted. There was, no doubt, a miscarriage of justice here, but the formal indictment of "levying war on the king", could not be substantiated. Indeed it is certain that he did not at all foresee the results of his actions, and that he exerted himself, when it was too late, to stem the torrent of mischief which he had let loose. John Wesley is sometimes said to have assisted in arousing the religious fanaticism of the associates; but this is neither true nor possible, for he was at the time, and had been for months before, engaged in a missionary circuit through the Northern counties. In the previous January, however, he had written a "Defence" of the "Appeal" issued by the Association, and obstinately maintained his narrow views in the "Freeman's Journal", though they were answered by Father Arthur O'Leary. The losses of the Catholics were grave, and cannot be precisely scheduled. Claim for compensation was afterwards made for 57 houses destroyed (three of these chapels or mass-houses), besides two embassy chapels. Numbers, moreover, were constrained to fly in confusion and by night, with their wives and children and little store of valuables. Their Protestant friends too often not daring to give them shelter, they fell in many instances into extreme distress. Others were shot by the soldiers in trying to escape from the mob; four are reported to have died from fear; Mr. Dillon of Moorfields, an old man, who had previously endured prosecution for his priesthood, was wantonly thrown out of his sick-bed and died six weeks later. The sum eventually paid to the Catholics is said to have been £28,219 from the city, and £5200 from the Government. Mr. Langdale put his losses at £100,000, but refused compensation, receiving instead leave to distil spirits for a year free of impost, and thereby (so runs the story) made up handsomely the damage he had suffered.

The events of the riots were chronicled day by day in the papers, e. g. *The Morning Advertiser*, the *London Chronicle*, the *London Gazette*; and were summarized in the monthly and annual periodicals, e. g. the *Political Magazine*, and *The Annual Register*. See also the Lords' and the Commons' Journals, LORD MAHON, *History of England* (1858), III, lxi, lxiii; HOLCROFT, *A Plain Narrative of the late Riots in London* (1780); COBBETT, *State Trials*, xxi, 485-487. Dickens has described the riots in "Barnaby Rudge." The riots are also mentioned by all historians and memoir writers of the period.

For the misfortunes of the Catholics in particular, see BURTON, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner* (London, 1909); *The Catholic Magazine* for 1833, being papers and documents collected by "L. C."; *Dolman's Review*, vols. V and VI, ten contributions by EDWARD PRICE; ALEXIUS J. F. MILLS, *The Riots in London in 1780* (London, 1883). The last two should be read with caution.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Gordos**, a titular see in the province of Lydia, suffragan of Sardis. The city is mentioned by Strabo, Hierocles, and Georgius Cyprius. Ptolemy locates it between the River Hermus, the modern Guediz Tchai, and Mt. Sipylus. Lequien (Or. Chris., I, 881) names five of its bishops: John, known to Socrates (Hist. Eccl., VII, xxxvi), and who assisted at the Council of Ephesus in 431; Theodotus, 458; Theodore, 536; George, 787; and Leo, 878. Between the years 901 and 907, under Leo the Wise (Ecthesis pseudo-Epiphani, ed. Gelzer, p. 553), Gordos is always mentioned as a suffragan of Sardis. It is not known when it was suppressed, but it no longer existed in the fifteenth century. Gordos, now Guerdz, is the chief town of a caza of the sanjak of Saroukhan in the vilayet of Aidin. The city numbers four thousand inhabitants, six hundred of whom are Greek schismatics, the

remainder being Mussulmans. It is the chief centre of the manufacture of Smyrna carpets.

CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, III, 556-559.

S. VAILLÉ.

**Gorgonius**, SAINT, Martyr, suffered in 304 at Nicomedia during the persecution of Diocletian. Gorgonius held a high position in the household of the emperor, and had often been entrusted with matters of the greatest importance. At the breaking out of the persecution he was consequently among the first to be charged, and, remaining constant in the profession of the Faith, was with his companions, Dorotheus, Peter, and several others, subjected to the most frightful torments and finally strangled. Diocletian, determined that their bodies should not receive the extraordinary honours which the early Christians were wont to pay the relics of the martyrs (honours so great as to occasion the charge of idolatry), ordered them to be thrown into the sea. The Christians nevertheless obtained possession of them, and later the body of Gorgonius was carried to Rome, whence in the eighth century it was translated by St. Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, and enshrined in the monastery of Gorze. Many French churches obtained portions of the saint's body from Gorze, but in the general pillage of the French Revolution, most of these relics were lost. Our chief sources of information regarding these martyrs are Lactantius and Eusebius. Their feast is kept on 9 Sept.

There are five other martyrs of this name venerated in the Church. The first is venerated at Nice on 10 March; the second, martyred at Antioch, is commemorated on 11 March; the third, martyred at Rome, is honoured at Tours on 11 March; the fourth, martyred at Nicomedia, is revered in the East on 12 March; while the fifth is one of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, whose feast is kept 10 March.

*Acta SS.*, XLIII, 328; *Analecta Bollandiana*, XVIII, 5.

JOHN F. X. MURPHY.

**Gorkum**, THE MARTYRS OF.—In the year 1572, Luther and Calvin had already wrested from the Church a great part of Europe. The iconoclastic storm had swept through the Netherlands, and was followed by a struggle between Lutheranism and Calvinism in which the latter was victorious. In 1571 the Calvinists held their first synod, at Embden. On 1 April of the next year the *Watergeuzen* (Sea-beggars) conquered Briel and later Vlissingen and other places. In June, Dortrecht and Gorkum fell into their hands, and at Gorkum they captured nine Franciscans. These were: Nicholas Pieck, guardian of Gorkum, Hieronymus of Weert, vicar, Theodorus van der Bem, of Amersfoort, Nicasius Janssen, of Heeze, Wilhelm of Denmark, Godefrid of Mervel, Antonius of Weert, Antonius of Hoornaer, and Franciscus de Roye, of Brussels. To these were added two lay brothers from the same monastery, Petrus of Assche and Cornelius of Wyk near Duurstede. Almost at the same time the Calvinists laid their hands on the learned parish priest of Gorkum, Leonardus Vechel of Bois-le-Duc, who had made distinguished studies in Louvain, and also his assistant Nicolaas Janssen, surnamed Poppel, of Welde in Belgium. With the above, were also imprisoned Godefrid van Duynsen, of Gorkum, who was active as a priest in his native city, and Joannes Lenartz of Oisterwijk, an Augustinian and director of the convent of Augustinian nuns in Gorkum. To these fifteen, who from the very first underwent all the sufferings and torments of the persecution, were later added four more companions: Joannes van Hoornaer, a Dominican of the Cologne province and parish priest not far from Gorkum, who, when apprised of the incarceration of the clergy of Gorkum, hastened to the city in order to administer the sacraments to them and was seized and imprisoned with the rest, Jacobus Lacops of Oudenaar, a Norbertine, who after leading a

frivolous life, being disobedient to his order, and neglectful of his religious duties, reformed, became a curate in Monster, Holland, and was imprisoned in 1572; Adrianus Janssen of Hilvarenbeek, at one time a Premonstratensian and parish priest in Monster, who was sent to Brielle with Jacobus Lacops; and lastly Andreas Wouters of Heynoord, whose conduct was not edifying up to the time of his arrest, but who made ample amends by his martyrdom.

After enduring much suffering and abuse in the prison at Gorkum (26 June–6 July) the first fifteen martyrs were transferred to Brielle. On their way to Dortrecht they were exhibited for money to the curious and arrived at Brielle 6 July. On the following day, Lumey, the commander of the *Watergeuzen*, caused the martyrs to be interrogated and ordered a sort of disputation. In the meantime the four other martyrs also arrived. It was exacted of each that he abandon his belief in the Blessed Sacrament and in papal supremacy. All remained firm in their faith. Meanwhile there came a letter from William of Orange which enjoined all those in authority to leave priests and religious unmolested. Nevertheless Lumey caused the martyrs to be hanged in the night of 9 July, in a turfshed amid cruel mutilations. Their beatification took place on 14 Nov., 1675, and their canonization on 29 June, 1865. For many years the place of their martyrdom in Brielle has been the scene of numerous pilgrimages and processions.

ESTIUS, *Novorum in Hollandia constantissimorum martyrum passionis historia* (Cologne, 1572); IDEM, *Historia martyrum Gorcomiensium* (Douai, 1603); KRONENBURG, *Neerlande Heiligen in later eeuwen* (Amsterdam, 1901); MEUFFELS, *Les martyrs de Gorkum* (Paris, 1908).

P. ALBERS.

Görres, GUIDO, historian, publicist, and poet; b. at Coblenz, on 28 May, 1805; d. at Munich on 14 July, 1852. He was the son of the great Johann Joseph Görres, and made his early classical studies in his native town. During his father's banishment he went to Aarau and Strasburg to pursue his education. Reaching the University of Bonn in 1824, he devoted himself chiefly to the study of philology and history. In Munich he continued his linguistic studies, and in 1830 received a prize from the French Academy. In the meantime (1827) his father had received a call as professor of history to Munich, and Guido, influenced by his father's lectures, now took up history as his chief study. The fruit of these studies were "Nikolaus von der Flue" (Ratisbon, 1831) and "Die Jungfrau von Orleans" (Ratisbon, 1834; 3rd ed., 1895). Jointly with Count Franz Pöckl, he published from 1834–39 an illustrated serial on the festivals of the Church, the "Festkalender in Bildern und Liedern", the first illustrated magazine for the young in German. Still carrying on his historical work, he made a great tour of investigation through France in search of further material relating to the Maid of Orleans. But before long his work took a different direction. He edited from 1838 the "Historisch-politische Blätter", a publication subsisting to this day, established to maintain the defence of the rights of the Catholic Church and to champion the interests of German Catholics. Guido Görres took charge of the editorial management with Phillips, and continued at this post until his death. The writings published by him in this review were numerous and on various topics. At the same time his talents as a poet found expression in many beautiful compositions. He became one of the foremost lyricists among the modern Catholic poets of Germany. The tale "Schön Röslein" (Munich, 1838), the charming collection of "Marienlieder" (Munich, 1843), some of which are still sung by the people, besides "Das Weihnachtsskrippelein" (Schaffhausen, 1843), "Das Leben der hl. Cäcilia in drei Gesängen" (Munich, 1843), and the widely-known and popular poems "Die Gottesfahrt nach Trier" (Coblenz,

1844), "Die arme Pilgerin zum hl. Rock" (Coblenz, 1845), the "Gedichte" (Munich, 1844), evince true art, deep perception, and delicate tenderness, combined with power of conception and vigour of form. His work "Der hurnene Siegfried und sein Kampf mit dem Drachen" (Schaffhausen, 1843) belongs to the domain of literary history. In 1846 he began with Count Pöckl, as he had formerly done in the case of the Feast Calendar, the publication of an illustrated magazine called the "Deutsches Hausbuch", which however appeared for two years only. On the death of Klemens Brentano Görres edited his "Marchen" (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1846). He also produced an excellent German translation of the "Imitation of Christ" (St. Polten, 1839, with illustrations by Steinle). In 1844 Görres married Maria Vespermann, who gave him three daughters. But his conjugal happiness was not to last more than eight years, for he died at Munich at the age of forty-seven years.

*Historisch-politische Blätter*, XXX, 133 sqq.; MEYERS, Guido Görres (Luxemburg, 1896); POLLMANN, *Die Romantik des Lyrikers Guido Görres in Historisch-polit. Blätter*, CXXXV (1905), 705–26.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Görres, JOHANN JOSEPH, b. at Coblenz, in the heart of the Rhine country, 25 January, 1776; d. at Munich, 29 January, 1848. He was the strongest and most gifted champion of Catholic Germany, from the religious and the political point of view, during the first half of the nineteenth century. His father, Moritz Görres, had been a timber merchant. His mother was descended from an Italian family named Mazza, which had settled in Coblenz. He made his secondary studies at the gymnasium of Coblenz, where, after the expulsion of the Jesuits, pedantic and superficial rationalistic methods prevailed. In his youth Görres was a republican and rationalist, and he looked upon the French Revolution as a movement to free the nations. His earliest writings, "Der allgemeine Friede, ein Ideal" (1798), likewise the monthly publication "Das rote Blatt", which was continued in "Der Ruberzahl in blauen Grunde" (1798–1799), reflect this state of mind. He was one of several delegates sent by the Rhine and Moselle provinces to Paris in the fall of the year 1799, to protest against the conduct of the French general Leval in the Rhine country, and to remove the uncertainty hanging over his native country. His stay in Paris cured him of his enthusiasm for the French Revolution, and the city appeared to him as a "flower-bedecked quagmire". The pamphlet "Die Resultate meiner Sendung nach Paris" (1800) gives an account of his impressions. In it he closes the first period of his life, which was filled with plans and aspirations for the betterment of the human race and with bitter disappointments.

Returning from Paris, Görres became professor of physics at the *Sekundarschule* (college) at Coblenz, where he remained until 1806. On 14 September, 1801, he married Catherine von Lasaulx. As the fruits of his scientific studies at Coblenz he published a translation of Fourcroy's *Synoptical Chemical Tables* (1801), besides the two treatises "Aphorismen über Organonomie" (1803) and "Exposition der Physiologie" (1805). At the same time under the influence of Schelling he became interested in natural philosophy, art, and poetry, as appears in his essays "Aphorismen über die Kunst" (1802); "Glauben und Wissen" (1805); and in his articles in Arétin's "Aurora". He identified himself with the Romantic movement, and in 1806 became Docent at the University of Heidelberg, where German romanticism flourished, and where he found himself thrown into close association with Achim von Arnim, Klemens Brentano, and Eichendorff. The last-named assisted him in the production of his "Teutschen Volksbücher" (1807). Later on came the "Alteutschen Volksund Meisterlieder" (1817). He also contributed to the "Zeitung für

Einsiedler" and the "Heidelberger Jahrbucher", the official organ of the Romantics. But the hostility of the Protestants at Heidelberg, many of whom turned against the Romantics when the latter recognized and proclaimed the greatness and nobility of the Catholic church, led Görres to quit Heidelberg (1808), and to return to his former position at Coblenz. He now devoted himself to Germanic and mythological studies, which enabled him to produce his work, "Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt" (2 vols., 1810). The important political events of the following years compelled him once more to enter the political arena. In 1814 he founded the weekly "Der Rheinische Merkur", in which he violently attacked Napoleon, laboured for the advancement of Germany, and pleaded for the restoration of the old German Empire. Napoleon is said to have called this periodical the fifth of the great powers that were allied against him.

Görres at this period became superintendent of public instruction in the Rhine provinces. But his demand for the restoration of the old German Empire under the Emperor of Austria, and his courageous struggle on behalf of civil and political liberty, brought down upon him the hostility of the German princes, especially after the publication of his brochure: "Deutschlands künftige Verfassung" (1816). The "Rheinische Merkur" was suppressed by the Prussian Government in 1816, and Görres was dismissed from his post as superintendent of public instruction. He went back to Heidelberg, but in 1817 returned to Coblenz and founded a relief-society for the alleviation of distress in the Rhenish province. At the same time he continued his fearless work as a pamphleteer, as shown chiefly in his "Adresse der Stadt und Landschaft Koblenz und ihre Uebergabe beim Fürsten Hardenberg" (1818), and his brochure "Deutschland und die Revolution" (1819). The Prussian Government thereupon confiscated his papers and ordered his arrest. He escaped, however, to Frankfurt, whence he made his way to Strasburg. Here he remained, save for a visit to Switzerland in 1821 until the year 1827. His written defence "In Sachen der Rheinprovinz und in eigener Angelegenheit" (1821) was a brilliant vindication of himself against the attitude of the Prussian Government. At the same time he addressed a warning to the princes and nations of Europe, which was published the same year, "Europa und die Revolution". In the following year he published "Die Heilige Allianz und die Völker auf dem Kongress von Verona" (1822).

Görres meanwhile turned again to his scientific studies, which now led him to give more attention to religious matters. He published during his stay in Strasburg "Firdusis Heldenbuch von Iran", and was a contributor to the magazine "Der Katholik", which had been founded in Mayence by Raess and Weiss, and in 1824 transferred to Strasburg. He contributed numerous articles to this review, among others the paper "Der hl. Franziskus von Assisi, ein Troubadour" (1826; 2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1879), the preface to Diepenbrock's edition of the works of Heinrich Suso, besides a study on Swedenborg. In this way Görres became more and more active as a champion and defender of religious interests.

Görres's nomination by King Ludwig I of Bavaria to a professorship at the University of Munich (1827) marked the opening of the last period of his life. His lectures attracted a number of distinguished students among whom we may mention Brunner, Haneberg, Sepp, Windischmann. But he became above all the head and front of a society of distinguished Catholic gentlemen who came to Munich under the patronage of King Ludwig I and who worked for the renovation of spiritual life, for the liberty of the Church, and for all things of interest to the Catholic Faith. Among the most eminent members of this circle we find the names of Arndts, Cornelius, Döllinger, Möhler, Phillips, Ringseis, and Streber. At intervals Görres was also

visited by political and religious leaders of Catholicism, both in Germany and in other countries, among them Brentano, Bohmer, Lacordaire, Lamennais, and Montalembert. In Munich also he continued his fertile and versatile literary activity. He pleaded for a Christian interpretation of history in his "Grundlage, Gliederung und Zeitenfolge der Weltgeschichte" (1830, new ed., 1884), and in the publication issued under his direction since 1831, "Gott in der Geschichte, Bilder aus allen Jahrhunderten der Christlichen Zeitrechnung". Other historical productions of his pen at this period were: "Die Japhetiden und ihre Gemeinsame Heimat Armenien" (1844), and "Die drei Grundwurzeln des Keltischen Stammes in Gallien und ihre Einwanderung" (1845). He treated political questions in the "Eos", a review founded by Herbst in 1828. His work "Der Dom zu Köln und das Münster zu Strassburg" (1842) properly belongs to the history of art.

But what engrossed Görres's attention above all since his stay in Strasburg was the study of mysticism. He carefully studied the mystical writers of the Middle Ages, observed partly in person the phenomena connected with the cases of the ecstatic young women of that time (Maria of Morl and others), and strove to comprehend more thoroughly the nature of Christian mysticism, which stands in the strongest contrast to rationalism and naturalism. These studies led to his writing his great work: "Die christliche Mystik" (4 vols., 1836-42; 2nd ed., 5 vols., 1879), which notwithstanding its lack of historical criticism, and in spite of many incorrect views in matters of philosophy and theology, is a magnificent work. It proved a strong stimulant to Christian faith and dealt a decisive blow to superficial rationalism in religious matters.

The religious difficulties in Prussia, in the thirties, which culminated in the arrest of the Archbishop of Cologne, Clement August (1837), recalled Görres into the lists to champion once more the rights of the Church against the State. His "Athanasius" (1834), of which there appeared four editions that same year, written in defence of the Archbishop of Cologne, who was persecuted for doing his duty, produced a profound impression and a vigorous movement on behalf of the Archbishop. This was soon followed by his "Die Triarier" (1838), in which he opposed H. Leo, P. Marheinecke, and K. Bruno, as the advocates of liberalism in science. After the settlement of the Cologne troubles he reviewed the conflict in his treatise: "Kirche und Staat nach Ablauf der Kölner Irrung" (1842). This attack on the religious liberty and the religious interests of German Catholics led a number of Görres's friends in Munich, with his assistance, to found the "Historisch-politische Blätter", a periodical, intended to defend the rights of Catholics and to maintain Catholic interests. It began to appear in 1838, under the editorial management of Phillips and of Guido Görres, son of the great Görres. He himself was a zealous contributor to this publication for the first ten years of its existence and until the close of his life. We find in the very first volume an interesting article by him, "Die Weltlage", while there is not one of the first twenty volumes which does not contain something from his gifted pen.

An important occasion once more led Görres to come forward as the champion of Catholic life. In his "Die Wahlfahrt von Trier" (1845) he combated the schism of the so-called German Catholics, set on foot by Johannes Ronge on the occasion of the exhibition of the Holy Coat of Trier, in 1844. The evening of his life was painfully saddened by the Lola Montez episode, in consequence of which several of the ablest Munich professors and Görres's friends were dismissed from their chairs by King Ludwig I (1847). Görres himself was not interfered with on this occasion. His writings were published in a collected form: "Gesammelte Werke, hg. von Marie Görres", 6 vols. (Munich,



1854-1860); also "Gesammelte Briefe hg. von Marie Gerres u. Fr. Binder" (3 vols., Munich, 1858-74).

Joseph von Gorres, *eine Skizze seines Lebens* (Ratisbon, 1848); Joseph von Gorres, in *Historisch-Politische Blätter* (1851), XXVII, 1-41; 89-126; 272-304; 1853, XXXII, 557-594; 637-680, 1860, LXV, 160-176, 249-261; BRULH, *Joseph von Gorres, ein Denkmal aus seinen Schriften aufbaut* (Aachen, 1854); HEINRICH, *Jos. von Gorres, ein Lebensbild* (Frankfort, 1867); GALLAND, *John Joseph von Gorres* (2nd ed., Freiburg im Br., 1877); SEPP, *Gorres und seine Zeitgenossen* (Nordlingen, 1877); IDEM, *Gorres* (Berlin, 1896); WIBBELT, *Gorres als Literarhistoriker* (Cologne, 1899); SCHULTZ, *Gorres und die jüngere Romantik* (Berlin, 1902). J. P. KIRSCH.

**Gortyna**, a titular see, and in the Greek Church metropolitan see, of the Island of Crete. The city, situated at the foot of Mount Ida, not far from the River Lethe, was first called Larissa, afterwards Creminia, then Gortys, and finally Gortyna. Homer mentions it as a fortified city, which gives an idea of its great antiquity. Previous to the Roman occupation it was continually at war with the two neighbouring and rival cities of Cnossus and Cydonia, contending with them for supremacy. The result was desolation in an island predestined to happiness by its geographical position, climate, and soil. The Cretans, indeed, were ever the cause of their own distress, being at all times discontented with their government. Under Roman rule Gortyna became the civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of the island, which then prospered in a degree hitherto unknown. Its first bishop was St. Titus, the disciple to whom St. Paul addressed one of his Epistles. A basilica dedicated to St. Titus, discovered at Gortyna partly in ruins, dates from the fifth, perhaps from the fourth, century. Among the earliest occupants of the see were St. Philip, a contemporary of Marcus Aurelius, whose feast is kept 11 April; St. Myron, commemorated 8 August; St. Cyril, 9 July; St. Eumenius, 18 September; St. Peter the Younger, 14 July. In 170 St. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, addressed a letter to the community of Gortyna (Euseb., H. E., IV, xxiii), then probably the metropolitan see of Crete. Among its archbishops mention should also be made of St. Andrew of Crete (d. 740), a famous Byzantine poet and orator, and opponent of the Iconoclasts. In 825 the island was taken by the Arabs, Archbishop Cyril was slain for refusing to apostatize, and Gortyna so completely destroyed that it never rose from its ruins. Thenceforth, moreover, the metropolitan ceased to bear the title of Gortyna, took that of Crete, and resided elsewhere, probably at Candia, a city built by the Arabs and made capital of the island. In the tenth century Nicephorus Phocas reconquered Crete for the Byzantine Empire, which held it until 1204, when it fell into the hands of the Venetians, who retained the island until 1669, when the Turks took possession of it. The Venetians did not allow the Greek bishops to reside in Crete, while the Latin archbishop bore the title of Candia, not of Gortyna. Even yet the Latin diocese retains the name of Candia (q. v.), Gortyna being a titular archiepiscopal title. On the other hand the Greek Archbishop of Gortyna calls himself Metropolitan of Crete. The extensive ruins of Gortyna are located near the village of Hagioi Deki. Among them are a temple of Apollo, several statues, the basilica of St. Titus, and numerous inscriptions, among which is the text of the so-called Laws of Gortyna, found in 1884, which afford us a good insight into Greek law of the fifth century B. C. Æsculapius was much honoured at Gortyna. Within an hour's distance of the ruins is an immense grotto, by many archæologists considered identical with the famous labyrinth. It is, however, only an ancient quarry out of which Gortyna was built; the labyrinth was situated near Cnossus.

LEQUEUR, *Oriens christianus* (Paris, 1740), II, 256-65; CORNELIUS, *Crete Sacra* (Venice, 1755), I, 189-220; II, 42-103; EUBEL, *Hierarchia Cath. med. ævi* (Münster, 1898-), I, 223 sq.; II, 156; PERROT, *L'île de Crète* (Paris, 1886); LAROCHE, *La Crète ancienne et moderne* (Paris, 1898); BOTHMER, *Kreta in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1899). S. VAILHÉ.

**Görz** (It. GORIZIA; Slovene GORICA), capital of the Austrian crown-land Gorz and Gradiska, has a population (1900) of 25,432, almost exclusively Catholic, of which 68 per cent are Italians, 20 per cent Slovenes, and 11.6 per cent Germans. Since 1751 Görz has been the seat of an archbishop, metropolitan of the ecclesiastical province of Illyria.

**History.**—The territory surrounding Görz belonged originally to the old Roman Prefecture of Illyricum, on the division of which into East and West Illyricum in 379 it remained a part of the latter, and shared its fortunes until Emperor Otto III divided it in 1001 between the Patriarch of Aquileia and the Count of Friuli. The latter immediately assumed the title of Duke of Görz after the castle of that name, for the town of Gorz was not recognized as such until 1307. In 1031 Görz passed to the Eppenstein family of Carinthia, and thence in 1090 to the Counts of Lurn, who in 1202, by arrangement with the patriarch, Pilgrim II, secured the territory belonging to the Patriarchate of Aquileia. By marriage Count Meinhard III came also into possession of the Tyrol. After his death (1258) the family divided into the Görz line, represented by Count Albert II, and the Tyrolean-Carinthian line, represented by Count Meinhard IV. The latter line became extinct in 1335 with Henry of Carinthia, who had been for a time King of Bohemia (1307-10); the Görz line reached the zenith of its power under Henry II (d. 1323), among whose possessions were included Lusatia, Pusterthal, and Istria, and who held the office of vicegerent of the empire in the March of Treviso. Unsuccessful wars, divisions of inheritance, etc. led to the decline of the house, and at the death of the last count, Leonhard, in 1500 without issue, his territory fell to Emperor Maximilian I, and, except for a brief interval of French occupation (1809-15), has since remained a possession of the reigning house of Austria.

Ecclesiastically, this territory was from the beginning under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Aquileia. The fact that the patriarchs for the most part resided at Udine on Venetian land, while the patriarchal cathedral was situated at Aquileia on Gorz territory, caused constant friction with Venice. Accordingly, in 1560 Emperor Ferdinand I agitated at Rome the question of establishing an independent bishopric at Görz, an attempt which was repeated many times during the following centuries, but fruitlessly until at last Benedict XIV, yielding to Austrian urgency and overriding the claim of the Republic of Venice to the Austrian part of the Patriarchate of Aquileia, established a separate vicariate Apostolic with residence at Görz (29 Nov., 1749). On 6 June, 1751, the patriarchate was definitively suppressed and replaced by two archbishoprics (18 April, 1752), those of Udine and Görz, the latter having as suffragans Trent, Trieste, Como, and Pedena. The vicar Apostolic, Karl Michael, Count von Attems, was appointed first Archbishop of Görz, and in 1766 was raised to the dignity of a prince. After his death (1774) came Rudolf, Count of Edling, who was, however, deposed by Emperor Joseph II in 1784 for his opposition to the imperial patent of tolerance of 13 October of that year, and died in 1803 at Lodi. On 8 March, 1787, the emperor raised the Diocese of Laibach to the rank of an archdiocese, and on 20 August, 1788, in place of Görz established a new diocese in the adjacent province of Gradiska. Pius VI gave his sanction to the new arrangement on the condition that Gradiska should be regarded only as a co-episcopal seat (with Görz); by his Bull "Recti prudentisque consilii" of 12 September, 1797, however, he transferred the episcopal see and chapter back to Görz, and ordained that in future the bishop should bear both titles, Görz and Gradiska. By the Bull of 19 August, 1807, Pius VII reduced Laibach to the rank of a simple bishopric, and placed it with Görz and Trieste under the immediate jurisdiction

of the Holy See. Finally, on 27 August, 1830, Pius VIII raised Gorz once more to the archiepiscopal rank, and assigned to it the Sees of Laibach, Triest-Capo d'Istria, Parenzo-Pola, and Veglia-Arbe as suffragans, Joseph Walland becoming archbishop. Since Archbishop Walland's death the archiepiscopal see has been occupied by: Franz Xaver Luschin (1835-54), distinguished for his apostolic zeal and unbounded charity; Andreas Gollmayr (1855-83), under whom the title of prince was restored to the bishops; Alois Zorn (1883-97), previously Bishop of Parenzo-Pola; Jakob Missia (1898-1902), raised to the cardinalate, 19 June, 1899; Andreas Jordan (1902-05); and Franz Borgia Sedej, b. at Kirchheim, 10 October, 1854; ordained priest 26 August, 1877; appointed prince-bishop by the emperor, 20 January, 1906; confirmed by the pope, 21 February of the same year, and consecrated on 25 March.

**Statistics.**—The archdiocese embraces the northern part of the Austrian coast, that is the County of Görz and Gradiska, and numbers (1909) 17 deaneries, 86 parishes, 42 curacies, 65 vicarages, 13 benefices, 113 positions for assistant priests, 271 churches and chapels, 304 secular and 41 regular priests, 257,704 Catholics. The following religious congregations have foundations in the archdiocese: the Franciscans, who have the monastery of Castagnavizza, situated above the city of Görz, with an upper gymnasium for those desiring to enter the order; also houses on the Holy Mountain (*Heiliger Berg*) near Görz, and on the island of Barbana near Grado; the Capuchins at Görz and in the monastery of the Holy Cross near Haidenschaft; the Jesuits at Görz; the Brothers of Mercy of St. John of God, who have charge of the town hospital at Gorz; the Ursulines at Gorz; the Sisters of Mercy of St. Vincent de Paul, who have charge of the poor-house and the hospital for women at Gorz, and of the orphan asylum at Contavalle, and have the domestic management of the preparatory seminaries of the prince-bishopric at Gorz; the School Sisters of Notre-Dame, who conduct a higher school for girls and St. Joseph's Asylum for girls at Görz; Sisters of Providence of St. Cajetan, with mother-house at Cormons and 5 branches; Sisters of Mercy of the Holy Cross, who are house-keepers in the central seminary of the prince-bishopric at Görz. The cathedral chapter, established in 1751, and called the Capitulum Teresianum after Empress Maria Theresa, has 3 dignitaries (provost, dean, and scholasticus), 4 capitular and 3 honorary canons, and at the present time (1909) one honorary canon *extra statum*. The patron of the diocese is St. Hermagoras. The theological seminary Carolinum, founded in 1757 by Archbishop von Attems as a *domus presbyterialis*, has been since 1818 the chief seminary for the whole ecclesiastical province of Görz, with the exception of the Diocese of Laibach, which has a seminary of its own. Besides the cathedral at Görz, completed about 1400, which exhibits various styles of architecture, mention should be made of the cathedral at Aquileia (basilican style), consecrated in 1031 by the Patriarch Popo; likewise the former patriarchal, now the parish, church in the city of Grado on the lagoons, ancient itself and rich in art treasures of the early Middle Ages, including sculptures, mosaics, etc., of the sixth century.

DE RUBEIS, *Monumenta ecclesiae Aquileinsis* (Argentina—Venice, 1740); CZERNIG, *Das Land Görz und Gradiska* (2 vols., Vienna, 1873-74); JACKSON, *Dalmatia, the Quarnero and Istria with Cetinje and the Island of Grado* (3 vols., Oxford, 1887); CAPRIN, *Lagune di Grado* (2nd ed., Trieste, 1890); *Die Oesterreichisch-Ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*, Vol. X: *Das Küstenland* (Vienna, 1891); TEUFFENBACH, *Kurzer Abriss der Geschichte der gefürsteten Grafschaft Görz und Gradiska bis zu deren Vereinigung mit dem Hause Habsburg im Jahre 1600* (Innsbruck, 1900); tr. It., CARRARA (Innsbruck, 1900); RITTER-ZAHONY, *Napoleon I. Die Besetzung von Görz durch die Franzosen im Frühjahr 1797* (Leipzig, 1905); *Guidebooks to Gorz by WOELT* (Leipzig, 1905) and NOÉ (2nd ed., Gorz, 1907); *Documenta historiam archidieceseos Goritensis illustrantia edita ab Ordinariato archiepiscopali Goritensi* (since 1907 published as a supplement to the diocesan paper, and in June, 1900, printed up

to page 200); SEDEJ (present Prince-Bishop of Gorz), *Gorz in Die katholische Kirche unserer Zeit und ihre Diener in Wort und Bild* (Munich, 1900), II, 321-30; (2nd ed., Munich, s. d.), 340-43; *Status personatus et localis Archidieceseos Goritensis ineunte anno 1909* (Gorz, 1909).

GREGOR REINHOLD.

**Goscelin** (or GOSSELIN, according to the spelling in the earliest MSS. of his works), a Benedictine biographical writer; d. about 1099. He was born in the north of France and became a monk of St. Bertin's at Omer. Hermann, Bishop of Salisbury, brought him to England, but the exact date of his doing so is disputed. Wright gives 1058, on the authority of William of Malmesbury, but Goscelin himself states that he accompanied Hermann to Rome in 1049, shortly before the great Council of Reims in that year, and as that prelate returned to England in 1053, it seems likely that Goscelin came with him then. He remained in England to the end of his life, visiting many monasteries and cathedrals, and collecting, wherever he went, materials for his numerous biographies of English saints. William of Malmesbury praises his industry in the highest terms. He was at Ely about 1082, where he wrote a life of St. Etheldreda. Between 1087 and 1092 he was at Ramsey, and compiled there a life of St. Ivo, or Ives. In 1098 he went to Canterbury, where he wrote his account of the translation of the relics of St. Augustine and his companions, which had taken place in 1091. This he dedicated to St. Anselm, and it was probably his last work. The Canterbury Obituary, quoted by Wharton, gives 15 May as the day of his death but does not name the year. He was certainly alive in the beginning of the year 1099, but we hear nothing of him afterwards. His works consist of the lives of many English saints, chiefly of those connected with Canterbury, where he spent his last years. Some of them have been printed by the Bollandists, by Mabillon, and by Migne. Others are contained in MSS. in the British Museum (London) and at Cambridge. A full list of his known writings is given in the eighth volume of the "Histoire littéraire de France". His chief work was a life of St. Augustine of Canterbury, professing to be based on older records and divided into two parts,—an "Historia major" (in Mabillon, Acta SS. O.S.B., I) and an "Historia minor" (in Wharton, Anglia Sacra, I). His life of St. Swithin (in Bollandists, Acta SS., July) is also of some importance, but the majority of his writings have not much value at the present day. His method seems to have been usually to take some older writer as his basis and to reproduce his work, in a somewhat inflated style, with additions of his own, but critics are agreed that no very great reliance can be placed on these latter. According to William of Malmesbury, Goscelin was also a skilled musician.

WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *De Gest. Pontif.*, ed. HAMILTON in *Rolls Series* (London, 1870); WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691), I; CAVE, *Script. Eccles.* (Geneva, 1705); FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Latina* (Florence, 1858); CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibl.* (Paris, 1905-7); WRIGHT, *Biographia Britannica Literaria* (London, 1842), I; ARCHER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

**Gospel and Gospels.**—The word *Gospel* usually designates a written record of Christ's words and deeds. It is very likely derived from the Anglo-Saxon *god* (good) and *spell* (to tell), and is generally treated as the exact equivalent of the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον* (*eu* well, *aggello*, I bear a message), and the Latin *Evangelium*, which has passed into French, German, Italian, and other modern languages. The Greek *εὐαγγέλιον* originally signified the "reward of good tidings" given to the messenger, and subsequently "good tidings". Its other important meanings will be set forth in the body of the present general article on the Gospels.

(1) *Titles of the Gospels.*—The first four historical books of the New Testament are supplied with titles (*Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον*,

etc.), which, however ancient, do not go back to the respective authors of those sacred writings. The Canon of Muratori, Clement of Alexandria, and St. Irenæus bear distinct witness to the existence of those headings in the latter part of the second century of our era. Indeed, the manner in which Clement (Strom., I, xxi), and St. Irenæus (Adv. Hær., III, xi, 7) employ them implies that, at that early date, our present titles to the Gospels had been in current use for some considerable time. Hence, it may be inferred that they were prefixed to the evangelical narratives as early as the first part of that same century. That, however, they do not go back to the first century of the Christian era, or at least that they are not original, is a position generally held at the present day. It is felt that since they are similar for the four Gospels, although the same Gospels were composed at some interval from each other, those titles were not framed, and consequently not prefixed to each individual narrative, before the collection of the four Gospels was actually made. Besides, as well pointed out by Prof. Bacon, "the historical books of the New Testament differ from its apocalyptic and epistolary literature, as those of the Old Testament differ from its prophecy, in being invariably anonymous, and for the same reason. Prophecies, whether in the earlier or in the later sense, and letters, to have authority, must be referable to some individual; the greater his name, the better. But history was regarded as a common possession. Its facts spoke for themselves. Only as the springs of common recollection began to dwindle, and marked differences to appear between the well-informed and accurate Gospels and the untrustworthy . . . did it become worth while for the Christian teacher or apologist to specify whether the given representation of the current tradition was 'according to' this or that special compiler, and to state his qualifications". It thus appears that the present titles of the Gospels are not traceable to the Evangelists themselves.

The first word common to the headings of our four Gospels is *Εὐαγγέλιον*, some meanings of which remain still to be set forth. The word, in the New Testament, has the specific meaning of "the good news of the kingdom" (cf. Matt., iv, 23; Mark, i, 15). In that sense, which may be considered as primary from the Christian standpoint, *Εὐαγγέλιον* denotes the good tidings of salvation announced to the world in connexion with Jesus Christ, and, in a more general way, the whole revelation of Redemption by Christ (cf. Matt., ix, 35; xxiv, 14; etc.; Mark, i, 14; xiii, 10; xvi, 15; Acts, xx, 24; Rom., i, 1, 9, 16; x, 16; etc.). This was, of course, the sole meaning connected with the word, so long as no authentic record of the glad tidings of salvation by Christ had been drawn up. In point of fact, it remained the only one in use even after such written records had been for some time received in the Christian Church: as there could be but one Gospel, that is, but one revelation of salvation by Jesus Christ, so the several records of it were not regarded as several Gospels, but only as distinct accounts of one and the same Gospel. Gradually, however, a derived meaning was coupled with the word *Εὐαγγέλιον*. Thus, in his first Apology (c. lxvi), St. Justin speaks of the "Memoirs of the Apostles which are called *Εὐαγγέλια*", clearing referring, in this way, not to the substance of the Evangelical history, but to the books themselves in which it is recorded. It is true that in this passage of St. Justin we have the first undoubted use of the term in that derived sense. But as the holy Doctor gives us to understand that in his day the word *Εὐαγγέλιον* had currently that meaning, it is only natural to think that it had been thus employed for some time before. It seems, therefore, that Zahn is right in claiming that the use of the term *Εὐαγγέλιον*, as denoting a written record of Christ's words and deeds, goes as far back as the beginning of the second century of the Christian era.

The second word common to the titles of the canonical Gospels is the preposition *κατά*, "according to", the exact import of which has long been a matter of discussion among Biblical scholars. Apart from various secondary meanings connected with that Greek particle, two principal significations have been ascribed to it. Many authors have taken it to mean not "written by", but "drawn up according to the conception of", Matthew, Mark, etc. In their eyes, the titles of our Gospels were not intended to indicate authorship, but to state the authority guaranteeing what is related, in about the same way as "the Gospel according to the Hebrews", or "the Gospel according to the Egyptians", does not mean the Gospel written by the Hebrews or the Egyptians, but that peculiar form of Gospel which either the Hebrews or the Egyptians had accepted. Most scholars, however, have preferred to regard the preposition *κατά* as denoting authorship, pretty much in the same way as, in Diodorus Siculus, the History of Herodotus is called 'Η καὶ Ἡρόδοτον ιστορία. At the present day it is generally admitted that, had the titles to the canonical Gospels been intended to set forth the ultimate authority or guarantor, and not to indicate the writer, the Second Gospel would, in accordance with the belief of primitive times, have been called "the Gospel according to Peter", and the third, "the Gospel according to Paul". At the same time it is rightly felt that these titles denote authorship, with a peculiar shade of meaning which is not conveyed by the titles prefixed to the Epistles of St. Paul, the Apocalypse of St. John, etc. The use of the genitive case in the latter titles Παύλου Ἐπιστολάι, Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου, etc.) has no other object than that of ascribing the contents of such works to the writer whose name they actually bear. The use of the preposition *κατά* (according to), on the contrary, while referring the composition of the contents of the First Gospel to St. Matthew, of those of the second to St. Mark, etc., implies that practically the same contents, the same glad tidings or Gospel, have been set forth by more than one narrator. Thus, "the Gospel according to Matthew" is equivalent to the Gospel history in the form in which St. Matthew put it in writing; "the Gospel according to Mark" designates the same Gospel history in another form, viz. in that in which St. Mark presented it in writing, etc. (cf. Maldonatus, "In quatuor Evangelistas", cap. i).

(2) *Number of the Gospels.*—The name *gospel*, as designating a written account of Christ's words and deeds, has been, and is still, applied to a large number of narratives connected with Christ's life, which circulated both before and after the composition of our Third Gospel (cf. Luke, i, 1-4). The titles of some fifty such works have come down to us, a fact which shows the intense interest which centred, at an early date, in the Person and work of Christ. It is only, however, in connexion with twenty of these "gospels", that some information has been preserved. Their names, as given by Harnack (Chronologie, I, 589 sqq.), are as follows:—

#### 1-4. The Canonical Gospels.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 5. The Gospel according to the Hebrews.    | 13. The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles. |
| 6. The Gospel of Peter.                    | 14. The Gospel of Basilides.           |
| 7. The Gospel according to the Egyptians.  | 15. The Gospel of Valentinus.          |
| 8. The Gospel of Matthias.                 | 16. The Gospel of Marcion.             |
| 9. The Gospel of Philip.                   | 17. The Gospel of Eve.                 |
| 10. The Gospel of Thomas.                  | 18. The Gospel of Judas.               |
| 11. The Proto-Evangelium of James.         | 19. The writing Γέννα Μαρίας.          |
| 12. The Gospel of Nicodemus (Acta Pilati). | 20. The Gospel Τελευώσεως.             |

Despite the early date which is sometimes claimed for some of these works, it is not likely that any one of them, outside our canonical Gospels, should be reckoned among the attempts at narrating the life of Christ, of which St. Luke speaks in the prologue to his Gospel. Most of them, as far as can be made out, are

late productions, the apocryphal character of which is generally admitted by contemporary scholars (see APOCRYPHA).

It is indeed impossible, at the present day, to describe the precise manner in which out of the numerous works ascribed to some Apostle, or simply bearing the name of *gospel*, only four, two of which are not ascribed to Apostles, came to be considered as sacred and canonical. It remains true, however, that all the early testimony which has a distinct bearing on the number of the canonical Gospels recognizes four such Gospels and none besides. Thus, Eusebius (d. 340), when sorting out the universally received books of the Canon, in distinction from those which some have questioned, writes: "And here, among the first, must be placed the holy *quaternion* of the Gospels", while he ranks the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" among the second, that is, among the disputed writings (Hist. Eccl., III, xxv). Clement of Alexandria (d. about 220) and Tertullian (d. 220) were familiar with our four Gospels, frequently quoting and commenting on them. The last-named writer speaks also of the Old Latin version known to himself and to his readers, and by so doing carries us back beyond his time. The saintly Bishop of Lyons, Irenæus (d. 202), who had known Polycarp in Asia Minor, not only admits and quotes our four Gospels, but argues that they must be just four, no more and no less. He says: "It is not possible that the Gospels be either more or fewer than they are. For since there are four zones of the world in which we live, and four principal winds, while the Church is scattered throughout the world, and the pillar and ground of the Church is the Gospel and the Spirit of life; it is fitting that we should have four pillars, breathing out immortality on every side and vivifying our flesh. . . The living creatures are quadriform, and the Gospel is quadriform, as is also the course followed by the Lord" (Adv. Hær., III, xi, 8). About the time when St. Irenæus gave this explicit testimony to our four Gospels, the Canon of Muratori bore likewise witness to them, as did also the Peshito and other early Syriac translations, and the various Coptic versions of the New Testament. The same thing must be said with regard to the Syriac harmony of the canonical Gospels, which was framed by St. Justin's disciple, Tatian, and which is usually referred to under its Greek name of *Diatessaron* (Τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων Εὐαγγέλιον). The recent discovery of this work has allowed Harnack to infer, from some of its particulars, that it was based on a still earlier harmony, that made by St. Hippolytus of Antioch, of our four Gospels. It has also set at rest the vexed question as to St. Justin's use of the canonical Gospels. "For since Tatian was a disciple of Justin, it is inconceivable that he should have worked on quite different Gospels from those of his teacher, while each held the Gospels he used to be the books of primary importance" (Adeney). Indeed, even before the discovery of Tatian's "*Diatessaron*," an unbiased study of Justin's authentic writings had made it clear that the holy doctor used exclusively our canonical Gospels under the name of *Memoirs of the Apostles*.

Of these testimonies of the second century two are particularly worthy of notice, viz. those of St. Justin and St. Irenæus. As the former writer belongs to the first part of that century, and speaks of the canonical Gospels as a well-known and fully authentic collection, it is only natural to think that at his time of writing (about A. D. 145) the same Gospels, and they only, had been recognized as sacred records of Christ's life, and that they had been regarded as such at least as early as the beginning of the second century of our era. The testimony of the latter apologist is still more important. "The very absurdity of his reasoning testifies to the well-established position attained in his day by the four Gospels, to the exclusion of all others. Irenæus' bishop was Potinus who lived to the age of 90,

and Irenæus had known Polycarp in Asia Minor. Here are links of connexion with the past which go back beyond the beginning of the second century" (Adeney).

In the writings of the Apostolic Fathers one does not, indeed, meet with unquestionable evidence in favour of only four canonical Gospels. But this is only what one might expect from the works of men who lived in the very century in which these inspired records were composed, and in which the word *Gospel* was yet applied to the glad tidings of salvation, and not to the written accounts thereof.

(3) *Chief Differences between Canonical and Apocryphal Gospels*.—From the outset, the four Gospels, the sacred character of which was thus recognized very early, differed in several respects from the numerous uncanonical Gospels which circulated during the first centuries of the Church. First of all, they commended themselves by their tone of simplicity and truthfulness, which stood in striking contrast with the trivial, absurd, or manifestly legendary character of many of those uncanonical productions. In the next place, they had an earlier origin than most of their apocryphal rivals, and indeed many of the latter productions were directly based on the canonical Gospels. A third feature in favour of our canonical records of Christ's life was the purity of their teachings, dogmatic and moral, over against the Jewish, Gnostic, or other heretical views with which not a few of the apocryphal gospels were tainted, and on account of which these unsound writings found favour among heretical bodies and, on the contrary, discredit in the eyes of Catholics. Lastly, and more particularly, the canonical Gospels were regarded as of Apostolic authority, two of them being ascribed to the Apostles St. Matthew and St. John, respectively, and two to St. Mark and St. Luke, the respective companions of St. Peter and St. Paul. Many other gospels indeed claimed Apostolic authority, but to none of them was this claim universally allowed in the early Church. The only apocryphal work which was at all generally received, and relied upon, in addition to our four canonical Gospels, is the "Gospel according to the Hebrews". It is a well-known fact that St. Jerome, speaking of this Gospel under the name of "The Gospel according to the Nazarenes", regards it as the Hebrew original of our Greek canonical Gospel according to St. Matthew. But, as far as can be judged from its fragments which have come down to us, it has no right to originality as compared with our first canonical Gospel. At a very early date, too, it was treated as devoid of Apostolic authority, and St. Jerome himself, who states that he had its Aramaic text at his disposal, does not assign it a place side by side with our canonical Gospels: all the authority which he ascribes to it is derived from his persuasion that it was the original text of our First Gospel, and not a distinct Gospel over and above the four universally received from time immemorial in the Catholic Church.

(4) *Order of the Gospels*.—While the ancient lists, versions, and ecclesiastical writers agree in admitting the canonical character of only four Gospels, they are far from being at one with regard to the order of these sacred records of Christ's words and deeds. In early Christian literature, the canonical Gospels are given in no less than eight orders, besides the one (St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John) with which we are familiar. The variations bear chiefly on the place given to St. John, then, secondarily, on the respective positions of St. Mark and St. Luke. St. John passes from the fourth place to the third, to the second, or even to the first. As regards St. Luke and St. Mark, St. Luke's Gospel is often placed first, doubtless as being the longer of the two, but at times also second, perhaps to bring it in immediate connexion with the Acts, which are traditionally ascribed to the author of our Third Gospel.

Of these various orders, the one which St. Jerome embodied in the Latin Vulgate, whence it passed into our modern translations, and even into the Greek editions of the New Testament, is unquestionably the most ancient. It is found in the Canon of Muratori, in St. Irenæus, in St. Gregory of Nazianzus, in St. Athanasius, in the lists of the sacred books drawn up by the Councils of Laodicea and of Carthage, and also in the oldest Greek uncial MSS.: the Vatican, the Sinaitic, and the Alexandrine. Its origin is best accounted for by the supposition that whoever formed the Gospel collection wished to arrange the Gospels in accordance with the respective date which tradition assigned to their composition. Thus, the first place was given to St. Matthew's Gospel, because a very early tradition described the work as originally written in Hebrew, that is, in the Aramaic language of Palestine. This, it was thought, proved that it had been composed for the Jewish believers in the Holy Land, at a date when the Apostles had not yet started to preach the glad tidings of salvation outside of Palestine, so that it must be prior to the other Gospels written in Greek and for converts in Greek-speaking countries. In like manner, it is clear that St. John's Gospel was assigned the last place, because tradition at a very early date looked upon it as the last in the order of time. As to St. Mark and St. Luke, tradition ever spoke of them as posterior to St. Matthew and anterior to St. John, so that their Gospels were naturally placed between those of St. Matthew and St. John. In this way, as it seems, was obtained the present general order of the Gospels in which we find, at the beginning, an Apostle as author; at the end, the other Apostle; between the two, those who have to derive their authority from Apostles.

The numerous orders which are different from the one most ancient and most generally received can easily be explained by the fact that, after the formation of the collection in which the four Gospels were for the first time united, these writings continued to be diffused, all four separately, in the various Churches, and might thus be found differently placed in the collections designed for public reading. It is likewise easy in most cases to make out the special reason for which a particular grouping of the four Gospels was adopted. The very ancient order, for instance, which places the two Apostles (St. Matthew, St. John) before the two disciples of Apostles (St. Mark, St. Luke) may be easily accounted for by the desire of paying a special honour to the Apostolic dignity. Again, such an ancient order as Matthew, Mark, John, Luke, bespeaks the intention of coupling each Apostle with an Apostolic assistant, and perhaps also that of bringing St. Luke nearer to the Acts, etc.

(5) *Classification of the Gospels.*—The present order of the Gospels has the twofold advantage of not separating from one another those Evangelical records (St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke) whose mutual resemblances are obvious and striking, and of placing at the end of the list of the Gospels the narrative (that of St. John) whose relations with the other three is that of dissimilarity rather than of likeness. It thus lends itself well to the classification of the Gospels which is now generally admitted by Biblical scholars. St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke are usually grouped together, and designated under the common name of the *Synoptic Gospels*. They derive this name from the fact that their narratives may be arranged and harmonized, section by section, so as to allow the eye to realize at a glance the numerous passages which are common to them, and also the portions which are peculiar either to only two, or even to only one, of them. The case stands very differently with regard to our Fourth Gospel. As it narrates but a few incidents in common with the Synoptists, and differs from them in respect to style, language, general plan, etc., its chief parts refuse to be included in a harmony such as may

be framed by means of the first three Gospels. While, therefore, the Synoptic narratives are naturally put together into one group, St. John's record is rightly considered as standing apart and as, so to speak, making up a class by itself (see *SYNOPTICS*).

(6) *The Gospels and the Oral Gospel.*—All recent critics admit that the contents of our four Gospels are intimately connected with more primitive accounts of Christ's life, which may be described, in a general way, as an *Oral Gospel*. They are well aware that Jesus Himself did not consign to writing His own teachings, and directed His Apostles not to write, but to preach, the Gospel to their fellow-men. They regard as an undoubted fact that these first disciples of the Master, faithful to the mission which He had entrusted to them, began, from the day of Pentecost on, boldly to declare by word of mouth what they had seen and heard (cf. Acts, iv, 2), considering as a special duty of theirs "the ministry of the word" (Acts, vi, 4). It is plain, too, that those whom the Apostles immediately selected to help them in the discharge of this most important mission had to be, like the Apostles themselves, able to bear witness to the life and teachings of Christ (cf. Acts, i, 21 sq.). The substance of the Evangelical narratives would thus be repeated viva voce by the early teachers of Christianity, before any one of them bethought himself to set it down in writing. It can be readily seen that such Apostolic teaching was then inculcated in words which tended to assume a stereotyped form of expression, similar to that which we find in the Synoptic Gospels. In like manner, also, one can easily realize how the Apostles would not be concerned with the exact order of events narrated, and would not aim at completeness in telling what they "had seen and heard". Thus, according to this opinion, was gradually formed what may be called the "Oral Gospel", that is, a relation of Christ's words and deeds, parallel, in respect to matter and form, to our canonical Gospels. In view of this, critics have endeavoured to find out the general contents of this Oral Gospel by means of the second part of the Book of the Acts, by a study of the doctrinal contents of the Epistles of St. Paul, and more particularly by a close comparison of the Synoptic narratives; and it may be freely said that their efforts in that direction have met with considerable success. As regards, however, the precise relation which should be admitted between our canonical Gospels and the Oral Gospel, there is still, among contemporary scholars, a variety of views which will be set forth and examined in the special articles on the individual Gospels. Suffice it to say, here, that the theory which regards the canonical Gospels as embodying, in substance, the oral teaching of the Apostles concerning the words and deeds of Christ is in distinct harmony with the Catholic position, which affirms both the historical value of these sacred records and the authoritative character of the Apostolic traditions, whether these are actually consigned to writing or simply enforced by the ever living voice of the Church.

(7) *Divergences of the Gospels.*—The existence of numerous and, at times, considerable differences between the four canonical Gospels is a fact which has long been noticed and which all scholars readily admit. Unbelievers of all ages have greatly exaggerated the importance of this fact, and have represented many of the actual variations between the Evangelical narratives as positive contradictions, in order to disprove the historical value and the inspired character of the sacred records of Christ's life. Over against this contention, sometimes maintained with a great display of erudition, the Church of God, which is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (I Tim., iii, 15), has always proclaimed her belief in the historical accuracy and consequent real harmony of the canonical Gospels; and her doctors (notably Eusebius of Cæsarea, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine) and commentators have invariably



professed that belief. As can readily be seen, variations are naturally to be expected in four distinct, and in many ways independent, accounts of Christ's words and deeds, so that their presence, instead of going against, rather makes for the substantial value of the Evangelical narratives. From among the various answers which have been given to the alleged contradictions of the Evangelists we simply mention the following. Many a time the variations are due to the fact that not one but two really distinct events are described, or two distinct sayings recorded, in the parallel passages of the Gospels. At other times, as is indeed very often the case, the supposed contradictions, when closely examined, turn out to be simply differences naturally entailed, and therefore distinctly accounted for, by the literary methods of the sacred writers, and, more particularly, by the respective purpose of the Evangelists in setting forth Christ's words and deeds. Lastly, and in a more general way, the Gospels should manifestly be treated with the same fairness and equity as are invariably used with regard to other historical records. "To borrow an illustration from classical literature, the 'Memoirs' of the Apostles are treated [by unbelievers] by a method which no critic would apply to the 'Memoirs' of Xenophon. The [Rationalistic] scholar admits the truthfulness of the different pictures of Socrates which were drawn by the philosopher, the moralist, and the man of the world, and combines them into one figure instinct with a noble life, half hidden and half revealed, as men viewed it from different points; but he seems often to forget his art when he studies the records of the Saviour's work. Hence it is that superficial differences are detached from the context which explains them. It is urged as an objection that parallel narratives are not identical. Variety of details is taken for discrepancy. The evidence may be wanting which might harmonize narratives apparently discordant; but experience shows that it is as rash to deny the probability of reconciliation as it is to fix the exact method by which it may be made out. If, as a general rule, we can follow the law which regulates the characteristic peculiarities of each Evangelist, and see in what way they answer to different aspects of one truth, and combine as complementary elements in the full representation of it, we may be well contented to acquiesce in the existence of some difficulties which at present admit of no exact solution, though they may be a necessary consequence of that independence of the Gospels which, in other cases, is the source of their united power" (Westcott).

Catholic authors: MEIGNAN, *Les Evangiles et la Critique* (Paris, 1870); FILLION, *Introd. gén. aux Evangiles* (Paris, 1888); TROCHON ET LESÈTRE, *Introd. à l'Écriture sainte*, III (Paris, 1890); BATIFFOL, *Six leçons sur les Evangiles* (Paris, 1897); CORNELY, *Introd. sp.* (Paris, 1897); JACQUIER, *Hist. des Liv. du N. T.*, II (Paris, 1905); VERDUNY, *L'Evangile* (Paris, 1907); BRASSAC, *Manuel biblique*, III (Paris, 1908).—Non-Catholic: WESTCOTT, *Introd. to the Study of the Gospels* (New York, 1887); WILKINSON, *Four Lectures on the Early History of the Gospels* (London, 1898); GODET, *Introd. to the New Test.* (tr. New York, 1899); ADENEY, *Biblical Introduction* (New York, 1904).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

**Gospel in the Liturgy.**—I. HISTORY.—From the very earliest times the public reading of parts of the Bible was an important element in the Liturgy inherited from the service of the Synagogue. The first part of that service, before the bread and wine were brought up to be offered and consecrated, was the Liturgy of the catechumens. This consisted of prayers, litanies, hymns, and especially readings from Holy Scripture. The object of the readings was obviously to instruct the people. Books were rare and few could read. What the Christian of the first centuries knew of the Bible, of Old Testament history, St. Paul's theology, and Our Lord's life he had learned from hearing the lessons in church, and from the homilies that followed to explain them. In the first period the portions read were—like the rite—not yet stereo-

typed. St. Justin Martyr (d. c. 167) in describing the rite he knew (apparently at Rome) begins by saying that: "On the day of the sun, as it is called, all the inhabitants of town and country come together in the same place, and the commentaries of the Apostles [*ἀναμνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*—gospels], or writings of the Prophets are read as long as time will allow. Then, when the reader has stopped, he who presides admonishes and exhorts all to imitate such glorious examples" (I Apol., 67). At this time, then, the text was read continuously from a Bible, till the president (the bishop who was celebrating) told the reader to stop. These readings varied in number. A common practice was to read first from the Old Testament (Prophecia), then from an Epistle (Apostolus) and lastly from a Gospel (Evangelium). In any case the Gospel was read last, as the fulfilment of all the rest. Origen calls it the crown of all the holy writings (In Johannem, i, 4, præf., P. G., XIV, 26). "We hear the Gospel as if God were present," says St. Augustine ("In Johannem", tract. xxx, 1, P. L. XXXV, 1632). It seems that in some places (in the West especially) for a time catechumens were not allowed to stay for the Gospel, which was considered part of the *disciplina arcani*. At the Synod of Orange, in 441, and at Valencia, in 524, they wanted to change this rule. On the other hand, in all Eastern Liturgies (e. g. that of the Apostolic Constitutions; Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", Oxford, 1896, p. 5) the catechumens are dismissed after the Gospel.

The public reading of certain Gospels in churches was the most important factor in deciding which were to be considered canonical. The four that were received and read in the Liturgy everywhere were for that very reason admitted to the Canon of Scripture. We have evidences of this liturgical reading of the Gospel from every part of Christendom in the first centuries. For Syria, the Apostolic Constitutions tell us that when a bishop was ordained he blessed the people "after the reading of the law and prophets and our Epistles and Acts and Gospels" (VIII, 5), and the manner of reading the Gospel is described in II, 57 (Cabrol and Leclercq, "Monumenta eccl. liturgica", Paris, 1900, I, p. 225); the "Peregrinatio Silvæ" (Etheria) describes the reading of the Gospel at Jerusalem (Duchesne: "Origines", 493). The homilies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom explain the Gospel as read at Cæsarea, Antioch, Constantinople. In Egypt, St. Cyril of Alexandria writes to the Emperor Theodosius II about the liturgical use of the Gospels (P. G., LXXVI, 471). In Africa, Tertullian mentions the same thing (adv. Marc., IV, 1) and tells us that the Roman Church "reads the Law and the Prophets together with the Gospels and Apostolic letters" (de præscr., VI, 36). St. Cyprian ordained a certain confessor named Aurelian that he might "read the Gospel that forms martyrs" (Ep. xxxiii, P. L., IV, 328). In every rite then, from the beginning, as now, the reading of the Gospel formed the chief feature, the cardinal point of the liturgy of the catechumens. It was not only read in the Liturgy. The "Peregrinatio Silvæ" (loc. cit.) alludes to the Gospel read at cock-crow. So in the Byzantine Rite it still forms part of the Office of Orthros (Lauds). At Rome the Gospel of the Liturgy was read first, with a homily, at Matins, of which use we have now only a fragment. But the monastic Office still contains the whole Gospel read after the Te Deum.

Gradually the portions to be read in the Liturgy became fixed. The steps in the development of the texts used are: first in the book of the Gospels (or complete Bible) marginal signs are added to show how much is to be read each time. Then indexes are drawn up to show which passages are appointed for each day. These indexes (generally written at the beginning or end of the Bible) are called *Synaxaria* in Greek, *Capitularia* in Latin; they give the first and

last words of each lesson (*pericope*). The complete Capitularium giving references for all the Lessons to be read each day is a *Comes*, *Liber comitus*, or *comicus*. Later they are composed with the whole text, so as to dispense with searching for it; they have thus become *Evangelioria*. The next step is to arrange together all the Lessons for each day, Prophecy, Epistle, Gospel, and even readings from non-canonical books. Such a compilation is a *Lectonarium*. Then, finally, when complete Missals are drawn up (about the tenth to the thirteenth centuries) the Lessons are included in them.

II. SELECTION OF GOSPELS.—What portions were read? In the first place there was a difference as to the text used. Till about the fifth century it seems that in Syria, at any rate, compilations of the four Gospels made into one narrative were used. The famous "Diatessaron" of Tatian is supposed to have been composed for this purpose (Martin in *Revue des Quest. Hist.*, 1883, and Savi in *Revue bibl.*, 1893). The Mozarabic and Gallican Rites may have imitated this custom for a time (Cabrol, "Étude sur la Pègrinatio Silvæ", Paris, 1895, 168-9). St. Augustine made an unsuccessful attempt to introduce it in Africa by inserting into one Gospel passages taken from the others (Sermo 232, P. L., XXXVIII, 1108). But the commoner use was to read the text of one of the Gospels as it stands (see Baudot, "Les Évangélistes", quoted below, 18-21). On great feasts the appropriate passage was taken. Thus, at Jerusalem, on Good Friday, "Legitur iam ille locus de evangelio cata Johannem, ubi reddidit Spiritum" (Per. Silvæ, Duchesne, l. c., 492), on Easter Eve "denuo legitur ille locus evangelii resurrectionis" (ibid., 493), on Low Sunday they read the Gospel about St. Thomas "Non credo nisi videro" (494), and so on. The "Pègrinatio" gives us the Gospels thus read for a number of days throughout the year (Baudot, op. cit., 20). For the rest of the year it seems that originally the text was read straight through (probably with the omission of such special passages). At each Synaxis they began again where they had left off last time. Thus Cassian says that in his time the monks read the New Testament through (Coll. patr., X, 14). The homilies of certain Fathers (St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, etc.) show that the lessons followed each other in order (Bäumer, "Gesch. des Breviers", Freiburg, 1895, 271). In the Eastern Churches the principle obtained that the Four Gospels should be read right through in the course of each year (Scrivener in Smith, "Dict. of Christ. Antiquities", s. v. "Lectonary"). The Byzantine Church began reading St. Matthew immediately after Pentecost. St. Luke followed from September (when their new year begins), St. Mark began before Lent, and St. John was read during Eastertide. There were some exceptions, e. g. for certain feasts and anniversaries. A similar arrangement is still observed by them, as any copy of their Gospel-book will show (*Εὐαγγέλιον*, Venice, 1893). The Syrians have the same arrangement, the Copts a different order, but based on the same principle of continuous readings (Scrivener, "Introduction to the criticism of the N. Test.", London, 1894, I; Baudot, op. cit., 24-32). For the present arrangement of the Byzantine Church see Nilles, "Kalendarium manuale", Innsbruck, 2nd ed., 1897, pp. 444-52. It is well known that they name their Sundays after the Sunday Gospel, e. g., the fourth after Pentecost is "Sunday of the Centurion" because Matt., viii, 5 sqq., is read then. This brings us to a much-disputed question: what principle underlies the order of the Gospels in the Roman missal? It is clearly not that of continuous readings. Father Beissel, S.J., has made an exhaustive study of this question ("Entstehung der Perikopen", see below), in which he compares all manner of *Comites*, Eastern and Western. Shortly, his conclusions are these: The root of the order is the selection of appropriate Gospels for the chief feasts and seasons of the year; for

these, the account that seemed most complete was chosen, without regard to the particular Evangelist. The intervals were then filled up so as to complete the picture of Our Lord's life, but without chronological order. First, Easter was considered with Holy Week. The lessons for this time are obvious. Working backwards, in Lent the Gospel of Our Lord's fast in the desert was put at the beginning, the entry to Jerusalem and the anointing by Mary (John, xii, 1, "six days before the Pasch") at the end. This led to the resurrection of Lazarus (in the East, too, always at this place). Some chief incidents from the end of Christ's life filled up the rest. The Epiphany suggested three Gospels about the Wise Men, the Baptism, and the first miracle, which events it commemorates (cf. Antiph. ad Magn., in 2 vesp.) and then events of Christ's childhood. Christmas and its feasts had obvious Gospels; Advent, those of the Day of Judgment and the preparation for Our Lord's coming by St. John Baptist. Forward from Easter, Ascension Day and Pentecost demanded certain passages clearly. The time between was filled with Our Lord's last messages before He left us (taken from His words on Maundy Thursday in St. John). There remains the most difficult set of Gospels of all—those for the Sundays after Pentecost. They seem to be meant to complete what has not yet been told about His life. Nevertheless, their order is very hard to understand. It has been suggested that they are meant to correspond to the lessons of Matins. In some cases, at any rate, such a comparison is tempting. Thus, on the third Sunday, in the first Nocturne, we read about Saul seeking his father's asses (I Kings, ix), in the Gospel (and therefore in the third Nocturne) about the man who loses one sheep, and the lost drachma (Luke, xv); on the fourth Sunday, David fights Goliath "in nomine Domini exereitum" (I Kings, xvii), in the Gospel, St. Peter throws out his net "in verbo tuo" (Luke, v); on the fifth, David mourns his enemy Saul (II Kings, i), in the Gospel we are told to be reconciled to our enemies (Matt., v). The eighth Sunday begins the Book of Wisdom (first Sunday in August), and in the Gospel the wise steward is commended (Luke, xvi). Perhaps the nearness of certain feasts had an influence, too. In some lists Luke, v, where our Lord says, "From henceforth thou shalt catch men", to St. Peter, came on the Sunday before his feast (29 June), and the story of St. Andrew and the multiplied bread (John, vi) before 30 November. Durandus notices this ("Rationale", VI, 142, "De dom. 25<sup>a</sup> post Pent."; see also Beissel, op. cit., 195-6). Beissel is disposed to think that much of the arrangement is accidental, and that no satisfactory explanation of the order of Gospels after Pentecost has been found. In any case the order throughout the year is very old. A tradition says that St. Jerome arranged it by command of St. Damasus (Berni, "De officio missæ", i, P. L., CXLII, 1057; "Micrologus", xxxi, P. L., CLI, 999, 1003). Certainly the Lessons now sung in our churches are those that St. Gregory the Great's deacon chanted at Rome thirteen hundred years ago (Beissel, op. cit., 196).

III. CEREMONY OF SINGING THE GOSPEL.—The Gospel has been for many centuries in East and West the privilege of the deacon. This was not always the case. At first a reader (*δυναστάς*, *lector*) read all the lessons. We have seen a case of this in the story of St. Cyprian and Aurelian (see above). St. Jerome (d. 420) speaks of the deacon as reader of the Gospel (Ep. cxlvii, n. 6), but the practice was not yet uniform in all churches. At Constantinople, on Easter day, the bishop did so (Sozom., H. E., vii, 19); in Alexandria, it was an archdeacon (ibid., he says that: "in other places deacons read the Gospel; in many churches only priests"). The Apostolic Constitutions refer the Gospel to the deacon; and in 527 a council, at Vaison, says deacons "are worthy to read the words that

Christ spoke in the Gospel" (Baudot, op. cit., 51). This custom became gradually universal, as is shown by the formulae that accompany the tradition of the Gospel-book at the deacon's ordination (the eleventh century Visigothic "Liber ordinum" has the form: "Ecce evangelium Christi, accipe, ex quo annunties bonam gratiam fidei populo", Baudot, p. 52). An exception that lasted through the Middle Ages was that at Christmas the emperor, dressed in a rochet and stole, sang the midnight Gospel: "Exiit edictum a Cæsare Augusto" etc. (Mabillon, "Musæum italicum", I, 256 sq.). Another mark of respect was that everyone stood to hear the Gospel, bareheaded, in the attitude of a servant receiving his master's orders (Apost. Const., II, 57, and Pope Anastasius I, 399-401, in the "Lib. Pontif."). Sozomenos (H. E., VII, 19) is indignant that the Patriarch of Alexandria sate ("a new and insolent practice"). The Grand Masters of the Knights of St. John drew their swords while the Gospel was read. This custom seems still to be observed by some great noblemen in Poland. If any one has a

stick in his hand he is to lay it down (Baudot, 116), but the bishop holds his crosier (see below). The Gospel was sung from the ambo (*ἀμβων*), a pulpit generally half-way down the church, from which it could be best heard by every one (Cabrol, Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de liturgie, Paris, 1907, s.v. "Ambon", I, 1330-47). Often there were two ambos: one for the other lessons,

on the left (looking from the altar); the other, for the Gospel, on the right. From here the deacon faced south, as the "Ordo Rom. II" says (Mabillon, Musæum italic., II, 46), noting that the men generally gather there. Later, when the ambo had disappeared, the deacon turned to the north. Micrologus (De missa, ix) notices this and explains it as an imitation of the celebrant's position at the altar at low Mass—one of the ways in which that service has reacted on to high Mass. The Byzantine Church still commands the deacon to sing the Gospel from the ambo (e. g. Brightman, op. cit., 372), though with them, too, it has generally become only a theoretical place in the middle of the floor. The deacon first asked the blessing of the bishop (or celebrant) then went to the ambo with the book, in procession, accompanied by lights and incense. Germanus of Paris (d. 576) mentions this (Ep. 1, P. L., LXXII, 91; cf. Durandus, "Ration.", IV, 24). See the ceremonies in the "Ordo Rom. I", 11, and "Ordo Rom. II", which are almost exactly ours. Meanwhile the Gradual was sung (see GRADUAL). The "Dominus vobiscum" at the beginning, the announcement of the Gospel ("Sequentia sancti Evangelii" etc.), and the answer, "Gloria tibi Domine", are also mentioned by the sixth-century Germanus (loc. cit.). At the end of the Gospel the people answered, "Amen", or "Deo Gratias", or "Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini" (Durandus, "Rationale", IV, 24; Beletth, "Rationale", XXXIX; St. Benedict's Rule, XI). Our present answer, "Laus tibi Christe", seems to be a later one (Gihl, "Messopfer", 444). The elaborate care taken to decorate the book of the Gospels throughout the Middle Ages was also a sign of respect

for its contents; St Jerome speaks of this (Ep. xxii, 32). In a collection of manuscripts the Evangelia nearly always stand out from the rest by their special sumptuousness. They are not uncommonly written in gold and silver letters on vellum stained purple—the extreme limit of medieval splendour. The bindings, too, are nearly always adorned with special care. It is on Gospel books that one generally sees ivory carvings, metal-work, jewellery, enamel, sometimes relics. (For descriptions see Baudot, op. cit., 58-69.) The same tradition continues in the East. Allowing for doubtful modern taste in Greece, Russia, Syria, etc., the *Εὐαγγέλιον* is still the handsomest book, often the handsomest object in a church. When it is not in use it generally displays the enamels of its cover on a desk outside the Iconostasis. To kiss the book was always from early times a sign of respect. This was done at one time not only by the celebrant and deacon, but by all the people present ("Ordo Rom. II", 8). Honorius III (1216-27) forbade this; but the book is still kissed by any high prelates who

may be present (Cærim. episc., I, 30; Gihl, op. cit., 445). For this and similar ceremonies see Baudot (op. cit., 110-19). When the ambo disappeared in the West the sub-deacon held the book while the Gospel was sung by the deacon. He also carried it first to lay it on the altar (Amalaricus of Metz: "De Eccl. offic.", P. L., CV, 1112; Durandus, loc. cit.). The deacon made the sign



EVANGELIARIUM OF CHARLEMAGNE  
Part of page 179, showing the beginning of the Gospel of St. John  
Original in the Schatzkammer at Vienna

of the cross first on the book and then on himself—taking a blessing from the book ("Ordo Rom. I", 11, "ut sigilletur"; Durandus, loc. cit., etc.; Beletth, XXXIX). The meaning of all these marks of reverence is that the Gospel-book, which contains Christ's words, was taken as a symbol of Christ himself. It was sometimes carried in the place of honour in various processions (Beissel, op. cit., 4); something of the same idea underlay the practice of putting it on a throne or altar in the middle of the synods (Baudot, 109-110). During provincial and general synods the Gospel is to be sung at each session.—Cærim. Episc. I, xxxi, 16, and the superstitious abuses that afterwards developed, in which it was used for magic (ibid., 118; Catalani, "de codice S. Evangelii", III, see below). The Byzantine Church has developed the ceremony of carrying the Evangelion to the ambo into the elaborate rite of the "Little Entrance" (Fortescue, "Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom", London, 1908, 68-74), and all the other Eastern Churches have similar stately ceremonies at this point of the Liturgy (Brightman, op. cit., for each rite). Another special practice that may be noticed here is that at a papal high Mass the Gospel (and the Epistle too) is read in Latin and Greek. This is already noticed by the first Roman Ordo (40). At Constantinople the Patriarch, on Easter Day, reads the Gospel in Greek, and it is then read by other persons (*οἱ ἄγιοι ἀρχιερεῖς*) in various languages ("Typikon" for that day, ed. Athens, 1908, pp. 368, 372, Nilles, "Kal. man.", II, 314-15). The same thing is done again at the Hesperinos. The little Synopsis (*Σύνοψις λέγει*) of Constantinople (1883) gives this Gospel of the Hesperinos (John, xx, 19-25)

in Greek (with two poetic versions, hexameter and iambic), Slavonic, Bulgarian, Albanian, Latin, Italian, French, English, Arabic, Turkish, and Armenian (all in Greek characters, pp. 634-73). The same custom is observed in Russia (Prince Max of Saxony, "Praelationes de liturgiis orientalibus", Freiburg im Br., 1908, I, 116-17), where the Gospel of the Liturgy (John, i) is read in Slavonic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.

IV. PRESENT CEREMONY OF THE GOSPEL.—Except for the disappearance of the ambo, the rules of the Rubrics in the Missal (Rubr. gen., X, 6; Ritus cel., VI, 5) are still almost exactly those we have seen observed in the Roman Rite since the seventh or eighth centuries. After the Epistle the deacon puts the Gospel book in the middle of the altar (while the celebrant reads his Gospel from the Missal). Liturgical editors publish books containing the Epistles and Gospels, otherwise a second Missal is used (the subdeacon has already chanted the Epistle from the same book). The celebrant then puts incense into the thurible and blesses it as usual. The subdeacon goes down and waits below, before the middle of the altar. The deacon kneeling by the celebrant just behind him at his right says the "Munda cor meum". Then, rising and taking the book, he kneels with it before the celebrant (turning towards the north) and says "Jube domne benedicere". *Jube* with an infinitive is a common late Latin way of expressing a polite imperative (Ducange-Maigne d'Arnis, "Lexicon manuale", ed. Migne, Paris, 1890, s. v., col. 1235). *Domnus* is a medieval form instead of *dominus*, which got to be looked upon as a Divine title (so in Greek, *κύριος* and *κύρις* for *κύριος*). The celebrant blesses him with the form in the Missal (*Dominus sit in corde tuo . . .*) and the sign of the cross; he kisses the celebrant's hand laid on the Missal. The celebrant goes to the Epistle side, where he waits; he turns round towards the deacon when the Gospel begins. The deacon, holding the book lifted up with both hands, comes down to the subdeacon's side; they make the usual reverence to the altar, and the procession starts. The thurifer goes first with incense, then two acolytes, then the deacon and subdeacon side by side, the deacon on the right. We have seen the antiquity of lights and incense at the Gospel. All this time, of course, the Gradual is being sung. The procession arrives at the place that represents the old ambo. It is still to the right of the altar (north side), but now inside the sanctuary, so that, except in very large churches, there is hardly any way to go; often the old procession to the ambo (the Latin "little entrance") is represented only by an awkward turning round. Arrived at the place, the deacon and subdeacon face each other, the subdeacon receives the book and holds it up open before him. Originally the subdeacon (two are required by the "Ordo Rom. I", 11, one as thurifer) accompanied the deacon up into the ambo, helped him find his place in the book, and then stood back behind him by the steps. At Milan, where the ambo is still used, this is still done.

In the Roman Rite the subdeacon himself takes the place of the desk of the ambo. But the "Cærimoniale Episcoporum" still allows the use of "legilia vel ambores" if there be any in the church. In that case the subdeacon is to stand behind the desk or at the deacon's right and to turn over the pages if necessary (II, viii, 45). There is a difficulty about the way they stand. The "Ritus celebrandi" says that the deacon is to stand "contra altare versus populum" (VI, 5). This must mean looking down the church. On the other hand the "Cærim. Episcoporum" (II, viii, 44) says that the subdeacon stands "vertens renes non quidem altari, sed versus ipsam partem dexteram quæ pro aquilone figuratur". This means the way in which they always stand now; namely, the deacon looks north or slightly north-east (supposing the church to

be properly orientated); the book is in the same direction as the Missal for the Gospel at low Mass. The acolytes stand on either side of the subdeacon, the thurifer at the deacon's right. The deacon, *junctis manibus*, sings "Dominus vobiscum" (answered by the choir as usual), then, making the sign of the cross with the right thumb on the book (the cross marked at these words in the Missal is put there to show the place) and signing himself on forehead, lips, and breast, he sings "Sequentia [or Initium] sancti Evangelii secundum N . . ." It appears that *sequentia* is a neuter plural (Gihl, op. cit., 438, n. 3). While the choir answers, "Gloria tibi Domine", he incenses the book three times, in the middle, to its right, and left, bowing before and after. He gives the thurible back and sings the text of the Gospel straight through. He bows at the Holy Name, if it occur, and sometimes (on the Epiphany, at the third Christmas Mass, etc.) genuflects (towards the book). The tones for the Gospel are given at the end of the new (Vatican) Missal. The normal one is a recitative on *do* falling to *la* four syllables before the end of each phrase, with the cadence *si, la, si, si-do* for questions, and a scandicus *la, si (quilsima), do* before the end. Two others, more ornamented, are now added *ad libitum*. The celebrant, standing at the Epistle side, looking towards the deacon, hears the Gospel and bows or genuflects with him, but towards the altar. When the Gospel is over the subdeacon brings him the book to kiss, he says: "Per evangelica dicta", and he is incensed by the deacon. The Mass then continues. We have noted that the only other persons now allowed to kiss the book are the ordinary, if he be present, and other prelates above him in rank (Cær. Episcop., I, xxx, 1, 3). A bishop celebrating in his own diocese reads his Gospel sitting on his throne, and hears it standing there, holding his crosier with both hands (Cær. Episcop., II, viii, 41, 46). In this case no one else is ever to kiss the book (ibid., I, xxix, 9).

In low Mass the ceremonies for the Gospel are, as usual, merely an abridgment and simplifying of those for high Mass. When the celebrant has finished reading the Gradual he says the "Munda cor meum", etc., in the middle of the altar (he says, "Jube Domine benedicere", because he is addressing God). Meanwhile the server brings the Missal to the north side (this is only an imitation of the deacon's place at high Mass). With the book turned slightly towards the people, the priest reads the Gospel with the same ceremonies (except, of course, for the incense) and kisses it at the end.

V. THE LAST GOSPEL.—The Gospel read at the end of Mass is a late development. Originally (till about the twelfth century) the service ended with the words that still imply that, "Ite missa est". The prayer "Placeat tibi", the blessing, and the last Gospel are all private devotions that have been gradually absorbed by the liturgical service. The beginning of St. John's Gospel (I, 1-14) was much used as an object of special devotion throughout the Middle Ages. It was sometimes read at children's baptism or at extreme unction (Benedict XIV, "De SS. Missæ sacrif.", II, xxiv, 8). There are curious cases of its use for various superstitious practices, written on amulets and charms. It then began to be recited by priests as part of their prayers after Mass. A trace of this is still left in the "Cærimoniale Episcoporum", which directs that a bishop at the end of his Mass shall begin the last Gospel at the altar and continue it (by heart) as he goes away to take off the vestments. It will also be noted that it is still not printed in the Ordinal of the Mass, though of course the rubric about it is there, and it will be found in the third Christmas Mass. By the thirteenth century it was sometimes said at the altar. But Durandus still supposes the Mass to be finished by the "Ite missa est" (Rationale, IV, 57); he adds the "Placeat" and blessing as a sort of supplement, and then goes on at once to

describe the psalms said after Mass ("deinde statim dicuntur hymni illi: Benedicite et Laudate", IV, 59). Nevertheless, the practice of saying it at the altar grew; eventually Pius V made this practice universal for the Roman Rite in his edition of the Missal (1570). The fact that all these three additions after the "Ite missa est" are to be said, even at high Mass, without any special ceremony, preserves the memory of their more or less accidental connexion with the liturgy. The normal last Gospel is John, i, 1-14. It is read by the celebrant at the north side of the altar after the blessing. He reads from the altar-card with the usual introduction (Dominus vobiscum . . . Initium S. Evangelii, etc.), taking the sign of the cross from the altar. He genuflects at the words, "Et verbum caro factum est", and the server, at the end, answers "Deo gratias". At high Mass the deacon and subdeacon stand on either side, genuflect too, and answer. They do not read the Gospel; it is in no way to be sung by the deacon, like the essential Gospel of the Liturgy. Whenever an office is commemorated, whose Gospel is begun in the ninth lesson of Matins, that Gospel is substituted for John, i, at the end of Mass. In this case the Missal must be brought to the north side (at high Mass by the subdeacon). This applies to all Sundays, ferie, and vigils that are commemorated. At the third Mass on Christmas day (since John, i, 1-14, forms the Gospel of the Mass) that of the Epiphany is read at the end; at low Mass on Palm Sunday the Gospel of the blessing of palms is read. Of Eastern Rites the Armenians alone have copied this practice of the last Gospel from the Latins.

All the medieval commentators (Durandus, Berno of Constance, Micrologus, etc.) discuss the Gospel at Mass and give mystic explanations of its use. See especially DURANDUS, *Rationale div. officiorum*, IV, 24, *De Evangelio*; BEISSSEL, *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches* (supplement to the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 96) (Freiburg im Br., 1907); BAUDOT, *Les Évangélistes*, series *Liturgie* (Paris, 1903); BENEDICT XIV., *De Sacrosancto Sacrificio Missæ*, ed. SCHNEIDER (Mainz, 1879), II, 7, pp. 118-25, II, 24, p. 297; GHR., *Das heilige Messopfer* (6th ed., Freiburg im Br., 1897), 400-406, 433-446, 723-724 (tr. St. Louis, 1903); DE HERDT, *Sacra liturgiæ praxis* (ed. 9, Louvain, 1894), I, 292-96, 438-46.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**Goss, ALEXANDER**, second Bishop of Liverpool; b. at Ormskirk, Lancashire, 5 July, 1814; d. at St. Edward's College, Liverpool, 3 Oct., 1872; connected on both sides with old Lancashire families who had always been Catholics; his father was descended from the Gooses or Gosses, his mother from the Rutters. His maternal uncle, the well-known priest, Rev. Henry Rutter, sent him to Ushaw College, 20 June, 1827, where he distinguished himself as a student. When he had completed his philosophy course, he was appointed as a "minor professor" to teach one of the classes in the humanity schools. On the death of his uncle, he spent the legacy he received, in going to Rome, where he studied theology at the English College, and was ordained priest, 4 July, 1841. On his return to England, early in March, 1842, he was sent to St. Wilfrid's Church, Manchester, but in the following October he was appointed vice-president of the newly founded college of St. Edward, Everton, near Liverpool. Fr. Goss held this office until he was chosen coadjutor-bishop to Dr. Brown, ten years later. He was consecrated by Cardinal Wiseman, at Liverpool, 25 Sept., 1853, and as there was no pressing need of his services, he took the opportunity to pay a long visit to Rome. On 25 January, 1856, he became Bishop of Liverpool by the death of Dr. Brown, and from that time his commanding personality made him a most prominent figure in that city. His lofty stature, dignified bearing, and vigorous speech were the fit accompaniments of a strong and straightforward character. He showed a vast amount of apostolic zeal in the duties of his sacred office, and was an eloquent preacher and a powerful controversialist. He was the beau-ideal of the rugged folk from which

he derived—the old recusants of Lancashire—the mainstay of the old Faith in England; which character obtained for him the respect of his adversaries, the objection of his friends, and the admiration of the people at large, as being a typical Englishman, blunt, manly, and honest. He seldom used any words that were not of Anglo-Saxon origin, and he never indulged in any ambiguities of speech. In politics, he followed the Conservative party. Under his firm administration, Catholicity made great advances, many churches and schools were built, and the bishop proved an unflinching champion of Catholic education. His fearless denunciation of social evils, and his outspoken expression of opinion attracted the notice of the Press, and even "The Times" devoted special attention to his speeches. He was an accomplished scholar, not only in theology, but also in archæology, and he was an active member of the Chetham, Holbein, and Manx societies. For the first he edited "Abbott's Journal" and "The Tryalls at Manchester in 1694" (1864); for the Manx society, "Chronica Regum Manniæ et Insularum", to which he made valuable additions. An account of Harkirke burial-ground for recusants, and an introduction written by him were published by the Chetham Society in Crosby Records (M. S., 12, 1887). He also collected materials for a history of Catholicity in the north, and edited Drioux's "Sacred History, comprising the leading facts of the Old and New Testament". For many years he suffered so much that his friend, Rev. T. E. Gibson, wrote of him (Lydiat Hall and its Associations, Introd.): "A prey to disease during the greater part of his episcopate, his life was the struggle of a fearless soul with bodily ailments and with the harassing mental anxieties incidental to his position." He was seized with his last illness suddenly, and he passed away the same evening. There are two paintings of the bishop at St. Edward's College, Liverpool.

GIBSON, *Lydiat Hall and its Associations* (1876); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1890), XXII, 256.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Gossaert, JAN**, called MABUSE from Maubeuge in Hainaut; Flemish painter; b. about 1472; d. at Middelburg about 1533. Nothing is known of him till after the age of thirty. In 1508 he went to Rome with the embassy of Philip of Burgundy, Admiral of Holland and Abbot of Middelburg, sent to Julius II by the Archduchess Marguerite. The visit occupied a year. On his return, Mabuse remained in the service of Philip, who had become Bishop of Utrecht. Perhaps he also accompanied him to Copenhagen (1515). This prince was a collector, a lover of the beautiful, especially of elegant villas, fountains, and ornamental waterpouts. After his death in 1524 Mabuse entered the service of Adolphus of Burgundy, Marquess of Veere. He lived at his court, sharing his friendship and that of Christian of Denmark, a prisoner of the Archduchess, always enjoying the liberality and goodwill of the great, and leading the free life of the artists of the country from Van Eyck to Van Dyck. The tales of Van Mander dealing with his manners and pranks must be regarded as trivial gossip. He had married Marguerite de Molenaar, by whom he had two children, Pierre, who was a painter like his father, and Gertrude, who married the painter, Henri van der Heyden.

The career of Mabuse is divided into two distinct periods by his visit to Rome. During the first period he is merely a noteworthy painter of the school of Memling and Gheeraert David. Good examples of this style are the panels of Antwerp, the "Holy Women returning from the Sepulchre", and the picture, incorrectly called "The Honest Judges", which represents the centurion and his escort descending from Calvary. These are beyond doubt the two wings of a lost "Cruci-



fixion". The execution is bold, the painting compact and smooth, but the faces are wooden and slightly grinning, the emotional portrayal being weak. What is most striking is the power of touch, the carving of the faces as with a chisel, the almost sculptural effect. They recall those clumsy Gothic groups of painted wood, so popular in the countries of the North during the fifteenth century. At Rome, on the contrary, he formed an entirely different conception of beauty, or rather he obtained an insight into absolute beauty. The revelation did not come to him through modern artists. In 1509 not one of the great works of Michael Angelo or Raphael was yet completed. But all Italy was filled with enthusiasm for the monuments of antiquity. Mabuse devoted his whole sojourn to studying and copying for Philip of Burgundy the ruins of Rome. The first result of this journey was a change in his decorative scheme, to which we owe the architectural backgrounds, the colonnades, the palaces, the visions of a world of marble with magnificent pediments, which raise their noble outlines in his pictures. It is plain that all this archæology is quite destitute of scientific value. It is nevertheless of extreme importance, since it was by no mere chance that the great beginners of the Renaissance movement—Brunellesco, Alberti, and Bramante—were architects. It was through them that the world of Vitruvius dethroned the Gothic world. With architecture the whole system of the arts altered its principles, and was reorganized on a rational basis and a monumental scale.

This revolution is readily apparent in the works of Mabuse. Statures grow taller, forms expand to preserve their proportion with the heroic scale of the decorative scheme; the nude banishes the flowing draperies; colour becomes thin; edges begin to merge into less rigid lines; the palette fades and assumes the cold tones of fresco. Mabuse's chief work, the triptych of the "Descent from the Cross" in the church of the Premonstratensians at Middelburg, which Dürer admired in December, 1520, was unfortunately burned in 1568. But the triptych of Prague, "St. Luke painting the Blessed Virgin" (1515), and above all the "Adoration of the Magi" of Howard Castle (Earl of Carlisle), with its twenty figures of life size, its animation, its breadth of conception, its vibrating life, enable us to understand the emotion produced in the Flemish school by such original conceptions. It was in fact the grand historical style of painting that Mabuse brought to his countrymen. As a decorator and as author of cartoons for tapestry ("Legend of Herkenbald", Brussels) he retains, nevertheless, mingled with the taste of the Renaissance something of the flamboyant imagination displayed in the cathedral of Brou. He seems less happy in his easel pictures, above all in the treatment of mythological subjects, which he was the first to treat and to spread throughout the North. His "Amphitrite" at Berlin (1516), his "Danaë" at Munich (1527), his "Lucretia" at the Colonna Gallery are paintings at once awkward and affected, unnatural, almost ridiculous. All the splendid sentiment of paganism escapes him. Yet it was this portion of his work which most impressed his contemporaries, and Guichard, as well as Van Mander, lauds him as the first to emancipate Flemish art from theology and transport it to the wholly natural sphere of humanism.

Finally, Mabuse was a portraitist of considerable importance. The "Children of Christian of Denmark" at Hampton Court, the "Carondelet" at the Louvre (1517), and the "Monk" at the same museum, are pieces of a vigour that has never been surpassed. The outline of the model here attains a relief comparable to high relief. The painting is in a silver tone, thin, almost without shadows. The design is less incisive but quite as accurate as that of Holbein. The "Virgins" of Mabuse are also portraits; the best, those of the Louvre and of Douai, already portray the beautiful

Flemish type, the fleshy oval, the transparency of the skin, which subsequently constitute the uniform grace of the Madonnas of Rubens. The spiritual beauty of Memling is absent; the charm is that of a beautiful woman. The nimbus has lost its significance; the ideal nature is expressed only by a sweeter model and a more resplendent light. Mabuse's historical importance is very great. Although he trained no pupils, his influence was felt by all. At Flanders he pointed out the way of the future, the path of the Renaissance. He had the good fortune to be the first-comer, and to be preserved from the excesses of unintelligent and ridiculous imitation into which his successors fell, e. g. the Heemskirks, the Floris, and Martin de Vos. What he most lacked was feeling, true inspiration. He falls far below the exquisite poetry of Massys, but he realized much more clearly the trend of art. If his masterpiece, the picture at Howard Castle, were not almost inaccessible to the general public, it would be seen that Rubens, throughout the sixteenth century, had no greater precursor in his country.

KAREL VAN MANDER, *Le livre des peintres* (1604). Fr. tr. with notes and commentaries by HYMAN (Paris, 1884); VAN DEN BRANDEN, *Geschiedenis der Antwerpsche schilderschool* (Antwerp, 1878-83); WAAGAN, *Manuel de l'Histoire de la peinture*, on German, Flemish, and Dutch schools (3 vols., Brussels, 1863); man, *Flemish, and Dutch schools* (May, 1903), II, 369; GOSSEAU, *Jean Gossart de Meuse, sa vie et son œuvre d'après les dernières recherches et documents inédits* (Lille, 1903); WURTZBACH, *Niederländisches Künstlerlexikon*, II (Leipzig, 1906).

LOUIS GILLET.

**Gosselin, JEAN-EDMÉ-AUGUSTE**, ecclesiastical author; b. at Rouen, France, 28 Sept., 1787; d. at Paris, 27 Nov., 1858. He studied philosophy and theology at St-Sulpice, Paris, 1806-11; became professor of dogma, while yet a subdeacon, after the expulsion of the Sulpicians from the seminary by Napoleon, 1811; was ordained priest, 1812. On the return of the Sulpicians (1814) he entered their society; was vice-president of the seminary at Issy, 1814-30; professor of theology to the candidates for the society, 1814-18; superior of the seminary from 1831 to 1844, when the feeble state of his health, which had always been delicate, obliged him to resign. His increasing infirmities from that time till his death permitted him to render little service except by his pen and the example of his piety, industry, and fortitude. A charming portrait of M. Gosselin has been left by Ernest Renan; in his "Lettres du Séminaire" we see the impression produced on the young man by his kindness, gentleness, sober piety, and prudence, his vast and varied erudition. And in the work of his old age, "Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse", Renan says: "He was the most polished and amiable man whom I have ever known."

Besides many minor writings of service in their day, Gosselin left three works which are still of great value. The first is the standard edition of Fénelon in twenty-two volumes (1820-24), to which he added his correspondence in eleven volumes (1827-29), besides a corrected and enlarged edition of Bausset's "Histoire de Fénelon" and other smaller works devoted to the Archbishop of Cambrai. Gosselin's edition is valuable for its notes and discussions, but its accuracy has been somewhat marred by his partiality for Fénelon. Out of it grew his best-known work, "Pouvoir du Pape au moyen âge" (1839; 2nd edition, 1845; tr. as "The Power of the Popes during the Middle Ages", Baltimore, 1853). This remains the classic study of its subject, though in part superseded by Mgr Duchesne's researches. It proved beyond question that the popes exercised temporal power over sovereigns during the Middle Ages. Orestes Brownson, in several articles devoted to it, while admitting its great erudition, attacked its position (adopted from Fénelon), that this power was derived not from Divine authority, but from the public law of that period. Gosselin lived to complete his valuable "Vie de M.

Emery" which was revised and published (1861) after his death.

BERTRAND, *Histoire littéraire de la compagnie de Saint-Sulpice* (Paris, 1900), *idem*, *Notice sur M. Gossein*, prefixed to his *Vie de M. Emery* (Paris, 1861); BROWNSON, *Works*, X-XIII.

JOHN F. FENLON.

Goswin. See MARIENBURG.

**Gother** (or **GOTER**), JOHN, priest and controversialist; b. at Southampton, date unknown; d. at sea on a voyage to Lisbon, 2 October, 1704 (O. S.). Educated a strict Presbyterian, he became a convert and entered the English College at Lisbon in 1668. He was ordained priest in 1682, and then returned to England to work on the mission in London. He was of a very retiring disposition, and soon began to devote the most of his time to controversial writings, which he began in 1685. His famous work, "A Papist Misrepresented and Represented", contains a long list of the vulgar errors regarding Catholic doctrine and practice together with his masterly refutations of them, and is as appropriate for use in controversy to-day, as when it was written, with the solitary exception of his remarks about Papal infallibility, which need to be brought up to date. This work brought no less an antagonist than Stillingfleet into the lists, together with a host of the lesser lights of Anglican Divinity, and then there arose a prolonged series, without end, of Answers, Objections, Rejoinders, and Refutations, throughout which Gother single-handed more than maintained his position. His literary style was exceedingly pure, and was often a great factor in winning converts to the Church. His trenchant simplicity has often been compared to Swift at his best. Dryden once facetiously remarked that Gother was the only person, except himself, who knew how to write English.

He was afterwards chaplain to George Holman of Warkworth Castle, Northamptonshire, where he received into the Church and instructed Richard Challoner, then a youth, the future celebrated Bishop and Vicar Apostolic of the London District. Shortly before his death, Gother was proposed as a possible successor to Bishop Ellis of the Western District. He died at sea on a voyage to Lisbon, having received the last rites from a priest who chanced to be on board. The master of the vessel was so impressed with Gother's sanctity, that he preserved the body and delivered it to the English College at Lisbon, where it was interred. His principal works are "A Papist Misrepresented and Represented, or a two-fold Character of Popery" (original ed., London, 1665; has passed through numerous editions down to the present day; a good summary is that of Bishop Challoner which is also published as a tract by the Catholic Truth Society); "Nubes Testium, or a Collection of the Primitive Fathers" (London, 1686); "The Sincere Christian's Guide in the choice of a Religion" (London, 1804); "Instructions on the Epistles and Gospels of the Whole Year" (London, 1780); "The Sinner's Complaint to God" (London, 1839); "Principles and Rules of the Gospel" (London, 1718); "A Practical Catechism"; "Instructions and Devotions for Hearing Mass" (London, 1767); "Instructions for Confession, Communion and Confirmation" (Dublin, 1825); and many other similar works.

BUTLER, *Historical Memoirs of English Catholics* (1882), IV, 425; LINGARD, *History of England*, X, 226; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; DODD, *Church History*, III, 482; PETRE, *Notices of English Colleges*.

C. F. WEMYSS BROWN.

**Gothic Architecture.**—The term was first used during the later Renaissance, and as a term of contempt. Says Vasari, "Then arose new architects who after the manner of their barbarous nations erected buildings in that style which we call Gothic", while Evelyn but expresses the mental attitude of his own time when he writes, "The ancient Greek and Roman architecture

answered all the perfections required in a faultless and accomplished building"—but the Goths and Vandals destroyed these and "introduced in their stead a certain fantastical and licentious manner of building: congestions of heavy, dark, melancholy, monkish piles, without any just proportion, use or beauty." For the first time, an attempt was made to destroy an instinctive and, so far as Europe was concerned, an almost universal form of art, and to substitute in its place another built up by artificial rules and premeditated theories; it was necessary, therefore, that the ground should be cleared of a once luxuriant growth that still showed signs of vitality, and to effect this the schools of Vignola, Palladio, and Wren were compelled to throw scorn on the art they were determined to discredit. As ignorant of the true habitat of the style as they were of its nature, the Italians of the Renaissance called it the "maniera Tedesca", and since to them the word *Goth* implied the perfection of barbarism, it is but natural that they should have applied it to a style they desired to destroy. The style ceased, for the particular type of civilization it expressed had come to an end; but the name remained, and when, early in the nineteenth century, the beginnings of a new epoch brought new apologists, the old title was taken over as the only one available, and since then constant efforts have been made to define it more exactly, to give it a new significance, or to substitute in its place a term more expressive of the idea to be conveyed. The word itself, in its present application, is repugnant to any sense of exact thought; ethnically, the art so described is immediately Franco-Norman in its origins, and between the Arian Goths, on the one hand, and the Catholic Franks and Normans, on the other, lies a racial, religious, and chronological gulf. With the conquest of Italy and Sicily by Justinian (535-553) "the race and name of Ostrogoths perished for ever" (Bryce, "The Holy Roman Empire", III, 29) five centuries before the beginnings of the art that bears their name. Modern scholarship seeks deeper even than racial tendencies for the root impulses of art in any of its forms, and apart from the desirable correction of an historical anachronism it is felt that medieval art (of which Gothic architecture is but one category), since it owes its existence to influences and tendencies stronger than those of blood, demands a name that shall be exact and significant, and indicative of the more just estimation in which it now is held.

But little success has followed any of the attempts at definition. The effort has produced such varying results as the epithets of Vasari and Evelyn, the nebulous or sentimental paraphrases of the early nineteenth-century romanticists, the narrow archæological definitions of De Caumont, and the rigid formalities of the more learned logicians and structural specialists, such as MM. Viollet le Duc, Anthyme St-Paul, and Enlart, and Professor Moore. The only scientific attempt is that of which the first was the originator, the last the most scholarly and exact exponent. Concisely stated, the contention of this school is that "the whole scheme of the building is determined by, and its whole strength is made to reside in a finely organized and frankly confessed framework rather than in walls. This framework, made up of piers, arches and buttresses, is freed from every unnecessary incumbrance of wall and is rendered as light in all its parts as is compatible with strength—the stability of the building depending not upon inert massiveness, except in the outermost abutments, but upon logical adjustment of active parts whose opposing forces neutralize each other and produce a perfect equilibrium. It is thus a system of balanced thrusts in contradistinction to the ancient system of inert stability. Gothic architecture is such a system carried out in a finely artistic spirit" (Charles H. Moore, "Development and Character of Gothic Architecture", I, 8). This is an admirable statement

of the fundamental structural element in Gothic architecture, but, carried away by enthusiasm for the crowning achievement of the human intellect in the domain of construction, those who have most clearly demonstrated its pre-eminence have usually fallen into the error of declaring this one quality to be the touchstone of Gothic architecture, minimizing the importance of all æsthetic considerations, and so denying the name of Gothic to everything where the system of balanced thrusts, ribbed vaulting, and concentrated loads did not consistently appear. Even Professor Moore himself says, "Wherever a framework maintained on the principle of thrust and counter-thrust is wanting, there we have not Gothic" (Moore, op. cit., I, 8). The result is that all the mediæval architecture of Western Europe, with the exception of that produced during the space of a century and a half, and chiefly within the limits of the old Royal Domain of France, is denied the title of Gothic. Of the whole body of English architecture produced between 1066 and 1528 it is said, "The English claim to any share in the original development of Gothic, or to the consideration of the pointed architecture of the Island as properly Gothic at all, must be abandoned" (Moore, op. cit., Preface to first ed., 8), and the same is said of the contemporary architecture of Germany, Italy, and Spain. Logically applied, this rule would exclude also all the timber-roofed churches and the civil and military structures erected in France contemporaneously with the cathedrals, and (though this point is not pressed) even the west fronts of such admittedly Gothic edifices as the cathedrals of Paris, Amiens, and Reims. As one of the most recent commentators on Gothic architecture has said, "A definition so restricted carries with it its own condemnation" (Francis Bond, "Gothic Architecture in England", I, 10).

A still greater argument against the acceptance of this structural definition lies in the fact that while, as Professor Moore declares, "the Gothic monument, though wonderful as a structural organism, is even more wonderful as a work of art" (op. cit., V, 190), this great artistic element, which for more than three centuries was predominant through the greater part of Western Europe, existed quite independently of the supreme structural system, and varies only in minor details of racial bias and of presentation, whether it is found in France or Normandy, Spain or Italy, Germany, Flanders, or Great Britain—this, which is in itself the manifestation of the underlying impulses and the actual accomplishments of the era it connotes, is treated as an accessory to a structural evolution, and is left without a name except the perfunctory title of "Pointed", which is even less descriptive than the word *Gothic* itself.

The structural definition has failed of general acceptance, for the temper of the time is increasingly impatient of materialistic definitions, and there is a demand for broader interpretations that shall take cognizance of underlying impulses rather than of material manifestations. The fact is recognized that around and beyond the structural aspects of Gothic architecture lie other qualities of equal importance and greater comprehensiveness, and, if the word is still to be used in the general sense in which it always has been employed, viz., as denoting the definite architectural expression of certain peoples acting under definite impulses and within definite limitations of time, a completely evolved structural principle cannot be used as the sole test of orthodoxy, if it excludes the great body of work executed within that period, and which in all other respects has complete uniformity and a consistent significance.

It may be said of Gothic architecture that it is an impulse and a tendency rather than a perfectly rounded accomplishment; æsthetically, it never achieved perfection in any given monument, or group of monuments, nor were its possibilities ever fully

worked out except in the category of structural science. Here alone, as Professor Moore has admirably shown, finality was achieved by the cathedral-builders of the Ile-de-France, but this fact cannot give to their work exclusive claim to the name of Gothic. The art of any given time is the expression of certain racial qualities modified by inheritance, tradition, and environment, and working themselves out under the control of religious and secular impulses. When these elements are sound and vital, combined in the right proportions, and operating for a sufficient length of time, the result is a definite style in some one or more of the arts. Such a style is Gothic architecture, and it is to this style, regarded in its most inclusive aspect, that the term *Gothic* is applied by general consent, and in this sense the word is here used.


Gothic architecture and Gothic art are the æsthetic expression of that epoch of European history when paganism had been extinguished, the traditions of classical civilization destroyed, the hordes of barbarian invaders beaten back, or Christianized and assimilated; and when the Catholic Church had established itself not only as the sole spiritual power, supreme and almost unquestioned in authority, but also as the arbiter of the destinies of sovereigns and of peoples. During the first five centuries of the Christian Era the Church had been fighting for life, first against a dying imperialism, then against barbarian invasions. The removal of the temporal authority to Constantinople had continued the traditions of civilization where Greek, Roman, and Asiatic elements were fused in a curious alembic, one result of which was an architectural style that later, and modified by many peoples, was to serve as the foundation-stone of the Catholic architecture of the West. Here, in the meantime, the condition had become one of complete chaos, but the end of the Dark Ages was at hand, and during the entire period of the sixth century events were occurring which could only have issue in the redemption of the West. The part played in the development of this new civilization by the Order of St. Benedict and by Pope St. Gregory the Great cannot be overestimated: through the former the Catholic Faith became a more living and personal attribute of the people, and began as well to force its way across the frontiers of barbarism, while by its means the long-lost ideals of law and order were in a measure re-established. As for St. Gregory the Great, he may almost be considered the foundation-stone of the new epoch. The redemption of Europe was completed during the four centuries following his death, and largely at the hands of the monks of Cluny and Pope St. Gregory VII (1073-1085), who freed the Church from secular dominion. With the twelfth century were to come the equally potent Cistercian reformation, the revivifying and purification of the episcopate and the secular clergy by the canons regular, the development of the great schools founded in the preceding century, the communes, the military orders, and the Crusades; while the thirteenth century, with the aid of Pope Innocent III, Philip Augustus, St. Louis, and the Franciscans and Dominicans, was to raise to the highest point of achievement the spiritual and material potentialities developed in the immediate past.

This is the epoch of Gothic architecture. As we analyse the agencies that together were to make possible a civilization that could blossom only in some pre-eminent art, we find that they fall into certain definite categories. Ethnically the northern blood of the Lombards, Franks, and Norsemen was to furnish the physical vitality of the new epoch. Politically the Holy Roman Empire, the Capetian sovereigns of the Franks, and the Dukes of Normandy were to restore that sense of nationality without which creative civilization is impossible, while the papacy, working through the irresistible influence of the monastic orders gave the underlying impulse. Normandy in the elev-

enth century was simply Cluny in action, and during this period the structural elements in Gothic architecture were brought into being. The twelfth century was that of the Cistercians, Carthusians, and Augustinians, the former infusing into all Europe a religious enthusiasm that clamoured for artistic expression, while by their antagonism to the over-rich art of the elder Benedictines, they turned attention from decoration to plan and form, and construction. The Cluniac and the Cistercian reforms through their own members and the other orders which they brought into being were the mobile and efficient arm of a reforming papacy, and from the day on which St. Benedict promulgated his rule, they became a visible manifestation of law and order. With the thirteenth century, the episcopate and the secular clergy joined in the labour

of adequately expressing a united and unquestioned religious faith, and we may say, therefore, that the civilization of the Middle Ages was what the Catholic Faith organized and invincible had made it. We may, therefore, with good reason, substitute for the undescriptive title "Gothic" the name "The Catholic Style" as being exact and reasonably inclusive.

The beginnings of the art that signalized the triumph of Catholic Christianity are to be found in Normandy. Certain elements may be traced back to the Carolingian builders, the Lombards in Italy, and the Copts and Syrians of the fourth century, and so to the Greeks of Byzantium. They are but elements however, germs that did not develop until infused with the red blood of the Norsemen and quickened by the



PLAN OF THE ABBEY CHURCH OF CLUNY


spirit of the Cluniac reform. The style developed in Normandy during the eleventh century contained the major part of these elemental norms, which were to be still further fused and co-ordinated by the Franks, raised to final perfection, and transfigured by a spirit which was that of the entire medieval world. Marvelous as was this achievement, that of the Normans was even more remarkable, for in the style they handed on to the Franks was inherent every essential potentiality. At this moment Normandy was the focus of northern vitality and almost, for the moment, the religious centre of Europe. The founding of monasteries was very like a mania and the result a remarkable revival of learning; the Abbeys of Bec, Fécamp, and Jumièges became famous throughout all Europe, drawing to themselves students from every portion of the continent; even Cluny herself had in this to take second place. It was a very vigorous and a very widespread civilization, and architectural expression became imperative. Convinced that "she was playing a part and a leading part in the civilization of Europe . . . Normandy perceived and imitated the architectural progress of nations even far removed from her own borders. At this time there was no other country in Europe that for architectural attainment could

compare with Lombardy. Therefore it was to Lombardy that the Normans turned for inspiration for their own buildings. They adopted what was vital in the Lombard style, combined this with what they had already learned from their French neighbours, and added besides a large element of their own national character" (Arthur Kingsley Porter, "Mediæval Architecture", VI, 243, 244).


What are these elements which were borrowed from the Lombards and the Franks, and which were to form the foundations of Gothic architecture?—They are, from the former, the compound pier and archivolt, the alternate system, the ribbed and domed vault; from the latter (i. e. from the Carolingian remains), the modified basilican plan with its triple aisles crossed by a projecting transept, and its three apses.—This, the basis of the typical Norman and Gothic plan, was

derived directly from the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, the date of which is unknown. It may have been built by Constantine, or by Justinian, or at any date between, Professor Lethaby leaning to the latter conclusion. In any case it is not earlier than A. D. 300, nor later than 550.—From the Franks were also borrowed the doubled western towers, the lantern or central tower over the crossing, and the threefold interior system of arcade, triforium, and clerestory. It will be seen that the main dispositions of the Gothic plan are derived from Carolingian developments of Byzantine modifications of the early Christian basilica, itself but an adaptation of that of pagan Rome; from the Lombards, however, had been acquired three elements which were to lie at the base of Gothic construction. Many of the most characteristic features of Byzantine, Carolingian, and Lombard architecture had been permanently rejected, showing that the process followed was not one of slavish imitation but rather of conscious selection; the vast possibilities inherent in others had not been appreciated, as for instance the polygonal, domed motive of San Vitale and Aachen, surrounded by its vaulted ambulatory, from which the Franks were to evolve the Gothic *chevet*, while the pointed arch the Normans never used, though they must have known of, or imagined, its existence.

The actual steps in the development of what may be called the Gothic order, from the primitive basilica to the full perfection of Chartres, fortunately exist, and




PLAN OF ST-GEORGES DE BOCHERVILLE



PLAN OF CHARTRES CATHEDRAL

we may trace the progress year by year and at the hands of diverse peoples. By the beginning of the tenth century, the available supply of ancient columns having become exhausted, square piers built up of small stones had everywhere taken the place of circular monolithic shafts, but the old basilican system remained intact (except in the polygonal, Carolingian churches), arcades supporting roof-bearing walls pierced by narrow windows, and an enclosing wall independent in its construction and forming aisles covered by lean-to roofs of wood. In Sant' Eustorgio at Milan (c. 900) we find evidences that transverse arches were thrown from each pier of the arcade to the aisle wall, so necessitating the addition of a flat pilaster to each pier to take the spring of the arch. These arches may have been evolved for the purpose of strengthening the fabric, or for ornamental reasons, or in imitation of similar arches in the Carolingian domical churches; but whatever their source the fact remains that they form the first structural step towards the evolution of the Gothic system of construction. Next, transverse arches were thrown across the nave, the first recorded example being the church of SS. Felice e Fortunato at Vicenza, dated 985. Neither for structural nor æsthetic reasons was it necessary that these



ABBAYE AUX DAMES, CAEN

nave arches should spring from every pier, so every alternate pier was chosen, the intermediate transverse aisle arch being suppressed and the pier, that no longer had a lateral arch to support, reduced in size. To support the great nave arches, pilasters were of course attached to the nave face of the pier, and these, as well as the aisle pilasters, were made semicircular in plan. If we assume, as we may, that in other examples all the transverse arches of the aisle were retained, while only each alternate pier bore a nave arch, we shall have a plan made up of compound piers supporting longitudinal and transverse wall-bearing arches that divide the entire area into squares, large and small, the great square of the nave being four times the area of each aisle square.

The next step for a people on the highway of progress would be the vaulting, in masonry, of these squares, for the wooden roofs were inflammable; moreover the Carolingian builders had constantly so vaulted their smaller square roof areas. The process began at once, and of course with the aisle squares, where the structural problem was simplest. The date is not recorded; no early examples remain in Lombardy, but in Normandy we find, about 1050, churches which possess aisles covered by square, groined vaults, with the transverse arches showing. The next step was of course the vaulting of the great squares of the nave, but before this was attempted the rib vault was devised, and the task rendered structurally more simple. The old transverse aisle arches had given the hint;


where an aisle so spanned was to be vaulted, the arches already in place formed a very convenient shelf on which some of the vault stones might rest, and, by so much, a portion of the temporary centering might be dispensed with. Intelligence could not fail to suggest that an expedient useful in the case of the transverse arch might be equally useful in that of the diagonals, which were far more difficult of construction, as well as the most liable to give way in the case of ribless, groined vaults. When did this era-making invention take place, and at the hands of what people? Where, we shall probably never know, nor yet the exact date; but it could not have been earlier than 1025, nor later than 1075. San Flaviano at Montefiascone, authentically dated 1032, has aisles with rib vaults which are possibly original and, if so, are the earliest on record, while the nave vault of Sant' Ambrogio at Milan (c. 1060) is of fully developed rib construction. "The most recent authorities (such as Venturi, *Storia dell' Arte Italiana*, 1903, who cites Stiehl, 1898) accept the view that the vaults are of foreign fashion derived from Burgundy, and were about contemporaneous with the campanile [1129]. . . . It seems that on the evidence we are compelled to suppose that Sant' Ambrogio derived its scheme of construction from Normandy. It may be that the origin of the vault is to be sought for in Normandy, or even in England; but there are many reasons for thinking that the seed idea, like so many others, came from the East." (W. R. Lethaby, "*Mediaeval Art*", IV, 109-111.)

In all probability the Lombards are the originators of this device so pregnant of future possibilities. The new vault, groined, ribbed, and domed, was in a class by itself, apart from anything that had gone before. Particularly did it differ from the Roman vault in that, while the latter had a level crown, obtained by using semicircular lateral and transverse arches and elliptical groin arches (naturally formed by the intersection of two semicircular barrel vaults of equal radius), the "Lombard" vault was constructed with semicircular diagonals, the result being that domical form which was always retained by the Gothic builders of France because of its intrinsic beauty. Finally, the new diagonals suggested new vertical supports in the angles of the pier, and so we obtain the fully developed compound pier, which later, at the hands of the English, was to be carried to such extremes of beauty, and to form a potent factor in the development of the pure logic of the Gothic structural system.

The last step in the working-out of the Gothic vaulting plan remained to be taken—the substitution of oblong for square vaulting areas. This was finally accomplished in the Ile-de-France after various Norman experiments, the evidences of which remain in the vaults of St-Georges de Bocherville and the two great abbeys of Caen. The sexpartite vaulting of the latter, together with that of the five other similarly vaulted Norman churches and of the choir of St-Denis at Paris, has always been an architectural puzzle, since it is manifestly a stage in the development of the oblong quadripartite vault, and yet is found in these cases some years after the latter system is known to have been fully understood in France, and nearly three-quarters of a century later than the vault of Sant' Ambrogio. There is reason to suppose that it is a revival of some of the earlier experiments in the development of the large, oblong, high vault from the small, square, aisle vault. It is conceivable that sexpartite vaults may once have existed in Lombardy and before the quadripartite vault was evolved; this would explain the persistence in Sant' Ambrogio of the vaulting shafts on the intermediate piers, for which no apparent reason exists. The vault of the Abbaye aux Dames may be considered either as a ribbed quadripartite vault of square plan, bisected and strengthened by a transverse arch with solid spandrels, or as a series of transverse arches, one on each pair of nave piers, with the



roof spaces filled in by curved surfaces of stone supported on diagonal ribs meeting on the crown of each alternate transverse arch. In the first case would be indicated a fear to trust the stability of so large a quadripartite vault, until experiment proved its effi-




FAÇADE, NOTRE-DAME, PARIS

ciency; in the second, a stage in the evolution of the great Sant' Ambrogio vault, all local evidence of which has been lost. The vault of the Abbaye aux Hommes is one more stage in the development; here the vault surfaces are curved both from the transverse arch and from the intermediate arch, which so becomes, not an arch—as in the Abbaye aux Dames—but a true vaulting rib. The result is a very strong vaulting system, particularly effective in its light and shade and its line composition, and it does not seem surprising that the Norman builders should have reverted to it from time to time, or that Abbot Suger himself should have borrowed it for his fine new abbey, choosing it for its strength or its beauty in place of the simpler and more open quadripartite vault.

In the meantime the second great structural problem, that of the abutment of the vault thrusts, had been solved by the Normans. In Roman construction the thrust of barrel vaults had been neutralized by walls of great thickness, that of groin vaults either by the same clumsy expedient or by transverse walls; when the Lombards first threw their transverse arches across narrow aisles, they added shallow exterior pilaster-strips at the point of contact, rather it would seem for decorative than for structural reasons, as the walls already were strong enough to take the slight thrust of the small arches. With the vaulting of the nave the problem became serious; in Sant' Ambrogio they dared not raise the spring of the high vault above the triforium floor, and the thrust of the vault was taken by two massive arches spanning the aisles, one below this floor, the other above, the latter being hidden under the wide, sloping roof of the nave which was continued unbroken to the aisle walls. This was, of course, but the transverse wall of the Romans, pierced by arched openings; the result was unbeautiful, and the task fell to the Normans of devising a better and more scientific method. At their hands the Lombard pilaster-strip became at once a functional buttress in-

stead of a decorative adjunct, while the successive steps in the evolution of the flying buttress remain on record and are peculiarly interesting. In the Abbaye aux Hommes, "the expedient was adopted of constructing half-barrel vaults springing from the aisle walls and abutting against the vaults of the nave beneath the lean-to roof. These were in reality concealed flying buttresses, but they were flying buttresses of bad form; for only a small part of their action met the concentrated action of the vaults that they were designed to stay, the greater part of it operating against the walls between the piers where no abutments were required" (Moore, *op. cit.*, I, 12, 13). In the Abbaye aux Dames these defects were remedied, for all the barrel vault was cut away except that narrow part which abutted against the spring of the vault. The flying buttress had been invented. As yet it was hidden under the triforium roof and did not declare itself to the eye, but functionally it was complete.


The fruit of the Cluniac reform working on Norman blood had been the evolution of the main lines of the Gothic plan (barring the easterly termination, or *chevet*) together with the development of the Gothic system of vaulting and the Gothic principle of concentrated thrusts met by pier buttresses and flying buttresses. The true "Gothic system" is therefore the product of Normandy. In the meantime what had been done towards the working-out of the other half of the Gothic idea—the discovering anew of the underlying principles of pure beauty, their analysis into the elements of form and composition, proportion, relation and rhythm, line and colour, and chiaroscuro—and finally what had been accomplished in the direction of evolving that new quality of form-expression which, differing as it does from any school of the past, gives to Gothic art its peculiar personality?—Nothing, so far as Normandy is concerned, except as regards certain large architectonic qualities first revealed in Jumièges, and, following this, in the Abbeys of Caen and St-Georges de Bocherville. The Abbaye aux Hommes is the norm of all French cathedrals; the Abbaye aux Dames, of the English order; while Jumièges, the first in date, remains one of the most astonishing buildings in history. If it had antecedents, if it came as the culmination of a long and progressive series of experiments in the development of architectonic form, the evidence is forever lost, for, as it now stands, it is isolated, almost preternatural. So far as we



CHEVET, CATHEDRAL OF LE MANS

know, it had no precursors, and yet here are the majestic ruins of a monastic church larger than any since the time of Constantine and far in advance, so far as design and development are concerned, of any contemporary structure. Montier en Der, an abbey of Haute-Marne, built by Abbots Adso and Berenger (960, 998), is the only recorded structure which bears

the least kinship to Jumièges, and the difference between the two—separated by only fifty years—is that between barbarism and civilization. All that was good in Lombard architecture has been assimilated, and in addition we find fixed for the whole Gothic period those lofty and monumental proportions, that masterly setting out of plan, the powerful grouping of lofty towers, the final organism of arcade, triforium,



CHEVET, CATHEDRAL OF BEAUVAIS


and clerestory that together were to set the type of Gothic architecture for its entire term and endure unchanged, though infinitely perfected, so long as the Christian civilization of the Middle Ages remained operative. After Jumièges the abbey of Caen were easy, and, given a continuation of cultural conditions, Amiens and Lincoln inevitable.

During the latter half of the eleventh century these cultural conditions ceased in Normandy. After the death of William the Conqueror the duchy fell on evil times, and the working out to its logical and supreme conclusion of the great style it had initiated fell into other hands, viz., those of the French of the old Royal Domain and of the transplanted Normans in England. In France the eleventh century had been marked by royal inefficiency, unchecked feudal tyranny, episcopal insubordination to papal control, indifference to the Cluniac reform, and general anarchy. By the middle of the century Cluny had done its immediate work and had begun to lapse from its lofty ideals, but others were to take its place and do its work, and in 1075 St. Robert of Molesme founded in Burgundy the first house of that Cistercian Order which was to play in the twelfth century the part that Cluny had played in the eleventh. The preliminary fight that was to clear the ground in France began with the Council of Reims called by Pope Leo IX (1049-1054), when the sovereign pontiff and the monastic orders made common cause against the simony, secularism, and independence of the French episcopate. The contest was carried on simultaneously with the even greater fight against the empire, and, as there, the victory remained with the papacy. With the close of the eleventh century conditions in France had become such that the torch that fell from the hands of the decadent Norman could be caught by the crescent Frank and carried on without a pause.

During the first half of the twelfth century the outburst of architectural vigour in the Ile-de-France is very remarkable. Soissons, Amiens, and Beauvais became simultaneously centres of activity, and the rib vault makes its appearance at the same time in many places. "During the first phase of the transition, 1100-40, the builders struggled to master the rib vault in its simpler problems: they learned to construct it on square and on oblong plans and even over the awkward curves of ambulatories, but their experi-

ments were always on a small scale. During the second phase (1140-80) the problem of vaulting great naves was attacked; the evolution centres in the peculiar development which the genius of the French builders gave to the concealed flying buttress and to the sexpartite vault, both borrowed from Normandy" (Porter, *op. cit.*, II, 54). The semicircular ambulatory of Morienvall (c. 1122), with its vaulting supported on ribs curved in plan, and the church of St-Etienne at Beauvais (c. 1130), of which Professor Moore says that with the exception of St-Louis of Poissy it is "the only Romanesque structure extant on the soil of France that was unmistakably designed for ribbed, groined vaulting over both nave and aisles," are valuable landmarks in the development. The second task of the French builders was simplified by the introduction of the pointed arch. As in the case of the ribbed vault, there is no means of knowing the exact source from whence this was derived. It had been in use in the East for nearly a thousand years before it appeared in the West; it was established in the South of France as an effective and economical contour for barrel vaults by the year 1050, whence it migrated to Burgundy and so to Berry (where it appears in 1110), but always in connexion with vaults rather than arches. The earliest structural pointed arch recorded in France is in the ambulatory of Morienvall, referred to above, and is dated 1122.

This form, so pregnant of structural and artistic possibilities, may have been brought from the Holy Land by returning pilgrims, or it may have been independently evolved. Whatever its source, its advantages were so great from a practical standpoint that it is hard to believe that the races that had produced Sant' Ambrogio and Jumièges should not have worked out independently the idea of the pointed arch. Its two great virtues are its slight thrust as compared with the round arch, and its infinite possibilities of variation in height. The elliptical diagonals of the Romans did not commend themselves to the builders of the North, and the doming that resulted from the uniform use of semicircular arches, while not offensive in the case of square areas, became impossible where oblong spaces were to be covered, the expedient of tilting the longitudinal arches not yet having suggested itself. With



THE CATHEDRAL OF REIMS

the pointed arch in use, all difficulties disappeared. Once introduced it became in a few years the universal form, and its beauty was such that it immediately won its way against the round arch for the spanning of all voids. Almost coincidentally with the acceptance of the pointed arch came the device of tilting, the transverse arches of Bury (c. 1125) being so treated. This would seem to indicate that to the Gothic builders the value of the pointed arch lay rather in its comparatively small thrust and in its intrinsic beauty than

in the facility with which it might be used for obtaining level crowns in oblong vaulting areas. This stilt-  
ing of the longitudinal arches was from the beginning almost invariable in France; structurally, it concentrated the vault thrust on a comparatively narrow vertical line, where it could be easily handled by the flying buttress; it permitted the largest possible window area in the clerestory, while the composition of lines and the delicately waved or twisted surfaces were so beautiful in themselves that, once discovered, they could not be abandoned by the logical and beauty-loving Franks.


The structural and æsthetic advance was now headlong in its impetuosity. A few years after Bury, St-Germer de Fly was built, the date assigned by Professor Moore being about 1130. Here we find a building almost as surprising as Jumièges; for if the date quoted above is correct, the church has no prototype, no preceding stages of experiment. The vaulting, both of the ambulatory and of the apse, is stilted and has its full complement of ribs, the shafting throughout is finely articulated, the dimensions are stately, the proportions just and effective, while the easterly termination is a perfectly developed apse with rudimentary chapels—a *chevet en posse*. The flying buttresses are still concealed under the triforium roof, and outwardly the building has no Gothic character whatever; but the Gothic organism is practically complete.

With Abbot Suger's St-Denis, the easterly termination of which is of original construction and is dated 1140, we come to what is almost the fully developed Gothic plan, order and system, together with the true *chevet* of double apsidal aisles and chapels. This last feature, perhaps the most brilliant in conception and splendid in effect of the several parts of a Gothic church, may have been derived either from the triapsidal termination of the Carolingian basilican church, or from the polygonal domed structures of the same epoch. Transitional forms are found throughout the eleventh century, and the development from such a plan as that of St-Generou, on the one hand, or Aachen, on the other, to St-Denis presupposes only that degree of inventive force and overflowing vitality which, as a matter of fact, existed during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

With the *chevet* as fully developed as it now appears in St-Denis, there remains only the gradual perfection and refinement of the structural system and the giving it that quality of distinctive beauty in every aspect that was to be the very flowering of the Catholic civilization of the Middle Ages. From the middle of the twelfth century both processes went on apace and simultaneously. Noyon followed immediately, and here, it is maintained, the flying buttress for the first time emerged through the roof, displaying in logical fashion the system of construction, and at the same time bringing the abutment above the spring of the vault, where the greatest thrust actually occurred, while permitting the lowering of the triforium roof so that the clerestory windows might be given greater height and brought into better proportion with the arcade and triforium. Sens, of the same date, exhibits a great advance in mechanical skill and logical exactitude, with an innovation that commands less admiration—the substitution of cylindrical columns for the intermediate piers on the caps of which rest the shafts of the intermediate ribs of the sexpartite vault. Continued in Notre-Dame, Paris, this clever, but unconvincing, device proved to be but an experimental form, and was abandoned as unsatisfactory in the greatest monuments of French Gothic, such as Chartres, Reims, Bourges, and Amiens, where recourse was had to the specifically Gothic compound pier, with the shafts of the transverse ribs, at least, of the vault, brought frankly and firmly down to the pavement.

The cathedral of Paris was begun in 1163 with the choir, and completed in 1235 with the raising of the

western towers. From East to West there is a steady growth in certainty of touch, in structural efficiency, and in the expression through beauty of form and line of the culminating civilization of medievalism. The interior order exhibits the defects of the imperfectly organized Norman system, particularly in the lofty, vaulted triforium or gallery, so great in size that there is no rhythm in the relationship of arcade, triforium, and clerestory, together with the columnar scheme of Sens and Noyon (the imposing of the vault shafts on the caps of plain cylindrical columns), which must be regarded as a falling back from the perfect articulation of the true Gothic system. The plan, however, is nobly developed, the general relations of height and breadth fine to a degree, while in the west front (1210-35) Gothic design reaches, perhaps, the highest point it ever achieved so far as classical simplicity, power, and proportion are concerned. The seed of Jumièges has developed into full fruition. The façade of Notre-Dame must rank as one of the few entirely perfect



INTERIOR VIEW OF SENS CATHEDRAL

architectural accomplishments of man. With the cathedral of Paris, also, the new art shows itself in all its wonderful inclusiveness; design, as apart from constructive science, appears full flood in the entire treatment of the exterior; the Lombard rose window has been evolved to its final point; decorative detail, both in design and in placing, has become sure and perfectly competent; while sculpture, stained glass, and, we know from records, painting have all forged forward to a point at least even with the sister art of architecture. In sculpture especially the advance has been amazing. For many generations it was held that the restoration of sculpture as a fine art was due to Italy, and specifically to Niccolò Pisano, but as a matter of fact the task was accomplished in France a century before his time. The revival began in the South, where Byzantine remains were numerous and the tradition still lingered. At Clermont-Ferrand, by the end of the eleventh century, a school of competent sculptors had been developed; Toulouse and Moissac followed suit, and by 1140 the Ile-de-France was producing works which show "a grace and mastery of design, a truth and tenderness of sentiment, and a fine-



ness and precision of chiselling that are unparalleled in any other schools save those of ancient Greece and of Italy in the fifteenth century" (Moore, *op. cit.*, XIII, 366). The sculptures of St-Denis, of Chartres, of Senlis, and of Paris are perfect examples of an art of sculpture beyond criticism in itself and exquisitely adapted to its architectonic function; the statue of Our Lady in the portal of the north transept of Paris may be placed for comparison side by side with the masterpieces of Hellenic sculpture and lose nothing by the test. Of stained glass enough remains here and elsewhere to show how marvellous was the wholly new art brought into being by the genius of medievalism; and that the painting and gilding of all the interior surfaces was on a scale of equal perfection, we are compelled to believe. As the cathedrals and churches now remain to us—much of the glass destroyed by savage iconoclasm and brutality, every trace of colour vanished from the walls, while the original altars themselves have been swept away together with their gorgeous hangings and decorations (monstrosities like that of Chartres, for instance, taking their places); shrines, screens, and tombs, all wonderfully wrought and glorious in colour and gold, shattered and cast into the rubbish heap—they can give but an inadequate idea at best of the nature of that Christian art which in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries came as the result of a fusion of all the arts, each one of which had been raised to the highest point of efficiency. Of the lost colour of Gothic art Mr. Prior says, "We can readily be assured that nothing of crudity found place in the colour scheme of the Middle Ages—for have we not their illuminated manuscripts in evidence? For its pure and delicate harmony, a page of a thirteenth or fourteenth century manuscript may compete with the work of the greatest masters of colour that the world has known, and we cannot doubt that the same mastery of brilliant and harmonious tints was shown in the colour scheme of cathedral painting" (*op. cit.*, *Introd.*, 19). Some hint of what has been lost may be obtained from the faded frescoes of Cimabue and the painters of Siena, as they may be seen to-day at Assisi and Florence and Siena itself.

The defects of Paris are almost wholly absent in Chartres, which is the most nearly perfect of all Gothic cathedrals both in conception and in the details of its working out. It is unquestionably the noblest interior in Christendom, even though the lower portions of its choir have been ruined by the most aggressive vandalism known to the eighteenth century. Its relations of dimension are of the same final and classical type as are those of the west front of Paris, while it stands at that middle point of achievement when the defects of the Norman system had been eliminated, and those of the too exuberant vitality of the thirteenth century had not yet appeared. As has been said above, Gothic architecture is an impulse and a tendency rather than a perfectly rounded accomplishment; the element of personality entered into it as into no other of the great styles, and it was therefore subject not only to dazzling flights of spontaneous genius, but also to the misguided imaginings of daring innovators. The noble calm of the Paris façade was followed by the nervous complexity and lack of relation of Laon. Only five years after this same masterpiece of Notre-Dame was achieved, the flying buttresses of the *chevet* were reconstructed, and in place of the original fine simplicity and logic of the system of doubled arcs, announcing perfectly the fundamental plan, were substituted the present daring and superb, but illogical and ungainly arches soaring from the outer abutments across both aisles sheer to the spring of the high vault. Similarly, when Amiens was built, the just proportions of Chartres were sacrificed to the pride of structural ability, and a faultless harmony of parts and proportions yielded to wire-drawn elegance and awe-inspiring altitudes, destined a

little later, in Beauvais, to be the Nemesis of Gothic art. Finally, the system of concentrated loads, which made possible a structure of masonry that was but a skeleton of shafts, arches, and buttresses, supporting vaults of stone and filled in by walls of glass, was so tempting to the sense of daring and to the inevitable logic of the French genius that it led to a recklessness in the reduction of solids to a minimum that, however much it may have justified itself structurally, however marvellous may have been the results it made possible in the line of glowing and translucent walls of Apocalyptic colour, must be considered as falling away from the justice and the grandeur of a classically architectonic scheme such as that of Chartres. "It was the Logic of the Parisian that brought to his Gothic both its extreme excellence and its decay: the *science* of vault construction fell in with his bent. The idea once having attracted him, his logical faculty compelled him to follow it to the end. His vaults rose higher and higher; his poise and counterpoise, his linkage of thrust and strain grew more complicated and daring, until material mass disappeared from his design and his cathedrals were chain-works of articulated stone pegged to the ground by pinnacles" (Edward S. Prior, "A History of Gothic Art in England", I, 9). The fact must not be ignored, that even in the culminating monuments of the thirteenth century in France the mania for skeleton construction led to unfortunate subterfuges. The reduction of masonry was carried beyond a possible minimum, and its insufficiency was supplemented by hidden bars, ties, and chains of iron. "The windows were sub-divided by strong grates of wrought-iron, some of the horizontal bars of which ran on through the piers continuously. At the Sainte Chapelle a chain was imbedded in the walls right round the building, and the stone vaulting ribs were reinforced by curved bands of iron placed on each side and bolted to them" (W. R. Lethaby, "Mediaeval Art", VII, 161). In spite of these errors of a too-perfect mastery of the art of building, the great group of cathedrals that followed during the thirteenth century in France must always remain the crowning glory of Catholic architecture. Bourges, Reims, and Amiens, with the numberless other examples of a perfected art, from the Channel to the Pyrenees, the Alps to the sea, form the greatest cycle of buildings in a definite and highly developed style that has ever been produced by man, and is the most salient exposition in history of human capacity for evolving a material perfection and irradiating it with absolute beauty and spiritual significance, all under the control and by the impulse of a dominant and undivided religious faith.

There are three abstruse subjects connected with the nature and growth of Gothic architecture on which much has been written, yet nothing thus far that may be considered finally conclusive: (1) the Commacini, or seventh-century guild of masons; (2) the "structural refinements" to which Professor Goodyear has devoted so much study; (3) the application of certain mystical numbers, and their relations to the solution of the problem of proportion. Of the Commacini, whose name first appears in a mid-fifth-century document, Mr. Lethaby says, "It is generally held by scholars that the word does not refer to a centre at Como, but should be understood as signifying an association or guild of masons, and that the Magistri Commacini heard of in the seventh century were of no special importance. It does seem probable, however, that the expansion of N. Italian art over many parts of Europe, which appears to have taken place in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, may be traced to the fact that in Italy the guilds had privileges which made members free to travel at a time when Western masons were attached to manors or monasteries" (W. R. Lethaby, "Mediaeval Art", IV, 114). Professor Goodyear may be assumed to have proved that the





# ENGLISH GOTHIC INTERIORS

HENRY VII'S CHAPEL, WESTMINSTER ABBEY  
NAVE OF EXETER CATHEDRAL

REREDOS, WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL  
PERSHORE ABBEY





irregularities in plan, the variations in spacing, the inclination of walls, and all the other manifold peculiarities of medieval building are in many cases premeditated, and not the result of negligence or accident. The æsthetic excuse he makes less obvious, however, nor has he yet established any general law which holds as consistently as do those governing architectural refinements in Greek architecture. The mystical deductions as to the persistence of certain numerical laws, the occult properties of numbers, and the angle called the "pi pitch" from the time of the builders of the pyramids, all of which are supposed to express certain fundamental laws governing the universe, and to have been transmitted from father to son for thousands of years, until they appear as the controlling principles of Gothic proportion, and the setting out of Gothic plans, may be found in "Ideal Metronomy", by the Rev. H. G. Wood (Boston, 1909).

When the *chevet* of Le Mans was finished, in 1254, the beginnings recorded in Jumièges two centuries before had worked themselves out to a point beyond which further wholesome development was impossible. The Franks had perfected what the Normans had initiated; the structural scheme inherent in Jumièges had progressed step by step to its conclusion; the great architectural harmonies of form and proportion and dimension, the mysterious and evocative powers of subtle and rhythmical relationship, had already achieved their highest fruition in Chartres and Reims, while an entirely new category of art, no sign of which had been accorded to the Normans, had by the Franks been brought again into being, viz., that of absolute beauty in ornament and decoration, whether in stone or glass or pigment, whether in itself as isolated detail or in regard to its placing and disposition. Moreover, this latter manifestation of art was in terms radically different to anything that had gone before, although the principles were identical with those of all great art: "In breadth of design, co-ordination of parts and measured recurrence of structural and ornamental elements, the Gothic artist obeyed, though in a different form, the same primary laws that had governed the ancient Greek" (Moore, *op. cit.*, I, 22). The same was true of his sense of abstract and concrete beauty; in the contours of his mouldings, the carving of his caps and crockets, bosses and spandrels, the development of his decorative compositions of mass and line, and light and shade, he fell in no respect behind his brothers of Greece, while he excelled those of Byzantium. The forms were different, wholly his own and original, but the essential spirit was the same.

In the meantime Gothic architecture had been following a parallel course of development in England, borrowing directly from Normandy and France, assimilating what it so acquired, and giving to all a distinctly national character that tended from year to year further to separate English Gothic from any other, both structurally and artistically. No sooner was the Conquest effected in 1066, than the building of Norman abbeys, cathedrals, and churches was put in hand. Actually the introduction of Norman Romanesque occurred sixteen years earlier, viz., in 1050, when St. Edward the Confessor began the building of Canterbury. The earliest work differs in no essential particular from that of Normandy, except as regards size, which in many cases was astonishing; not only were the abbeys often far larger than anything in Normandy, they were the greatest buildings in Europe. Winchester and St. Paul's were more than double the ground area of the Abbaye aux Hommes, while the London cathedral and Bury St. Edmunds were each a fourth larger even than the gigantic Cluny itself. From the first the English peculiarity of great length combined with comparatively narrow nave (30-35 feet in clear span) is conspicuous. As the Norman buildings were destroyed, and rebuilt under Gothic influence, the original-setting out was generally adhered

to, and Gothic naves are seldom found of a width greater than that of the Norman. Very early, also, occurs the typical deep English choir, Canterbury in 1096, having one nine bays in depth. This excessive length of the eastern arm was due quite as much to practical considerations as to those of beauty. Religion was popular in England for some centuries after the Conquest, and great quantities of worshippers had to be provided for. In Spain the choir of monks or secular clergy thrust itself through the nave half way to the west doors; in France it usually took in at least the crossing; the cathedrals of the Ile-de-France were secular and the very wide choirs easily accommodated the few canons. In England, however, the numbers of the monks and canons was so great, and so many of the cathedrals were monastic in their foundation, that




INTERIOR, CATHEDRAL OF CHARTRES

enormously long choirs were necessary for the seating, in their narrow width, of those permanently attached to each church.

The great abbeys and cathedrals were seldom vaulted, being covered by timber roofs of low pitch, except as regards their easily vaulted aisles. Barrel vaults were occasionally used, groin vaults in innumerable cases; the groin vault with ribs first occurs in Durham in 1093, an astonishing date, since the earliest ribbed vault claimed for France is in the diminutive church of Rhuis, a structure the date of which is unknown, but is placed at about 1100. The earliest known rib vault is claimed by Rivoira to be that of San Flaviano, in Umbria, but there is some doubt as to whether this is the original vault of a church known to have been built in 1032. San Nazzaro Maggiore, at Milan, has an authentic rib vault of 1075, and it appears therefore that the choir vault of Durham is earlier than any certain example in France, however small, and that it was built within twenty years of the first dated rib vault in Lombardy. The vaults of Durham nave are pointed and ribbed, and are not later than 1128, six years after the pointed arch appears in the little French church of Morienvall.

No further development towards Gothic occurred in England until the middle of the twelfth century. Great abbeys in the fully developed Norman style,

such as Kirkstall and Fountains, Malmesbury, Peterborough, Norwich, and Ely, were reared all over England, but the prevailing monastic influence was Benedictine, and this was always architecturally conservative, and at the same time magnificent. Apses with encircling ambulatories were almost invariable,




PLAN OF SALISBURY CATHEDRAL

and there was frequently the western transept, as at Bury and Ely. Towards the end of the Norman period the Cluniac influence greatly intensified the native richness in decoration of Benedictine art, and to this we owe in great measure the rich and intricate carving of the late Norman work that persisted down even to the chapel of Our Lady at Glastonbury, built in 1184. Before this date had occurred two events which were to initiate and, in varying degrees, control the growth of Gothic in England: the coming of the Cistercians and the rebuilding of Canterbury choir by William of Sens. The Cistercians always favoured Gothic, over the massive and grandiose Romanesque of the Benedictines and Cluniacs, because of its early austerity and the economies it made possible in building. Regular Canons, also, and for similar reasons, adopted the economical new form, and this double influence was constantly exerted towards structural and artistic simplicity—a fortunate thing for the new style, since it prevented a too early flowering in the richness and luxuriance of beautiful detail.

That William of Sens introduced to England and set before English eyes so much as he could of so much as then existed of French Gothic is quite true, but it does not appear that his was the first Gothic done in England, or that it had a wide or lasting influence. Mr. Bond divides the local adaptation of Gothic into three schools—of the West, the North, and the South—giving to the former priority in time. He says: "The first complete Gothic of England commences not with the choir of Lincoln, but of Wells, as begun by Reginald FitzBohun who was bishop from 1174 to 1191. . . . It was in the West of England that the art of Gothic vaulting was first mastered; first, so far as we know, at Worcester; and it was in the West, first apparently at Wells, that every arch was pointed and the semicircular arch exterminated" (op. cit., VII, 105). This development was under way at Worcester, Dore, Wells, Shrewsbury, and Glastonbury, to name only a few of the examples quoted, by the time the work at Canterbury passed from the hands of William of Sens to those of William the Englishman, and there is little evidence that it had any particular effect on the progress already begun. In the North, Lincoln choir followed close after Canterbury and was manifestly influenced by it in many ways, but as Mr. Bond says, "it is equally plain that the obligation is almost wholly to the English and not to the French part of that design" (op. cit., VII, 111-12), for not all of Canterbury choir is French, even in the case of the work of William of Sens himself; the slender shafts of Purbeck marble, the springing of the vault ribs from the level of the triforium caps rather than from the string course

above, the penetrations of the clerestory, the elaborately compound angle piers, with their ring of detached columns, are all English, and it is precisely these features St. Hugh copied at Lincoln. Neither does there appear in the retro-choir of Chichester, begun about the time William of Sens went back to France, any evidence that his work had established a dominating precedent; here the work is of a distinctively native cast, the columns of the arcade in particular being original to a degree and of the most distinguished beauty.

The exotic element in Canterbury proved to be but an episode and English Gothic went on developing itself after its own independent fashion. The choir of Lincoln exerted far greater influence and became the general model for all parts of England. In some cases an attempt, and a successful one, was made to dispense with the vault entirely, as at Hexham, Tyne-mouth, and Whitby, where in each instance the timber roof of the Anglo-Norman abbey was retained, and the chief attention was devoted to refining and improving the detail and composition of the wall design, where extremely beautiful results were obtained, as at Whitby, by the strictly English elaboration of the arch mouldings and the profiling of the pier sections. The flying buttress also was slow of acceptance and never, indeed, became the striking feature it was in all the buildings of thirteenth-century France. The English cared little for logic and less for structural brilliancy, or even consistency; the goals they aimed at were beauty in all its forms, individual expression, novelty, originality—qualities they not seldom achieved at the expense of structural integrity. The Gothic of France was singularly consistent; it rapidly developed into a classical system from which no radical departures were made and into which the element of individual initiative hardly entered, once the body of laws and precedents had been established. The Gothic of England never possessed any such canon either of logic or of taste. Every bishop, abbot, or master-builder strove to outdo his fellows, to strike out some new and dazzling masterpiece, and if, as a result, the medieval building of England failed of the finality, the certainty, and the uniformity of that of France, it achieved a variety and personality far in advance of anything to be found across the channel. The second importation of French ideas, in the shape of Westminster Abbey, was apparently as helpless to change the English character as Canterbury choir had been; here also the French setting out, the *chevet*, the structural system, were overlaid with English qualities. "We may readily make the fullest allowance for French influence at Westminster, for so entirely is it translated into the terms of English detail that the result is triumphantly English. It is a remarkable thing indeed, that this church, which was so much influenced by French facts, should, *in spirit*, be one of the most English of English buildings" (Lethaby, "Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen", V, 125). French "facts" were apparently as helpless to control the general building of a people as they had been to restrain English workmen in their detail, and



PLAN OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY

after the great abbey was finished in all its beauty England went on as before. By this time the stylistic quality of English Gothic had been pretty well fixed in such works as Beverley choir and transepts; Christ Church and St. Patrick's, Dublin; Ely presbytery, Southwell choir, Netley and Rievaulx Abbeys, together with the "Nine Altars" of Durham and Fountains, all completed between the years 1225 and 1250, the peculiar qualities of English work had taken on a definite and very beautiful form. This is the period usually denominated "Early English", and, while it shows no particular advance in structural development, it records a notable change in point of design; nearly all the attention of the builders seems devoted to solving the problems of beauty in form and line, in detail and composition—this chiefly in the interior treatment. The relations of the arcade, triforium, and clerestory, the varying designs of the latter with their subtle arrangements of slender shafts and delicate lancets; the beautiful pier sections and moulding profiles, together with the sculpture of capitals, bosses, crockets, and terminals—varying as between the many sub-schools of the four main architectural provinces, yet always marked by a quality of pure beauty seldom attained even in the Ile-de-France—all are significant of a distinctively national artistic development, even though it follows lines other than those that held across the Channel.

Coincidentally with the building of Westminster went on such works as the retro-choir of Exeter, the presbytery of Lincoln, the nave of Lichfield, and Tintern Abbey, wherein are the first signs of change from Early English to Geometrical. This process was continued up to the end of the century, and in the works of its last quarter are to be found the highest attainments of English art. Carlisle choir and east front, Guisborough and Pershore choirs, and St. Mary's Abbey, York, are all expressed in a type of art that rises to the level of the highest attainments of man. The exquisite line-composition of Pershore and of York Abbeys, the refinement combined with masculine strength, the swift, steel-like curves of the moulding profiles, the perfected beauty of the carved foliage, together with the masterly arrangement of the lines and spaces of light, the hollows and depths of shade—all work together to build up a masterly art. Much of the product of this time has perished, and even of York Abbey, which seems to have represented the high-water mark of pure English design, nothing remains except a shattered aisle wall, a crossing pier, and a few piles of marble fragments. Though at the beginning of the nineteenth century the greater portion of the fabric was intact, about 1820 it was sold to speculators to be burned into lime.

During the first half of the fourteenth century architectural progress was cumulative, reaching its apogee during the reign of Edward III. The fine simplicity and almost Hellenic feeling for line visible in the work of the preceding half century, and that gives it a place in this respect in advance of any other Gothic work of any time or people, has yielded to decorative richness, the multiplication of ornament and detail, and an intricate composition of light and shade. The incomparable carving of Lincoln and Wells, York Abbey, West Walton, and Llandaff, architectural yet with all the qualities of form that are found in the noblest sculpture, yields first to the lovely, but dangerously naturalistic, type of Southwell chapter house, and then to the globular forms, the bulbous modelling, and the effete curves of Patrington, Heckington, and the fourteenth-century tombs of Beverley and Ely. Curvilinear window tracery, in all its suave grace, has taken the place of the fine and vigorous geometrical forms as of Netley, advanced a stage beyond the prototypes of France. Finally, the brilliantly articulated lierne vaulting, with its intermediate ribs emphasizing the verticality of the composition and carrying out to

completion in the roof the fine drawing of multiple piers and moulded arches, is swerving towards the unjustifiable type that came just before the fan vault, i. e. the criss-crossing of a network of purely decorative ribs over the vault-surfaces in violation of structural principle.

Decadence and perfect achievement go hand in hand—Exeter nave, the finest English interior remaining intact, on the one hand, Wells presbytery, on the other. But whatever the weaknesses that were showing themselves, they entered little into the make-up of the great parish churches, which represent, more than the episcopal and monastic structures, the genius of the period. This was one of the three great epochs of such parish architecture in England, and it is not to be forgotten that the true qualities of English Gothic art reveal themselves quite as fully in the minor as in the major buildings of this country. For a full century, i. e. from 1350 until 1450, the history of English Gothic is largely a history of parish church-building. The Black Death, which in 1349 smote the land with a pestilence that cut its population almost in halves, was followed by the Wars of the Roses, and the peace and prosperity of Edward III did not wholly return until the accession of Henry VII. During this long period, however, the trend of stylistic development was wholly changed by the remarkable innovations initiated by Abbot Thokey at Gloucester in 1330, and carried on by William of Wykeham at Winchester from 1380. "The supreme importance of Gloucester in the history of the later Gothic has never been adequately recognized. She turned the current of English architecture in a wholly new direction. But for Gloucester, English Decorated work might well have developed into a Flamboyant as rich and fanciful as that of France. But to the remotest corners of the land, to cathedral, abbey church, collegiate and parish church, there was brought the influence of Gloucester by the countless pilgrims to the shrine of Edward the Second in her choir" (Bond, *op. cit.*, VII, 134). The manifest tendencies of Decorated—not, it must be confessed, of the most promising kind—were terminated, and instead a new progress was instituted towards the development of what we now know as Perpendicular "the first style of architecture that can properly be called English" (Moore, *op. cit.*, VI, 212). Hitherto English Gothic has been rather a lovely overlaying of Continental principles by a distinctively racial decoration and a certain fine fastidiousness of design, with minor modifications of plan and system that left the foundations intact, so far as they had been apprehended and assimilated. Now was to come a perfectly independent manifestation in which system, design, and decoration were all new and all exclusively English. The adoption of the French scheme of a structural framework, the walls being no longer of masonry, but of glass set in a thin scaffolding of stone mullions, was at last adopted, but its working-out bore almost no relation whatever to the French method. Before the architectural revolution there were signs that sense of proportion and composition was decaying, as for example in the Lady Chapel of Ely (1321), which has almost no architectonic qualities to commend it, but, whether William of Wykeham or profounder psychological influences are responsible, the fact remains that the danger was averted, and England recalled to sounder principles, which resulted in a new life in Gothic that persisted until Henry VIII and the regents under Edward VI brought the whole epoch of medieval civilization to an end and surrendered an unwilling people to the Reformation. Winchester nave and York choir; Westminster Hall, King's College Chapel, Cambridge, and St. George's, Windsor; Sherborne and Malvern, the choir vault of Oxford cathedral and the chapel of Henry VII at Westminster, together with the major part of the Oxford and Cambridge colleges, the great central towers of many of the cathedrals and abbeys,

and, finally, parish churches of all sizes and almost without number, are indicative of the surprising new life in art and therefore of the strength of the sound Catholic civilization of England. The beauty of the new style, its structural integrity, and its fecund variety are worthy of high admiration. What it lacked of the majesty of form and the serene reserve of an earlier time is almost made up for by a fineness of line, a richness of design without opulence, and a splendour of colour that find few antecedents in history, while the fan vault takes its place as one of the very great inventions of architecture. "In these splendid vaultings of the fifteenth century we have indeed the last work of English monastic art" (Prior, *op. cit.*, VII, 95).

Step by step, diverging steadily from her point of departure from the Gothic of France, England had worked out to the full her own form of Gothic artistic expression. French precedents sat lightly upon her, and she was not favourably disposed to coercion. In plan the Norman and Burgundian type had been adhered to, and instead of that concentration which had produced in France a parallelogram with one end semicircular, there had been an expansion which resulted in the episcopal or archiepiscopal cross plans of Lincoln, Beverley, and Salisbury—long, narrow naves, equally long choirs, widely-spreading, aisled transepts, and frequently choir transepts as well, with a deep Lady Chapel prolonging the main axis still further to the east. The plan of a French cathedral such as Paris or Amiens announces its ordonnance but indifferently; that of an English cathedral, exactly. Outwardly, the former is hardly more than a mountainous mass without composition; vast and awe-inspiring, but without emphasis or variety, except in regard to its western front when taken by itself. The latter—with its long, lateral façade, its building-up by successive planes, both horizontal and vertical, its Lady Chapel, choir, central tower, and west towers, its bold transepts, porches, and chapels—becomes an elaborate yet monumental composition of brilliant masses and infinitely varied light and shade. With the exception of Hales, Lincoln, and Beaulieu (now destroyed), Tewkesbury, and Westminster, the *chevet* gained no hold in England, nor did the apsidal termination widely commend itself; instead, the square east end became the established type, and when to this was added a retro-choir with a still lower Lady Chapel still further to the east, the result was an independent architectural scheme equally admirable to that complex glory of the French *chevet*.—Mr. Prior advances the interesting theory that the square east end was a fixed feature of both Saxon and Celtic church-building, that it was taken to Burgundy by St. Stephen Harding, the Englishman, who had been a monk of Sherborne in Dorset, where the old national tradition had survived the Norman invasion, and that it came back with the Cistercians, who, by their sheer dynamic force, were able to impose it at last on Benedictine abbey and secular cathedral alike, so bringing an originally local device to its own again. He says further: "In this matter the Canterbury choir of William of Sens was a survival rather than a pattern for English use. By the end of the twelfth century the small Celtic sanctuary had imposed itself on the choirs of our great Norman churches still more decisively than it has in the basilican introduction of St. Augustine" (A History of Gothic Art in England, II, 79).—In height, as related to breadth, the earlier and more reserved French relations were never exceeded, while they were often discounted; until Tudor times the elimination of the wall in favour of skeleton construction combined with glass screens, found little following, and a grave and conservative relationship was preserved between solids and voids. The central tower, the culmination and concentration of the composition, was almost invariable, while the west front was usually subordinated to the design as a whole. The elaborate articu-

lation of piers and archivolts, until both became compositions of fine lines of light and shade, was carried further in England than elsewhere, and the introduction of tiercerons, or accessory vault ribs, with the ridge ribs to receive them, was in keeping with an instinct that felt the subtle beauty of these multiplied lines. The logical sense, that demanded the grounding of every downward thrust of vault rib either at the pavement or on the abacus of the pier or column caps, was not operative, and in most cases the vaulting shafts were stopped on corbels above the level of the arcade capitals. From the Cistercian aversion to ornament, and perhaps also in part from the use of turned shafts of dark marble applied to the piers and bonded in by stone rings or bronze dowels, came the turned and moulded cap with the circular abacus. In its polygonal chapter houses England developed a brilliant conception all its own, and almost the same might be said of the parish church, while in the designing of tombs, chantries, reredoses, choir-screens, and chancel-fittings of wood, the delicate fancy of the English had full play in the creation of a mass of exquisite sculpture and joinery that has no counterpart elsewhere. If logic and consistency are the note of French Gothic, personality and daring are those of the Gothic of England. The west fronts of Peterborough, Bury St. Edmunds, Wells, Ely, and Lincoln; the chapter houses of York, Salisbury, Lincoln, and Westminster; the octagon of Ely, the fan vaulting of Gloucester, Sherborne, Oxford, and Westminster—all are examples of a vitality of impulse, a fertility in conception, a soaring imagination, and a cheerful disregard of scholastic precedent that give English Gothic a quality of its own as important in the make-up of the art-expression of Catholic Europe during the Middle Ages as is the masterly and final structural achievement of the Ile-de-France.

Outside France and England the racial adaptations of the Gothic impulse are much less vital and distinctive. Wales early evolved a school which had great influence in the development of style in the West of England, but it soon became merged therein and did not long preserve its identity: Ireland shows in its minor monastic work peculiar and very individual qualities hitherto unnoticed, but to which attention is being called at last by Mr. Champneys (cf. "The Architectural Review", London, 1906; also "The Magazine of Christian Art", 1908). In Scotland French influence was more pronounced than in the South, and the Norman of Jedburgh and Kelso, the Gothic of Dryburgh, Melrose, and Edinburgh deserve more careful study than has yet been given them. In all essential particulars, however, they are of the English school, and show no radical departures from the type established in the South by the Benedictines, Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinians, and Friars. In Germany the Gothic expression was slow in establishing itself, few evidences appearing before the Gothic style had reached perfection in France and England. "A reason for this, may perhaps be found in the fact that Germany in the twelfth century possessed a Romanesque architecture which, especially in the important churches along the Rhine, was of a very admirable character and was well suited to the needs and tastes of the German people" (Moore, *op. cit.*, VII, 237). Another reason may also be discovered in the further fact that the pressure of Cistercian influence during its great formative period was towards France and England rather than in the direction of Germany, while the impulse of creative civilization in the twelfth century was from Norman and Frankish rather than Teutonic blood. When, about the middle of the thirteenth century, French architects began the construction of the cathedral of Cologne after the exaggerated manner of Beauvais, they might almost have claimed that theirs was the first Gothic structure in Germany. Pointed arches and ribbed vaults had




appeared sporadically in some of the larger churches at the end of the twelfth century, such as Worms, Mainz, and Bamberg, but the lateral arches are not stilted, and so far as proportion, design, exterior treatment and detail are concerned, these churches are strictly of the Rhenish Romanesque type, as are indeed, outwardly, the internally more Gothic Magdeburg and Limburg. St. Gereon, Cologne, and the Liebfrauenkirche, Trier, the first completed in 1227, the second begun in the same year, are churches of novel plan, each apparently having resulted from an effort to turn a French *chevet* into a church by repeating its design, so producing a plan approximating a circle, and harking back in an indeterminate sort of way to the polygonal, domed churches of Charlemagne; in both cases French schemes and forms have been used rather superficially and with little appreciation. Cologne remains, in spite of these examples, the first church in Germany that is strictly Gothic in its idea and its setting out, but even here its detail and ornament are German rather than French. It had a considerable influence on the superficial development of style, and towards the end of the century such works as St. Elizabeth, Marburg, and the cathedrals of Strasburg and Freiburg show the spreading of a style that had come too late to reach any very complete fruition. Until the end of the Middle Ages, when curious fantasies in design and decoration gave to German Gothic a certain unquestioned individuality, the contributions to the development of this phase of art were not notable; the most conspicuous is the *Hallenbau* scheme which consists in raising one or more aisles on either side of the nave to an equal height therewith, or rather in building a great hall roofed with level vaulting supported on rows of slender shafts dividing it into aisles. Lübeck has five of these aisles, others no less than seven. The *Hallenbau* church, whatever its width, was usually covered by one enormous roof, and the result, both internally and externally, is as far as possible from the Gothic idea of a logical assemblage of parts, each bearing a just and beautiful proportion to the others, all interrelated and forming a highly articulated organism, the exterior of which announced explicitly every structural form of plan and ordonnance. The "open-work" spire, such as that of Freiburg, is a German development of a Flamboyant idea, which had much aesthetically to commend it, its lacelike surfaces being often treated with great effectiveness.

Flemish Gothic is distinctly a sub-school of that of France rather than of Germany. The nave of Tournai, built in 1060 is still Rhenish Romanesque, though pointed arches and certain Burgundian qualities are creeping in; its proportions, however, partake of the finer feeling of the Franks, even though its general conception is Rhenish. During the first half of the thirteenth century such thoroughly strong and refined examples of true Gothic as St. Martin, Ypres, St. Bavon and St. Michael, Ghent, appear, widely divided in their quality from the halting efforts of Germany proper. The civic work of Flanders is perhaps its most distinctively national creation, and the Cloth Hall, Ypres, with the great group of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century town halls—Bruges, Brussels, Louvain, Oudenarde, Alost, and Ghent—while excessive in their flamboyant detail, yet retain the essential elements of fine composition and vigorous design.

In Italy the introduction of Gothic forms was as long delayed as in Germany, while, so far as native work is concerned, the fundamental principles of Gothic construction were never accepted at all. It was essentially a northern art, and in Italy neither the mental disposition of the people nor the spiritual and temporal conditions put a premium on ideas in themselves racially foreign. Nevertheless, once introduced, they produced in many cases very beautiful results, particularly in decoration and design, and Italian

Gothic certainly contributes valuable elements to the total of medieval art. During the eleventh century one school after another had come into existence in almost every part of Italy, all based more or less on some local modification of the primitive basilican idea, yet varying in different directions as the peculiar influences of each section might direct. In Torcello, Murano, and Venice these were naturally Byzantine, more or less modified by the variations at Ravenna. In Sicily, Byzantine influence was mingled with strains from Mohammedan sources and with a strong influence brought in by King Roger and his Norman followers. Pisa and Florence worked on their own lines with some slight Lombardic admixture, while those portions of the peninsula under Lombard control developed their vital and inspiring style from the




FAÇADE, CATHEDRAL OF ORVIETO

persisting Carolingian tradition. The abstract beauty of much of this Italian product of the eleventh century is very pronounced, St. Mark's at Venice, San Miniato at Florence, Cefalu, Monreale, and the Capella Palatina in Sicily; Troja, Toscanella, San Michele at Pavia, San Zeno at Verona—all possess elements of great art, but no one of the styles indicated by any of these buildings was destined to a final working-out under cultural conditions that made such a result inevitable. Development during the twelfth century was almost wholly local in its extent and decorative in its scope, and it was not until the coming of the Cistercians, with their Gothic of Burgundy, at the opening of the thirteenth century, that the incipient or reminiscent local modes were extinguished, and an attempt made at a general unification of style.

Apparently the Gothic influence had come too late. The era when architecture was to be the favourite mode for the artistic voicing of a civilization was, at least in the South, nearly at an end; painting and sculpture were to take its place, and therefore the Gothic architecture of Italy was to remain both racially alien and in its nature episodic. In the former class are those churches the designs of which were apparently imported almost bodily from Burgundy by the Cistercian monks, such as Fossanova, Casamari, and San Galgano, all works of great beauty of form and proportion, all vaulted in stone, the two former having fully developed rib vaults with stilted lateral arches in good Gothic form, though in none is the buttress sys-

tem well developed. A little later come Sant' Andrea, Vercelli (1219-24), said to be the work of an English architect, but manifestly French, with a full system of flying buttresses, San Francesco at Assisi (1228-53), attributed by Vasari to a German architect, but also unmistakably French in its first inspiration, though considerably modified by what may well be local Franciscan influence, and San Francesco at Bologna, of which much the same may be said.

The first really local development of Gothic seems to have been at the hands of the friars, Sta. Croce and Sta. Maria Novella at Florence, dating from the end of the century, varying so widely from any contemporary form of Gothic that their peculiarities must be assigned either to the friars themselves or to the influx of Italian personality. One of the fundamental characteristics of Gothic is a sense of just proportion and a fine relationship of parts, combined with a passion for beauty of line, form, light and shade, colour, and their relationships, not invariably achieved, but always sought for with a consuming eagerness. These qualities are almost wholly lacking in the churches above named, as well as in the cathedral itself, which partakes



DUICAL PALACE, VENICE


of nearly all of their peculiarities. We know that in England, when the Franciscans and Dominicans built their own great, popular churches, while they worked for the same large open spaces and economy of material, they nevertheless regarded these considerations of proportion and pure beauty, therefore the conclusion seems inevitable that it is not to the nature of the Mendicant Orders, but to some incapacity in the race, as it then was, that we owe the radical shortcomings of the work of Arnolfo and his fellows in Italy. The fact remains, however, that the great churches of the friars are the chief offenders. San Giovanni e Paolo and the Friari at Venice, the cathedral of Arezzo, San Petronio, Bologna, and the cathedral of Florence are, with the friars' churches in the city last named, brilliant examples of the lamentable results that may be obtained when the structural and æsthetic laws of a great style are ignored or misunderstood. Siena and Orvieto cathedrals avoid the bald ugliness of this class of work, but in their structure they have no kinship with Gothic, while in respect to their façades the only quality they possess which is Gothic in any degree is a certain sense of beauty in ornament, itself derived from a recurrence to the forms of nature for inspiration, combined with an intense refinement of line and modelling and a blending of the arts of sculpture and colour in a poetic and lovely composition. Perhaps the nearest approach to true Gothic feeling and accomplishment is to be found in the unfinished front of Genoa cathedral; being of the twelfth century, it is sufficiently early to have received something of the first great Gothic impulse, and is a masterpiece of deli-

cate relations and exquisite detail. The best Gothic work in Italy is not ecclesiastical, but secular, and is to be found in the palaces of Venice, Siena, Florence, and Bologna. The Doge's Palace and the innumerable private structures of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the first-named city have all the qualities of pure beauty of design and detail, as well as the unerring sense of proportion and relationship, that are characteristic of Gothic art, while the forms through which these are expressed are wholly medieval, yet with a complete racial note that raises them almost to the dignity of a national school of Gothic design.

Spain, as a Christian State, was non-existent except as a small area of still unconquered territory near the Pyrenees, until the middle of the thirteenth century, when Ferdinand III, afterwards canonized, united the crowns of Castile and Leon, won back Seville and Cordova, and established the final victory of the Cross over the Crescent in the Iberian Peninsula. Until this time the Gothic spirit had hardly more than crossed the mountains and always as a direct importation from Burgundy and Aquitaine; Salamanca cathedral, St. Vincent of Avila, the cathedrals of Lerida, Tudela, and Tarragona, the Abbey of Verula, and the church of Las Huelgas at Burgos, all built between 1120 and 1180, show a very undeveloped type of early Gothic construction, combined with a rich and imaginative treatment of Southern Romanesque design in the exterior. Salamanca and St. Isidoro at Leon both possess domes or lanterns over the crossing, remarkable in point of structural ingenuity and beauty of design both internally and externally. If the scheme was borrowed from the other side of the Pyrenees, it has been wholly transformed and glorified, and this brilliant innovation, containing such possibilities of development that were never carried further, may justly be attributed to native Spanish genius. No progressive growth occurred, however, during the next fifty years, and it was not until the definitive victories of St. Ferdinand made Spanish nationality possible, and the coming of the Cistercians gave the necessary spiritual impulse, that Gothic architecture in any true sense appeared in Spain, and then as another direct importation from France rather than as a development of the latent racial qualities inherent in Salamanca. Burgos, Barcelona, Toledo, and Leon are closely French in their setting-out and ordonnance, but in detail they vary widely from all French precedents. There is a southern richness and romance both in the exterior and interior design and detail of Burgos, for example, as well as in the other Spanish work from the middle of the thirteenth century onward, that gives it a certain personality quite distinct from that of any other school of Gothic. This sumptuousness of detail and colour, and composition of light and shade, enters into every detail; altars and reredoses, the latter often vast in size and of the richest materials; grilles of intricately wrought and chiselled metal; sculptured tombs; stalls of the most elaborate carving; great pictures, tapestries, and statues innumerable, together with a Flemish type of stained glass in the most brilliant colouring, were lavished on every church; and since Spain has escaped the pillage and destruction of religious revolutions, much of medieval completeness remains, though considerably overlaid with a thick coating of Renaissance, and therefore it is only in Spanish churches that one may obtain some idea of the general effect of a medieval church as it once was before it became subjected to the mishandling of revolutionists, iconoclasts, and restorers.

The end of Gothic architecture and of all Catholic art came with varying degrees of rapidity and at different times as between the several schools of Europe. Generally speaking, its death-knell was sounded when the work of St. Gregory the Great, St. Gregory VII, and St. Innocent III was temporarily undone, and the

French Crown established a temporal control over the papacy. The exile at Avignon, begun in 1305, followed as it was by the Great Schism, broke the links that bound kings and peoples to the hitherto dominant Church, opened the doors of Italy to the influx of the neo-paganism that came from the East with the fall of Constantinople in 1453, permitted the uprising of heresy in all parts of Europe, and made possible the




PALAIS DE JUSTICE, ROUEN

supremacy in Italy of the tyrants of the fourteenth century—Visconti, Sforza, Medici. The Black Death, which scourged all Europe, and the Hundred Years War in France brought down from its high estate the civilization that had flowered at Chartres, and Reims, and Amiens, and when architecture began to recover itself in France after the return of peace, its advance was on lines suggested by the fourteenth century Gothic of England, which had continued to grow rich and fertile, the most vital school of Gothic art of the time in Europe. The seeds were sown during the war itself, the chapel of St. John Baptist of the cathedral of Amiens, built in 1375, being of a fully developed Flamboyant style. From now on the substitution was complete; whatever building there was, was explicitly Flamboyant; the old logical system, the old breadth and nobility of design, detail always duly subordinated to just composition, were gone almost in a night. Says Enlart: "Ce style, qui est l'exagération et la décadence de l'art gothique, n'apporte presque aucun perfectionnement à l'art de bâtir ou de dessiner, mais seulement un système décoratif très particulier et plus ou moins arbitraire, qui, appliqué sans exception dans les moindres détails, produit beaucoup d'effet et beaucoup d'harmonie d'ensemble" (This style, which is the exaggeration and decadence of Gothic art, adds hardly any perfecting to the art of building or of designing, but only a very peculiar and more or less arbitrary system of decoration, which, when applied with thorough consistency to the minutest details, is very effective and produces a very harmonious general effect.—"Manuel d'archéologie française", I, 586).

The delicate and fantastic beauty of Flamboyant detail is unquestionable, and, as decoration, the lacelike webs of thin lines, graceful curving forms, and craftily spotted lights and shades, as they appear in Rouen, Troyes, and Abbeville west fronts and the transepts of Beauvais, in Louviers, Caudebec, Notre-Dame de l'Epine, St. Maclou, Rouen, St-Michel, and St-Germain, Amiens, are amongst the most charming creations of artistic fancy. It must be remembered, however, that it is all strictly a form of decoration, not an architectonic style, nor even a sub-school thereof, unless in such peculiarly admirable examples as the Troyes façade, the chevet of Mt. St-Michel, and the very wonderful St-Germain at Amiens, the still persisting quality of structural integrity combined with just pro-

portions and a certain unusual restraint in the placing of decoration justify a dignity hardly argued by the unparalleled license of the general output of the Flamboyant period. To a certain extent it is an architectural mystery, for it is an excessive refinement of art appearing after the close of a period of sound and vigorous civilization, in the midst of war and anarchy, contemporaneously with religious degradation, growing side by side with tendencies that in a few years were to bring the civilization it connotes forever to an end. In this it was not alone, however. Similar conditions in Italy surrounded the culmination of the great arts of painting and sculpture, while in England the delicate and exquisite Perpendicular Gothic reached its highest development in the reign of Henry VIII. Says Mr. Porter, in considering this phenomenon "Thus in the hour of political and economic misfortune, in the midst of the financial ruin and degradation of the Church, was born flamboyant architecture—the last frail blossom of medieval genius. Did this art come into being as a prophetic manifestation of the great national awakening that was to produce Jeanne d'Arc and shake off the English yoke? I should hardly dare affirm it, for the history of architecture ever reflects, rather than presages, economic developments" (op. cit., II, X, 368). One may go further even than this, and say that the flowering of art is always a generation or more later than the causes of its being. Dante and Giotto are the last of the medieval epoch, rather than the forerunners of the Renaissance. Shakespeare is Elizabethan by accident of birth, but essentially he is the fruit of pre-Reformation England. The early Renaissance in Italy is the flowering of medievalism, rather than the germinating seed of the Renaissance, and similarly the poetic, if inorganic, Flamboyant art of France takes its colour not from the downfall of Catholic civilization in fifteenth-century France, but from the better days that preceded the great *débâcle*. The magic of fifteenth-century art is neither the unwholesome iridescence of decay nor the first brightening towards the dawn of a Renaissance, but the afterglow of a great day, in the brightness of which stood the creative personalities of Sts. Odo of Cluny and Robert of Molesme, Bernard and Norbert, Gregory VII and Innocent III, King Philip Augustus and King Louis IX.

Generally speaking, fifteenth-century architecture throughout Europe is secular as opposed to the Clu-



FIRST COURT, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

niac Romanesque and Norman, and the Cistercian Gothic of the three preceding centuries. Perpendicular Gothic in England and its derivative, Tudor, is largely the product of guilds of architects, sculptors, and masons, working primarily for great merchants and the friars, the latter being the dominant religious influence of the time. In France and Flanders the Flamboyant style is peculiarly the product of the individualistic architect and the purveyor of artistic luxuries, and during the entire period the best and most significant work is to be sought amongst guild-

halls, palaces, castles, manors, and colleges, and in the towers, chapels, tombs and other memorials paid for by the new orders of rich merchants and affluent courtiers.

The end now came rapidly. In Italy Gothic feeling as well as Gothic forms had disappeared altogether by the end of the fifteenth century, the last flicker of the instinctive art of medievalism, as distinguished from the premeditated artifice of the Renaissance, appearing in the work of the Lombardi in Venice, and in such structures as the church of Sta Maria dei Miracoli and the Scuola di San Marco (1480-95). In France something of Gothic romance and intrinsic beauty continued down to 1550 in the *manoirs* and *châteaux*, while in Germany it dragged along a few decades longer in isolated instances. In Spain the superb central tower of Burgos was built as late as 1567, though already full-fledged Renaissance work was in process in other parts of the Peninsula. In England the sumptuous Perpendicular of the Chapel of Henry VII at Westminster hardened rapidly into the formalities of later Tudor, and ceased wholly as a definite style when the suppression of the monasteries, the separation of the English Church from the Roman obedience, and the imposition of the principles of the dogmatic Reformation of Germany on the English people brought church-building to an end. With the final submission of the English during the reign of Elizabeth to a dogmatic revolution they had not invited, but were powerless to resist, came an influx of German influence that rapidly wiped out the very tradition of Gothic, except in the case of the universities and in that of the minor domestic building, substituting in its place the most unintelligent use of supposedly classical forms anywhere to be found in the history of the Renaissance. At Oxford and Cambridge the cultural tradition was strong enough to withstand for a century the complete acceptance of the new fashion, and down to the middle of the seventeenth century the elder tradition persisted in such work as St. John's, Cambridge, and Wadham, Oxford, while its compulsion was so strong as to coerce even Inigo Jones into building the fine garden front of St. John's, Oxford, in a style at least reminiscent of what had been universal two centuries before. The same instinctive impulse continued in the case of manors and farmsteads even to a later date, and to this day in certain portions of England the stone-mason, carpenter, and tile layer preserve the old rules and traditions of the craft that have been handed down from father to son for centuries.

From the year 1000 to the year 1500, Catholic Europe had slowly worked out its own form of artistic expression, largely through "the most consummate art of building which the world has achieved" (Prior, "History of Gothic Art in England", I, 7). As paganism had done in Greece, so, and equally, Christianity wrought in the North. Primarily it was an art of church-building and adornment, for the Church was the one concrete and unmistakable fact in life. "While all else was unstable and changeful, she, with her unbroken tradition and her uninterrupted services vindicated the principle of order and the moral continuity of the race. . . . The services of monastic and secular clergy alike, their offices of faith, charity and labour in the field and the hovel, in the school and the hospital as well as in the church were for centuries the chief witness of the spirit of human brotherhood" (Norton, "Historical Studies of Church Building in the Middle Ages", I, 16). Therefore, on the heels of the tenth-century triumph of the Church came the eleventh-century passion for church-building; as says Rudolphus, the monk of Cluny, writing in the midst of it all, "Erat enim instar ac si mundus ipse excutiendo semet, rejectâ vetustate, passim candidam ecclesiarum vestem indueret" (It was as if the world, shaking itself and putting off the old things, were putting on the white robe of churches). The old vesture was

indeed cast away and the new "white robe of churches" was of other make. The underlying laws of the new style were identical with those of all other great styles, the vision of beauty was no different in any respect, the forms alone were absolutely new. For five centuries the artistic mode of Western Europe went on its way without a pause, one in spirit wherever it was found. "The motives which inspired these great buildings of this period, the principles which underlay their forms, the general character of the forms themselves were in their essential nature the same throughout Western Europe from Italy to England. The differences in the works of different lands are but local and external varieties" (Norton, op. cit., I, 10). This universal mode was universally destroyed, and in the space of a few years. With the opening of the fifteenth century the victory of the Renaissance was definitely assured, while it was brought to its completion just a century later. Of the product of these five centuries of activity comparatively little remains intact. As Mr. Prior says, "Western Europe up to the middle of the sixteenth century might be called a treasure house filled with gems of Gothic genius. The desecrations and revolutions of two centuries wrecked one half, swept Gothic churches clear of their ornaments and then levelled to the ground many of the fabrics which they furnished. Of much that was not actually destroyed, carelessness and neglect and the necessities of rebuilding have since made equal havoc. . . . At its worst this rebuilding, re-painting, re-carving has been wanton and causeless substitution. . . . For the next generation to us any direct acquaintance with the great comprehensive Gothic genius, except by means of parodies, will be difficult" (A History of Gothic Art in England, I, 3, 4). Enough remains, however, to enable us to reconstruct, at least in imagination, an unique artistic product of Christian civilization, of which it is possible for Professor Norton to say that "it advanced with constant increase of power of expression, of pliability and variety of adaptation, of beauty in design and skill in construction until at last, in the consummate splendour of such a cathedral as that of Our Lady of Chartres or of Amiens, it reached a height of achievement that has never been surpassed" (op. cit., I, 13).


BOND, *Gothic Architecture in England* (London, 1905); BRANDON, *Analysis of Gothic Architecture* (London, 1847); DE CAUMONT, *Hist. de l'architecture religieuse du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1841); CRAM, *The Gothic Quest* (New York, 1905); IDEM, *Ruined Abbeys of Old Britain* (New York, 1905); CUMMINGS, *History of Architecture in Italy* (Boston, 1901); ENLART, *Manuel d'archéologie française* (Paris, 1902); IDEM, *Origines anglaises du style Flamboyant* (London, 1906); IDEM, *Origines françaises de l'architecture Gothique en Italie* (Paris, 1894); FERGUSON, *Hist. of Architecture* (London, 1893); FÖRSTER, *Denkmäler deutscher Baukunst* (Leipzig, 1855); LENOIR, *Architecture monastique* (Paris, 1852-56); LETHBRIDGE, *Medieval Art* (London and New York, 1904); IDEM, *Westminster Abbey and Craftsmen* (London, 1906); MÂLE, *L'Art religieux du XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle en France* (Paris, 1902); MOORE, *Gothic Architecture* (New York, 1904); MORRIS, *Gothic Architecture* (London, 1893); NORTON, *Church Building in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1902); PARKER, *Glossary of Gothic Architecture* (Oxford, 1850); PORTER, *Medieval Architecture* (New York, 1909); PRIOR, *Gothic Art in England* (London, 1900); IDEM, *The Cathedral Builders* (London, 1905); PUGIN, *Specimens of Gothic Architecture* (London, 1821); RIVOIRA, *Le Origini della Architettura Lombarda* (Rome, 1901-07); RUPRIGHT-ROBERT, *L'Architecture normande* (Paris, 1885-87); RUSKIN, *Seven Lamps of Architecture* (Oxford, 1891); ST. PAUL, *Histoire monumentale de la France* (Paris, 1888); IDEM, *Les Origines du Gothique Flamboyant de France* (Caen, 1907); SCOTT, *Medieval Architecture* (London, 1879); STREET, *Gothic Architecture in Spain* (London, 1885); SHARPE, *Architectural Parallels* (London, 1848); SUGER, *De Consecratione Eccl. Sci. Dionysii* (Paris, 1867); IDEM, *De Rebus in Administratione sua Gestis* (Paris, 1867); VIOLLET LE DUC, *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture Française* (Paris, 1854); IDEM, *Entretiens sur L'Architecture* (Paris, 1863-72).

RALPH ADAMS CRAM.



**Gothic Liturgies.** See MOZARABIC RITE.

**Goths.** See OSTROGOTHS; VISIGOTHS.


**Gottfried von Strasburg**, one of the greatest of Middle High German epic poets. Of his life we know



SALISBURY CATHEDRAL (FROM N. E.)  
GLOUCESTER CATHEDRAL (FROM S. E.)



LINCOLN CATHEDRAL (FROM E.)  
PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL (W. FRONT)



ENGLISH GOTHIC EXTERIORS





absolutely nothing; even from his poem we derive no information on this subject. The dates of his birth and death cannot be accurately fixed, but a passage in the eighth book of his "Tristan und Isolde" furnishes a clue to the approximate date of its composition. There Hartmann and Wolfram are mentioned as still living, while Reinmar of Hagenau and Heinrich von Veldeke are spoken of as deceased. From this it may be inferred that the poem was written about 1210. The fact that Gottfried is referred to by contemporaries as *Meister*, not *Her*, has been cited as proof that he was of the burgher class. But this is not certain. The title was sometimes given to denote learning, and might then be applied even to one of noble birth, and Gottfried certainly was learned for his time, since he knew Latin and French. Moreover he shows himself thoroughly familiar with the life of courtly society. It would seem that he was in easy circumstances, since he indulges in no complaints, so frequent with medieval poets, about poverty and lack of patronage. The supposition that he was a town clerk at Strasburg has been given up as unsupported by convincing evidence.

His great poem "Tristan und Isolde" is one of the most finished products of Middle High German literature. The story is briefly as follows. Tristan is sent by his uncle King Marke of Cornwall (Cornwall) to woo for him the princess Isolde. On the home voyage the two young people by mistake drink a love-potion intended by Isolde's mother for King Marke and his bride. As a result they fall madly in love with each other, and their illicit relations continue after Isolde's marriage to Marke. Time and again they know how to allay suspicion, but at last Tristan has to flee. He meets and loves another Isolde, her of the white hands, but finds he cannot forget his former love. Here Gottfried's poem breaks off. A continuation was written by Ulrich von Türheim (c. 1246) and Heinrich von Freiburg (c. 1300). According to this Tristan marries the second Isolde, but returns to Cornwall to enter on new love-adventures that culminate in the tragic death of the guilty pair.

Whether the Tristan legend is of Celtic origin, as is generally believed, or whether it arose in France, has not been definitely settled. Its literary development certainly took place in Northern France, where it was also loosely connected with the Arthurian cycle of romances. It was introduced into Germany about 1170 by Eilhart von Oberg, who based his poem on a French *jongleur* version. Gottfried cites as his source the poem of the *trouvère* Thomas of Brittany, of which only a few fragments are extant. They begin unfortunately where Gottfried breaks off, and hence do not afford us a clear idea of his original. But Thomas's version is preserved in a Norwegian translation made by a monk Robert in 1226 and in the Middle English poem of "Sir Tristrem". Gottfried followed this version rather closely, and hence the merit of his work lies not in its composition, but in its style. This style is that of the courtly epic in its perfection. The rhyme is well nigh perfect, and the diction is clear and highly polished. Mannerisms are not wanting; antithesis, word-play, unnecessary repetitions, and an inordinate fondness for allegory foreshadow the decline of the epic that was to set in after Gottfried's death.

Gottfried's poem is the most passionate love romance of the Middle Ages. Its wonderful psychology art cannot be questioned, but its morality is open to severe criticism. Its theme is the sensuous love that defies moral law and tramples under foot the most sacred human obligations. That the pair act under the irresistible spell of a magic potion, to be sure, serves in a manner to attenuate their guilt. If Gottfried had lived to finish the poem, it may well be that he would have brought out more emphatically the tragic element of the story. In that case the poem would not have appeared to be a mere glorification of sensuous love.

Besides the Tristan nothing is preserved of Gottfried's poetry except a couple of lyrics. A lengthy song of praise in honour of the Blessed Virgin was formerly attributed to him, but has been proved to be of different authorship.

Editions of "Tristan und Isolde" have been given by R. Bechstein (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1890) in "Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters", VII, VIII, and W. Golther in Kurschner's "Deutsche National Litteratur", IV (Berlin and Stuttgart, 1889). A critical edition has been published by K. Marold (Leipzig, 1906). Translations into modern German with additions to complete the story were made by H. Kurz (3rd ed., Stuttgart, 1877) and by W. Hertz (4th ed., Stuttgart, 1904). The legend also furnished to Richard Wagner the theme for his famous music-drama "Tristan und Isolde" (1859).

Consult the introduction and notes to the editions mentioned. Also BECHSTEIN, *Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen der Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 1876); KUFFERT, *Tristan et Iseult* (Brussels, 1894); GOLTHER, *Die Sage von Tristan und Isolde* (Munich, 1887); BOSSE, *Tristan et Iseult, Poème de Gotfrid de Strasbourg, comparé à d'autres poèmes sur le même sujet* (Paris, 1865); PIQUET, *L'originalité de Gotfrid de Strasbourg* (Lille, 1905); GOLTHER, *Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1907), especially pp. 165-80.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

**Gottschalk** (GODESCALCUS), SAINT, Martyr, Prince of the Wends; d. at Lenzen on the Elbe, 7 June, 1066. His feast is noted for 7 June in the additions of the Carthusians at Brussels to the martyrology of Usuardus. He was the son of Udo, Prince of the Abrodites, who remained a Christian, though a poor one ("male christianus", says Adam of Bremen, Mon. Germ. SS., VII, 329), after his father Mistiwoi had renounced the faith. He was sent to the monastery of St. Michael at Lenzen for his education. Udo, for some act of cruelty, was slain by a Saxon. At the news Gottschalk cast aside all Christian principles; thinking only of revenge, he escaped from the monastery, crossed the Elbe, and gathered an army from his own and the other Slavic tribes who then lived on the northern and eastern boundaries of Germany. It is said that thousands of Saxons were slaughtered before they were aware of the approach of an army. But his forces were not able to withstand those of Duke Bernard II. Gottschalk was taken prisoner and his lands were given to Ratibor. After some years he was released, and went to Denmark with many of his people. Canute of Denmark employed them in his wars in Norway, and afterwards sent them to England with his nephew Sweyn. In these expeditions Gottschalk was very successful. He had now returned to the practice of his faith, and married Sigrith, a daughter, some say, of Canute, others of King Magnus of Norway. After the death of Ratibor and his sons he returned to his home, and by his courage and prudence regained his princely position. Adam of Bremen calls him a pious and god-fearing man. But he was more; he was an organizer and an apostle. His object in life seems to have been to collect the scattered tribes of the Slavs into one kingdom, and to make that Christian. In the former he succeeded well. To effect the latter purpose he obtained priests from Germany. He would accompany the missionaries from place to place and would inculcate their words by his own explanations and instructions. He established monasteries at Oldenburg, Mecklenburg, Ratzeburg, Lubeck, and Lenzen; the first three he had erected into dioceses. He also contributed most generously to the building of churches and the support of the clergy. In all this he was ably seconded by Adalbert, Archbishop of Hamburg, and numerous conversions were the result of their efforts. But a reaction set in. Some of the tribes refused to adopt Christianity, and rose in rebellion; Gottschalk and many of the clergy and laity fell victims to their hatred of Christianity.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*; SCHROEDL in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HAYCK, *Kirchenlex. Deutschlands*, III, 654; *Acta SS.*, June, II, 34.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

**Gottschalk of Orbais**, medieval theologian; b. about 805, d. after 866, probably 30 October, 868 (or 869), in the monastery of Hautvilliers near Reims; son of a noble Saxon count named Berno, who presented him, when still a child, as an oblate in the Benedictine monastery of Fulda. When Gottschalk came of age, he felt no vocation for the religious state, and asked to leave the monastery. But his abbot, Rabanus Maurus, following the prevailing opinion of the age, held that a child, who had been presented as an oblate by his parents, was bound to become a religious, and in consequence, Gottschalk was made a monk against his will. Before receiving major orders he fled from Fulda and obtained dispensation from his vows at the Council of Mainz, in June, 829. Rabanus Maurus, however, appealed to the emperor and defended his position in a special treatise: "*De oblatione puerorum*" (P. L., CVII, 419-440), whereupon Gottschalk was compelled to live the life of a monk, but was granted the privilege of exchanging the monastery of Fulda for that of Orbais, in the Diocese of Soissons. In order to make his enforced life in the monastery more bearable, Gottschalk, who had brilliant talents, gave himself to the study of theology. He found great pleasure in the works of St. Augustine, whose doctrine on grace and predestination attracted him in an especial manner.

If we may believe his opponents, Gottschalk misinterpreted some difficult passages in the writings of St. Augustine and developed a false doctrine of double complete predestination for eternal salvation and for eternal reprobation. He left his monastery without permission, and under the pretence of a pilgrimage to Rome, travelled through Italy, spreading his doctrine wherever he went. In 840 Noting, the future Bishop of Brescia, informed Rabanus Maurus of the rapid spread of Gottschalk's doctrine in Upper Italy, and asked him to write a treatise against it. The treatise is found in P. L., CXII, 1530-53. After his return from Italy, Gottschalk had himself ordained priest, not by the Bishop of Soissons, to whose diocese he belonged, but by the chorepiscopus Richbold of Reims, and again returned to Italy. In 846 Rabanus Maurus warned Count Eberhard of Friuli against Gottschalk, who was enjoying the count's hospitality. Gottschalk now returned to Germany by way of Dalmatia, Pannonia, and Noricum. On 1 October, 848, he appeared at the Council of Mainz, where his doctrine on predestination was condemned as heretical and he was delivered for punishment to his metropolitan, Hincmar of Reims. At a synod held in Quierzy in the spring of 849, he was obliged to burn his writings, was deposed from his priestly office because he had been ordained by a chorepiscopus without the consent or knowledge of his own bishop, and was whipped in accordance with the rule of St. Benedict, which prescribes such punishment for refractory monks. He was then imprisoned for life in the monastery of Hautvilliers where he died obstinate and mentally deranged, after an imprisonment of about twenty years.

Most of Gottschalk's writings have been lost. There still remain two short treatises in defence of his doctrine on predestination, in the form of two confessions of faith (P. L., CXXI, 347-366); some fragments of a work against Rabanus Maurus (P. L., loc. cit. 365-368); and some well-written poems (Traube, loc. cit. below).

It is doubtful whether Gottschalk's doctrine on predestination was heretical. There is nothing in his extant writings that cannot be interpreted in a Catholic sense. He, indeed, taught that God does not wish all men to be saved, and that Christ died only for those who were predestined to be saved; but these

doctrines are not necessarily heretical. He may have meant (and certain passages in his extant writings warrant the assumption) that, in consequence of God's foreknowing that some men will die in sin, He does not wish these to be saved; and that Christ's death was of no avail to those who will be damned for their sins. Gottschalk's doctrine concerning the Trinity scarcely admits a Catholic interpretation. He appears to hold that the one and common nature of the three Persons in God is merely an abstract universal, which becomes individualized and receives concrete existence in the three Persons and that, hence, each Person has its own separate deity (see Hincmar's "*De una et non trina deitate*" in P. L., CXXV, 473-618).

BORRASCH, *Der Mönch Gottschalk von Orbais* (Thorn, 1868); SCHROEDL, *Hinkmar* (Freiburg im Br., 1884), 90-108; IDEM in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Gottschalk von Orbais*; FREYSTEDT in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte* (Gotha, 1897), XXVIII, 1-22, 161-182, 529-544; GAGNARD, *Gottschalk moine d'Orbais, Thèse* (St. Quentin, 1898); TRAUBE in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Antiquitates*, *Poet. Lat. Carol. æv.* II, 707 sqq.; CELLOT, *Historia Gottschalki* (Paris, 1655); HURTER, *Nomenclator*; HEFELE, *Concilien-geschichte*, IV, 130, 136, 205.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Göttweig** (GOTTWEIG, GOTTVICUM, GOTTVICENSE), ABBEY OF, a Benedictine abbey situated on a hill of the same name, not quite four miles south of Krems, in Lower Austria. It was founded as a monastery for Canons Regular by Blessed Altmann, Bishop of Passau. In 1072 the high altar of the church was dedicated, but the solemn dedication of the monastery did not take place until 1083. The charter of foundation, issued 9 September, 1083, is still preserved in the archives of the monastery. In 1094 the discipline of the Canons Regular at Göttweig had become so lax that Bishop Ulrich of Passau, with the permission of Pope Urban II, introduced the Rule of St. Benedict. Prior Hartmann of St. Blasien in the Schwarzwald was elected abbot. He took with him from St. Blasien a number of chosen monks, among whom were Bl. Wirnto and Bl. Berthold, who later became Abbots of Formbach and Garsten respectively. Under Hartmann (1094-1114) Göttweig became a famous abode of learning and strict monastic observance. He founded a monastic school, organized a library, and built at the foot of the hill a nunnery where Ava, the earliest German poetess (d. 1127), lived as a recluse. The nunnery, which was afterwards transferred to the top of the hill, continued to exist until 1557.

The history of Göttweig, as might be expected, had its periods of decline as well as prosperity. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it declined so rapidly that from 1556 to 1564 it had no abbot, and in 1564 not a single monk was left at the monastery. At this crisis an imperial deputation arrived at Göttweig, and elected Michael Herrlich, a conventual of Melk, as abbot. The new abbot (1564-1604) restored the monastery spiritually and financially, and rebuilt it after it had been almost entirely destroyed by fire in 1580. Other famous abbots were: George Falb (1612-1631) and David Corner (1631-1648), who successfully opposed the spread of Protestantism in the district; Gottfried Bessel (q. v., 1714-1749), who rebuilt the monastery on a grander scale after it had burnt down in 1718, and inaugurated an era of great intellectual activity; and Magnus Klein (1768-1783), during whose rule Göttweig became a centre of learning. The chief employment of the Benedictines of Göttweig has always consisted in parish work. Its present Abbot, Adalbert Dungal (b. 1842; abbot since 29 Sept., 1886), is also president of the Austrian Benedictine Congregation of the Immaculate Conception. To Göttweig belong (Dec., 1908) 65 priests, 5 clerics, 1 novice, 4 lay brothers, 31 parishes administered by Benedictines, 3 administered by secular priests, and 7 succursal churches. It has a library of 100,000 books and 1100 manuscripts, and valuable collections of coins, engravings, antiquities, and natural history.

DUNDEL-FUCHS, *Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte Goltweigs* (3 vols., Vienna, 1901-4) in *Fontes Rerum Austr.*, Second Division, LI, LII, LV; KARLIN, *Codex traditionum monast. Goltweig in Fontes Rer Austr.* (Vienna, 1855), VIII; *Topographie von Niederösterreich*, publ. by the *Verein für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich* (Vienna, 1893), III, 495-584; DUNDEL in *Beneditiner-Buch* (Würzburg, 1883), 125-150

MICHAEL OTT.

**Goulburn** (GULBURNENSIS), DIOCESE OF, one of the six suffragan sees of the ecclesiastical province of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia. Goulburn, the episcopal city (population in 1901, 10,612), bestrides the Sydney-Melbourne railroad at an elevation of 2071 feet above the sea. The diocese has an excellent climate, and a fertile soil, that is devoted to agricultural and pastoral pursuits, and to the cultivation of the vine, for which it is eminently suited. It is watered by the three principal rivers of Australia, the Murrumbidgee, flowing through the middle of the diocese, and the Murray and the Lachlan on the southern and the northern boundaries respectively. The Barren Jack Reservoir (situated in the heart of the diocese) will, when completed, be among the largest bodies of conserved water in the world, with a capacity equal to that of Sydney Harbour, will be capable of irrigating several million acres of fertile land, and by promoting closer settlement and intensive cultivation, will in time make the Goulburn diocese the garden region of the great island-continent. The political and commercial importance of the region is also enhanced by the selection of the Yass-Canberra district, which is entirely within the diocesan borders, as the site of the future federal capital of the Australian commonwealth.

The two first resident priests of Goulburn were Fathers Fitzpatrick and Brennan, whose pastorate extended from the coast to the Murray River. Goulburn formed part of the See of Sydney (q. v.) till 1864, when it was formed into a separate diocese. Dr. Bonaventure Geoghegan was translated thereto from Adelaide, but died in Ireland in 1864, without having taken possession of the newly-created see. His successor was Dr. William Lanigan (consecrated at Goulburn, Pentecost Sunday, 1867). He was the first Australian bishop consecrated in his own cathedral, and was an ardent promoter of Catholic education. He died 13 June, 1900. His successor (consecrated coadjutor to Dr. Lanigan, 7 July, 1895), is Dr. John Gallagher, the first priest ordained for the diocese (2 Nov., 1869). On his arrival, in 1870, there were in the diocese five priests. In November, 1908, there were 59 priests (51 seculars, 8 regulars), 24 parochial districts, 8 Christian Brothers, 279 sisters (187 Sisters of Mercy, 49 Presentation Sisters, 43 Sisters of St. Joseph), 2 orphanages for girls and 1 for boys, 1 college for boys, 5 boarding-schools for girls, 64 primary Catholic schools (supported by voluntary contributions) with 4250 children in attendance, and a grand total of 5000 children receiving the benefits of religious education. There is a parochial school in every district throughout the diocese where over thirty children can be brought together. Catholics constitute one-third of the population of the diocese, which is one of the best equipped in Australia.

MORAN, *History of the Catholic Church in Australia* (Sydney, s. d.); *The Australian Handbook*; LEVEY, *Hutchinson's Australasian Encyclopedia* (London, 1892).

HENRY W. CLEARY.

**Gounod**, CHARLES-FRANÇOIS, one of the most distinguished French musicians and composers of the nineteenth century, b. in Paris, on 17 June, 1818; d. there, 17 October, 1893. His father, a painter and architect of some distinction and a man of high character and sensitive nature, died when Charles was still in his childhood, and his education devolved upon his mother, a gifted pianist, who used her talents to provide for her two sons, Charles and Urbain. Gounod was sent early to the Lycée Saint-Louis, where he was one of the best scholars. His musical gifts, strikingly

apparent from his earliest childhood, were carefully developed by his mother. He received his first great musical impression at the age of thirteen, when his mother took him to hear Rossini's opera "Otello", the principal rôles of which were presented by Malibran, Rubini, Lablache, and Tamburini, four of the greatest singers the world has ever heard. That same year he witnessed a performance of Mozart's "Don Juan" and was raised by it to a high pitch of enthusiasm. In fact Mozart remained Gounod's ideal throughout his career. Other works which he heard at this period and which left lasting effects upon his mind were Beethoven's Pastoral and Ninth Symphonies. Having taken his degree as *Bachelier-ès-lettres* at the Lycée, he was sent by his mother to the Conservatoire, where he entered the theory classes of Reicha and Lesueur. Subsequently he studied counterpoint and composition under Halévy and Paer, professors in the same institution.

In 1839 his cantata "Fernand" won for him the *Grand Prix de Rome*, carrying with it the privilege of



CHARLES-FRANÇOIS GOUNOD  
After painting by Carolus Duran

him even more powerfully. The great works of classic polyphony which he heard, Sunday after Sunday, in the Sistine Chapel undoubtedly left an indelible impression upon Gounod's imagination and memory; still he does not seem to have penetrated to the life from which they sprang and the spirit which animated them, that is the spirit of the Church and her liturgy. This is easily accounted for when one considers that his favourite reading during this, the formative, period of his life was Goethe's "Faust" and the poems of Lamartine, and that the atmosphere in which he lived was not pronouncedly Christian. Throughout the greater part of the composer's career he seems to have been unable to rise above this dualism of principles and ideals. After leaving Italy, Gounod visited Vienna, where he wrote a requiem for chorus and orchestra and a mass *a capella*. Both works were performed under his direction in the church of St. Charles. In 1842 he returned to Paris and was soon appointed choirmaster at the church of the Missions Étrangères, a position which he held for four years and a half. It was during this period that Gounod thought he had a vocation for the priesthood, and for two semesters attended the lectures on theology at the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice. In 1848 he resigned his position as choirmaster. This seems to have been the turning-point in the young musician's career. In his autobiography he takes us into his confidence: "For a composer, there is but one road to follow in order to make a name, and that is the theatre [the operatic stage]. The theatre is the place where one finds the

opportunity and the way to speak every day to the public; it is a daily and permanent exposition opened to the musician. Religious music and the symphony are certainly of a higher order, abstractly considered, than dramatic music, but the opportunities and the means of making one's self known along those lines are rare and appeal only to an intermittent public rather than to a regular public like that of the theatre. And then what an infinite variety for a dramatic author in the choice of subjects. What a field opened to fancy, to imagination, and to romance. The theatre tempted me" (pp. 166-67). Gounod's main activity was, from now on, directed towards the operatic stage.

The subjects he chose for his compositions, and which he successfully interpreted, were not calculated to preserve in his heart and mind the conditions requisite for an adequate interpretation of liturgical texts. His music, allied to the poetry of Emile Augier, Jules Barbier, and Michel Carré, who acted as his librettists at various times, became the most powerful and the most widely diffused expression of French Romanticism in its more lyrical, sentimental form. It was, indeed, rather the lyric, sentimental side of such works as Goethe's "Faust", Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet", Corneille's "Polyeucte" which he seized upon than their heroic or metaphysical aspects. Among the operatic works which have made Gounod's name famous throughout the musical world are to be mentioned: "Sapho" (1851), "La nonne sanglante" (1854), "Le médecin malgré lui" (1858), "La reine de Saba" (1862), "Mireille" (1864), "La Colombe" (1866), "Roméo et Juliette" (1867), "Cinq Mars" (1877), "Polyeucte" (1878), "Le tribut de Zamora" (1881). The Franco-Prussian War caused Gounod to abandon Paris and reside in London for several years. After his return in 1875, he devoted himself more and more to religious music. In 1882 he brought out his oratorio "The Redemption", for which he himself wrote the text and which he styled *opus vite mee*. Three years later, in 1885, appeared "Mors et Vita", his last great work, the text for which he selected from Holy Scripture. In spite of Gounod's activity in the operatic field he never ceased writing to liturgical texts. His compositions of this character are numerous and varied. His "Messe Solennelle de Sainte-Cécile", "Messe de Pâques", "Messe du Sacré Cœur", and "Messe des Orphéonistes" have enjoyed great vogue in France, Belgium, England, and the United States. The mass in honour of Joan of Arc and the one in honour of St. John Baptist de la Salle are less widely known than the first three mentioned. Although these two works come nearer to the spirit of the liturgy than any of the earlier masses, nevertheless they bear the general character of all his compositions for the church. Gounod was a child of his time and of the France of the nineteenth century. His temperament, emotional to the point of sentimentality, his artistic education and environment bound him to the theatre and prevented him from penetrating into the spirit of the liturgy and from giving it adequate musical interpretation.

*Autobiography*, tr. CROCKER (Chicago and New York, 1895); BELLAIQUE, *Portraits and Silhouettes of Musicians* (New York, 1897); SAINT-SAËNS, *Portraits et Souvenirs* (Paris, s. d.); PAGNERRE, *Charles Gounod, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1890).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

**Goupil, RENÉ**, a Jesuit missionary; b. 1607, in Anjou; martyred in New York State, 23 September, 1642. Health preventing him from joining the Society regularly, he volunteered to serve it gratis in Canada, as a *donné*. After working two years as a surgeon in the hospitals of Quebec, he started (1642) for the Huron mission with Father Jogues, whose constant companion and disciple he remained until death. Captured by the Iroquois near Lake St. Peter, he resignedly accepted his fate. Like the other captives

he was beaten, his nails torn out, and his finger-joints cut off. On the thirteen days' journey to the Iroquois country, he suffered from heat, hunger, and blows, his wounds festering and swarming with worms. Meeting half-way a band of 200 warriors, he was forced to march between their double ranks and almost beaten to death. Goupil might have escaped, but he stayed with Jogues. At Ossernenon, on the Mohawk, they were greeted with jeers, threats, and blows, and Goupil's face was so scarred that Jogues applied to him the words of Isaiah (liii, 2) prophesying the disfigurement of Christ. He survived the fresh tortures inflicted on him at Andagaron, a neighbouring village, and, unable to instruct his captors in the faith, he taught the children the sign of the cross. This was the cause of his death. Returning one evening to the village with Jogues, he was felled to the ground by a hatchet-blow from an Indian, and he expired invoking the name of Jesus. He was the first of the order in the Canadian missions to suffer martyrdom. He had previously bound himself to the Society by the religious vows pronounced in the presence of Father Jogues, who calls him in his letters "an angel of innocence and a martyr of Jesus Christ."

BRESSANI, *Les Jésuites Martyrs du Canada* (Montreal, 1877); SHEA, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886); ROCHEMONTAIGNE, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France* (Paris, 1896); MARTIN, *Le Père Isaac Jogues* (Paris, 1882).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

**Gousset, THOMAS-MARIE-JOSEPH**, French cardinal and theologian; b. at Montigny-les-Charlieu, a village of Franche-Comté, in 1792; d. at Reims in 1866. The

son of a vine-grower, he at first laboured in the fields, and did not begin his studies till the age of seventeen. Ordained priest in 1817, he was a curate for several months, and was then charged with teaching moral theology at the Grand Séminaire of Besançon. He retained this chair until 1830, acquiring the reputation of an expert professor and consummate casuist.

It was then he re-edited with accompanying notes and dissertations the "Conférences d'Angers" (26 vols., 1823), and the "Dictionnaire théologique" of Bergier (1826), of which he published another edition in 1843. From these years of his professorship date his clear exposition of the "Doctrine de l'Eglise sur le prêt à intérêt" (1825), "Le Code civil commenté dans ses rapports avec la théologie morale" (1827), and the "Justification de la théologie du P. Liguori" (1829). Summoned to the post of vicar-general of Besançon by Cardinal de Rohan, he fulfilled the duties of the post from 1830 to 1835. At this date he was named Bishop of Périgueux, and in the following year he presented to Villemain his "Observations sur la liberté d'enseignement", a protest against the monopoly of the university. In 1840 he was called to the Archdiocese of Reims, but his episcopal duties did not prevent him from completing important theological works. In 1844 appeared in French his "Théologie morale à l'usage des curés et des confesseurs", which ran quickly through several editions. His treatise on dogmatic



THOMAS CARDINAL GOUSSET



theology (2 vols., 1848) had no less success. The dignity of cardinal, for which he was fitted by his wide knowledge and the soundness of his doctrine and numerous works, was conferred on him in 1850. In virtue of the Constitution of 1852 he became senator of the empire, and in 1856 commander of the Legion of Honour. His last works were: "Exposition des principes de droit canonique" (1859); "Du droit de l'Eglise touchant la possession des biens destinés au culte et la souveraineté temporelle du Pape" (1862).

FÈVRE, *Vie de son Em. le Cardinal Gousset* (Paris, 1884).

A. FOURNET.

**Government, FORMS OF.** See STATE.

**Gower, JOHN**, poet; b. between 1327-1330, probably in Kent; d. October, 1408. He was of gentle blood and well connected. He may have been a merchant in London, but this cannot be authoritatively affirmed. It seems certain from his writings that, even if trained to the profession of the law, he did not practise it. Leland's statements that he frequented the law courts and studied the laws of his country for gain, and that he was chief judge of the Common Pleas, are no longer accepted as correct. The latter statement was, as a matter of fact, subsequently withdrawn by Leland, but the revival of it by Fuller gave it a wide vogue and a long-continued persistence. The poet was undoubtedly wealthy, being an owner of landed property in the Counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Kent, and possibly also in Essex. That he was a man of some standing at court, as well as a writer of acknowledged eminence, may be inferred from his statement in the first version of his "Confessio Amantis", (ll. 43-53), that on one occasion King Richard II recognized him in a boat on the Thames, invited him into the royal barge, and charged him to write some new thing for the monarch's own inspection and delectation. John Gower, the poet, has been by some writers identified with one John Gower, clerk, who by grant from King Richard II held the rectory of Great Braxted in Essex from 1390 to 1397. That the poet and the clerk were one and the same person may, however, reasonably be doubted. According to Gower himself he was not a clerk when he wrote the "Mirour de l'Omme" (l. 21772: *Pour ce que je ne suy pas clers*), and in the Prologus (l. 52) of the "Confessio Amantis" he calls himself a "burel clerk", that is, a man of simple learning or a layman. At all events we may safely conclude that he was not in full Holy orders, for in January, 1397-8, when he was about seventy years of age, he married Agnes Groundolf, and it might be inferred from some passages in his works that she was not his first wife. At that time he was living in the priory of St. Mary Overy (now St. Saviour), Southwark, to which he was a generous benefactor, and he continued to reside there after his marriage. About 1400 he became blind. He died in October, 1408, and was buried in the chapel of St. John the Baptist in St. Mary Overy. His tomb is still to be seen. His effigy lies under a canopy, with the head resting on a pillow formed of three folio volumes inscribed with the titles of his three best-known works, namely, the "Speculum Meditantis", the "Vox Clamantis", and the "Confessio Amantis".

Gower wrote in three languages, French, Latin, and English. His French works are the "Mirour de l'Omme", or "Speculum Hominis", which modern research has almost to a certainty identified with the "Speculum Meditantis", long supposed to be lost; the "Cinkante Balades"; and the "Traitié". The "Mirour de l'Omme", as we now have it, consists of 28,603 lines, but, as some leaves at the beginning, throughout the work, and at the end are missing from the manuscript, it probably consisted in its complete state of about 31,000 lines. It is written in twelve-line stanzas of octosyllabic verse, with two sets of rhymes in each stanza arranged *aab aab bba bba*. It is

divided into ten parts, treats of vices and virtues, and of the different grades of society, and endeavours to point out the path by which a sinner may return to God and obtain pardon through the aid of Our Lord Jesus Christ and of His sweet mother, the glorious Virgin. It concludes with a life of Our Lady, into which is also naturally introduced an account of the principal events in the life of Christ. It was probably written about 1376-1379.

The "Cinkante (i. e. Cinquante, Fifty) Balades" really contains fifty-two, or, if we count the two of the dedication, fifty-four. The first fifty-one deal in various ways with the passion of love; the last of the series is in honour of the Blessed Virgin, with a general envoi. The dedication to Henry IV comprises, besides the French verse, some Latin verse and two Latin prose quotations. Each *balade* contains normally either twenty-eight or twenty-five lines of ten-syllable verse, divided into three stanzas of eight or seven lines respectively, with an envoi of four lines; but there are occasional deviations from this model. There are different rhyming schemes in the work. It is likely that the "Balades" were written at various periods in the poet's life and that they were brought together, in the order and form in which we now have them, in 1399.



JOHN GOWER  
From a limning in his "Vox Clamantis", Cottonian Library

The "Traitié" deals with the married state and seeks to show by precept and example the obligation of observing the marriage vow. It is written in ten-syllable verse, and consists of eighteen *balades*, each *balade* containing three seven-line stanzas. The rhymes are arranged thus: *ab ab bcc*. It concludes with one stanza in the nature of an envoi—"Al université de tout le monde"—appended to the eighteenth *balade*, and this envoi-stanza is in turn followed by thirty-six rhymed Latin hexameters and pentameters. There are also Latin marginal explanations of the different points discussed. The "Traitié" was probably written in 1397.

The "Cinkante Balades" and the "Traitié" were printed by the Roxburghe Club in 1818 (ed. Earl Gower), and by Dr. Edmund Stengel in 1886. All the French works were printed by G. C. Macaulay in 1899, the "Mirour de l'Omme" for the first time.

The Latin works of Gower are the "Vox Clamantis", the "Cronica Tripertita", some eighteen shorter poems, the verses, and marginal and other summaries already mentioned or to be mentioned below, and probably a preface, found in several manuscripts, describing his three principal poems. The "Vox Clamantis" contains 10,265 lines of elegiac verse. It is in seven books, of which the first three have prologues, also in elegiacs. Prefixed to the whole there is a prose summary of each book. It deals with the rising of the peasants in 1381; the need of pure religious faith; the vices of the clergy of every degree, of the merchants, of the lawyers, and of the common people; and the duties of a king. It calls on Richard II to select wise counsellors, to avoid heavy and oppressive taxation, to abandon sensuality, to restore

the laws, and to banish crime. In the last book the poet shows the evils of vice and the necessity of repentance. It was probably begun in 1381 or 1382 and completed about 1399.

The "Cronica Triperitita" is written in rhyming hexameters and is in three parts, containing 1055 lines, with Latin prose marginal summaries. It gives an account of King Richard's management of the affairs of the realm from 1387 until his deposition and the accession of Henry IV in 1399. It was probably written soon after the latter date. The "Vox Clamantis" and the "Cronica Triperitita", together with some of the minor Latin poems, were printed by the Roxburghe Club in 1850 (ed. H. O. Coxe); the "Cronica Triperitita" and some minor poems were printed in the "Political Poems", Rolls Series, by T. Wright; and four other minor poems were printed by Karl Meyer in his dissertation entitled "John Gower's Beziehungen Zu Chaucer und Richard II" (1889). All the Latin poems were printed by G. C. Macaulay in 1902.

Gower's English works are the "Confessio Amantis" and a poem addressed to King Henry IV, which from its subject has been called "In Praise of Peace". The "Confessio Amantis" is in a prologue and eight books. It is written throughout in octosyllabic rhyming couplets, with Latin verses interspersed and a Latin marginal summary of the text. It contains altogether 33,446 English lines. It was begun probably between 1383 and 1386, and finished in 1390, and it underwent two subsequent revisions about 1391 and 1393. In its plan, which was doubtless borrowed from the "Roman de la Rose", this work is a dialogue first between the poet, in the character of a lover, and Venus, and afterwards between the poet, in the character of a penitent, and Genius, whom Venus assigns to him as confessor. In the conversation between the penitent and the confessor the seven deadly sins are discussed and illustrated by tales borrowed from Ovid, Josephus, Vincent de Beauvais, Statius, the "Gesta Romanorum", the Bible, and other sources. In the eighth book, having described the duty of a king and prayed for England, the poet bids farewell to earthly love.

The "Confessio Amantis" has come down to us in three classes of manuscripts. The principal deviations of the later from the earlier forms are the omissions (1) of the mention of Richard II in the prologue as the inspirer of the work, and (2) of complimentary references to Chaucer near the end of the eighth book. The reasons for these omissions are somewhat obscure. In the case of the king the change in the text may perhaps be set down to a disapproval of the royal policy which grew up in Gower's mind between the time he began and that at which he completed the work, and this view is made all the more probable when we remember the severe way in which he elsewhere treats the youthful monarch. In the case of Chaucer the omission may have been due to a feeling on the part of Gower that the lines were irrelevant; but it is more likely to have been the result of a literary quarrel.

"In Praise of Peace" is a poem in fifty-six stanzas of seven lines each, rhyming *ab ab bcc*. It is dedicated to Henry IV and was probably written in 1400. It is followed by fifty-six lines of elegiac Latin verse.

The "Confessio Amantis" was translated into Portuguese by Robert Payn, canon of the city of Lisbon, and into Spanish prose by Juan de Cuenca in 1400. It was printed by Caxton in 1483, by Berthelette in 1532 and 1554, by Chalmers in 1810, by Pauli in 1857, by Morley in 1899, and, with "In Praise of Peace", by G. C. Macaulay in 1901.

There are several manuscripts of Gower's works extant, ranging from forty-one (some of them imperfect) of the "Confessio Amantis" to one of the "Mirour de l'Homme", of the "Cinkante Balades", and of

"In Praise of Peace". These manuscripts are to be found in various public and private libraries in London, Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Lincoln, Dublin, Manchester, and elsewhere.

It is to be noted that while Gower on several occasions freely censures the vices of the clergy of every rank, secular and regular, he expressly disassociates himself from all sympathy with the Lollards, and strongly denounces "lollardie" in his later writings. He lived and died in full communion with the Catholic Church. It was unfortunate for Gower's reputation that for more than two centuries he was constantly associated with Chaucer and mentioned along with him, both being taken as typical writers of English verse of the fourteenth century. As the canons of criticism developed, it was inevitable that the minor poet should suffer from contrast with his great contemporary. Hence Gower has been generally relegated to an undeservedly inferior rank among poets. But in the "Cinkante Balades" at least he displays many true poetic qualities, and his art of telling a story in a natural way, as shown for example in the "Confessio Amantis", is by no means slender, and in some respects will stand comparison with Chaucer's admittedly great gifts as a narrator.

G. C. MACAULAY in his edition of *The Complete Works of John Gower* (4 vols., Oxford, 1899-1901) has given elaborate introductions, notes, and glossaries, and has discussed very fully and fairly many controverted points in connexion with Gower. This may be regarded as the standard edition. Besides the editions already mentioned the following works may be consulted: MORLEY, *English Writers*, IV (London, 1893); TAIR in *Diet. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; EASTON, *Readings in Gower* (Boston, 1895); STOW, *A Survey of London* (ed. MORLEY, London); *The Retrospective Review and Historical and Antiquarian Magazine*, 2nd series, II (London, 1828); TODD, *Illustrations of the Lives and Writings of Gower and Chaucer* (London, 1810); BALE, *Scriptorium Illustrum majores Britanniae, quam nunc Angliam et Scotiam vocant, Catalogus* (Basle, 1557); LELAND, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Britannicis* (ed. HALL, 1709); IDEM, *Collectanea*, ed. HEARNE (1715); IDEM, *Itinerarium*, ed. HEARNE (1710-12); FULLER, *The Worthies of England* (London, 1662); GOUGH, *Sepulchral Monuments*, II (London, 1796).

P. J. LENNOX.

**Goya y Lucientes**, FRANCISCO JOSÉ DE, painter and etcher, b. in Fuendetodos, Aragon, Spain, 31 March, 1746; d. in Bordeaux, 16 April, 1828. His father was a small landowner and could give only a meagre education to his son. It is more than probable that a monk of Santa Fé awakened the latent art in the boy; and certain it is that when fourteen, he painted frescoes in the Church of Fuendetodos, and a year later began regular art studies with Martínez. Going to Saragossa he entered the San Luis Academy, where for four or five years he worked under Luxan, and then went to Madrid. When only twenty years old, he left for Italy and worked his way to Rome as a bull-fighter. In Italy he painted little, yet he won a prize at Parma for a "Hannibal seeing Italy from the Alps", and completed in a few hours a full-length portrait of Pope Benedict XIV, now in the Vatican. On Goya's return to Spain (1775), Mengs was so impressed with his talents that he commissioned him to make sketches for the Prado and Escorial tapestries, and Goya was thereby brought into contact with the court, lived for the rest of his life among princes, and became the most brilliant member of the circle of Don Luis, the king's brother. He married (1775) Josefa, daughter of Bayeu, painter to Charles III, by whom he had twenty children. Five small canvases (all in San Fernando) painted at this time are strikingly original in composition, and have a marvellous silvery quality rivalling that of Velasquez. In 1780 he was made a member of the Fernando Academy in recognition of his "Christ Crucified" (Prado) and his "St. Francis on the Mountain". He was now the acknowledged leader of the Spanish School, and well named the last of the old masters and the first of the new. He painted portraits with the greatest facility and rapidity—all marvellous resemblances—and over two hun-

dred grandees, poets, scholars, and great ladies of the court sat to him. Notable among these canvases are those of Queen Maria Luisa, Charles IV and his family, Doña Maria Josefa, and Queen Isabella of Sicily, the last two celebrated for their beautiful and tender representation of maidenhood. In 1789 Goya was appointed *pintor de camera* of Charles IV with an income of \$2500 a year, and in 1795 was unanimously elected director of the Madrid Academy.

Goya painted frescoes in the churches of Seville, Valencia, Saragossa, Toledo, and Madrid, those in S. Antonio de la Florida (Madrid) being especially notable for their grace and movement. His paintings, other than portraits and religious works, portray the life of Spain, and exhibit his immense vitality, restlessness, energy, audacity and unaffectedness. His technique was a complete overthrow of tradition. Impetuous and intolerant, he sought etching as a means of expression. The "Capriccioso", begun in

1792, appeared in 1796. In this series, dedicated to the king, he pilloried the prevailing vices and absurdities with a subtler and more bitter needle than Callot's and a spirit less commonplace than Hogarth's. He is often called the Spanish Rabelais. Goya almost invariably used aquatint to give "depth" and suggest planes in these etchings, and every one of



FRANCESCO JOSÉ DE GOYA

these eighty plates Delacroix is said to have copied. The "Miseries of War" followed these and are far more serious in conception. Many of them suggest Rembrandt's methods. He began lithography in Madrid, and the first important artistic drawing ever made on stone was by Goya, and this, too, when he was seventy-three.

Ferdinand VII, at his restoration in 1814, invited Goya to his court; but, unhappy, totally deaf, and growing blind, he left Madrid on the completion of his most important ecclesiastical work, "St. Joseph of Calasanz", for the church of S. Anton Abad, and settled in Bordeaux. Here in his eightieth year he lithographed the notable series of bull-fights. Goya was the strongest figure in the age of tumult and change in which he lived, the last link between tradition and the great movement in art of the nineteenth century, which he epitomized when he said: "a picture, the effect of which is true, is finished." He was buried in Bordeaux. One son, of all his children, survived him. His other works are: double portrait of La Maja, in the San Fernando Academy; portrait of Duchess of Alva, in the Louvre; a collection of etchings and aquatints in the British Museum; equestrian portrait of Charles IV, in Madrid; sanguine drawing of Duke of Wellington, in the British Museum.

MEIER-GRAEF, *Development of Modern Art* (tr. New York, 1908); HAMERTON, *Etchings and Etchers* (Boston, 1886); YRIARTE, *Life of Goya* (Paris, 1867); ROTHENSTEIN, *Goya* (London, 1900); CALVERT, *F. J. Goya* (New York, 1903).

LEIGH HUNT.

**Goyaz**, DIOCESE OF (GOYASIENSIS), co-extensive with the state of the same name, one of the twenty states which, with the Federal District, comprise the Republic of Brazil. It has an area of 288,546 square miles, or a little more than six times that of the State

of New York. The longitudinal position of the capital (also called Goyaz) corresponds to about twenty-five degrees east of New York City; and as regards its latitude, it is about as far south of the Equator as, say, Acapulco in Southern Mexico is north of it. The diocese is suffragan of Bahia (the primatial see), and was founded in 1826 by Leo XII. The country is mountainous, one peak of the Serra dos Pyreneos being about 9600 feet high. The soil is naturally fertile and rich in precious metals, but for various reasons the resources of the state are practically undeveloped. Catalães is at present (1909) the only town touched by a railway. Cattle-rearing is the chief industry. The population is about 400,000. Goyaz, the capital (15,000), founded in 1736 as Santa Anna, contains the cathedral, a lyceum, schools of classics and philosophy, and various elementary schools. The legislative assembly of the state sits here. According to an article of the constitution, the future federal capital of Brazil must occupy an elevated site on a central plateau of the country, and it is suggested that the state of Goyaz offers the most suitable location for the fulfilment of these conditions. The religious statistics are as follows: secular priests, 39; regular, 38; churches and chapels, 36; there is a mission-house of the Dominicans of Toulouse, and also a pension and school of the Dominican nuns.

GARNIER, *Almanaque Brasileiro* (1903-4); *Hazell's Annual* (London, 1909); *Brazil at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition* (St. Louis, 1904)

T. HUNT.

**Gozo**, DIOCESE OF (GOULOS-GAUDISIENSIS), comprises the Island of Gozo in the Mediterranean Sea (seventeen miles west of the harbour of Valetta, Malta) and islet of Comino, and has a population of 22,700 souls. It is more picturesque than the sister island of Malta, and the country, covered as it is with conical hills, is more fertile in its plains and valleys. On a central plateau the ruined fortifications of an ancient town contain the cathedral church and public buildings, outside of which is a large suburb. Gozo is famed for its grotto of Calypso, at a little distance from which are the ruins of a Cyclopean temple, a most conspicuous monument of antiquity.

Up to the year 1864, Gozo formed part of the Diocese of Malta, but Pius IX, acceding to the repeated prayer of the clergy and the people, erected it into a separate diocese immediately subject to the Holy See. On 16 March, 1863, Monsignor Francesco Michele Butigieg, a native of Gozo, was appointed titular Bishop of Lita and deputy auxiliary of the Archbishop-Bishop of Malta, for the Island of Gozo. He was consecrated at Rome on 3 May of the same year, on 22 September, 1864, was created first bishop of the new Diocese of Gozo, and on the 23rd day of the following month made his solemn entry into the new cathedral. Through the efforts of Mgr. Pietro Pace, who was then vicar-general of the diocese (now Archbishop of Rhodes and Bishop of Malta), a diocesan seminary was established on the site formerly occupied by the San Giuliano Hospital, the revenues of which were appropriated to the new institution. This seminary was inaugurated 3 November, 1866, and, by the express desire of Pope Pius IX, was placed under the direction of the Jesuits. On the death of Mgr. Butigieg, Father Micallef, Superior General of the Augustinian Order, was made Bishop of Città di Castello and appointed administrator of the Diocese of Gozo. He left Gozo in May, 1867, and in 1871 became Archbishop of Pisa. His successor to the administration of the diocese was Mgr. Antonio Grech Delicata, titular Bishop of Chalcedon, a native of Malta, who, in 1868, was appointed Bishop of Gozo, and as such assisted at the Vatican Council. Mgr. Grech Delicata's charity towards the poor went so far that he even divested himself of his own patrimony. This worthy prelate died on the last day of the year 1876.

On 12 March, 1877, Mgr. Canon Professor Pietro Pace, a native of Gozo, was appointed to succeed Mgr. Grech Delicata, and was consecrated at Rome by Cardinal Howard. Under his administration the seminary was augmented by the installation of a meteorological observatory, which was inaugurated by the celebrated Padre Denza, Director of the Vatican Observatory. During this administration an episcopal educational institute for girls was also established, under the care of the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, to whom was also entrusted the direction of the annexed orphan asylum. The same bishop provided the diocese with a new episcopal palace and new monasteries, besides laying out large sums of money on the cathedral. In 1889, Mgr. Pace was promoted Archbishop of Rhodes and Bishop of Malta. His successor in the See of Gozo (and actual bishop) is the Reverend G. M. Camilleri, O.S.A., a native of Valetta (b. 15 March, 1842). Under Mgr. Camilleri's administration the first diocesan synod was celebrated, in October, 1903. This synod was of absolute necessity, as the diocese was still governed under the rules of the Synod of Malta of 1703, and consequently lacked a safe guide adapted to the times. Constitutions and decrees were also promulgated and published which gave new life to the working of the diocese.

The cathedral church of Gozo was built in 1697-1703, by Lorenzo Gafa. Its ground plan is in the form of a Latin cross. Its interior is adorned with fine paintings. The "Massaggiere di Maria", an Italian periodical, is recognized in the Diocese of Gozo as the official organ of the sanctuary of the Bl. Virgin *ta Pinnu*.

FERRIS, *Ecclesiastical History of Malta* (1877); *Idem, Description of the Churches of Malta and Gozo* (1886); *Const. et Decret. Synod. Gaud. primæ* (Malta, 1904).

ANTONIO VELLA.

**Gozzi, CARLO**, Italian author, b. at Venice, 1720; d. 1806. He spent in military service the three years that ensued upon the completion of his school studies. Then impelled by real necessity, since the family means had been wasted away, he, like his brother Gasparo, directed his attention to literature. He became a member of the Accademia dei Granelleschi, whose conservative feelings with regard to the native literary traditions he shared, and ere long began an attack upon the dramatic methods of both of the leading playwrights of the time, Chiari and Goldoni. The ignorance and the bombast of the former had excited his ire, while the reform advocated by Goldoni seemed to him undesirable, inasmuch as it involved the abolishment of the eminently Italian *commedia dell' arte*. To illustrate his own views as to what was likely to be a popular form of the drama in Venice, he began the composition of his "Fiabe", for whose improbable plots he derived inspiration from various collections of fantastic tales, such as those contained in the Italian "Cunto de li cunti" of Basile, the "Cabinet des fées", and Oriental compilations. From Spanish plays of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries he also drew no little matter, and withal he freely used his own fancy and indulged lavishly his own satirical powers. There is little order, and hardly any subordination to rule in his "Fiabe", which, it should be said, differ from the *commedie dell' arte*, whose manner they were intended to continue, in that they are often written out in full and are not merely sketchy scenarii. They preserve the stock characters of the *commedie dell' arte*, such as Truffaldino, Brighella, and Pantalone, and make them speak in dialect, a fact which stood in the way of their diffusion outside of the Venetian region; and they jumble together the heroic and the grotesque, the serious and the ridiculous, the real and the fantastic, bringing on the scene devils, necromancers, knights, fairies, monsters, and like figures. The high degree of popularity attained by the "Fiabe" in the author's time, and it was enough to enable him to

drive Goldoni from Venice, is explained by the presence in them of many elements of contemporaneous and topical interest. At home they later fell into oblivion in so far as theatrical repertoires are concerned; for some time they continued to attract attention abroad, as is evinced by the consideration given to them by Goethe, by Schiller, who made a version of one of them, the "Turandot", by Schopenhauer, by Wagner, by Mme de Staël, and others. As J. A. Symonds has said of them, and as Wagner seemed to apprehend, they have in them good material for operatic libretti. He prepared some plays based on Spanish dramas in opposition to the spread of the sentimental drama as represented by the *drame larmoyant* and *tragédie bourgeoise* of French origin. Among other works we have from him a chivalrous and romantic poem of satiric import, practically a mock-heroic, the "Marfisa bizzarra"; the almanac entitled "Tartana degl' Infussi", which has attacks on Goldoni and Chiari; and the autobiographical "Memorie della sua vita". This last rather entertaining document was called forth by the strictures put upon him by a rival, Pietro Antonio Gratarol, whom he had previously forced from Venice by the ridicule which he had brought upon him in a comedy, the "Droghe d'amore". The "Memorie" have been translated into English by J. A. Symonds (London, 1890). The "Fiabe" have been edited by E. Masi (Bologna, 1885), with a bibliography of all Gozzi's writings, while his other works may be found in the edition published at Venice in 1802.

MAGRINI, *I tempi, la vita e gli scritti di Carlo Gozzi* (Benevento, 1883).

J. D. M. FORD.

**Gozzoli (BENOZZO DI LESE DI SANDRO, surnamed GOZZOLI)**, painter; b. at Florence, 1420; d. at Pisa, 1497. He was a pupil of Fra Angelico, and assisted him in his work at Rome and at Orvieto. It was not until 1449 that Benozzo began to work independently. The principal centres of his artistic activity were Montefalco (1450-1452), Florence (1457-1463), San Gimignano (1464-1467), and Pisa (1469-1485). For the church of San Fortunato, near Montefalco in Umbria, he executed many frescoes, among them an Annunciation, a Madonna, and a few altar-pieces; the best-known are the "Glory of St. Fortunatus", and the "Madonna of the Holy Girdle" (now in the Lateran Museum). Fra Angelico's influence pervades all his work; but the pupil's own personal traits are always in evidence. In 1452 we find him at Montefalco decorating the church of St. Francis. The frescoes in the choir are the most noteworthy. The ceiling contains grandiose figures of saints; the end wall, the "Glory of St. Francis"; the side walls, the "Life of the Seraphic Patriarch of Assisi" in twelve scenes. At Florence Piero de' Medici commissioned Benozzo to paint in fresco the chapel of the palace (afterwards known as the Riccardi Palace) which Michelozzo had just built. The altar had already been decorated by a "Nativity" from the hand of Filippo Lippi. On the three principal walls Gozzoli depicted the "Procession of the Magi in quest of the new-born King". This work, which has kept all its original freshness of colouring, is one of the most successful of the Renaissance period, and furnishes a very striking picture of the sumptuous life led in the fifteenth century. All the personages in the caravans are portraits, and include the Medici and their court. Along the sides of its single window are clustered rows of angels so exquisitely graceful in design as to be worthy of Fra Angelico.

In the "city of the beautiful towers" (La città delle belle torri), San Gimignano, Gozzoli painted for the Collegiale a "Martyrdom of St. Sebastian"; along the walls of the choir in San Agostino he set forth St. Augustine's life in a series of seventeen frescoes, which he employed as a means of introducing the world of



MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS AS ONE OF THE MAGI  
BENOZZO GOZZOLI, PALAZZO RICCARDI, FLORENCE






learning in the fifteenth century, just as he made use of the Magi caravan to depict its lavish display and luxury in dress. His principal work is in the Campo Santo at Pisa: on its northern wall he painted twenty-three subjects, twenty-one of which are taken from the Old Testament, beginning with "Noe's discovery (or invention) of wine", and ending with the "Visit of the Queen of Sheba", a wonderful Biblical epic. During his sojourn at Pisa he found time to paint many other subjects; the principal one is the "Glory of St. Thomas Aquinas", now in the Louvre. It was, however, in fresco that Gozzoli won for himself an immortal name among Florentine painters. He had the honour of restoring narrative painting to the place it had won for itself in the fourteenth century. Benozzo was a lover of nature, a skilful landscapist, an adept at representing animal life, and clever in the use of ornament. His lively imagination revels in brilliant costumes and

Among the three fundamental ideas—sin, redemption, and grace—grace plays the part of the means, indispensable and Divinely ordained, to effect the redemption from sin through Christ and to lead men to their eternal destiny in heaven. Before the Council of Trent, the Schoolmen seldom used the term *gratia actualis*, preferring *auxilium speciale*, *motio divina*, and similar designations; nor did they formally distinguish actual grace from sanctifying grace. But, in consequence of modern controversies regarding grace, it has become usual and necessary in theology to draw a sharper distinction between the transient help to act (actual grace) and the permanent state of grace (sanctifying grace). For this reason we adopt this distinction as our principle of division in the following exposition of the Catholic doctrine.

I. ACTUAL GRACE.—It derives its name, *actual*, from the Latin *actualis* (*ad actum*), for it is granted by



PARADISE



PORTRAIT OF HIMSELF



PARADISE

GOZZOLI, DETAILS OF FRESCOS, PALAZZO RICCARDI, FLORENCE

splendid architectural detail. Imperfections due to negligence are occasionally met with in his work, also excess of detail and awkwardness of grouping. These faults arise from the exuberance of his talent and are more than counterbalanced by the wonderful quality of his work. Benozzo remained true to the chaste ideals of his master, yet was able to combine in his work the sincerity, the skill, and the veraciousness of a charming story-teller. Pisan gratitude voted Benozzo a tomb in the "gallery" of the Campo Santo he had so magnificently decorated.

CROWE AND CAVALCASSELLE, *A History of Painting in Italy* (London, 1864-1866), III, 498 sqq.; VASARI, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori*, ed. SANSON (Florence, 1878), III, 45-68; GRUDICI, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (May, 1859); RIO, *De L'Art chrétien* (Paris, 1874), II, 478 sqq.; FAUCON in *L'Art* (1881 and 1883); MUNTZ, *Histoire de l'art pendant la Renaissance* (Paris, 1891), II, 617-628; SUPINO, *Il Campo Santo di Pisa* (Florence, 1896), 191-297; SORTAIS, *Le Maître et l'Élève: Fra Angelico et Benozzo Gozzoli* (Paris, 1906), 155-256.

GASTON SORTAIS.

**Grace** (*gratia*, *Χάρις*), in general, is a supernatural gift of God to intellectual creatures (men, angels) for their eternal salvation, whether the latter be furthered and attained through salutary acts or a state of holiness. Eternal salvation itself consists in heavenly bliss resulting from the intuitive knowledge of the Triune God, who to the one not endowed with grace "inhabited light inaccessible" (I Tim., vi, 16). Christian grace is a fundamental idea of the Christian religion, the pillar on which, by a special ordination of God, the majestic edifice of Christianity rests in its entirety.

VI.—44

God for the performance of salutary acts and is present and disappears with the action itself. Its opposite, therefore, is not *possible* grace, which is without usefulness or importance, but *habitual* grace, which causes a state of holiness, so that the mutual relations between these two kinds of grace are the relations between *action* and *state*, not those between *actuality* and *potentiality*. Later, we shall discuss habitual grace more fully under the name of sanctifying or justifying grace. As to actual grace, we have to examine: (1) its Nature; (2) its Properties. The third, and difficult, question of the relationship between grace and liberty shall be reserved for discussion in the article GRACE, CONTROVERSIES ON.

(1) *Nature of Actual Grace*.—To know the nature of actual grace, we must consider both the comprehension and the extension of the term. Its comprehension is exhibited to us by (a) its definition; its extension, by the complete enumeration of all Divine helps of grace; in other words, by (b) the logical division of the idea, inasmuch as the sum of all the particulars represents, in every science, the logical extent of an idea or term.

(a) The definition of actual grace is based on the idea of grace in general, which, in Biblical, classical, and modern language, admits of a fourfold meaning. In the first place, subjectively, grace signifies good will, benevolence; then, objectively, it designates every favour which proceeds from this benevolence and, consequently, every gratuitous gift (*donum gratuitum*, *beneficium*). In the former (subjective) sense,

the king's *grace* grants life to the criminal condemned to death; in the latter (objective) sense the king distributes *graces* to his lieges. In this connexion *grace* also stands for charm, attractiveness; as when we speak of the three Graces in mythology, or of the *grace* poured forth on the lips of the bridegroom (Ps. xlv, 3), because charm calls forth benevolent love in the giver and prompts him to the bestowal of benefactions. As the recipient of *graces* experiences, on his part, sentiments of gratefulness, and expresses these sentiments in thanks, the word *gratia* (plural of *gratia*) also stands for thanksgiving in the expressions *gratias agere* and *Deo gratias*, which have their counterpart in the English, to say *grace* after meals.

A comparison of these four senses of the word *grace* reveals a clear relationship of analogy among them, since *grace*, in its objective signification of "gratuitous gift" or "favour", occupies a central position around which the other meanings may be logically grouped. For the attractiveness of the recipient as well as the benevolence of the giver is the cause, whereas the expression of thanks which proceeds from the grateful disposition is the effect, of the gratuitous gift of *grace*. This last-mentioned meaning is, consequently, the fundamental one in *grace*. The characteristic idea of a free gift must be taken in the strict sense and exclude merit in every form, be it in the range of commutative justice as, e. g., in sale and purchase, or in that of distributive justice, as is the case in the so-called remunerations and gratuities. Hence St. Paul says: "If by *grace*, it is not now by works: otherwise *grace* is no more *grace*" (Rom., xi, 6).

True, even gratuitous Divine gifts may still fall within the range of mere nature. Thus we petition God, under the guidance of the Church, for mere natural *graces*, as health, favourable weather, deliverance from plague, famine, and war. Now such natural *graces*, which appear simultaneously as due and gratuitous, are by no means a contradiction in themselves. For, first, the whole creation is for mankind a gratuitous gift of the love of God, whom neither justice nor equity compelled to create the world. And secondly, the individual man can, in virtue of his title of creation, lay a rightful claim only to the essential endowments of his nature. Goods granted over and above this class, though belonging to the just demands of human nature in general, have for him the significance of an actual *grace*, or favour, as, for example, eminent talents, robust health, perfect limbs, fortitude. We would have omitted mentioning this so-called "*grace* of creation", had not Pelagius, by emphasizing the gratuitous character of such natural *graces*, succeeded, at the Synod of Diospolis or Lydda (A. D. 415) in deluding the unsuspecting bishops in regard to the dangers of his heresy. The five African bishops, Augustine among them, in their report to Pope Innocent I, rightly called attention to the fact that Pelagius admitted only the *grace* through which we are men, but denied *grace* properly so called, through which we are Christians and children of God. Whenever Scripture and tradition speak simply of *grace*, reference is made to a supernatural *grace* which is opposed to natural *grace* as to its contrary and lies so far beyond all rightful claim and strenuous effort of the creature that it remains positively undue to the already existing nature, because it includes goods of a Divine order, as, e. g., Divine sonship, indwelling of the Spirit, vision of God. Actual *grace* is of this kind, because, as a means, it stands in intrinsic and essential relation to these Divine goods which are the end. As a consequence, the most important element characteristic of its nature must be the supernatural.

As a further determining factor must be added its necessary derivation from the merits of Christ's redemption; for there is the question of Christian *grace*. In the Thomist theory of redemption, which considers not Christ, but the Trinity, as the cause of *grace* in the

angels and in our first parents in Paradise, the addition of this new characteristic appears self-explanatory. As to the Scotists, they derive each and every supernatural *grace* in heaven and on earth solely from the merits of Christ, inasmuch as the God-Man would have appeared on earth even had Adam not sinned. But they, too, are compelled to introduce, in the present dispensation, a distinction between the "*grace* of Christ" and the "*grace* of the Redeemer" for the reason that, in their ideal theory, neither the angels nor the inhabitants of Paradise owe their holiness to the Redeemer. The addition, *ex meritis Christi*, must therefore be included in the notion of actual *grace*. But there are also merely external *graces*, which owe their existence to the merits of Christ's redemption—as the Bible, preaching, the crucifix, the example of Christ. One of these, the hypostatic union, marks even the highest point of all possible *graces*. The Pelagians themselves sought to outdo one another in their encomiums on the excellency of Christ's example and its effectiveness in suggesting pious thoughts and salutary resolutions. They thus endeavoured to avoid the admission of interior *graces* inherent in the soul; for these alone were opposed to Pelagius's proudly virtuous supremacy of the free will (*liberum arbitrium*), the whole strength of which resided within itself. For this reason the Church all the more emphatically proclaimed, and still proclaims, the necessity of interior *grace* for which exterior *graces* are merely a preparation. Yet there are also interior *graces* which do not procure the individual sanctification of the recipient, but the sanctification of others through the recipient. These, by the extension of the generic term to specifically designate a new subdivision, are, by antonomasia, called gratuitously given *graces* (*gratie gratis datae*). To this class belong the extraordinary charismata of the miracle-worker, the prophet, the speaker of tongues, etc. (see I Cor., xii, 4 sqq.), as well as the ordinary powers of the priest and confessor. As the object of these *graces* is, according to their nature, the spread of the kingdom of God on earth and the sanctification of men, their possession in itself does not exclude personal unholiness. The will of God, however, is that personal righteousness and holiness should also distinguish the possessor. With regard to the personal holiness of man, only that interior *grace* is of importance which is interiorly inherent in the soul and renders it holy and pleasing to God. Hence its name, *ingratiating grace* (*gratia gratum faciens*). To this category belongs not only sanctifying, but also actual *grace*.

Taking into account, then, all the elements so far considered, we may define actual *grace* as a *supernatural help of God for salutary acts granted in consideration of the merits of Christ*.—It is called a "*help of God for salutary acts*", because, on the one hand, it differs from permanent sanctifying *grace*, in that it consists only in a passing influence of God on the soul, and, on the other, it is destined only for actions which have a necessary relation to man's eternal salvation. It is further called a "*supernatural help*" so as to exclude from its definition not only all merely natural *graces*, but also, in a special manner, ordinary Divine conservation and concurrence (*concursus generalis divinus*). Finally, the "*merits of Christ*" are named as its meritorious cause because all *graces* granted to fallen man are derived from this one source. It is for this reason that the prayers of the Church either invoke Christ directly or conclude with the words: *Through Jesus Christ Our Lord*.

We have laid down above, as the most important characteristic of the nature of actual (and of every Christian) *grace*, its supernatural character. This was done partly because a deeper insight into its nature may be gained from the analysis of this element. As pure nature is in itself completely incapable of performing salutary acts through its own strength, actual

grace must come to the rescue of its incapacity and supply the deficient powers, without which no supernatural activity is possible. Actual grace thus becomes a special causal principle which communicates to impotent nature moral, and especially physical, powers.

Grace, as a moral cause, presupposes the existence of obstacles which render the work of salvation so difficult that their removal is morally impossible without special Divine help. Grace must be brought into operation as healing grace (*gratia sanans, medicinalis*); free will, bent towards the earth and weakened by concupiscence, is yet filled with love of good and horror of evil. The consciousness of the necessity of this moral influence may become so perfect that we beg of God the grace of a violent victory over our evil nature; witness the celebrated prayer of the Church: "Ad te nostras, etiam rebelles, compelle propitius voluntates" (Vouchsafe to compel our wills to Thee, albeit they resist). In the ordinary course of things the Divine inspiration of joy in virtue and aversion from sin will, no doubt, methodically lead to the free performance of salutary acts; but the moral influence of grace can effect the temporary control of freedom in the sinner. The sudden conversion of the Apostle Paul is an illustration of this. It will be readily understood that the above-mentioned triumph over the obstacles to salvation demands in itself a grace which is natural only in substance, but supernatural in mode. Hence many theologians require even for the so-called state of pure nature (which never existed) such natural graces as are mere remedies against the *fomes peccati* of natural concupiscence. The end of supernatural bliss and the consequently necessary endowment with supernatural means of grace would not have existed in this state (*status nature pure*), but the disastrous results of an evil tendency unbridled would have been experienced to the same extent as after the fall.

More important than the moral causality of grace is its physical causality, for man must also receive from God the physical power to perform salutary works. Without it, activity in the order of salvation is not only more difficult and laborious, it is altogether impossible. The feet of a child, to draw a comparison from actual life, may be so weak that a mere moral influence, such as the holding out of a beautiful toy, will not suffice to enable it to walk without the physical support of the mother—the use of the leading-strings. The latter situation is the one in which man is placed with regard to supernatural activity.

From the question which is to be discussed later, and which regards the metaphysical necessity of grace for all salutary acts, whether of an easy or difficult nature, it follows, with irresistible logic, that the incapacity of nature cannot be ascribed solely to a mere weakened condition and moral difficulties resulting from sin, but that it must be attributed also, and principally, to physical inability. The communication of the physical power to the soul admits, theologically, of only one interpretation, namely, that grace raises the faculties of the soul (intellect and will) above their natural constitution into a supernatural sphere of being, and thus renders them capable of substantially supernatural operations. The reason why, through our inner consciousness, we can gain no psychological knowledge of this higher activity of the soul lies in the fact that our self-consciousness extends solely to the acts, and in no wise to the substance, of the soul. From this same fact arises the philosophical necessity of proving the spirituality, the immortality, and the very existence of the human soul from the characteristic nature of its activity. Inexorable theological logic postulates the supernatural nature of the acts tending towards our salvation, because theological faith, for example, "the beginning, foundation, and source of all justification", must certainly be of the same supernatural order as the intuitive vision of God

to which it ultimately leads. The necessity of the physical causality of grace, as is readily seen, is nowise dependent on the existence of concupiscence, but remains just as imperative for our first parents in their state of innocence and for the angels subject to no evil tendency. Actual grace, therefore, considered under this aspect, bears the name of "elevating grace" (*gratia elevans*), though not in a sense which would exclude from it the possibility of simultaneously fulfilling the moral function of healing grace in the present state of man. It is only after these considerations that the comprehension of the nature of actual grace in all its relations becomes possible, that we may say, with Perrone: Actual grace is that unmerited interior assistance which God, in virtue of the merits of Christ, confers upon fallen man in order to strengthen, on the one hand, his infirmity resulting from sin and, on the other, to render him capable, by elevation to the supernatural order, of supernatural acts of the soul, so that he may attain justification, persevere in it to the end, and thus enter into everlasting life.

(b) The Logical Division of actual grace should enumerate all the kinds to which the definition is universally applicable. If we adopt the different faculties of the soul as our principle of division, we shall have three kinds: graces of the intellect, of the will, and of the sensitive faculties. With regard to the consent of the will we distinguish two pairs of graces: first, preventing and co-operating; then efficacious and merely sufficient grace. It must be immediately shown that all these graces are no arbitrarily invented entities, but actually existing realities.

(c) Graces of the Different Faculties of the Soul.—The illuminating grace of the intellect (*gratia illuminationis, illustrationis*) first presents itself for consideration. It is that grace which in the work of salvation suggests good thoughts to the intellect. This may happen in a twofold manner, either mediately or immediately. The existence of mediate graces of the mind is not only vouched for a priori by the presence of merely external graces, as when a stirring sermon or the sight of the crucifix forces the sinner to earnest reflection; it is also explicitly attested by Holy Writ, where the "commandment of the Lord" is represented as "enlightening the eyes" (Ps. xviii, 9), and the external example of Christ as a model for our imitation (I Pet., ii, 21). But, as this mediate grace need neither interrupt the psychological course of the law governing the association of ideas nor be of a strictly supernatural nature, its sole object will be to prepare unostentatiously the way for a grace of greater importance and necessity, immediate illuminating grace. In the latter, the Holy Ghost Himself through immediate elevation and penetration of the powers of the mind prompts the soul and manifests to it in a supernatural light the eternal truths of salvation. Though our sacred discourses be perfect masterpieces of eloquence, though our picture of the wounds of the crucified Saviour be ever so vivid and realistic, they alone can never be the first step towards the conversion of a sinner, except when God by a vigorous impulse stirs the heart and, according to an expression of St. Fulgentius (Ep. xvii, De incarn. et grat., n. 67), "opens the ear of the interior man". St. Paul acknowledges, also, that the faith which his own preaching and that of his disciple Apollo had sown in Corinth, and which, under their "planting and watering" (mediate grace of preaching), had taken root, would have miserably perished, had not God himself given "the increase". (See I Cor., iii, 6: "Ego plantavi, Apollo rigavit, sed Deus incrementum dedit.") Among the Fathers of the Church none has more strongly emphasized the fruitlessness of preaching without interior illumination than the Doctor of Grace, Augustine, who says among other things: "Magisteria forinsecus adiutoria quedam sunt et admonitiones; cathedram in cœlo habet qui corda tenet" ("Instruction

and admonition help somewhat externally, but he who reaches the heart has a place in heaven"—(Tract. III, 13, in I Joh.). The more speculative question may now be asked: Whether the mediate and immediate grace of the mind affects the idea, the judgment, or the reasoning. There can be no doubt that it primarily influences the judgment (*judicium*), be the latter theoretical (e. g. on the credibility of revelation) or practical (e. g. regarding the hideous character of sin). But the reasoning process and the idea (*apprehensio*) may also become a grace of the mind, firstly, because they both belong to the essence of human knowledge, and grace always operates in a manner conformable to nature; secondly, because ideas are in final analysis but the result and fruit of condensed judgments and reasonings.

Besides the grace of the mind, the strengthening grace of the will (generally called *gratia inspirationis*) plays not only the most important, but an indispensable, part, for no works of salvation are even thinkable without operations of the will. It may also be either mediate or immediate, according as the pious affections and wholesome resolutions are awakened in the soul by the immediately preceding illumination of the mind or by God Himself (by appropriation the Holy Ghost). Owing to the psychological interpenetration of cognition and volition, every (mediate or immediate) grace of the mind is in itself also a grace affecting the will. This twofold action—on intellect and will—has therefore the significance of two different acts of the soul, but of only one grace. Consequently, immediate elevation and motion of the will by the Holy Spirit can alone be considered a new grace. The Pelagians logically denied the existence especially of this grace, even if, according to the improbable opinion of some historians of dogma, they were forced by Augustine in the course of the debate to admit at least the immediate grace of the mind. Augustine threw in the whole weight of his personality in favour of the existence and necessity of the grace of the will, to which he applied the names, *delectatio celestis*, *inspiratio dilectionis*, *cupiditas boni*, and the like. The celebrated Provincial Council of Carthage (A. D. 418) confirmed his teaching when it declared that grace does not simply consist in the manifestation of the Divine precepts whereby we may know our positive and negative duties, but it also confers upon us the power to love and accomplish whatever we have recognized as righteous in things pertaining to salvation (cf. Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 10th ed., n. 104, Freiburg, 1908). The Church has never shared the ethical optimism of Socrates, which made virtue consist in mere knowledge, and held that mere teaching was sufficient to inculcate it. If even natural virtue must be fought for, and is acquired only through energetic work and constant practice, how much more does not a supernatural life of virtue require the Divine help of grace with which the Christian must freely co-operate, and thus advance by slow degrees in perfection. The strengthening grace of the will, like the grace of the mind, assumes the form of vital acts of the soul and manifests itself chiefly in what are called affections of the will. Scholastic psychology enumerates eleven such affections, namely: love and hatred, delight and sadness, desire and aversion, hope and despair, daring and fear, finally, anger. This whole list of feelings has, with the sole exception of despair, which imperils the work of salvation, a practical significance in relation to good and evil; these affections may therefore develop into real graces of the will. But, inasmuch as all motions of the will may be ultimately reduced to love as fundamental feeling (cf. St. Thomas, "Summa", I-II, Q. xxv, a. 2), the functions of the grace of the will may be systematically focussed in love; hence the concise declaration of the above-mentioned Synod of Carthage (l. c.): "Cum sit utrumque donum Dei, et scire quid

facere debeamus et diligere ut faciamus" (Since both are gifts of God—the knowing what we ought to do, and the desire to do it). But care must be taken not to understand immediately, by this "love", perfect love of God, which comes only at the end of the process of justification as the crowning-stone of the edifice, even though Augustine (De Trinit., VIII, 10, and frequently) honours with the name *caritas* the mere love for good and any good motion of the will whatsoever. Berti (De theol. discipl., XIV, 7), therefore, is wrong when he asserts that, according to Augustine, the only grace properly so called is the theological virtue of charity. Are faith, hope, contrition, fear, only graces improperly so called, or do they become graces in the true sense only in connexion with charity?

It cannot be determined with certainty of faith whether to the graces of mind and will so far spoken of should be added special actual graces affecting the sensitive faculties of the soul. But their existence may be asserted with great probability. For if, according to an appropriate remark of Aristotle (De animâ, I, viii), it is true that thinking is impossible without imagination, supernatural thought also must find its originator and point of support in a corresponding phantasm to which, like the ivy on the wall, it clings and thus creeps upward. At any rate, the harmonious agreement of the grace of the intellect with the accompanying phantasm can but be of favourable influence on the soul visited by grace. It is likewise clear that in the rebellious motions of concupiscence, which reside in the sensitive faculties, the grace of the will has a dangerous enemy which must be overcome by the infusion of contrary dispositions, as aversion from sin, before the will is aroused to make firm resolutions. Paul, consequently, thrice besought the Lord that the sting of the flesh might depart from him, but was answered: "Sufficit tibi gratia mea" (II Cor., xii, 9).

(β) Graces regarding Free Will.—If we take the attitude of free will as the dividing principle of actual grace, we must first have a grace which precedes the free determination of the will and another which follows this determination and co-operates with the will. This is the first pair of graces, preventing and co-operating grace (*gratia præveniens et cooperans*). Preventing grace must, according to its physical nature, consist in unfree, indeliberate vital acts of the soul; co-operating grace, on the contrary, solely in free, deliberate actions of the will. The latter assume the character of actual graces, not only because they are immediately suggested by God, but also because they may become, after the achievement of success, the principle of new salutary acts. In this manner an intense act of perfect love of God may simultaneously effect and, as it were, assure by itself the observance of the Divine commandments. The existence of preventing grace, officially determined by the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. v), must be admitted with the same certainty as the facts that the illuminating grace of the intellect belongs to a faculty not free in itself and that the grace of the will must first and foremost exhibit itself in spontaneous, indeliberate, unfree emotions. This is proved by the Biblical metaphors of the reluctant hearing of the voice of God (Jer., xvii, 23; Ps. xciv, 8), of the drawing by the Father (John, vi, 44), of the knocking at the gate (Apoc., iii, 20). The Fathers of the Church bear witness to the reality of preventing grace in their very appropriate formula: "Gratia est in nobis, sed sine nobis", that is, grace as a vital act is in the soul, but as an unfree, salutary act it does not proceed from the soul, but immediately from God. Thus Augustine (De grat. et lib. arbit., xvii, 33), Gregory the Great (Moral., XVI, x), Bernard of Clairvaux (De grat. et lib. arbit., xiv), and others. As the unfree emotions of the will are by their very nature destined to elicit free salutary acts, it is clear that preventing grace must develop into helping or



co-operating grace as soon as free will gives its consent. These free salutary acts are, according to the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. xvi), not only actual graces, but also meritorious actions (*actus meritorii*). There is just as little doubt possible regarding their existence as concerning the fact that many men freely follow the call of grace, work out their eternal salvation, and attain the beatific vision, so that the dogma of the Christian heaven proves simultaneously the reality of co-operating graces. Their principal advocate is Augustine (*De grat. et lib. arbitr.*, xvi, 32). If the more philosophical question of the co-operation of grace and liberty be raised, it will be easily perceived that the supernatural element of the free salutary act can be only from God, its vitality only from the will. The postulated unity of the action of the will could evidently not be safeguarded, if God and the will performed either two separate acts or mere halves of an act. It can exist only when the supernatural power of grace transforms itself into the vital strength of the will, constitutes the latter as a free faculty *in actu primo* by elevation to the supernatural order, and simultaneously co-operates as supernatural Divine concurrence in the performance of the real salutary act or *actus secundus*. This co-operation is not unlike that of God with the creature in the natural order, in which both perform together one and the same act, God as first cause (*causa prima*), the creature as secondary cause (*causa secunda*). For further particulars see St. Thomas, "Contra Gent.", III, lxx.

A second pair of graces important for the understanding of the controversies on grace is that of efficacious and merely sufficient grace (*gratia efficax et mere sufficiens*). By efficacious grace is understood that Divine assistance which, considered even *in actu primo*, includes with infallible certainty, and consequently in its definition, the free salutary act; for did it remain inefficacious, it would cease to be efficacious and would therefore be self-contradictory. As to whether the infallibility of its success is the result of the physical nature of this grace or of the infallible foreknowledge of God (*scientia media*) is a much debated question between Thomists and Molinists which need not be further treated here. Its existence, however, is admitted as an article of faith by both sides and is established with the same firmness as the predestination of the elect or the existence of a heaven peopled with innumerable saints. As to "merely sufficient grace", Calvinists and Jansenists have, as is well known, eliminated it from their doctrinal system. They admitted only efficacious graces whose action overpowers the will and leaves no room for freedom. If Jansen (d. 1638) nominally admitted "sufficient grace", calling it "little grace" (*gratia parva*), he understood by it, in reality, only "insufficient grace", i. e. "one from which no action can result, except its insufficiency be removed by another grace" (*De grat. Christ.*, IV, x). He did not shrink from reviling sufficient grace, understood in the Catholic sense, as a monstrous conception and a means of filling hell with reprobates, while later Jansenists discovered in it such a pernicious character as to infer the appropriateness of the prayer: "A gratiâ sufficiente, libera nos Domine" ("From sufficient grace, O Lord deliver us").—Cf. prop. 6 damn. ab Alex. VIII, a. 1690 in Denzinger, n. 1296). The Catholic idea of sufficient grace is obtained by the distinction of a twofold element in every actual grace, its intrinsic energy (*potestas agendi, vis*) and its extrinsic efficiency (*efficientia*). Under the former aspect there exists between sufficient and efficacious grace, both considered *in actu primo*, no real, but only a logical, distinction; for sufficient grace also confers full power for action, but is condemned to unfruitfulness owing to the free resistance of the will. If, on the contrary, extrinsic efficiency be considered, it is evident that the will either co-operates freely or not. If it refuses its co-operation, even the strongest grace re-

mains a merely sufficient one (*gratia mere sufficiens*), although by nature it would have been completely sufficient (*gratia vere sufficiens*) and with good will could have been efficacious. This ecclesiastical conception of the nature of sufficient grace, to which the Catholic systems of grace must invariably conform themselves, is nothing else but a reproduction of the teaching of the Bible. To cite only one text (Prov., i, 24), the calling and the stretching-out of the hand of God certainly signifies the complete sufficiency of grace, just as the obstinate refusal of the sinner "to regard" is tantamount to the free rejection of the proffered hand. Augustine is in complete agreement with the constant tradition on this point, and Jansenists have vainly claimed him as one of their own. We have an example of his teaching in the following text: "*Gratia Dei est quæ hominum adjuvat voluntates; quâ ut non adjuventur, in ipsis itidem causa est, non in Deo*" ("It is the grace of God that helps the wills of men; and when they are not helped by it, the reason is in themselves, not in God.")—"De pecc. mer. et rem.", II, xvii). On the Greek Fathers see Isaac Habert, *Theologia Græcor. Patrum*, II, 6 sq. (Paris, 1646).

(2) *Properties of Actual Grace*.—After the treatment of the nature of actual grace, we come logically to the discussion of its properties. These are three in number: necessity, gratuity, and universality.

(a) Necessity.—With the early Protestants and Jansenists, the necessity of actual grace may be so exaggerated as to lead to the assertion of the absolute and complete incapacity of mere nature to do good; or, with the Pelagians and Semipelagians, it may be so understood as to extend the capacity of nature to each and every thing, even to supernatural activity, or at least to its essential elements. The three heresies of early Protestantism and Jansenism, Pelagianism, and Semipelagianism furnish us with the practical division which we adopt for the systematic exposition of the Catholic doctrine.

(a) We maintain against Early Protestantism and Jansenism the capacity of mere nature in regard to both religious knowledge and moral action. Fundamental for natural religion and ethics is the article of faith which asserts the power of mere reason to derive a certain natural knowledge of God from creation (Vatican, Sess. III, de revelat., can. i). This is a central truth which is most clearly attested by Scripture (Wisdom, xiii, 1 sqq.; Rom., i, 20 sq.; ii, 14 sq.) and tradition (see God). Unswervingly adhering to this position, the Church has ever exhibited herself as a mighty defender of reason and its inherent powers against the ravages of scepticism so subversive of all truth. Through the whole course of centuries she has steadfastly clung to the unalterable conviction that a faculty of perception constituted for vision, like human reason, cannot possibly be condemned to blindness, and that its natural powers enable it to know, even in the fallen state, whatever is within its legitimate sphere. On the other hand, the Church also erected against presumptuous Rationalism and Theosophism a bulwark for the defence of knowledge by faith, a knowledge superior to, and different in principle from, rational knowledge. With Clement of Alexandria she drew a sharp distinction between *γνῶσις* and *πίστις*—knowledge and faith, philosophy and revelation, assigning to reason the double rôle of indispensable forerunner and docile handmaid (cf. Vatican, Sess. III, cap. iv). This noble struggle of the Church for the rights of reason and its true relation to faith explains historically her decidedly hostile attitude towards the scepticism of Nicholas de Ulricuria (A. D. 1348), towards the Renaissance philosophy of Pomponatius (1513) defending a "twofold truth", towards the so-called "log-stick-and-stone" theory (*Klotz-Stock-und-Steintheorie*) of Martin Luther and his followers, so inimical to reason, towards the doctrine of the complete powerlessness of nature without

grace defended by Baius and Jansen, towards the system of Hermes impregnated with Kantian criticism, towards traditionalism, which based all moral and religious knowledge on the authority of language and instruction, finally, against the modern Agnosticism of the Modernists, which undermines the very foundations of faith, and which was only recently dealt so fatal a blow by Pope Pius X's condemnation. Documentary evidence has thus been produced that the Catholic Church far from being an "institution of obscurantism", has at all times fulfilled a powerful and far-reaching mission of civilization, since she took reason and science under her powerful patronage and defended their rights against those very oppressors of reason who are accustomed to bring against her the groundless charge of intellectual inferiority. A sound intellectualism is just as indispensable a condition of her life as the doctrine of a supernatural order raised above all the limits of nature. (Cf. Chastel, "De la valeur de la raison humaine", Paris, 1854.)

Not less reasonable an attitude was assumed by the Church respecting the moral capabilities of fallen man in the domain of natural ethics. Against Baianism, the forerunner of Jansenism, she adhered in her teaching to the conviction confirmed by healthy experience, that natural man is capable of performing some naturally good works without actual grace, and particularly without the grace of faith, and that not all the deeds of infidels and pagans are sins. This is evidenced by the condemnation of two propositions of Baius by Pope Pius V in the year 1567: "Liberum arbitrium sine gratia Dei adiutorio non nisi ad peccandum valet" ("Free will without the aid of God's grace avails for nothing but sin."—Prop. xxvii); and again: "Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata et philosophorum virtutes sunt vitia" ("All the acts of infidels are sins, and their virtues are vices."—Prop. 25). The history of paganism and everyday experience condemn, moreover, with equal emphasis these extravagant exaggerations of Baius. Among the duties of the natural moral law some—as love for parents or children, abstention from theft and drunkenness—are of such an elementary character that it is impossible to perceive why they could not be fulfilled without grace and faith at least by judicious, cultured, and noble-minded pagans. Did not the Saviour himself recognize as something good natural human love and fraternal greeting, such as they exist also among publicans and pagans? He denied to them only a supernatural reward (*mercedem*, Matt., v, 46 sq.). And Paul has explicitly stated that "the Gentiles, who have not the [Mosaic] law, do by nature [*naturaliter, phōra*] those things that are of the law" (Rom., ii, 14). The Fathers of the Church did not judge differently. Baius, it is true, adduced Augustine as his chief witness, and in the latter's writings we find, to be sure, sentences which seem to favour him. Baius, however, overlooked the fact that the former rhetorician and Platonic idealist of Hippo does not always weigh every word as carefully as the wary Schoolman, Thomas Aquinas, but consciously delights (cf. Enarr. in Ps. xvi, n. 19) in antinomistically applying to the genus the designation which belongs only to the highest species. As he calls the least good motion of the will *caritas*, by anticipation, so he brands every unmeritorious work (*opus steriliter bonum*) as sin (*peccatum*) and false virtue (*falsa virtus*). In both cases it is an obvious use of the rhetorical figure called catachresis. With a strong perception for the ethically good, wherever it may be found, he eulogizes elsewhere the chastity of his heathen friend Alypius (Confess., VI, x) and of the pagan Polemo (Ep. cxi, 2), admires the civil virtues of the Romans, the masters of the world (Ep. cxxxviii, 3), and gives expression to the truth that even the most wicked man is not found completely wanting in naturally good works ("De Spiritu et litera", c. xxviii.—Cf. Ripalda, "De Ente superna-

turali", tom. III: "Adversus Baium et Baianos", Cologne, 1648; J. Ernst, "Werke und Tugenden der Unglaublichen nach Augustinus", Freiburg, 1871).

The ethical capacity of pure, and especially of fallen, nature has undoubtedly also its determined limits which it cannot overstep. In a general manner, the possibility of the observance of the easier natural precepts without the aid of natural or supernatural grace may be asserted, but not the possibility of the observance of the more difficult commandments and prohibitions of the natural law. The difficulty of determining where the easy ends and the difficult begins will naturally lead, in some secondary questions, to great diversity of opinion among theologians. In fundamental points, however, harmony is easily obtainable and exists in fact. In the first place, all without exception are agreed on the proposition that fallen man cannot of his own strength observe the natural law in its entirety and for a long time without occasional errors and lapses into grievous sin. And how could he? For, according to the council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. xiii), even the already justified man will be victorious in the "conflict with the flesh, the world, and the devil" only on condition that he co-operate with never-failing grace (cf. Rom., vii, 22 sqq.). Secondly, all theologians admit that the natural will, unaided by Divine assistance, succumbs, especially in the fallen state, with moral (not physical) necessity to the attack of vehement and enduring temptations against the Decalogue. For could it by its own strength decide the conflict in its own favour even at the most critical moments, that power which we have just eliminated would be restored to it, namely the power to observe unaided, through the prompt victory over vehement temptations, the whole natural law in all its extent. The practical significance of this second universally admitted proposition lies in the acknowledgment that, according to revelation, there is no man on earth who does not occasionally meet with this or that grievous temptation to mortal sin, and even the justified are no exception to this law; wherefore, even they are bound to constant vigilance in fear and trembling and to never-ceasing prayer for Divine assistance (cf. Council of Trent, l. c.). In the third question, whether natural love of God, even in its highest form (*amor Dei naturalis perfectus*), is possible without grace, the opinions of theologians are still very divergent. Bellarmine denies this possibility on the ground that, without any grace, a mere natural justification could in such a case be brought into being through the love of God. Scotus, on the contrary, spiritedly defends the attainability of the highest natural love for God. A golden middle course will easily open to the one who accurately distinguishes between affective and effective love. The affective element of the highest love is, as natural duty, accessible to the mere natural will without grace. Effective love, on the contrary, since it supposes an unchanging, systematic, and active will, would entail the above-discarded possibility of triumphing over all temptations and of observing the whole moral law. (For further details on these interesting problems, see Pohle, "Lehrbuch der Dogmatik", 4th ed., II, 364–70, Paderborn, 1909.)

According to Jansenism, the mere absence of the state of grace and love (*status gratiae et caritatis*) branded as sins all the deeds of the sinner, even the ethically good ones (e. g., almsgiving). This was the lowest ebb in its disparagement and depreciation of the moral forces in man; and here, too, Baius had paved the way. The possession of sanctifying grace or theological love thus became the measure and criterion of natural morality. Taking as his basis the total corruption of nature through original sin (i. e. concupiscence) as taught by early Protestantism, Quesnel, especially (Prop. xlii in Denzinger, n. 1394), gave the above-expressed thought the alleged Augustinian form that there is no medium between love of

God and love of the world, charity and concupiscence, so that even the prayers of the impious are nothing else but sins. (Cfr. Prop. xlix: "Oratio impiorum est novum peccatum et quod Deus illis concedit, est novum in eos iudicium"). The answer of the Church to such severe exaggerations was the dogmatic Bull, "Unigenitus" (1713), of Pope Clement XI. The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, can. vii) had however already decreed against Martin Luther: "Si quis dixerit, opera omnia quæ ante justificationem fiunt . . . vere esse peccata . . . anathema sit" (If anyone shall say that all the works done before justification are indeed sins, let him be anathema). Moreover, what reasonable man would concede that the process of justification with its so-called dispositions consists in a long series of sins? And if the Bible, in order to effect the conversion of the sinner, frequently summons him to contrition and penance, to prayer and almsdeeds, shall we admit the blasphemy that the Most Holy summons him to the commission of so many sins?—The Catholic doctrine on this point, obstinately adhered to through all the centuries, is so clear that even an Augustine could not have departed from it without becoming a public heretic. True, Baius and Quesnel succeeded in cleverly concealing their heresy in a phraseology similar to the Augustinian, but without penetrating the meaning of Augustine. The latter, it must be conceded, in the course of the struggle with self-confident Pelagianism, ultimately so strongly emphasized the opposition between grace and sin, love of God and love of the world, that the intermediary domain of naturally good works almost completely disappeared. But Scholasticism had long since applied the necessary correction to this exaggeration. That the sinner, in consequence of his habitual state of sin, must sin in everything, is not the doctrine of Augustine. The universality of sin in the world which he contemplated, is not for him the result of a fundamental necessity, but merely the manifestation of a general historical phenomenon which admits of exceptions (De spir. et lit., c. xxvii, n. 48). He specifically declares marital love, love of children and friends to be something lawful in all men, something commendable, natural and dutiful, even though Divine love alone leads to heaven. He admits the possibility of these natural virtues also in the impious: "Sed videtis, istam caritatem esse posse et impiorum, i. e. paganorum, Judæorum, hæreticorum" (Serm. cccxlix de temp. in Migne, P.L., XXXIX, 1529).

(8) Pelagianism, which still survives under new forms, fell into the extreme directly opposed to the theories rejected above. It exaggerated the capacity of human nature to an incredible degree, and hardly left any room for Christian grace. It amounted to nothing less than the divinization of the moral forces of free will. Even when it was question of acts tending to supernatural salvation, natural will was declared able to rise by its own strength from justification to eternal life. Rank naturalism in its essence, Pelagianism contained, as a logical consequence, the suppression of original sin and the negation of grace. It laid down the proud assertion that the sovereign will may ultimately raise itself to complete holiness and impeccability (*impeccantia, ἀναμάρτησία*) through the persevering observance of all the precepts, even the most difficult, and through the infallible triumph over every temptation, even the most vehement. This was an unmistakable reproduction of the ancient Stoic ideal of virtue. For the self-confident Pelagian, the petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Lead us not into temptation", served, properly speaking, no purpose: it was at most a proof of his humility, not a profession of the truth. In no other part of the system is the vanity of the Christian Diogenes so glaringly perceptible through the lacerated cloak of the philosopher. Hence the Provincial Synod of Carthage (418) insisted on the true doctrine on this very point (see

Denzinger, nn. 106–8) and emphasized the absolute necessity of grace for all salutary acts. True, Pelagius (d. 405) and his disciple Coelestius, who found an active associate in the skilful and learned Bishop Julian of Eclanum, admitted from the beginning the improper creative grace, later also a merely external supernatural grace, such as the Bible and the example of Christ. But the heresiarch rejected with all the more obstinacy the inner grace of the Holy Ghost, especially for the will. The object of grace was, at the most, to facilitate the work of salvation, in no wise to make it fundamentally possible. Never before had a heretic dared to lay the axe so unsparingly to the deepest roots of Christianity. And never again did it occur in ecclesiastical history that one man alone, with the weapons of the mind and ecclesiastical science, overthrew and annihilated in one generation an equally dangerous heresy. This man was Augustine. In the short period between A. D. 411 and A. D. 413 no fewer than twenty-four synods were held which considered the heresy of Pelagius. But the death-blow was dealt as early as 416 at Mileve, where fifty-nine bishops, under the leadership of St. Augustine, laid down the fundamental canons which were subsequently (418) repeated at Carthage and received, after the celebrated "Tractoria" of Pope Zosimus (418), the value of definitions of faith. It was there that the absolute necessity of grace for salvation triumphed over the Pelagian idea of its mere utility, and the absolute incapacity of nature over supreme self-sufficiency. When Augustine died, in 430, Pelagianism was dead. The decisions of faith issued at Mileve and Carthage were frequently renewed by oecumenical councils, as in 529 at Orange, lastly at Trent (Sess. VI, can. ii).

The beautiful parable of the vine and its branches (John, xv, 1 sqq.) should have been sufficient to reveal to Pelagianism what a striking contrast there was between it and antecedent Christianity. Augustine and the synods time and again used it in the controversy as a very decisive proof out of the mouth of the Saviour Himself. Only when the supernatural vital union of the Apostles with the vine (Christ) planted by the Father is established, does it become possible to bring forth supernatural fruit; for "without me you can do nothing" (John, xv, 5). The categorical assertion of the necessity of grace for the holy Apostles themselves brings home to us still more forcibly the absolute incapacity of mere fallen nature in the performance of salutary acts. All supernatural activity may be concretely summed up in the three following elements: salutary thoughts, holy resolves, good actions. Now the Apostle Paul teaches that right thinking is from God (II Cor., iii, 5), that the righteous will must be based on Divine mercy (Rom., ix, 16), finally that it is God who works in us, "both to will and to accomplish" (Phil., ii, 13). The victorious struggle of St. Augustine, which earned for him the honourable title of "Doctor of Grace", was merely a struggle for the ancient Catholic truth. Pelagianism was immediately felt in the Christian community as a thorn in the flesh and as the poison of novelty. Before all the world Augustine could attest: "Talis est hæresis pelagiana, non antiqua, sed ante non multum tempus exorta" (Such is the Pelagian heresy, not ancient, but having sprung up a short time ago.—De grat., et lib. arbit., c. iv). In fact, the teaching of the most ancient Fathers of the Church, e. g. Irenæus (Adv. hæ., III, xvii, 2), did not differ from that of Augustine, although it was less vigorous and explicit. The constant practice of prayer in the ancient Church pointed significantly to her lively faith in the necessity of grace, for prayer and grace are correlative ideas, which cannot be separated. Hence the celebrated axiom of Pope Celestine I (d. 432): "Ut legem credendi statuat lex supplicandi" ("That the law of prayer may determine the law of belief").—See Den-

zinger, n. 139). It is clearly evident that the Fathers of the Church wished the universally expressed necessity of grace to be understood not merely as a moral necessity for the strengthening of human weakness, but as a metaphysical one for the communication of physical powers. For in their comparisons they state that grace is not less necessary than are wings for flying, the eyes for seeing, the rain for the growth of plants, etc. In accordance with this, they also declare that, in as far as supernatural activity is concerned, grace is just as indispensable for the angels not subject to concupiscence, and was for man before the fall, as it is for man after the sin of Adam.

There is need of special refutation of Pelagius's presumptuous contention that man is capable of avoiding unaided during his whole lifetime all sins; nay, that he can even rise to impeccability. The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, can. xxiii), with much more precision than the Synod of Mileve (416), answered this monstrosity with the definition of faith: "Si quis hominem semel justificatum dixerit . . . posse in tota vitâ peccata omnia etiam venialia vitare, nisi ex speciali Dei privilegio, quemadmodum de beatâ Virgine tenet ecclesia, anathema sit" (If anyone shall say that a man once justified . . . can, throughout his life, avoid all sins, even venial, unless by a special privilege of God, as the Church believes of the B1. Virgin Mary, let him be anathema).

This celebrated canon presents some difficulties of thought which must be briefly discussed. In its gist it is an affirmation that not even the justified, much less the sinner and infidel, can avoid all sins, especially venial ones, through his whole life except by special privilege such as was granted to the Mother of God. The canon does not assert that besides Mary other saints, as St. Joseph or St. John the Baptist, possessed this privilege. Almost all theologians rightly consider this to be the sole exception, justified only by the dignity of the Divine maternity. Justice is done to the wording of the canon, if by *tota vitâ* we understand a long period, about a generation, and by *peccata venialia* chiefly the semi-deliberate venial sins due to surprise or precipitancy. It is in no way declared that a great saint is unable to keep free from all sin during a short interval, as the interval of a day; nor that he is incapable of avoiding for a long time with ordinary grace and without special privilege all venial sins committed with full deliberation or complete liberty. The same must be said with still greater reason of mortal sins, although the preservation of baptismal innocence may be of rare occurrence. The expression, *omnia peccata*, must be understood collectively, as applying to the sum, and not distributively, as meaning each individual sin, which would no longer be a sin if it could not be avoided in every instance. For the same reason the words, *non posse*, designate not a physical, but a moral impossibility of avoiding sin, i. e. a difficulty based on insuperable obstacles which only a special privilege could suppress. The meaning is, therefore: The observer of a long series of temptations in the life of a just man will find that at some time or other, to-day or to-morrow, the will held captive by concupiscence will succumb with moral necessity. This may be due to negligence, surprise, weariness, or moral weakness—all of which are factors that do not completely destroy the freedom of the will and thus admit at least of a venial sin. This hard truth must naturally grieve a proud heart. But it is precisely to curb pride, that most dangerous enemy of our salvation, and to nourish in us the precious virtue of humility, that God permits these falls into sin. Nothing incites us more powerfully to vigilance and perseverance in prayer than the consciousness of our sinfulness and infirmity. Even the greatest saint must, therefore, pray daily not out of hypocrisy or self-deception, but out of an intimate knowledge of his heart: "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our

debtors" (Matt., vi, 12). A holy Apostle had to acknowledge of himself and his intimate friends: "In many things we all offend" (James, iii, 2). Boldly could the hagiographer in the Old Testament raise the question not difficult of answer: "Who can say: My heart is clean, I am pure from sin?" (Proverbs, xx, 9). This view, defended by the Bible, was also the constant sentiment of the Fathers of the Church, to whom the proud language of the Pelagians was unknown. To the latter's consideration Augustine (De nat. et grat., xxxvi) presents the impressive thoughts: "Could we bring together here in living form all the saints of both sexes and question them whether they were without sin, would they not exclaim unanimously: 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us'?" (I John, i, 8.)

(γ) Semipelagianism is an unsuccessful attempt to effect a compromise between Pelagianism and Augustinism, attributing to mere nature and its capabilities a somewhat greater importance in matters pertaining to salvation than Augustine was willing to concede. Several pious monks of Marseilles (hence also the name of "Massilians"), John Cassian (d. 432) at their head, held (about A. D. 428) the following opinion of the relationship between nature and grace: (1) A distinction must be established between "the beginning of faith" (*initium fidei*) and "increase in the faith" (*augmentum fidei*); the former may be referred to the natural power of free will, while increase in the faith and faith itself can only be the work of Christian grace. (2) Nature can merit grace through its own efforts, but this natural merit (*meritum naturæ*) is only founded in equity, it does not confer, as Pelagius contended, a right in strict justice. (3) "Final perseverance" (*donum perseverantiæ*) specifically can be secured by the justified with their own strength, and is therefore not a special grace. (4) The bestowal or denial of baptismal grace in children is dependent on their conditional future merits or demerits, which the Omniscience of God foresaw not historically, but hypothetically from eternity.—Although this last proposition is philosophically false, the Church has never condemned it as heretical; the first three theses, on the contrary, have been rejected as opposed to Catholic teaching.

Informed by his disciples, Prosper and Hilary, of events at Marseilles, Augustine energetically set to work, in spite of his advanced age, and wrote his two books against the Semipelagians: "De Prædestinatione sanctorum" and "De dono perseverantiæ". Simultaneously he humbly acknowledged that he had the misfortune of having professed similar errors previously to his episcopal consecration (A. D. 394). He attacked resolutely, though with mildness and moderation, all the positions of his adversaries, rightly looking upon their attitude as a relapse into the already defeated Pelagianism. After Augustine's death, his disciples resumed the struggle. They succeeded in interesting in their cause Pope Celestine I, who, in his dogmatic writing to the bishops of Gaul (431), laid down as a rule of faith the fundamental teaching of St. Augustine on original sin and grace. But as this so-called "Indiculus" was issued more as a papal instruction than as an *ex cathedrâ* definition, the controversy still continued for almost a century, until St. Cæsarius of Arles convoked the Second Synod of Orange (A. D. 529). This synod received the solemn confirmation of Pope Boniface II (530) and was thus vested with œcumenical authority. (According to the opinion of Scheeben and Gutberlet this confirmation extended only to the first eight canons and the epilogue.) From now on Semipelagianism, also, was proscribed as heresy, and Augustinism was completely victorious.

In the refutation of Semipelagianism, in so far as the necessity of actual grace is concerned, it will not

be amiss to follow an adult through all the stages on the way to salvation, from the state of unbelief and mortal sin to the state of grace and a happy death. With regard, first, to the period of unbelief, the Second Synod of Orange (can. v) decreed that prevenient grace is absolutely necessary to the infidel not only for faith itself, but also for the very beginning of faith. By the "beginning of faith", it intended to designate all the good aspirations and motions to believe which precede faith properly so called, as early dawn precedes sunrise. Consequently, the whole preparation for the faith is made under the influence of grace, e. g. the instruction of persons to be converted. The accuracy of this view is confirmed by the Bible. According to the assurance of the Saviour, external preaching is useless if the invisible influence of grace (the being drawn by the Father) does not set in to effect the gradual "coming" to Christ (John, vi, 44). Were faith rooted in mere nature, were it based on mere natural inclination to believe or on natural merit, nature could legitimately glory in its own achievement of the work of salvation in its entirety, from faith to justification—nay, to beatific vision itself. And still Paul (I Cor., iv, 7; Eph., ii, 8 sq.) abominates nothing so much as the "glorying" of nature. Although Augustine could substantiate his doctrine by references to the anterior Fathers of the Church, as Cyprian, Ambrose, and Gregory of Nazianzus, he seems to have been embarrassed by the Semipelagian appeal to the Greeks, chiefly Chrysostom. He pleaded the circumstances of the time (De præd. sanctor., c. xiv). In fact, difference of doctrine between the East and the West cannot be denied. With delight could the Semipelagians quote from Chrysostom passages like the following: "We must first select good and then God adds what appertains to his office; he does not act antecedently to our will so as not to destroy our liberty" (Hom. xii in Hebr., n. 3). How must this attitude of the Eastern Church be explained?—To gain a correct notion of the then existing circumstances, it must be remembered that the Greeks had to defend not only grace, but almost more so the freedom of the will. For the anti-Christian systems of Gnosticism, Manichæism, and neo-Platonism—all products of the East—stood completely under the spell of the liberty-destroying philosophy of fatalism. In such an environment it was important to preserve intact the freedom of the will even under the influence of grace, to arouse slothful nature from the fatalistic sleep, and to recommend the ascetical maxim: "Help yourself, and Heaven will help you." It may have been imprudent to leave the necessity of prevenient grace altogether in the background because of false considerations of timeliness, and to insist almost exclusively on co-operating grace while silently presupposing the existence of prevenient grace. But was Chrysostom opposing a Pelagius or a Cassian? In fact he also knew and admitted prevenient grace, as when he writes: "You do not hold of yourself, but you have received from God. Hence you have received what you possess, and not only this or that, but everything you have. For these are not your own merits, but the grace of God. Although you cite faith, you owe it nevertheless to call" (Hom. xii in I Cor.). Chrysostom was always orthodox in the doctrine on grace.

After the triumph over unbelief, the process of justification begins with faith and concludes only with the infusion of sanctifying grace and theological love. The question is whether, on this arduous road, grace must precede and co-operate with every salutary step of the believing sinner. The negative attitude of the Semipelagians, who ascribed the dispositions for justification to the natural efforts of free will, was proscribed as heretical at Orange (can. vii) and again at Trent (Sess. VI, can. iii). Rightly so. For the thoroughly supernatural sonship of God (*filialio adoptiva*),

which ultimately terminates the process of justification, can be attained only through absolutely supernatural acts, for the performance of which nature without grace is physically incapable. Hence the Bible, besides faith, also refers other dispositions, as "hope" (Rom., xv, 13) and "love" (I John, iv, 7) explicitly to God as their author; and tradition has unswervingly adhered to the priority of grace (cf. St. Augustine, "Enchir.", xxxii). Once the adult has finally reached the state of grace after a happy termination of the process of justification, the obligation devolves upon him of complying with many negative and positive duties in order to preserve sanctifying grace, persevere in virtue until the end, and gain heaven after a happy death. Will he be capable of accomplishing all this without a constant stream of actual graces? It might appear so. For the justified person is, through the possession of sanctifying grace and supernatural virtues, permanently maintained in the supernatural order. It is not unnatural, therefore, to admit, prescinding from final perseverance, that he is enabled by his supernatural habit to perform salutary actions. This is in reality the teaching of Molina, Bellarmine, Billot, and others. But to this view Perrone (De gratiâ, n. 203) rightly objects that Holy Writ makes no distinction between the different degrees of the work of salvation, that Augustine (De nat. et grat., xxiv) proclaims the constant need of grace also for the "healthy" and "justified", and finally that the Church requires an uninterrupted influence of grace even for the good works of the just, and puts in the mouths of all Christians without exception the prayer: "Actiones nostras, quæsumus Domine, aspirando præveni et adjuvando prosequere", etc. And does not concupiscence, which remains also in the justified, stand in need of at least healing grace? Moreover, no passive habit puts itself in motion, but, like a well-tuned harp, must be, as it were, brought into play by some external agency. It might be added that nature, raised to a permanent supernatural state, still retains its natural activity and consequently requires a supernatural impulse for supernatural actions.

The most important concern, however, which the just man must take to heart is final perseverance, because it is a decided characteristic of the predestined and assures entrance into heaven with infallible certainty. The Semipelagian delusion that this great grace may be due to the initiative and power of the just was refuted, after the Second Synod of Orange (can. x), chiefly by the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, can. xxii) in the following proposition of faith: "Si quis dixerit, justificatum . . . sine speciali auxilio Dei in acceptâ justitiâ perseverare posse . . . , anathema sit." Here, also, the explanation of some difficulties will facilitate the correct interpretation of the canon. Final perseverance, in its most perfect sense, consists in the untarnished preservation of baptismal innocence until death. In a less strict sense it is the preservation of the state of grace from the last conversion until death. In both senses we have what is called perfect perseverance (*perseverantia perfecta*). By imperfect perseverance (*perseverantia imperfecta*) must be understood the temporary continuance in grace, e. g., for a month or a year, until the commission of the next mortal sin. We must distinguish also between passive and active perseverance, according as the justified dies in the state of grace, independently of his will, as baptized children and the insane, or actively co-operates with grace whenever the state of grace is imperilled by grievous temptations. The Council of Trent had, above all, this latter case in view, since it speaks of the necessity of a special assistance (*auxilium speciale*), which can designate nothing else but an actual grace or rather a whole series of these. This "special grace" is, consequently, not conferred with the possession of sanctifying grace,



nor is it to be confounded with ordinary graces, nor finally to be looked upon as a result of the mere power of perseverance (*posse perseverare*). Hence, as a new and special grace, it ultimately is but a continuous series of efficacious (not merely sufficient) graces combined with a particular external protection of God against fall into sin and with the final experience of a happy death. The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, can. xvi) is therefore justified in speaking of it as a great gift—"magnum donum". The Bible extols final perseverance, now as a special grace not included in the bare notion of justification (Phil., i, 6; I Pet., i, 5), now as the precious fruit of special prayer (Matt., xxvi, 41; John, xvii, 11; Col., iv, 12). Augustine (De dono persever., c. iii) used the necessity of such prayer as a basis of argumentation, but added, for the consolation of the faithful, that, while this great grace could not be merited by good works, it could by persevering, genuine prayer be obtained with infallible certainty. Hence the practice of pious Christians to pray daily for a good death can never be too earnestly commended.

(b) *Gratuity*.—Beside the necessity of actual grace, its absolute gratuity stands out as the second fundamental question in the Christian doctrine on this subject. The very name of grace excludes the notion of merit. But the gratuity of specifically Christian grace is so great and of such a superior character that even mere natural petition for grace or positive natural dispositions cannot determine God to the bestowal of his supernatural assistance. A mere negative preparation or mere negative dispositions, on the contrary, which consist only in the natural removal of obstacles, are in all probability not essentially opposed to gratuity. Owing to its gratuitous character, grace cannot be earned by strictly natural merit either in strict justice (*meritum de condigno*) or as a matter of fitness (*meritum de congruo*). But is not this assertion in conflict with the dogma that the just man can, through supernatural works, merit *de condigno* an increase in the state of grace and eternal glory, just as the sinner can, through salutary acts, earn *de congruo* justification and all graces leading up to it? That it is not, will be clearly evident if it be remembered that the merits springing from supernatural grace are no longer natural, but supernatural (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. xvi). The absolute gratuity of grace is, therefore, safeguarded if it is referred to the initial grace (*prima gratia vocans*), with which the work of salvation begins, and which is preceded by pure and mere nature. For it then follows that the whole subsequent series of graces, up to justification, is not and cannot be merited any more than the initial grace. We shall now briefly examine the gratuity of grace in its several degrees as indicated above.

(a) The gratuitous character of grace categorically excludes real and strict natural merit with a rightful claim to just compensation as well as merit improperly so called implying a claim to reward as a matter of fitness. The meritorious character of our actions in the former sense was defended by the Pelagians, while the Semipelagians advocated it in the latter meaning. To this twofold error the infallible teaching authority of the Church opposed the dogmatic declaration that the initial grace preparatory to justification is in no wise due to natural merit as a determining factor (Cf. Second Synod of Orange, epilogue; Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. v). The categorical synodal expression, *nullis præcedentibus meritis*, wards off from grace, as a poisonous breath, not only the Pelagian *condign* merit, but also the Semipelagian *congruous* merit. The presupposition that grace can be merited by natural deeds involves a latent contradiction. For it would be attributing to nature the power to bridge over with its own strength the chasm lying between the natural and the supernatural order. In powerfully eloquent words does Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans,

declare that the vocation to the Faith was not granted to the Jews in consequence of the works of the Mosaic Law, nor to the pagans because of the observance of the natural moral law, but that the concession was entirely gratuitous. He inserts the harsh statement: "Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will; and whom he will, he hardeneth" (Rom., ix, 18). The Doctor of Grace, Augustine (De peccato orig., xxiv, 28), like a second Paul, advocates the absolute gratuity of grace, when he writes: "Non enim gratia Dei erit ullo modo, nisi gratuita fuerit omni modo" (For it will not be the grace of God in any way unless it has been gratuitous in every way). He lays stress on the fundamental principle: "Grace does not find the merits in existence, but causes them", and substantiates it decisively thus: "Non gratia ex merito, sed meritum ex gratia. Nam si gratia ex merito, emisti, non gratis accepisti" (Not grace by merit, but merit by grace. For if grace by merit, thou hast bought, not received *gratis*.—Serm., 169, c. II). Not even Chrysostom could be suspected of Semipelagianism, as he thought in this matter precisely like Paul and Augustine.

(β) While natural merit suppresses the idea of gratuity in grace, the same cannot be affirmed of natural prayer (*preces naturæ, oratio naturalis*), as long as we do not ascribe to it any intrinsic right to be heard and to God a duty to answer it—a right and duty which are undoubtedly implied in supernatural petitions (cf. John, xvi, 23 sq.). Prayer does not, like merit, appeal to the justice or equity of God, but to his liberality and mercy. The sphere of influence of prayer is consequently much more extensive than the power of merit. The gratuity of Christian grace is, nevertheless, to be understood so strictly that pure nature cannot obtain even the smallest grace by the most fervent prayer. Such is the doctrine asserted by the Second Synod of Orange (can. iii) against the Semipelagians. It is based on a positive Divine decree and can no longer be deduced from the intrinsic impossibility of the contrary. It is therefore permissible, without prejudice to the Faith, to adopt Ripalda's opinion (De ente supernat., disp. xix, sect. 3), which holds that, in an economy of salvation different from the present, natural prayer for grace would be entitled to be heard. How little this is the case in the present dispensation is best learned from the language of the Bible. We are told that in our infirmity "we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit himself asketh for us with unspeakable groanings" (Rom. viii, 26; cf. I Cor., xii, 3). The supernatural union with Christ is, moreover, represented as the indispensable condition of every successful petition (John, xv, 7). Every wholesome prayer being in itself a salutary act, it must, according to antecedent statements, spring from prevenient grace. Augustine (De dono persever., xxiii, 64) in vivid descriptions brings home to the Semipelagians their delusion in thinking that true prayer comes from us and not from God who inspires it.

On an almost identical level with natural prayer stand the positive preparation and dispositions to grace (*capacitas, sive preparatio positiva*). It often occurs in human life that the positive disposition to a natural good includes in itself a certain claim to satisfaction, as, e. g. thirst of itself calls for quenching. This is still more the case when the disposition has been acquired by a positive preparation for the good in question. Thus the student has acquired by his preparation for the examination a certain claim to be sooner or later admitted to it. But how about grace? Does there exist in man a positive disposition and a claim to grace in the sense that the withholding of this expected blessing would sensibly injure and bitterly disappoint the soul? Or can man, unaided, positively dispose himself for the reception of grace, confident that God will reward his natural efforts with the bestowal of supernatural grace? Both suppositions are untenable. For, according to the express teach-

ing of the Apostle Paul and of the Fathers of the Church, the gratuity of grace is rooted solely in the supreme freedom of the Divine will, and the nature of man possesses not even the slightest claim to grace. As a consequence, the relapse into Semipelagianism is unavoidable as soon as we seek in the positive disposition or preparation a cause for the bestowal of grace. It should be remembered, moreover, that nature is never found in its pure form, but that, from the beginning, mankind is defiled by original sin. This consideration still more forcibly puts before us the necessity of denying to sinful nature the power to draw down upon itself, like an arid region, the effusion of Divine grace, either by its natural constitution or its own endeavours.

(γ) Negative disposition or preparation (*capacitas sive preparatio negativa*) designates, in general, the absence or removal of obstacles which are an impediment to the introduction of a new form, as green wood is dried up to become fit for burning. The question arises, whether the requirement of such merely negative natural preparation is reconcilable with the absolute gratuity of grace. Some of the earlier Schoolmen cited in answer the celebrated much-debated axiom: *Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam* (To the one who does what in him lies, God does not deny grace). If among the proposed interpretations of this proposition we adopt the one asserting that, in consequence of the commendable endeavours of the natural will, God does not withhold from anyone the first grace of vocation, we necessarily fall into the Semipelagian heresy refuted above. In order systematically to exclude this contingency, many Schoolmen thus interpreted the axiom with St. Thomas (Summa, I-II, Q. cix, a. 6): "To the one who accomplishes what he can with the help of supernatural grace God grants further and more powerful graces up to justification." But, interpreted in this manner, the axiom offers nothing new and has nothing to do with the above-proposed question. There remains, therefore, a third interpretation: God, out of mere liberality, does not withhold His grace from the one who accomplishes what he can with his natural moral strength, i. e. from the one who, by deliberate abstention from offences, seeks to dispose God favourably towards him and thus prepares himself negatively for grace. Some theologians (e. g. Vasquez, Glossner) declared even this most mitigated and mildest interpretation to be Semipelagian. Most modern theological authorities, however, with Molina, Suarez, and Lessius, see in it nothing else but the expression of the truth: To the one who prepares himself negatively and places no obstacle to the ever-ready influence of grace, God in general is more inclined to offer his grace than to another who wallows in the mire of sin and thus neglects to accomplish what lies in his power. In this manner the cause of the distribution of grace is located not in the dignity of nature, but, conformably to orthodoxy, in the universal will of God to save mankind.

(c) Universality.—The universality of grace does not conflict with its gratuity, if God, in virtue of his will to save all men, distributes with sovereign liberty his graces to all adults without exception. But if the universality of grace is only a result of the Divine will to save all mankind, we must first turn our attention to the latter as the basis of the former.

(a) By the "will to save" (*voluntas Dei salvifica*) theologians understand the earnest and sincere will of God to free all men from sin and lead them to supernatural happiness. As this will refers to human nature as such, it is a merciful will, also called "first" or "antecedent will" (*voluntas prima sive antecedens*). It is not absolute, but conditional, inasmuch as no one is saved if he does not will it or does not comply with the conditions laid down by God for salvation. The "second" or "consequent will" (*voluntas secunda sive*

*consequens*), on the contrary, can only be absolute, i. e. a will of justice, as God must simply reward or punish according as one has deserved by his works heaven or hell.—We consider here solely the "antecedent will" to save; regarding the will of justice see PREDESTINATION.

Against the error of the Calvinists and Jansenists the ecclesiastical teaching authority (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, can. xvii; Prop. v Jansenii damn., in Denzinger, n. 827, 1096) proclaimed in the first place the doctrine that God seriously wills the salvation not of the predestined only, but also of other men. As the Church obliged all her faithful to the recital of the passage of the creed, "Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de cœlis", it is also established with certainty of faith that at least all the faithful are included in the universality of salvation willed by God. Not to mention the touching scene in which Jesus weeps over the impenitent Jerusalem (cf. Matt., xxiii, 37), the following is the declaration of the Saviour himself respecting believers: "For God so loved the world, as to give his only-begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him, may not perish, but may have life everlasting" (John, iii, 16). Far from limiting the will to save to these two classes of men, the predestined and believers, theologians adhere to the theological conclusion that God, without regard to original sin, wills the eternal salvation of all the posterity of Adam. The range of this will certainly extends further than the circle of believers, the eternal reprobation of many of whom is a notorious fact. For Pope Alexander VIII (1690) condemned the proposition that Christ died "for all the faithful and only for them" (*pro omnibus et solis fidelibus*).—See Denzinger, n. 1294). The foreknowledge of original sin is no reason for God to except some men from his will of redemption, as the Calvinist sect called *Infra-lapsarians* or *Postlapsarians* (from *infra*, or *post*, *lapsum*) asserted in Holland against the strictly Calvinist opinion of those called *Supralapsarians* or *Antelapsarians* (from *supra*, or *ante*, *lapsum*).—See ARMINIANISM). In proof of the Catholic contention, the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. ii) rested on the Biblical text which exhibits the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ as offered not only for our sins, "but also for those of the whole world" (I John, ii, 2). We possess, besides, two classical Scriptural passages which exclude all doubt. The Book of Wisdom (xi, 24 sqq.) eulogizes in stirring language the all-exceeding mercy of God and bases its universality on the omnipotence of God (*quia omnia potes*), on his universal domination (*quoniam tua sunt; diligis omnia, quæ fecisti*), and on his love for souls (*qui amas animas*). Wherever, therefore, Divine omnipotence and domination extend, wherever immortal souls are to be found, thither also the will to grant salvation extends, so that it cannot be exclusive of any human being. After St. Paul (I Tim., ii, 1 sqq.) has ordained prayers for all men and proclaimed them "acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved" (*omnes homines vult salvos fieri*), he adds a threefold motivation: "For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus: who gave himself a redemption for all" (I. c.). Hence it is just as true that the will to grant salvation extends to all men as it is that God is the God of all men, and that Christ as mediator assumed the nature of all men and redeemed them on the Cross. In regard to tradition, Passaglia, as early as 1851, brilliantly demonstrated the universality of this Divine intention from two hundred Fathers of the Church and ecclesiastical writers. Augustine alone presents some difficulty. It may, however, be considered as certain to-day that the great Bishop of Hippo interpreted in the year 412 the Pauline text with all the other Fathers of the Church in the sense of a universal will to save all men without exception and that subsequently he never explicitly retracted this

view (De spir. et lit., xxiii, 58). But it is equally certain that from 421 onwards (cf. Enchir., xxvii, 103; Contr. Julian., IV, viii, 42; De corr. et grat., xv, 47) he attempted such tortuous and violent interpretations of the clear, unmistakable text that the Divine will regarding human salvation was no longer universal, but particular. The mystery can only be solved by the admission that Augustine still believed in a plurality of literal senses in the Bible (cf. Confess., XII, xvii sqq.). To avoid the necessity of imputing to the Holy Ghost the inspiration of contradictions in the same text, he conceived in his three divergent interpretations the Divine will concerning salvation as the "second" or "consequent will", which, as absolute will destined men to eternal happiness, must naturally be particular, no less than the consequent will affecting the reprobate (cf. J. B. Faure, "Notæ in Enchir. s. Augustini", c. 103, p. 195 sqq., Naples, 1847). The most difficult problem concerning this Divine will to save all men, a real *crux theologorum*, lies in the mysterious attitude of God towards children dying without baptism. Did God sincerely and earnestly will the salvation also of the little ones who, without fault of their own, fail to receive the baptism of water or blood and are thus forever deprived of the beatific vision? Only a few theologians (e. g. Bellarmine, Vasquez) are bold enough to answer this question in the negative. Either invincible ignorance, as among the pagans, or the physical order of nature, as in stillbirths, precludes the possibility of the administration of baptism without the least culpability on the part of the children. The difficulty lies, therefore, in the fact that God, the author of the natural order, eventually declines to remove the existing obstacles by means of a miracle. The well-meant opinion of some theologians (Arrubal, Kilber, Mannens) that the whole and full guilt falls in all instances not on God, but on men (for example, on the imprudence of the mothers), is evidently too airy an hypothesis to be entitled to consideration. The subterfuge of Klee, the writer on dogma, that self-consciousness is awakened for a short time in dying children, to render baptism of desire possible to them, is just as unsatisfactory and objectionable as Cardinal Cajetan's admission, disapproved of by Pius X, that the prayer of Christian parents, acting like a baptism of desire, saves their children for heaven. We are thus confronted with an unsolved mystery. Our ignorance of the manner does not destroy, however, the theological certainty of the fact. For the above-cited Biblical texts are of such unquestionable universality that it is impossible to exclude a priori millions of children from the Divine will to save humankind.—Cf. Bolgeni, "Stato dei bambini morti senza battesimo" (Rome, 1787); Didiot, "Ungetauft verstorbene Kinder, Dogmatische Trostbriefe" (Kempfen, 1898); A. Seitz, "Die Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche" (Freiburg, 1903), pp. 301 sqq.

(8) The universality of grace is a necessary consequence of the will to save all men. For adults this will transforms itself into the concrete Divine will to distribute "sufficient" graces; it evidently involves no obligation on God to bestow only "efficacious" graces. If it can be established, therefore, that God grants to the three classes of the just, sinners, and infidels truly sufficient graces for their eternal salvation, the proof of the universality of grace will have been furnished. Without prejudice to this universality, God may either await the moment of its actual necessity before bestowing grace, or He may, even in time of need (e. g. in vehement temptation), grant immediately only the grace of prayer (*gratia orationis sive remote sufficiens*). But in the latter case he must be ever ready to confer immediate grace for action (*gr. operationis s. proxime sufficiens*), if the adult has made a faithful use of the grace of prayer.

So far as the category of the just is concerned, the heretical proposition of Jansen, that "the observance

of some commandments of God is impossible to the just for want of grace" (see Denzinger, n. 1092), had already been exploded by the anathema of the Council of Trent (see Council of Trent, Sess. VI, can. xviii). In fact Holy Writ teaches concerning the just, that the yoke of Jesus is sweet, and His burden light (Matt., xi, 30), that the commandments of God are not heavy (I John, v, 3), that "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able: but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it" (I Cor., x, 13). These statements warrant not only the full possibility of the observance of the Divine commandments and the triumph over vehement temptations; they virtually express simultaneously the concession of the necessary grace without which all these salutary acts are known to be absolutely impossible. It is true that in the polemical writings of some Fathers of the Church against the Pelagians and Semipelagians we read the proposition: "The grace of God is not granted to all." But a closer examination of the passages immediately reveals the fact that they speak of efficacious, not of sufficient, grace. This distinction is expressly stated by the anonymous writer of the fifth century whom Pope Gelasius commends as an "experienced ecclesiastical teacher" (*probatus ecclesie magister*). In his excellent work "De vocatione gentium", he differentiates the "general" (*benignitas Dei generalis*) and the "particular" economy of grace (*specialis misericordia*), referring the former to the distribution of sufficient, the latter to that of efficacious, graces. We come to the second class, that of Christian sinners, among whom we reckon apostates and formal heretics, as these can hardly be placed on a par with the heathen. In their valuation of the distribution of grace, theologians distinguish somewhat sharply between ordinary sinners (among whom they include habitual and relapsing sinners) and those sinners whose intellect is blinded, and whose heart is hardened, the so-called obdurate sinners (*obcæcati et indurati, impenitentes*). The bestowal of grace on the former group is, they say, of a higher degree of certainty than its concession to the latter, although for both the universality of sufficient grace is beyond any doubt. Not only is it said of sinners in general: "I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way, and live" (Ezech., xxxiii, 11), and again: "The Lord . . . dealeth patiently for your sake, not willing that any should perish, but that all should return to penance" (II Peter, iii, 9), but even the obdurate and impenitent sinners are energetically summoned by the Bible to dutiful penance or at least are most vehemently reprimanded because of their wickedness (Is., lxv, 2; Rom., ii, 4; Acts, vii, 51). Now where a duty of conversion exists, the necessary grace must be at hand without which no conversion is possible. For, as Augustine (De nat. et grat., xliii, n. 50) affirms: "Deus impossibilia non jubet" (God does not give impossible orders). Obduracy, however, forms such a powerful obstacle to conversion that some ancient theologians embraced the untenable opinion that God finally completely withdraws from these sinners, a withdrawal due to His mercy, which desires to save them from a more severe punishment in hell. But St. Thomas Aquinas (De verit., Q. xxiv, a. 11) stated that "complete obduracy" (*obstinatio perfecta*), or absolute impossibility of conversion, begins only in hell itself; "incomplete obduracy", on the contrary, ever presents on earth in the enfeebled moral affections of the heart a point of contact through which the appeal of grace may obtain entrance. Were the rigorist opinion of God's complete abandonment of the obdurate correct, despair of God's mercy would be perfectly justified in such souls. The Catholic catechism, however, presents this as a new grievous sin.

The third and last question arises: Is the grace of

God also conceded to the heathen? The Divine readiness to grant assistance also to the heathen (see Denzinger, n. 1295, 1379) is a certain truth confirmed by the Church against the Jansenists Arnauld and Quesnel. To question it is to deny the above-demonstrated intention of God to save all men; for the overwhelming majority of mankind would fall outside its range. The Apostle of the Gentiles, Paul (Rom., ii, 6 sqq.), lays stress on God's impartiality towards Jews and Greeks, without "respect of persons", on the Day of Judgment, when he will reward also the Greek "that worketh good" with eternal life. The Fathers of the Church, as Clement of Rome (1 ep. ad Cor., vii), Clement of Alexandria (Cohort. ad gent., 9), and Chrysostom (Hom. viii in John, n. 1), do not doubt the dispensation of sufficient graces to the nations "that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death". Orosius (De arbit. libert., n. 19), a disciple of St. Augustine, proceeds so far in his optimism as to believe in this distribution of grace "quotidie per tempora, per dies, per momenta, per *diuina* et cunctis et singulis" (daily through the seasons, through the days, through the moments, through the smallest possible divisions of time, and to all men and every man). But the clearer the fact, the more obscure the manner. In what way, one instinctively asks, did God provide for the salvation of the heathen? Theologians to-day generally give the following presentation of the process: It is presupposed that, according to Hebr., xi, 6, the two dogmas of the existence of God and of future retribution must be, in all instances, believed not only by necessity of means (*necessitate mediæ*), but also with explicit faith (*fide explicita*) before the process of justification can be initiated. As a consequence, God will not refrain in extraordinary cases from miraculous intervention in order to save a noble-minded heathen who conscientiously observes the natural moral law. He may either, in a miraculous manner, depute a missionary to him (Acts, i, 1 sqq.), or teach him the revealed truths through an angel (Cardinal Toletus), or he may come to his assistance by an interior private revelation. It is clear, nevertheless, that these different ways cannot be considered as everyday ordinary means. For the multitude of heathen this assistance must be found in a universal means of salvation equally independent of wonderful events and of the preaching of Christian missionaries. Some modern theologians discover it in the circumstance that the two dogmas mentioned above were already contained in the primitive supernatural revelation made in Paradise for all mankind. These truths were subsequently spread over the whole world, survive, as a meagre remnant, in the traditions of the pagan nations, and are orally transmitted from generation to generation as supernatural truths of salvation. The knowableness of these dogmas by unaided reason does not constitute an objection, for they are simultaneously natural and revealed truths. Once the condition of external preaching (cf. Rom., x, 17: "*fides ex auditu*") has thus been fulfilled, it only remains for God to hasten to man's assistance with his supernatural illuminating and strengthening grace and to initiate with the faith in God and retribution (which implicitly includes all else necessary for salvation) the process of justification. In this manner the attainment of the state of grace and of eternal glory becomes possible for the heathen who faithfully co-operates with the grace of vocation. However all this may be, one thing is certain: every heathen who incurs eternal damnation will be forced on the last day to the honest confession: "It is not for want of grace, but through my own fault that I am lost."

(For the relation between grace and liberty, see GRACE, CONTROVERSIES ON.)

II. SANCTIFYING GRACE.—Since the end and aim of all efficacious grace is directed to the production of sanctifying grace where it does not already exist, or to

retain and increase it where it is already present, its excellence, dignity, and importance become immediately apparent; for holiness and the sonship of God depend solely upon the possession of sanctifying grace, wherefore it is frequently called simply *grace* without any qualifying word to accompany it as, for instance, in the phrases "to live in grace" or "to fall from grace".

All pertinent questions group themselves around three points of view from which the subject may be considered:—

(1) The preparation for sanctifying grace, or the process of justification.

(2) The nature of sanctifying grace.

(3) The characteristics of sanctifying grace.

(1) *Preparation for Sanctifying Grace, or the Process of Justification* (for exhaustive treatment of justification see article on JUSTIFICATION).—The word justification (*justificatio*, from *justum facere*) derives its name from justice (*justitia*), by which is not merely meant the cardinal virtue in the sense of a constant purpose to respect the rights of others (*sum cuique*), nor is the term taken in the concept of all those virtues which go to make up the moral law, but connotes, especially, the whole inner relation of man to God as to his supernatural end. Every adult soul stained either with original sin or with actual mortal sin (children are of course excepted) must, in order to arrive at the state of justification, pass through a short or long process of justification, which may be likened to the gradual development of the child in its mother's womb. This development attains its fullness in the birth of the child, accompanied by the anguish and suffering with which this birth is invariably attended; our rebirth in God is likewise preceded by great spiritual sufferings of fear and contrition.

In the process of justification we must distinguish two periods: first, the preparatory acts or dispositions (faith, fear, hope, etc.); then the last, decisive moment of the transformation of the sinner from the state of sin to that of justification or sanctifying grace, which may be called the active justification (*actus justificationis*); with this the real process comes to an end, and the state of habitual holiness and sonship of God begins. Touching both of these periods there has existed, and still exists, in part, a great conflict of opinion between Catholicism and Protestantism. This conflict may be reduced to four differences of teaching. By a justifying faith the Church understands qualitatively the theoretical faith in the truths of Revelation, and demands over and above this faith other acts of preparation for justification. Protestantism, on the other hand, reduces the process of justification to merely a fiduciary faith; and maintains that this faith, exclusive even of good works, is all-sufficient for justification, laying great stress upon the scriptural statement *sola fides justificat*. The Church teaches that justification consists of an actual obliteration of sin and an interior sanctification. Protestantism, on the other hand, makes of the forgiveness of sin merely a concealment of it, so to speak; and of the sanctification a forensic declaration of justification, or an external imputation of the justice of Christ. In the presentation of the process of justification, we will everywhere note this fourfold confessional conflict.

(a) *The Fiduciary Faith of the Protestants*.—The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. vi, and can. xii) decrees that not the fiduciary faith, but a real mental act of faith, consisting of a firm belief in all revealed truths makes up the faith of justification and the "beginning, foundation, and source" (loc. cit., cap. viii) of justification. What did the Reformers with Luther understand by fiduciary faith? They understood thereby not the first or fundamental disposition or preparation for the (active) justification, but merely the spiritual grasp (*instrumentum*) with which we seize and lay hold of the external justice of Christ and with it, as with a

mantle of grace, cover our sins (which still continue to exist interiorly) in the infallible, certain belief (*fiducia*) that God, for the sake of Christ, will no longer hold our sins against us. Hereby the seat of justifying faith is transferred from the intellect to the will; and faith itself, in as far as it still abides in the intellect, is converted into a certain belief in one's own justification. The main question is: "Is this conception Biblical?" Murray (*De gratia*, disp. x, n. 18, Dublin, 1877) states in his statistics that the word *fides* (*pietatis*) occurs eighty times in the Epistle to the Romans and in the synoptic Gospels, and in only six of these can it be construed to mean *fiducia*. But neither here nor anywhere else does it ever mean the conviction of, or belief in, one's own justification, or the Lutheran fiduciary faith. Even in the leading text (Rom., iv, 5) the justifying faith of St. Paul is identical with the mental act of faith or belief in Divine truth; for Abraham was justified not by faith in his own justification, but by faith in the truth of the Divine promise that he would be the "father of many nations" (cf. Rom., iv, 9 sqq.). In strict accord with this is the Pauline teaching that the faith of justification, which we must profess "with heart and mouth", is identical with the mental act of faith in the Resurrection of Christ, the central dogma of Christianity (Rom., x, 9 sq.), and that the minimum expressly necessary for justification is contained in the two dogmas: the existence of God, and the doctrine of eternal reward (Heb., xi, 6).

The Redeemer Himself made belief in the teaching of the Gospel a necessary condition for salvation, when he solemnly commanded the Apostles to preach the Gospel to the whole world (Mark, xvi, 15). St. John the Evangelist declares his Gospel has been written for the purpose of exciting belief in the Divine Sonship of Christ, and links to this faith the possession of eternal life (John, xx, 31). Such was the mind of the Christian Church from the beginning. To say nothing of the testimony of the Fathers (cf. Bellarmine, *De justific.*, I, 9), Saint Fulgentius, a disciple of St. Augustine, in his precious booklet, "*De verâ fide ad Petrum*", does not understand by true faith a fiduciary faith, but the firm belief in all the truths contained in the Apostles' Creed, and he calls this faith the "Foundation of all good things", and the "Beginning of human salvation" (loc. cit., Prolog.). The practice of the Church in the earliest ages, as shown by the ancient custom, going back to Apostolic times, of giving the catechumens (*κατηχούμενοι* from *κατὰ χεῖρ*, *vivâ voce instruere*) a verbal instruction in the articles of faith and of directing them, shortly before baptism, to make a public recitation of the Apostles' Creed, strengthens this view. After this they were called not *fiduciales* but *fideles*, in contra-distinction to *infideles* and *heretici* (from *ἀπερίσθαι*, to select, to proceed eclectically) who rejected Revelation as a whole or in part.

In answer to the theological question: How many truths of faith must one expressly (*fide explicitâ*) believe under command (*necessitate præcepti*)? theologians say that an ordinary Catholic must expressly know and believe the most important dogmas and the truths of the moral law, for instance, the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, the six precepts of the Church, the Seven Sacraments, the Our Father. Greater things are, of course, expected from the educated, especially from catechists, confessors, preachers, wherefore upon these the study of theology rests as an obligation. If the question be put: In how many truths as a means (*necessitate mediâ*) must one believe to be saved? many catechists answer *Six things*: God's existence; an eternal reward; the Trinity; the Incarnation; the immortality of the soul; the necessity of Grace. But according to St. Paul (Heb., xi, 6) we can only be certain of the necessity of the first two dogmas, while the belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation could not of course be exacted from ante-

Christian Judaism or from Paganism. Then, too, belief in the Trinity may be implicitly included in the dogma of God's existence, and belief in the Incarnation in the dogma of the Divine providence, just as the immortality of the soul is implicitly included in the dogma of an eternal reward. However, there arises for any one baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, and entering thus the Church of Christ, the necessity of making an act of explicit faith (*fides explicita*). This necessity (*necessitas mediâ*) arises *per accidens*, and is suspended only by a Divine dispensation in cases of extreme necessity, where such an act of faith is either physically or morally impossible, as in the case of pagans or those dying in a state of unconsciousness. For further matter on this point see Pohle, "*Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*", 4th ed., II, 488 sqq. (Paderborn, 1909).

(b) The *Sola-fides* doctrine of the Protestants.—The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, can. ix) decrees that over and above the faith which formally dwells in the intellect, other acts of predisposition, arising from the will, such as fear, hope, love, contrition, and good resolution (loc. cit., cap. vi), are necessary for the reception of the grace of justification. This definition was made by the council as against the second fundamental error of Protestantism, namely that "faith alone justifies" (*sola fides justificat*).

Martin Luther stands as the originator of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, for he hoped that in this wise he might be able to calm his own conscience, which was in a state of great perturbation, and consequently he took refuge behind the assertion that the necessity of good works over and above mere faith was altogether a pharisaical supposition. Manifestly this did not bring him the peace and comfort for which he had hoped, and at least it brought no conviction to his mind; for many times, in a spirit of honesty and sheer good nature, he applauded good works, but recognized them only as necessary concomitants, not as efficient dispositions, for justification. This was also the tenor of Calvin's interpretation (Institutes, III, 11, 19). Luther was surprised to find himself by his unprecedented doctrine in direct contradiction to the Bible, therefore he rejected the Epistle of St. James as "one of straw" and into the text of St. Paul to the Romans (iii, 28) he boldly inserted the word *alone*. This falsification of the Bible was certainly not done in the spirit of the Apostle's teaching, for nowhere does St. Paul teach that faith alone (without charity) will bring justification, even though we should accept as also Pauline the text given in a different context, that supernatural faith alone justifies, but the fruitless works of the Jewish Law do not.

In this statement St. Paul emphasizes the fact that grace is purely gratuitous; that no merely natural good works can merit grace; but he does not state that no other acts in their nature and purport predisposing are necessary for justification over and above the requisite faith. Any other construction of the above passage would be violent and incorrect. If Luther's interpretation were allowed to stand, then St. Paul would come into direct contradiction not only with St. James (ii, 24 sqq.), but also with himself; for, except St. John, the favourite Apostle, he is the most outspoken of all Apostles in proclaiming the necessity and excellence of charity over faith in the matter of justification (cf. I Cor., xiii, 1, sqq.). Whenever faith justifies it is not faith alone, but faith made operative and replenished by charity (cf. Gal., v, 6, "*fides, quæ per caritatem operatur*"). In the plainest language the Apostle St. James says this: "*ex operibus justificatur homo, et non ex fide tantum*" (James, ii, 24); and here, by works, he does not understand the pagan good works to which St. Paul refers in the Epistle to the Romans, or the works done in fulfilment of the Jewish Law, but the works of salvation made possible by the operation of supernatural grace, which was



recognized by St. Augustine (lib. LXXXIII, Q. lxxvi, n. 2). In conformity with this interpretation and with this only is the tenor of the Scriptural doctrine, namely, that over and above faith other acts are necessary for justification, such as fear (Ecclus., i, 28), and hope (Rom., viii, 24), charity (Luke, vii, 47), penance with contrition (Luke, xiii, 3; Acts, ii, 38; iii, 19), almsgiving (Dan., iv, 24; Tob., xii, 9). Without charity and the works of charity faith is dead. Faith receives life only from and through charity (James, ii, 26). Only to dead faith (*fides informis*) is the doctrine applied: "Faith alone does not justify". On the other hand, faith informed by charity (*fides formata*) has the power of justification. St. Augustine (De Trinit., XV, 18) expresses it pithily thus: "Sine caritate quippe fides potest quidem esse, sed non et prodesse." Hence we see that from the very beginning the Church has taught that not only faith but that a sincere conversion of heart effected by charity and contrition is also requisite for justification—witness the regular method of administering baptism and the discipline of penance in the early Church.

The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. viii) has, in the light of Revelation, assigned to faith the only correct status in the process of justification, inasmuch as the council, by declaring it to be the "beginning, the foundation, and the root", has placed faith at the very front in the whole process.

Faith is the beginning of salvation, because no one can be converted to God unless he recognize Him as his supernatural end and aim, just as a mariner without an objective and without a compass wanders aimlessly over the sea at the mercy of wind and wave.

Faith is not only the initiatory act of justification, but the foundation as well, because upon it all the other predisposing acts rest securely, not in geometric regularity or inert as the stones of a building rest upon a foundation, but organically and imbued with life as the branches and blossoms spring from a root or stem. Thus there is preserved to faith in the Catholic system its fundamental and co-ordinating significance in the matter of justification. A masterly, psychological description of the whole process of justification, which even Ad. Harnack styles "a magnificent work of art", will be found in the famous cap. vi, "Disponuntur" (Denzinger, n. 798). According to this the process of justification follows a regular order of progression in four stages: from faith to fear, from fear to hope, from hope to incipient charity, from incipient charity to contrition with purpose of amendment. If the contrition be perfect (*contritio caritate perfecta*), then active justification results, that is, the soul is immediately placed in the state of grace even before the reception of the sacrament of baptism or penance, though not without the desire for the sacrament (*votum sacramenti*). If, on the other hand, the contrition be only an imperfect one (*attritio*), then the sanctifying grace can only be imparted by the actual reception of the sacrament (cf. Trent, Sess. VI, cc. iv and xiv). The Council of Trent had no intention, however, of making the sequence of the various stages in the process of justification, given above, inflexible; nor of making any one of the stages indispensable. Since a real conversion is inconceivable without faith and contrition, we naturally place faith at the beginning and contrition at the end of the process. In exceptional cases, however, for example in sudden conversions, it is quite possible for the sinner to overlap the intervening stages between faith and charity, in which case fear, hope, and contrition are virtually included in charity.

The "justification by faith alone" theory was by Luther styled the article of the standing and falling church (*articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*), and by his followers was regarded as the material principle of Protestantism, just as the sufficiency of the Bible without tradition was considered its formal principle.

Both of these principles are un-Biblical and are not accepted anywhere to-day in their original severity, save only in the very small circle of orthodox Lutherans.

The Lutheran Church of Scandinavia has, according to the Swedish theologian Krogh-Tonningh, experienced a silent reformation which in the lapse of the several centuries has gradually brought it back to the Catholic view of justification, which view alone can be supported by Revelation and Christian experience (cf. Dorner, "Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie", 361 sqq., Munich, 1867; Möhler, "Symbolik", §16, Mainz, 1890; "Realencyk. für prot. Theol.", s. v. "Rechtfertigung").

(c) The Protestant theory of non-imputation.—Embarrassed by the fatal notion that original sin wrought in man an utter destruction extending even to the annihilation of all moral freedom of election, and that it continues its existence even in the just man as sin in the shape of an ineradicable concupiscence, Martin Luther and Calvin taught very logically that a sinner is justified by fiduciary faith, in such a way, however, that sin is not absolutely removed or wiped out, but merely covered up or not held against the sinner. According to the teaching of the Catholic Church, however, in active justification an actual and real forgiveness of sins takes place so that the sin is really removed from the soul, not only original sin by baptism but also mortal sin by the sacrament of penance (Trent, Sess. V, can. v; Sess. VI, cap. xiv; Sess. XIV, cap. ii). This view is entirely consonant with the teaching of Holy Scripture, for the Biblical expressions: "blotting out" as applied to sin (Ps., i, 3; Is., xliii, 25; xlv, 22; Acts, iii, 19), "exhausting" (Heb., ix, 28), "taking away" [I Kings, xii, 13; I Par., xxi, 8; Mich., vii, 18; Ps. x (Heb.), 15; cii, 12], cannot be reconciled with the idea of a mere covering up of sin which is supposed to continue its existence in a covert manner. Other Biblical expressions are just as irreconcilable with this Lutheran idea, for instance, the expression of "cleansing" and "washing away" the mire of sin (Ps., i, 4, 9; Is., i, 18; Ezech., xxxvi, 25; I Cor., vi, 11; Apoc., i, 5), that of coming "from death to life" (Col., ii, 13; I John, iii, 14); the removal from darkness to light (Eph., v, 9). Especially these latter expressions are significant, because they characterize the justification as a movement from one thing to another which is directly contrary or opposed to the thing from which the movement is made. The opposites, black and white, night and day, darkness and light, life and death, have this peculiarity, that the presence of one means the extinction of its opposite. Just as the sun dispels all darkness, so does the advent of justifying grace drive away sin, which ceases from that on to have an existence at least in the ethical order of things, though in the knowledge of God it may have a shadowy kind of existence as something which once was, but has ceased to be. It becomes intelligible, therefore, that in him who is justified, though concupiscence remain, there is "no condemnation" (Rom., viii, 1); and why, according to James (i, 14 sqq.), concupiscence as such is really no sin; and it is apparent that St. Paul (Rom., vii, 17) is speaking only figuratively when he calls concupiscence *sin*, because it springs from sin and brings sin in its train. Where in the Bible the expressions "covering up" and "not imputing" sin occur, as for instance in Ps. xxxi, 1 sq., they must be interpreted in accordance with the Divine perfections, for it is repugnant that God should declare any one free from sin to whom sin is still actually cleaving. It is one of God's attributes always to substantiate His declarations; if He covers sin and does not impute it, this can only be effected by an utter extinction or blotting out of the sin. Tradition also has always taught this view of the forgiveness of sins. (See Denifle, "Die abendländischen

Schriftausleger bis Luther uber justitia Dei and justificatio" Mainz, 1903).

(d) The Protestant theory of Imputation.—Calvin rested his theory with the negative moment, holding that justification ends with the mere forgiveness of sin, in the sense of not imputing the sin; but other Reformers (Luther and Melancthon) demanded a positive moment as well, concerning the nature of which there was a very pronounced disagreement. At the time of Osiander (d. 1552) there were from fourteen to twenty opinions on the matter, each differing from every other; but they had this in common that they all denied the interior holiness and the inherent justification of the Catholic idea of the process. Among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession the following view was rather generally accepted: The person to be justified seizes by means of the fiduciary faith the exterior justice of Christ, and therewith covers his sins; this exterior justice is imputed to him as if it were his own, and he stands before God as having an outward justification, but in his inner self he remains the same sinner as of old. This exterior, forensic declaration of justification was received with great acclaim by the frenzied, fanatical masses of that time, and was given wide and vociferous expression in the cry: "Justitia Christi *extra nos*".

The Catholic idea maintains that the formal cause of justification does not consist in an exterior imputation of the justice of Christ, but in a real, interior sanctification effected by grace, which abounds in the soul and makes it permanently holy before God (cf. Trent, Sess. VI, cap. vii; can. xi). Although the sinner is justified by the justice of Christ, inasmuch as the Redeemer has merited for him the grace of justification (*causa meritoria*), nevertheless he is formally justified and made holy by his own personal justice and holiness (*causa formalis*), just as a philosopher by his own inherent learning becomes a scholar, not, however, by any exterior imputation of the wisdom of God (Trent, Sess. VI, can. x). To this idea of inherent holiness which theologians call sanctifying grace are we safely conducted by the words of Holy Writ.

To prove this we may remark that the word *justify* (*δικαιωθῆναι*, Heb. צַדִּיק in Hiphil) in the Bible may have a fourfold meaning:—

(a) The forensic declaration of justice by a tribunal or court (cf. Is., v, 23; Prov., xvii, 15).

(β) The interior growth in holiness (Apoc., xxii, 11).

(γ) As a substantive, *justificatio*, the external law (Ps. cxviii, 8, and elsewhere).

(δ) The inner, immanent sanctification of the sinner.—Only this last meaning can be intended where there is mention of passing to a new life (Eph., ii, 5; Col., ii, 13; I John, iii, 14); renovation in spirit (Eph., iv, 23 sq.); supernatural likeness to God (Rom., viii, 29; II Cor., iii, 18; II Pet., i, 4); a new creation (II Cor., v, 17; Gal., vi, 15); rebirth in God (John, iii, 5; Tit., iii, 5; James, i, 18), etc., all of which designations not only imply a setting aside of sin, but express as well a permanent state of holiness. All of these terms express not an aid to action, but rather a form of being; and this appears also from the fact that the grace of justification is described as being "poured forth in our hearts" (Rom., v, 5); as "the spirit of adoption of sons" of God (Rom., viii, 15); as the "spirit, born of the spirit" (John, iii, 6); making us "conformable to the image of the Son" (Rom., viii, 28); as a participation in the Divine nature (II Pet., i, 4); the abiding seed in us (I John, iii, 9), and so on. As regards the tradition of the Church, even Harnack admits that St. Augustine faithfully reproduces the teaching of St. Paul. Hence the Council of Trent need not go back to St. Paul, but only to St. Augustine, for the purpose of demonstrating that the Protestant theory of imputation is at once against St. Paul and St. Augustine.

Moreover, this theory must be rejected as not being

in accordance with reason. For in a man who is at once sinful and just, half holy and half unholy, we cannot possibly recognize a masterpiece of God's omnipotence, but only a wretched caricature, the deformity of which is exaggerated all the more by the violent introduction of the justice of Christ. The logical consequences which follow from this system, and which have been deduced by the Reformers themselves, are indeed appalling to Catholics. It would follow that, since the justice of Christ is always and ever the same, every person justified, from the ordinary everyday person to the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, would possess precisely the same justification and would have, in degree and kind, the same holiness and justice. This deduction was expressly made by Luther. Can any man of sound mind accept it? If this be so, then the justification of children by baptism is impossible, for, not having come to the age of reason, they cannot have the fiduciary faith wherewith they must seize the justice of Christ to cover up their original sin. Very logically, therefore, the Anabaptists, Mennonites, and Baptists reject the validity of infant baptism. It would likewise follow that the justification acquired by faith alone could be forfeited only by infidelity, a most awful consequence which Luther (De Wette, II, 37) clothed in the following words, though he could hardly have meant them seriously: "*Pecca fortiter et crede fortius et nihil nocebunt centum homicidia et mille stupra*." Luckily this inexorable logic falls powerless against the decency and good morals of the Lutherans of our time, and is, therefore, harmless now, though it was not so at the time of the Peasants' War in the Reformation.

The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. vii) defined that the inherent justice is not only the formal cause of justification, but as well the only formal cause (*unica formalis causa*); this was done as against the heretical teaching of the Reformer Bucer (d. 1551), who held that the inherent justice must be supplemented by the imputed justice of Christ. A further object of this decree was to check the Catholic theologian Albert Pighius and others, who seemed to doubt that the inner justice could be ample for justification without being supplemented by another favour of God (*favor Dei externus*) (cf. Pallavacini, Hist. Conc. Trident., VIII, 11, 12). This decree was well-founded, for the nature and operation of justification are determined by the infusion of sanctifying grace. In other words, without the aid of other factors, sanctifying grace in itself possesses the power to effect the destruction of sin and the interior sanctification of the soul to be justified. For since sin and grace are diametrically opposed to each other, the mere advent of grace is sufficient to drive sin away; and thus grace, in its positive operations, immediately brings about holiness, kinship of God, and a renovation of spirit, etc. From this it follows that in the present process of justification, the remission of sin, both original and mortal, is linked to the infusion of sanctifying grace as a *conditio sine quod non*, and therefore a remission of sin without a simultaneous interior sanctification is theologically impossible. As to the interesting controversy whether the incompatibility of grace and sin rests on merely moral, or physical, or metaphysical contrariety, refer to Pohle ("Lehrbuch der Dogmatik", II, 511 sqq., Paderborn, 1909); Scheeben ("Die Myst. des Christentums", 543 sqq., Freiburg, 1898).

(2) *The Nature of Sanctifying Grace*.—The real nature of sanctifying grace is, by reason of its direct invisibility, veiled in mystery, so that we can learn its nature better by a study of its formal operations in the soul than by a study of the grace itself. Indissolubly linked to the nature of this grace and to its formal operations are other manifestations of grace which are referable not to any intrinsic necessity but to the goodness of God; accordingly three questions present themselves for consideration:

- (a) The inner nature of sanctifying grace.
- (b) Its formal operations.
- (c) Its supernatural retinue.

(a) The Inner Nature.—(a) As we have seen that sanctifying grace designates a grace producing a permanent condition, it follows that it must not be confounded with a particular actual grace nor with a series of actual graces, as some ante-Tridentine theologians seem to have held. This view is confirmed by the fact that the grace imparted to children in baptism does not differ essentially from the sanctifying grace imparted to adults, an opinion which was not considered as altogether certain under Pope Innocent III (1201), was regarded as having a high degree of probability by Pope Clement V (1311), and was defined as certain by the Council of Trent (Sess. V, can. iii-v). Baptized infants cannot be justified by the use of actual grace, but only by a grace which effects or produces a certain condition in the recipient. Is this grace of condition or state, as Peter Lombard (Sent., I, dist. xvii, §18) held, identical with the Holy Spirit, whom we may call the permanent, uncreated grace (*gratia increata*)? It is quite impossible. For the person of the Holy Ghost cannot be poured out into our hearts (Rom., v, 5), nor does it cleave to the soul as inherent justice (Trent, sess. VI, can. xi), nor can it be increased by good works (loc. cit., can. xxiv), and all this is apart from the fact that the justifying grace in Holy Writ is expressly termed a "gift [or grace] of the Holy Ghost" (Acts, ii, 38; x, 45), and as the abiding seed of God (I John, iii, 9). From this it follows that the grace must be as distinct from the Holy Ghost as the gift from the giver and the seed from the sower; consequently the Holy Spirit is our holiness, not by the holiness by which He Himself is holy, but by that holiness by which He makes us holy. He is not, therefore, the *causa formalis*, but merely the *causa efficiens*, of our holiness.

Moreover, sanctifying grace as an active reality, and not a merely external relation, must be philosophically either substance or accident. Now, it is certainly not a substance which exists by itself, or apart from the soul, therefore it is a physical accident inhering in the soul, so that the soul becomes the subject in which grace inheres; but such an accident is in metaphysics called quality (*qualitas*, *ποιότης*), therefore sanctifying grace may be philosophically termed a "permanent, supernatural quality of the soul", or, as the Roman Catechism (P. II, cap. ii, de bap., n. 50) says, "divina qualitas in animâ inherens".

(b) Sanctifying grace cannot be termed a habit (*habitus*) with the same precision as it is called a quality. Metaphysicians enumerate four kinds of quality: habit and disposition; power and want of power; passion and passible quality, for example, to blush, pale with wrath; form and figure (cf. Aristotle, Categ., VI). Manifestly sanctifying grace must be placed in the first of these four classes, namely habit or disposition; but as dispositions are fleeting things, and habit has a permanency, theologians agree that sanctifying grace is undoubtedly a habit, hence the name: Habitual Grace (*gratia habitualis*). *Habitus* is subdivided into *habitus entitativus* and *habitus operativus*. A *habitus entitativus* is a quality or condition added to a substance by which condition or quality the substance is found permanently good or bad, for instance: sickness or health, beauty, deformity, etc. *Habitus operativus* is a disposition to produce certain operations or acts, for instance, moderation or extravagance; this *habitus* is called either virtue or vice just as the soul is inclined thereby to a moral good or to a moral evil. Now, since sanctifying grace does not of itself impart any such readiness, celerity, or facility in action, we must consider it primarily as a *habitus entitativus*, not as a *habitus operativus*. Therefore, since the popular concept of *habitus*, which usually designates a readiness, does not accurately express the idea of sancti-

fying grace, another term is employed, i. e. a quality after the manner of a habit (*qualitas per modum habitus*), and this term is applied with Bellarmine (De grat. et lib. arbit., I, iii). Grace, however, preserves an inner relation to a supernatural activity, because it does not impart to the soul the act but rather the disposition to perform supernatural and meritorious acts; therefore grace is remotely and mediately a disposition to act (*habitus remote operativus*). On account of this and other metaphysical subtleties the Council of Trent has refrained from applying the term *habitus* to sanctifying grace.

In the order of nature a distinction is made between natural and acquired habits (*habitus innatus*, and *habitus acquisitus*), to distinguish between natural instincts, such, for instance, as are common to the brute creation, and acquired habits such as we develop by practice, for instance skill in playing a musical instrument etc. But grace is supernatural, and can not, therefore, be classed either as a natural or an acquired habit; it can only be received, accordingly, by infusion from above, therefore it is a supernatural infused habit (*habitus infusus*).

(v) If theologians could succeed in establishing the identity sometimes maintained between the nature of grace and charity, a great step forward would be taken in the examination of the nature of grace, for we are more familiar with the infused virtue of charity than with the hidden mysterious nature of sanctifying grace. For the identity of grace and charity some of the older theologians have contended—Peter Lombard, Scotus, Bellarmine, Lessius, and others—declaring that, according to the Bible and the teaching of the Fathers, the process of justification may be at times attributable to sanctifying grace and at other times to the virtue of charity. Similar effects demand a similar cause; therefore there exists, in this view, merely a virtual distinction between the two, inasmuch as one and the same reality appears under one aspect as grace, and under another as charity. This similarity is confirmed by the further fact that the life or death of the soul is occasioned respectively by the presence in, or absence from, the soul of charity. Nevertheless, all these arguments may tend to establish a similarity, but do not prove a case of identity. Probably the correct view is that which sees a real distinction between grace and charity, and this view is held by most theologians, including St. Thomas Aquinas and Suarez. Many passages in Scripture and patrology and in the enactments of synods confirm this view. Often, indeed, grace and charity are placed side by side, which could not be done without a pleonasm if they were identical. Lastly, sanctifying grace is a *habitus entitativus*, and theological charity a *habitus operativus*: the former, namely sanctifying grace, being a *habitus entitativus*, informs and transforms the substance of the soul; the latter, namely charity, being a *habitus operativus*, supernaturally informs and influences the will (cf. Ripalda, "De ente sup.", disp. cxxiii; Billuart, "De gratiâ", disp. iv, 4).

(b) The climax of the presentation of the nature of sanctifying grace is found in its character as a participation in the Divine nature, which in a measure indicates its specific difference. To this undeniable fact of the supernatural participation in the Divine nature is our attention directed not only by the express words of Holy Writ: *ut efficiamini divine consortes nature* (II Pet., i, 4), but also by the Biblical concept of "the issue and birth from God", since the begotten must receive of the nature of the progenitor, though in this case it only holds in an accidental and analogical sense. Since this same idea has been found in the writings of the Fathers, and is incorporated in the liturgy of the Mass, to dispute or reject it would be nothing short of temerity. It is difficult to excogitate a manner (*modus*) in which this participation of the

Divine nature is effected. Two extremes must be avoided, so that the truth will be found.

An exaggerated theory was taught by certain mystics and quietists, a theory not free from pantheistic taint. In this view the soul is formally changed into God, an altogether untenable and impossible hypothesis, since concupiscence remains even after justification, and the presence of concupiscence is, of course, absolutely repugnant to the Divine nature.

Another theory, held by the Scotists, teaches that the participation is merely of a moral-juridical nature, and not in the least a physical participation. But since sanctifying grace is a physical accident in the soul, one cannot help referring such participation in the Divine nature to a physical and interior assimilation with God, by virtue of which we are permitted to share those goods of the Divine order to which God alone by His own nature can lay claim. In any event the "participatio divinæ naturæ" is not in any sense to be considered a deification, but only a making of the soul "like unto God". To the difficult question: Of which special attribute of God does this participation partake? theologians can answer only by conjectures. Manifestly only the communicable attributes can at all be considered in the matter, wherefore Gonet (Clyp. thomist., IV, ii, x) was clearly wrong when he said that the attribute of participation was the *aseitas*, absolutely the most incommunicable of all the Divine attributes. Ripalda (loc. cit., disp. xx, sect. 14) is probably nearer the truth when he suggests Divine sanctity as the attribute, for the very idea of sanctifying grace brings the sanctity of God into the foreground.

The theory of Suarez (De grat., VII, i, xxx), which is also favoured by Scripture and the Fathers, is perhaps the most plausible. In this theory sanctifying grace imparts to the soul a participation in the Divine spirituality, which no rational creature can by its own unaided powers penetrate or comprehend. It is, therefore, the office of grace to impart to the soul, in a supernatural way, that degree of spirituality which is absolutely necessary to give us an idea of God and His spirit, either here below in the shadows of earthly existence, or there above in the unveiled splendour of Heaven. If we were asked to condense all that we have thus far been considering into a definition, we would formulate the following: Sanctifying grace is "a quality strictly supernatural, inherent in the soul as a *habitus*, by which we are made to participate in the divine nature".

(b) Formal Operations.—Sanctifying Grace has its formal operations, which are fundamentally nothing else than the formal cause considered in its various moments. These operations are made known by Revelation; therefore to children and to the faithful can the splendour of grace best be presented by a vivid description of its operations. These are: sanctity, beauty, friendship, and sonship of God.

(a) The Sanctity of the soul, as its first formal operation, is contained in the idea itself of sanctifying grace, inasmuch as the infusion of it makes the subject holy and inaugurates the state or condition of sanctity. So far it is, as to its nature, a *physical* adornment of the soul; it is also a *moral* form of sanctification, which of itself makes baptized children just and holy in the sight of God. This first operation is thrown into relief by the fact that the "new man", created in justice and holiness (Eph., iv, 24), was preceded by the "old man" of sin, and that grace changed the sinner into a saint (Trent, Sess. VI, cap. vii: *ex injusto fit justus*). The two moments of actual justification, namely the remission of sin and the sanctification, are at the same time moments of habitual justification, and become the formal operations of grace. The mere infusion of the grace effects at once the remission of original and mortal sin, and inaugurates the condition or state of holiness. (See Pohle, Lehrb. der Dogm., 527 sq.)

(β) Although the beauty of the soul is not mentioned by the teaching office of the Church as one of the operations of grace, nevertheless the Roman Catechism refers to it (P. II, cap. ii, de bap., n. 50). If it be permissible to understand by the spouse in the Canticle of Canticles a symbol of the soul decked in grace, then all the passages touching the ravishing beauty of the spouse may find a fitting application to the soul. Hence it is that the Fathers express the supernatural beauty of a soul in grace by the most splendid comparisons and figures of speech, for instance: "a divine picture" (Ambrose); "a golden statue" (Chrysostom); "a streaming light" (Basil), etc. Assuming that, apart from the material beauty expressed in the fine arts, there exists a purely spiritual beauty, we can safely state that grace, as the participation in the Divine nature, calls forth in the soul a physical reflection of the uncreated beauty of God, which is not to be compared with the soul's natural likeness to God. We can attain to a more intimate idea of the Divine likeness in the soul adorned with grace, if we refer the picture not merely to the absolute Divine nature, as the prototype of all beauty, but more especially to the Trinity whose glorious nature is so charmingly mirrored in the soul by the Divine adoption and the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost (cf. H. Krug, De pulchritudine divina, Freiburg, 1902).

(γ) The Friendship of God is, consequently, one of the most excellent of the effects of grace; Aristotle denied the possibility of such a friendship by reason of the great disparity between God and man. As a matter of fact man is, inasmuch as he is God's creature, His servant, and by reason of sin (original and mortal) he is God's enemy. This relation of service and enmity is transformed by sanctifying grace into one of friendship (Trent, Sess. VI, cap. vii: *ex inimico amicus*). According to the Scriptural concept (Wis., vii, 14; John, xv, 15) this friendship resembles a mystical matrimonial union between the soul and its Divine spouse (Matt., ix, 15; Apoc., xix, 7). Friendship consists in the mutual love and esteem of two persons based upon an exchange of service or good office (Aristot., "Eth. Nicom.", VIII sq.). True friendship resting only on virtue (*amicitia honesta*) demands undeniably a love of benevolence, which seeks only the happiness and well-being of the friend, whereas the friendly exchange of benefits rests upon a utilitarian basis (*amicitia utilis*) or one of pleasure (*amicitia delectabilis*), which presupposes a selfish love; still the benevolent love of friendship must be mutual, because an unrequited love becomes merely one of silent admiration, which is not friendship by any means. But the strong bond of union lies undeniably in the fact of a mutual benefit, by reason of which friend regards friend as his other self (*alter ego*). Finally, between friends an equality of position or station is demanded, and where this does not exist an elevation of the inferior's status (*amicitia excellentia*), as, for example, in the case of a friendship between a king and noble subject. It is easy to perceive that all these conditions are fulfilled in the friendship between God and man effected by grace. For, just as God regards the just man with the pure love of benevolence, He likewise prepares him by the infusion of theological charity for the reception of a correspondingly pure and unselfish affection. Again, although man's knowledge of the love of God is very limited, while God's knowledge of love in man is perfect, this conjecture is sufficient—indeed in human friendships it alone is possible—to form the basis of a friendly relation. The exchange of gifts consists, on the part of God, in the bestowal of supernatural benefits, on the part of man, in the promotion of God's glory, and partly in the performance of works of fraternal charity. There is, indeed, in the first instance, a vast difference in the respective positions of God and man; but by the infusion of grace man receives a patent of

nobility, and thus a friendship of excellency (*amicitia excellentiæ*) is established between God and the just. (See Schiffrini, "De gratiâ divinâ", 305 sqq., Freiburg, 1901.)

(δ) In the Divine filiation of the soul the formal workings of sanctifying grace reach their culminating point; by it man is entitled to a share in the paternal inheritance, which consists in the beatific vision. This excellence of grace is not only mentioned countless times in Holy Writ (Rom., viii, 15 sq.; I John, iii, 1 sq., etc.), but is included in the Scriptural idea of a *re-birth in God* (cf. John, i, 12 sq.; iii, 5; Titus, iii, 5; James, i, 18, etc.). Since this re-birth in God is not effected by a substantial issuance from the substance of God, as in the case of the Son of God or *Logos* (*Christus*), but is merely an analogical or accidental coming forth from God, our sonship of God is only of an adoptive kind, as we find it expressed in Scripture (Rom., viii, 15; Gal., iv, 5). This adoption was defined by St. Thomas (III, Q. xxiii, a. 1): *personæ extraneæ in filium et heredem gratuita assumptio*. To the nature of this adoption there are four requisites: (i) the original unrelateness of the adopted person; (ii) fatherly love on the part of the adopting parent for the person adopted; (iii) the absolute gratuity of the choice to sonship and heirship; (iv) the consent of the adopted child to the act of adoption. Applying these conditions to the adoption of man by God, we find that God's adoption exceeds man's in every point, for the sinner is not merely a stranger to God but is as one who has cast off His friendship and become an enemy. In the case of human adoption the mutual love is presumed as existing, in the case of God's adoption the love of God effects the requisite disposition in the soul to be adopted. The great and unfathomable love of God at once bestows the adoption and the consequent heirship to the kingdom of heaven, and the value of this inheritance is not diminished by the number of coheirs, as in the case of worldly inheritance.

God does not impose His favours upon any one, therefore a consent is expected from adult adopted sons of God (Trent, Sess. VI, cap. vii, *per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum*). It is quite in keeping with the excellence of the heavenly Father that He should supply for His children during the pilgrimage a fitting sustenance which will sustain the dignity of their position, and be to them a pledge of resurrection and eternal life; and this is the Bread of the Holy Eucharist (see EUCHARIST).

(c) The Supernatural Retinue.—This expression is derived from the Roman Catechism (P. II., c. i, n. 51), which teaches: "Huic (gratiæ sanctificantis) additur nobilissimus omnium virtutum comitatus". As the concomitants of sanctifying grace, these infused virtues are not formal operations, but gifts really distinct from this grace, connected nevertheless with it by a physical, or rather a moral, indissoluble link—relationship. Therefore the Council of Vienne (1311) speaks of *informans gratia et virtutes*, and the Council of Trent, in a more general way, of *gratia et dona*. The three theological virtues, the moral virtues, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the soul are all considered. The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, c. vii) teaches that the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity are in the process of justification infused into the soul as supernatural habits. Concerning the time of infusion, it is an article of faith (Sess. VI, can. xi) that the virtue of charity is infused immediately with sanctifying grace, so that throughout the whole term of existence sanctifying grace and charity are found as inseparable companions. Concerning the *habitus* of faith and hope, Suarez is of the opinion (as against St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure) that, assuming a favourable disposition in the recipient, they are infused earlier in the process of justification. Universally known is the expression of St. Paul (I Cor., xiii, 13),

"And now there remain faith, hope, and charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity." Since, here, faith and hope are placed on a par with charity, but charity is considered as diffused in the soul (Rom., v, 5), conveying thus the idea of an infused habit, it will be seen that the doctrine of the Church so consonant with the teaching of the Fathers is also supported by Scripture. The theological virtues have God directly as their formal object, but the moral virtues are directed in their exercise to created things in their moral relations. All the special moral virtues can be reduced to the four cardinal virtues: prudence (*prudentia*), justice (*justitia*), fortitude (*fortitudo*), temperance (*temperantia*). The Church favours the opinion that along with grace and charity the four cardinal virtues (and, according to many theologians, their subsidiary virtues also) are communicated to the souls of the just as supernatural *habitus*, whose office it is to give to the intellect and the will, in their moral relations with created things, a supernatural direction and inclination. By reason of the opposition of the Scotists this view enjoys only a degree of probability, which, however, is supported by passages in Scripture (Prov., viii, 7; Ezech., xi, 19; II Pet., i, 3 sqq.) as well as the teaching of the Fathers (Augustine, Gregory the Great, and others). Some theologians add to the infusion of the theological and moral virtues also that of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, though this view cannot be called anything more than a mere opinion. There are difficulties in the way of the acceptance of this opinion which cannot be here discussed.

The article of faith goes only to this extent, that Christ as man possessed the seven gifts (cf. Is., xi, 1 sqq.; Ixi, 1; Luke, iv, 18). Remembering, however, that St. Paul (Rom., viii, 9 sq.) considers Christ, as man, the mystical head of mankind, and the august exemplar of our own justification, we may possibly assume that God gives in the process of justification also the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost.

The crowning point of justification is found in the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It is the perfection and the supreme adornment of the justified soul. Adequately considered, the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit consists of a twofold grace, the created accidental grace (*gratia creata accidentalis*), and the uncreated substantial grace (*gratia increata substantialis*). The former is the basis and the indispensable assumption for the latter; for where God Himself erects His throne, there must be found a fitting and becoming adornment. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the soul must not be confounded with God's presence in all created things, by virtue of the Divine attribute of Omnipresence. The personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the soul rests so securely upon the teaching of Holy Writ and of the Fathers that to deny it would constitute a grave error. In fact, St. Paul (Rom., v, 5) says: "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us". In this passage the Apostle distinguishes clearly between the accidental grace of theological charity and the Person of the Giver. From this it follows that the Holy Spirit has been given to us, and dwells within us (Rom., viii, 11), so that we really become temples of the Holy Ghost (I Cor., iii, 16 sq.; vi, 19). Among all the Fathers of the Church (excepting, perhaps, St. Augustine) it is the Greeks who are more especially noteworthy for their rapturous utterances touching the infusion of the Holy Ghost. Note the expressions: "The replenishing of the soul with balsamic odours", "a glow permeating the soul", "a gilding and refining of the soul". Against the Pneumatomachians they strive to prove the real Divinity of the Holy Spirit from His indwelling, maintaining that only God can establish Himself in the soul; surely no creature can inhabit any other creatures. But clear and undeniable as the fact of the indwelling is, equally difficult and perplexing is it in degree to



explain the method and manner (*modus*) of this indwelling.

Theologians offer two explanations. The greater number hold that the indwelling must not be considered a substantial information, nor a hypostatic union, but that it really means an indwelling of the Trinity (John, xiv, 23), but is more specifically appropriated to the Holy Ghost by reason of His notional character as the Hypostatic Holiness and Personal Love.

Another small group of theologians (Petavius, Scheeben, Hurter, etc.), basing their opinion upon the teaching of the Fathers, especially the Greek, distinguish between the *inhabitatio totius Trinitatis*, and the *inhabitatio Spiritus Sancti*, and decide that this latter must be regarded as a union (*unio, unio*) pertaining to the Holy Ghost alone, from which the other two Persons are excluded. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile this theory, in spite of its deep mystical significance, with the recognized principles of the doctrine of the Trinity, namely the law of appropriation and Divine mission. Hence this theory is almost universally rejected (see Franzelin, "De Deo trino" thes. xliii-xlviii, Rome, 1881).

(3) *The Characteristics of Sanctifying Grace.*—The Protestant conception of justification boasts of three characteristics: absolute certainty (*certitudo*), complete uniformity in all the justified (*equalitas*), unforfeitableness (*inamissibilitas*). According to the teaching of the Church, sanctifying grace has the opposite characteristics: uncertainty (*incertitudo*), inequality (*inequalitas*), and amissibility (*amissibilitas*).

(a) *Uncertainty.*—The heretical doctrine of the Reformers, that man by a fiduciary faith knows with absolute certainty that he is justified, received the attention of the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. ix), in one entire chapter (*De inani fiducia hereticorum*), three canons (loc. cit., can. xiii-xv) condemning the necessity, the alleged power, and the function of fiduciary faith. The object of the Church in defining the dogma was not to shatter the trust in God (*certitudo spei*) in the matter of personal salvation, but to repel the misleading assumptions of an unwarranted certainty of salvation (*certitudo fidei*). In doing this the Church is altogether obedient to the instruction of Holy Writ, for, since Scripture declares that we must work out our salvation "with fear and trembling" (Phil., ii, 12), it is impossible to regard our individual salvation as something fixed and certain. Why did St. Paul (I Cor., ix, 27) chastise his body if not afraid lest, having preached to others, he might himself "become a castaway"? He says expressly (I Cor., iv, 4): "For I am not conscious to myself of any thing, yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me, is the Lord." Tradition also rejects the Lutheran idea of certainty of justification. Pope Gregory the Great (lib. VII, ep. xxv) was asked by a pious lady of the court, named Gregoria, to say what was the state of her soul. He replied that she was putting to him a difficult and useless question, which he could not answer, because God had not vouchsafed to him any revelation concerning the state of her soul, and only after her death could she have any certain knowledge as to the forgiveness of her sins. No one can be absolutely certain of his or her salvation unless—as to Magdalen, to the man with the palsy, or to the penitent thief—a special revelation be given (Trent, Sess. VI, can. xvi). Nor can a theological certainty, any more than an absolute certainty of belief, be claimed regarding the matter of salvation, for the spirit of the Gospel is strongly opposed to anything like an unwarranted certainty of salvation. Therefore the rather hostile attitude to the Gospel spirit advanced by Ambrosius Catherinus (d. 1553), in his little work: "De certitudine gratiæ", received such general opposition from other theologians. Since no metaphysical certainty can be cherished in the matter of justification in any particular

case, we must content ourselves with a moral certainty, which, of course, is but warranted in the case of baptized children, and which, in the case of adults, diminishes more or less, just as all the conditions of salvation are complied with—not an easy matter to determine. Nevertheless any excessive anxiety and disturbance may be allayed (Rom., viii, 16, 38 sq.) by the subjective conviction that we are probably in the state of grace.

(b) *Inequality.*—If man, as the Protestant theory of justification teaches, is justified by faith alone, by the external justice of Christ, or God, the conclusion which Martin Luther (*Sermo de Nat. Mariæ*) drew must follow, namely that "we are all equal to Mary the Mother of God and just as holy as she". But if, on the other hand, according to the teaching of the Church, we are justified by the justice and merits of Christ in such fashion that this becomes formally our own justice and holiness, then there must result an inequality of grace in individuals, and for two reasons: first, because according to the generosity of God or the receptive condition of the soul an unequal amount of grace is infused; then, also, because the grace originally received can be increased by the performance of good works (Trent, Sess. VI, cap. vii, can. xxiv). This possibility of increase in grace by good works, whence would follow its inequality in individuals, finds its warrant in those Scriptural texts in which an increase of grace is either expressed or implied (Prov., iv, 18; Eccles., xviii, 22; II Cor., ix, 10; Eph., iv, 7; II Pet., iii, 18; Apoc., xxii, 11). Tradition had occasion, as early as the close of the fourth century, to defend the old Faith of the Church against the heretic Jovinian, who strove to introduce into the Church the Stoic doctrine of the equality of all virtue and all vice. St. Jerome (Con. Jovin., II, xxiii) was the chief defender of orthodoxy in this instance. The Church never recognized any other teaching than that laid down by St. Augustine (Tract. in Jo., vi, 8): "Ipsi sancti in ecclesiâ sunt alii aliis sanctiores, alii aliis meliores." Indeed, this view should commend itself to every thinking man.

The increase of grace is by theologians justly called a *second justification (justificatio secunda)*, as distinct from the *first justification (justificatio prima)*, which is coupled with a remission of sin; for, though there be in the second justification no transit from sin to grace, there is an advance from grace to a more perfect sharing therein. If inquiry be made as to the mode of this increase, it can only be explained by the philosophical maxim: "Qualities are susceptible of increase and decrease"; for instance, light and heat by the varying degree of intensity increase or diminish. The question is not a theological but a philosophical one to decide whether the increase be effected by an addition of grade to grade (*additio gradus ad gradum*), as most theologians believe; or whether it be by a deeper and firmer taking of root in the soul (*major radicatio in subjecto*), as many Thomists claim. This question has a special connexion with that concerning the multiplication of the *habitual act*.

But the last question that arises has decidedly a theological phase, namely, can the infusion of sanctifying grace be increased infinitely? Or is there a limit, a point at which it must be arrested? To maintain that the increase can go on to infinity, i. e. that man by successive advances in holiness can finally enter into the possession of an infinite endowment involves a manifest contradiction, for such a grade is as impossible as an infinite temperature in physics. Theoretically, therefore, we can consider only an increase without any real limit (*in indefinitum*). Practically, however, two ideals of unattained and unattainable holiness have been determined, which, nevertheless, are finite. The one is the inconceivably great holiness of the human soul of Christ, the other the fullness of grace which dwelt in the soul of the Virgin Mary.

(c) Amissibility.—In consonance with his doctrine of justification by faith alone, Luther made the loss or forfeiture of justification depend solely upon infidelity, while Calvin maintained that the predestined could not possibly lose their justification; as to those not predestined, he said, God merely aroused in them a deceitful show of faith and justification. On account of the grave moral dangers which lurked in the assertion that outside of unbelief there can be no serious sin destructive of Divine grace in the soul, the Council of Trent was obliged to condemn (Sess. VI, can. xxiii, xxvii) both these views. The lax principles of "evangelical liberty", the favourite catchword of the budding Reformation, were simply repudiated (Trent, Sess. VI, can. xix-xxi). But the synod (Sess. VI, cap. xi) added that not venial but only mortal sin involved the loss of grace. In this declaration there was a perfect accord with Scripture and Tradition. Even in the Old Testament the prophet Ezekiel (Ezech., xviii, 24) says of the godless: "All his justices which he hath done, shall not be remembered: in the prevarication, by which he hath prevaricated, and in his sin, which he hath committed, in them he shall die." Not in vain does St. Paul (I Cor., x, 12) warn the just: "Wherefore he that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall"; and state uncompromisingly: "The unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God . . . neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers . . . nor covetous, nor drunkards . . . shall possess the kingdom of God" (I Cor., vi, 9 sq.). Hence it is not by infidelity alone that the Kingdom of Heaven will be lost. Tradition shows that the discipline of confessors in the early Church proclaims the belief that grace and justification are lost by mortal sin. The principle of justification by faith alone is unknown to the Fathers. The fact that mortal sin takes the soul out of the state of grace is due to the very nature of mortal sin. Mortal sin is an absolute turning away from God, the supernatural end of the soul, and is an absolute turning to creatures; therefore, habitual mortal sin cannot exist with habitual grace any more than fire and water can co-exist in the same subject. But as venial sin does not constitute such an open rupture with God, and does not destroy the friendship of God, therefore venial sin does not expel sanctifying grace from the soul. Hence, St. Augustine says (De spir. et lit., xxviii, 48): "Non impediunt a vitâ aeternâ iustum quædam peccata venialia, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur."

But does venial sin, without extinguishing grace, nevertheless diminish it, just as good works give an increase of grace? Denys the Carthusian (d. 1471) was of the opinion that it does, though St. Thomas rejects it (II-II, Q. xxiv, a. 10). A gradual decrease of grace would only be possible on the supposition that either a definite number of venial sins amounted to a mortal sin, or that the supply of grace might be diminished, grade by grade, down to ultimate extinction. The first hypothesis is contrary to the nature of venial sin; the second leads to the heretical view that grace may be lost without the commission of mortal sin. Nevertheless, venial sins have an indirect influence on the state of grace, for they make a relapse into mortal sin easy (cf. Eccles., xix, 1). Does the loss of sanctifying grace bring with it the forfeiture of the supernatural retinue of infused virtues? Since the theological virtue of charity, though not identical, nevertheless is inseparably connected with grace, it is clear that both must stand or fall together, hence the expressions "to fall from grace" and "to lose charity" are equivalent. It is an article of faith (Trent, Sess. VI, can. xxviii, cap. xv) that theological faith may survive the commission of mortal sin, and can be extinguished only by its diametrical opposite, namely, infidelity. It may be regarded as a matter of Church teaching that theological hope also survives mortal sin, unless this hope should be utterly killed by

its extreme opposite, namely despair, though probably it is not destroyed by its second opposite, presumption. With regard to the moral virtues, the seven gifts and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, which invariably accompany grace and charity, it is clear that when mortal sin enters into the soul they cease to exist (cf. Suarez, "De gratiâ", IX, 3 sqq.). As to the fruits of sanctifying grace, see MERIT.

GENERAL LITERATURE.—ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theol.*, I-II, Q. cix-cxvi, and his commentaries: BILLIARD, *De gratiâ*, ed. LEQUETTE (Paris, s. d.), III; SALMANTICENSIS, *De gratiâ Dei in Curs. theol.*, IX sqq. (Paris, 1870); DE LEMOS, *Panoplia divina gratiæ* (Liège, 1876); SOTO, *De naturâ et gratiâ* (Venice, 1560); also BELLARMINE, SUAREZ, VASQUEZ, and particularly RIPALDA, *De ente supernaturali* (3 vols., Cologne, 1648). Among later authors cf. CERCIA, *De gratiâ Christi* (3 vols., Paris, 1879); MAZZELLA, *De gratiâ Christi*, 3rd ed. (Rome, 1882); SATOLLI, *De gratiâ* (Rome, 1886); SCHIFFINI, *De gratiâ divinâ* (Freiburg, 1901); LABOUSSE, *De gratiâ divinâ* (Louvain, 1902); HERRMANN, *Tractatus de divinâ gratiâ* (Rome, 1904); LÉFICIER, *De gratiâ* (Paris, 1907); VAN NOORT, *De gratiâ Christi* (Amsterdam, 1908); BILLOT, *De gratiâ Christi et libero arbitrio*, I (Rome, 1908); TERRIEN, *La grâce et la gloire* (2 vols., Paris, 1897); VON SCHÄZLER, *Natur und Ueberratur: Das Dogma von der Gnade* (Mainz, 1865); IDEM, *Neue Untersuchungen über das Dogma von der Gnade*; KUHN, *Die christliche Lehre von der göttlichen Gnade* (Tübingen, 1888); KLEUTGEN, *Theologie der Vorzeit*, 2nd ed., II (Münster, 1877), 152 sqq.; OSWALD, *Die Lehre von der Heiligung*, 3rd ed. (Paderborn, 1885); HEINRICH-GUTBERLET, *Dogmat. Theologie*, VIII: *Von der Gnade* (Mainz, 1897). See also the manuals on dogmatic theology, especially those by JUNGMAN, HURTER, SCHEEBEN, ENIG, SIMAR, CHR. PESCH, TEPE, etc. For complete treatment see POHLE, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, 4th ed., II (Paderborn, 1909), 529-578; for the teaching of the Fathers of ISAAC HABERT, *Gratiæ, græcor. Patrum circa universam materiam gratiæ* (Paris, 1646); E. SCHOLZ, *Die Lehre des hl. Basilii von der Gnade* (Freiburg, 1881); HUMMER, *Des hl. Gregor v. Nazianz Lehre von der Gnade* (Kempten, 1880); WEIGL, *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill v. Alex.* (Mainz, 1905). ACTUAL GRACE.—PALMIERI, *De gratiâ divinâ actuali* (Gulpen, 1885); SCHEEBEN, *Natur und Gnade* (Mainz, 1861); GLOSSNER, *Lehre des hl. Thomas vom Wesen der Gnade* (Mainz, 1871); G. BYONIUS, *De gratiâ auxilium in BECANUS, Theol. scholastica* (Rouen, 1658); BOUCAF, *Theol. Patrum dogmatico-scholasticæ positioni* (Paris, 1718); ZACCARIA, *Dissert. de adiutorio sine quo non in Thesaur. theol.*, V (Venice, 1762); ERNST, *Werke und Tugenden der Ungläubigen nach Augustinus* (Freiburg, 1871); WÖRTER, *Die Geistesentwicklung des hl. Augustinus* (Paderborn, 1892); ROTTMANN, *Der Augustinismus* (Munich, 1892); WOLFSGRUBER, *Augustinus* (Paderborn, 1898). Concerning Jansenism cf. DECHAMPS, *De hæresi jansenianâ* (Paris, 1654); FONTANA, *Bulla "Unigenitus" dogmatice propugnata* (Rome, 1717); DUCHESNE, *Histoire du jansenisme* (Douai, 1731); LINSSENMAN, *Michael Bajus und die Grundlegung des Jansenismus* (Tübingen, 1867); SCHILL, *Die Konstitution "Unigenitus", ihre Veranlassung und ihre Folgen* (Freiburg, 1876); INGOLD, *Rome et France: La seconde phase du Jansenisme* (Paris, 1901). Concerning Pelagianism and Semipelagianism cf. WÖRTER, *Der Pelagianismus nach seinem Ursprung und seiner Lehre* (Freiburg, 1874); KLASSEN, *Die unvere Entwicklung des Pelagianismus* (Freiburg, 1882); SCHWANE, *Dogmengeschichte*, 2nd ed., II (Freiburg, 1895), §860 sqq.; H. ZIMMER, *Pelagius in Irland* (Berlin, 1901); WIGGERS, *Geschichte des Semipelagianismus* (Hamburg, 1835); A. HOCH, *Lehre des Joh. Cassian von Natur und Gnade* (Freiburg, 1895); A. KOCH, *Der hl. Faustus, Bischof von Riez* (Stuttgart, 1895); WÖRTER, *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus* (Münster, 1900); MINGES, *Die Gnadentheorie des Duns Scotus auf ihren angeblichen Pelagianismus und Semipelagianismus geprüft* (Münster, 1906); PASSAGLIA, *De partitione voluntatis divine in primam et secundam* (Rome, 1851); MANNENS, *De voluntate salvificâ et prædestinatione* (Louvain, 1883); A. FISCHER, *De salute infidelium* (Essen, 1886); BUCCRONI, *De auxilio sufficienti infidelium dato* (Rome, 1890); F. SCHMID, *Die ausserordentlichen Heilwege für die gefallene Menschheit* (Brixen, 1899).

SANCTIFYING GRACE.—A. VEGA, *De justificatione doctrina universa* (Venice, 1548); BELLARMINE, *De justificatione impij*, ed. FÉVRE, VI (Paris, 1873), 149 sqq.; BECANUS, *De gratiâ habituali* (Rouen, 1658); KATSCHTALER, *De gratiâ sanctificante* (Salzburg, 1886); VILLADA, *De effectibus formalibus gratiæ habitualis* (Lalodillo, 1899); L. HUBERT, *De gratiâ sanctificante* (Paris, 1902); NUSSBAUM, *Die Lehre der katholischen Kirche über die Rechtfertigung* (Munich, 1837); BARTMANN, *St. Paulus und St. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung* (Freiburg, 1897); W. LIESE, *Der heilswürdige Glaube, sein Begriff und Inhalt* (Freiburg, 1902); J. WIESER, *St. Pauli doctrina de justificatione* (Trent, 1874); SIMAR, *Theologie des hl. Paulus*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg, 1883); MÖHLER, *Symbolik* (Mainz, 1890); AD. HARNACK, *Dogmengeschichte*, 3rd ed., III (Freiburg, 1896); L. GALEY, *La foi et les œuvres* (Montauban, 1902); DENIFLE, *Die abendlandischen Schriftausleger über justitia Dei u. justificatione* (Mainz, 1905); KROGH-TONNING, *Die Gnadentheorie und die stille Reformation* (Christiania, 1894); A. RADEMACHER, *Die übernatürliche Lebensordnung nach der paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie* (Freiburg, 1903); TERRIEN, *La grâce et la gloire ou la filiation adoptive* (2 vols., Paris, 1897); KIRSCHKAMP, *Gnade und Glorie in ihrem inneren Zusammenhang* (Würzburg, 1877); HAGO, *Die Reichtümer der göttlichen Gnade und die Schwere ihres Verlustes* (Ratisbon, 1899); SCHEEBEN, *Die Herrlichkeiten der göttlichen Gnade*, 8th ed. (Freiburg, 1908);

LAHOTSE, *De virtutibus theologicis* (Louvain, 1890); MAZZELLA, *De virtutibus infusis* (Rome, 1894); SATOLLI, *De habitibus* (Rome, 1897); BOUQUILLON, *De virtutibus theologicis* (Bruges, 1890); SCHIFFINI, *De virtutibus infusis* (Freiburg, 1904); C. WEISS, *S. Thomas de septem donis doctrina* (Vienna, 1895); OBERDORFFER, *De inhabitatione Spiritus S. in animabus iustorum* (Tournai, 1890); B. PROGET, *De l'inhabitation du St. Esprit dans les âmes justes* (Paris, 1901); DE BELLEVUE, *L'œuvre du St. Esprit ou la sanctification des âmes* (Paris, 1901); DEHARBE, *Die vollkommene Liebe Gottes* (Ratisbon, 1856); MARCHANT, *Die theol. Tugenden* (Ratisbon, 1884); KIRSCHKAMP, *Der Geist des Katholicismus in der Lehre vom Glauben und von der Liebe* (Paderborn, 1894); J. REGLER, *Die sieben Gaben des hl. Geistes* (Ratisbon, 1899).

J. POHLE.

**Grace, CONTROVERSIES ON.**—These are concerned chiefly with the relation between grace and free will. How can the all-persuasiveness of grace, which exercises such a potent influence on the human will and elicits therefrom such good works, reside harmoniously in the same subject with the simultaneous consent of the free will? Since merely sufficient grace (*gratia mere sufficiens*) in its very concept contains the idea of a withholding of consent on the part of free will, and is therefore at the very outset destined to inefficiency (*gratia inefficax*), the question in its last analysis reduces itself to the relation between free will and efficacious grace (*gratia efficax*), which contains the very idea that by it and with it the free will does precisely that which this grace desires should be done. The most radical solution would be simply to cut the Gordian knot, and with the Pelagians set aside supernatural grace, or with the Reformers and Jansenists banish entirely all free will. For whether we boldly set aside the first or the second alternative, in either case the great problem of the relation between grace and free will will have been disposed of, and the great mystery solved in the simplest manner possible. For if there be no grace, why, then, all things are accomplished by the *liberum arbitrium*; if there be no freedom, then grace reigns supreme. As against the Pelagians and Semipelagians the existence and necessity of efficacious grace for all meritorious acts was duly treated in the article GRACE. Here we propose to defend briefly the preservation of free will with grace as against the systems of the Reformers and Jansenists, which are hostile to free will.

**I. HERETICAL SOLUTIONS.**—According to Luther's theory, man's free will was so impaired by original sin that like a horse it could perform good or bad acts only as "it was ridden either by God or the devil". Nor did the Redemption by Christ restore the will as it was enjoyed in Paradise; therefore the will influenced by grace must by an interior necessity follow in all things the coercion of grace. Of all the Reformers, Calvin (*Instit.*, lib. II) has given the most consistent and scholarly theory of the loss of free will under grace. He maintains that the sin of Adam annihilated the freedom of the will; that the Redemption did not restore this primitive freedom, though it released man from the bondage of Satan; that, however, the will influenced by grace does not remain entirely passive, but preserves the spontaneity of its unfree acts. The later Lutherans, as well as those of the present time, scarcely ever emphasize as harshly as their master the moral impotence of nature in the domain of ethical good, but the followers of Calvin still cling stubbornly to his teaching (cf. G. van Noort, "De gratia Christi", Amsterdam, 1908, p. 16). In opposition to both sects, the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, can. iv-v) defined as dogma not only the survival of moral freedom in spite of original sin, but also the preservation of the freedom of the will acted upon and working with grace, especially efficacious grace.

The definition of Jansen (d. 1638) is not materially different from that of Luther and Calvin, save only that, in distinguishing more closely between freedom from external coercion (*libertas a coactione*) and freedom from intrinsic necessity (*libertas ab intrinseca necessitate*), he concedes to the will under the influence of

grace only the former kind of liberty, at the same time maintaining against all sound ethics that in our fallen state the mere freedom from external coercion is sufficient for merit and demerit, and that therefore the really decisive freedom from intrinsic necessity is not required. In its exterior form this system seeks to clothe itself completely in Augustinian attire, and to give the impression that even St. Augustine taught unqualified Jansenism. The system teaches that the will of fallen man sways like a reed between two delights, the heavenly delight of grace (*delectatio celestis s. caritas*) and the earthly delight of concupiscence (*delectatio terrena s. concupiscentia*). Both are ever present in man; like hostile forces, each strives for the mastery, the irksome will being necessarily overcome by whichever delight happens to be the stronger. If the heavenly delight be stronger than the opposing earthly one, it overcomes as efficacious grace (*gratia efficax s. magna*), the will with an irresistible impulse for good. If, on the other hand, the evil delight be the stronger, it compels the will to sin and this in spite of the likewise present heavenly delight, which as sufficient grace (*gratia sufficiens s. parva*) is just too weak to gain the ascendancy over the other. If both these delights are exactly equal in strength so as to maintain a perfect equilibrium, then the will remains trembling in the balance. It will be seen that this theory is conceived in perfect accord with the parallelogram of forces, and reduces itself in its last analysis to the most extreme determinism, and absolutely kills all freedom. Not the conquering power of the heavenly delight (*delectatio celestis victrix*), which is emphasized in the Augustinian system also, but the idea that this delight cannot be resisted (*gratia irresistibilis*) was branded as heresy by Innocent X on 31 May, 1653 (cf. Denzinger, "Enchiridion Symbolorum", ed. Bannwart, S.J., 1908, n. 1093 and 1095).

The sources of our faith record a decided protest against the subjugation of free will by efficacious grace. For if grace, instead of elevating and ennobling free will, subverts it, then all the Biblical counsels and prohibitions relative to the affairs of salvation which can be accomplished only with the help of efficacious grace, become vain and meaningless. Only in the event of the will remaining free have the words of Christ any significance: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments" (Matt., xix, 17). Saint Paul presupposes the co-operation of free will when he writes to his disciple Timothy: "Exercise thyself (*exerce te ipsum*) unto godliness" (1 Tim., iv, 7), and again when he says generally: "And every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour" (1 Cor., iii, 8). Tradition, as Calvin candidly admits (*Instit.*, II, 3, 10), regards freedom of will and the efficacy of grace not as antagonistic principles, but as harmonious factors. Like Jansen, however, Calvin believes that he can regard St. Augustine as a supporter of his heresy. How unfounded and mistaken is this claim has been clearly demonstrated in the article AUGUSTINE, SAINT.

**II. CATHOLIC SYSTEMS OF GRACE.**—According as the theological examination of grace and free will in its efforts to demonstrate the mutual relations between the two took as its starting-point respectively either grace or free will, two pairs of closely related systems were evolved: Thomism and Augustinianism, which take grace as the starting-point, and Molinism and Congruism, which set out from free will. These are the extremes. The middle ground is held by Syncretism, which may be regarded as an eclectic system making an effort at compromise.

(1) **Thomism.**—This system rests upon thoughts to which St. Thomas himself in his time gave expression. It received its most significant development from the subtle Michael Baez (1528-1604), a Dominican gifted with a remarkably clear and acute mind, who was the chief opponent of Molina. From the idea that God is the primal cause (*causa prima*) and the

prime mover (*motor primus*), it is concluded that every act and every movement of the thoroughly contingent secondary causes (*causae secundae*) or creatures must emanate from the first cause, and that by the application of their potentiality to the act. But God, respecting the nature of things, moves necessary agents to necessary, and free agents to free, activity—including sin, except that God is the originator only of its physical entity, not of its formal malice. Inasmuch as the Divine influence precedes all acts of the creature, not in the order of time, but in that of causality, the motion emanating from God and seconded by free intelligent agents takes on the character of a physical premotion (*præmotio physica*) of the free acts, which may also be called a physical predetermination (*prædeterminatio physica*), because the free determination of the will is accomplished only by virtue of the divine predetermination.

In this premotion or predetermination is also found the medium of the Divine knowledge by which God's omniscience foresees infallibly all the future acts, whether absolute or conditional, of intelligent creatures, and which explains away at once the undemonstrable and imaginary *scientia media* of the Molinists. For just as certainly as God in His predetermined decrees knows His own will, so certainly does He know all the necessarily included determinations of the free will of creatures, be they of absolute or conditional futurity. Now if we carry these philosophical principles from the domain of the natural to the supernatural, then efficacious grace (*gratia efficax*) must be regarded as a physical premotion of the supernaturally equipped will to the performance of a good act, for revelation undeniably refers back to grace not only the possibility, but also the willing and the actual performance of a good act. But the will predetermined to this free good act must with a metaphysical certainty correspond with grace, for it would be a contradiction to assert that the *consensus*, brought about by efficacious grace, can at the same time be an actual *dissensus*. This historical necessity (*necessitas consequentia*), involved in every act of freedom and distinguishable from the compelling necessity (*necessitas consequentis*), does not destroy the freedom of the act.

For although it be true that a man who is freely sitting cannot at the same time be standing (*sensus compositus*), nevertheless his freedom in sitting is maintained by the fact that he might be standing instead of sitting (*sensus divisus*). So it remains true that grace is not efficacious because the free will consents, but conversely the free will consents because grace efficaciously promotes it to the willing and performing of a good act. Hence *gratia efficax* is intrinsically and by its nature (*ab intrinseco s. per se*) efficacious, and consequently intrinsically and essentially different from sufficient grace (*gratia sufficiens*), which imparts only the *posse*, not the *agere*. To make merely sufficient grace efficacious a new supplementary grace must needs be supplied. How then is such a grace really sufficient (*gratia vere sufficiens*)? To this most of the Thomists reply: If the free will did not resist the grace offered, God would not hesitate to supply the efficacious grace so that the failure of the grace is to be referred to the sinful resistance of the free will (cf. Limbourg, S.J., "Selbstzeichnung der thomistischen Gnadenlehre" in "Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie", Innsbruck, 1877).

A survey of the strictly regulated uniformity of this system, of the relentless and logical sequence of the idea of the *causa prima* and *motor primus* in every natural and supernatural activity of creatures, and lastly of the lofty and resolute defence of the inalienable right of grace to be considered the chief factor in the affair of salvation, must instil into the minds of impartial and dispassionate students a deep respect for the Thomistic system. Nevertheless the Molinists claim that there are certain gaps and crevices in this

majestic structure, and, by inserting the levers of criticism in these, they believe they can shake the foundations of the edifice and encompass its downfall. We shall here confine ourselves to the four greatest objections which Molinism marshals against Thomism.

The first objection is the danger that in the Thomistic system the freedom of the will cannot be maintained as against efficacious grace, a difficulty which by the way is not unperceived by the Thomists themselves. For since the essence of freedom does not lie in the contingency of the act nor in the merely passive indifference of the will, but rather in its active indifference—to will or not to will, to will this and not that—so it appears impossible to reconcile the physical predetermination of a particular act by an alien will and the active spontaneousness of the determination by the will itself; nay more, they seem to exclude each other as utterly as do determinism and indeterminism, necessity and freedom. The Thomists answer this objection by making a distinction between *sensus compositus* and *sensus divisus*, but the Molinists insist that this distinction is not correctly applicable here. For just as a man who is bound to a chair cannot be said to be sitting freely as long as his ability to stand is thwarted by indissoluble cords, so the will predetermined by efficacious grace to a certain thing cannot be said to retain the power to dissent, especially since the will, predetermined to this or that act, has not the option to receive or disregard the premotion, since this depends simply and solely on the will of God. And does not the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. v, can. iv) describe efficacious grace as a grace which man "can reject", and from which he "can dissent"? Consequently, the very same grace, which *de facto* is efficacious, might under other circumstances be inefficacious. Herein the second objection to the Thomistic distinction between *gratia efficax* and *gratia sufficiens* is already indicated. If both graces are in their nature and intrinsically different, it is difficult to see how a grace can be really sufficient which requires another grace to complete it. Hence, it would appear that the Thomistic *gratia sufficiens* is in reality a *gratia insufficiens*. The Thomists cannot well refer the inefficacy of this grace to the resistance of the free will, for this act of resistance must be traced to a *præmotio physica* as inevitable as the efficacious grace.

Moreover a third great difficulty lies in the fact that sin, as an act, demands the predetermining activity of the "first mover", so that God would according to this system appear to be the originator of sinful acts. The Thomistic distinction between the entity of sin and its malice offers no solution of the difficulty. For since the Divine influence itself, which promotes *ad unum*, both introduces physically the sin as an act and entity, and also, by the simultaneous withholding of the opposite premotion to a good act, makes the sin itself an inescapable fatality, it is not easy to explain why sin cannot be traced back to God as the originator. Furthermore, most sinners commit their misdeeds, not with a regard to the depravity, but for the sake of the physical entity of the acts, so that ethics must, together with the wickedness, condemn the physical entity of sin. The Molinists deny that this objection affects their own system, when they postulate the *concursus* of God in the sinful act, and help themselves out of the dilemma by drawing the distinction between the entity and malice of sin. They say that the Divine co-operation is a *concursus simultaneus*, which employs the co-operating arm of God only after the will by its own free determination has decided upon the commission of the sinful act, whereas the Thomistic co-operation is essentially a *concursus præivus* which as an inevitable physical premotion predetermines the act regardless of the fact whether the human will can resist or not. From this consideration arises the fourth and last objection to the claim of the Thomists, that they have only apparently found in

their physical premotion an infallible medium by which God knows in advance with absolute certainty all the free acts of his creatures, whether they be good or bad. For as these premissions, as has been shown above, must in their last analysis be considered the knell of freedom, they cannot well be considered as the means by which God obtains a foreknowledge of the free acts of rational agents. Consequently the claims and proper place of the *scientia media* in the system may be regarded as vindicated.

(2) *Augustinianism*.—Just as Thomism appeals to the teaching of St. Thomas as its authority, Augustinianism appeals to St. Augustine. Both systems maintain that grace is intrinsically and by its very nature efficacious, but Augustinianism claims merely a *prædeterminatio moralis*, and proceeds not from the concept of God as the first and universal cause and prime mover, but with Jansen builds upon the idea of a twofold delight in human nature. The exponents of this system are: Berti, Bellelli, Louis Habert, Bertieri, Brancatus de Lauria, and others. The greatest defender of the system is Laurentius Berti (1696–1766), who in his work “De theologicis disciplinis” (Rome, 1739) propounded the theory with such boldness, that the Archbishop of Vienna, Jean d’Yse de Saléon, in his work entitled “Le Jansenisme et le Jansénisme resuscités dans les livres de Bellelli et Bertieri” (s. l., 1745), declares it to be nothing other than a revival of Jansenism. After an official investigation, however, Benedict XIV exonerated the system.

The foundation of the system is the same as that of Jansenism, though it claims to be thoroughly Augustinian. In Augustinianism also there is a ceaseless conflict between the heavenly delight and the evil delight of the flesh, and the stronger delight invariably gains the mastery over the will. Sufficient grace, as a weak delight, imparts merely the ability (*posse*), or such a feeble will that only the advent of the victorious delight of grace (*delectatio celestis victrix, caritas*) can guarantee the will and the actual deed. Therefore, like Thomism, the system postulates an essential difference between sufficient and efficacious grace. The necessity of *gratia efficax* does not spring from the subordinate relation between *causa prima* and *causa secunda*, but from the inherited perversity of fallen human nature, whose evil inclinations can no longer, as once in Paradise, be overcome by the converting grace (*gratia versatilis; adiutorium sine quo non*), but only by the intrinsically efficacious heavenly delight (*gratia efficax; adiutorium quo*).

Augustinianism differs, however, from Jansenism in its most distinctive feature, since it regards the influence of the victorious delight as not intrinsically coercive, nor irresistible. Though the will follows the relatively stronger influence of grace or concupiscence infallibly (*infallibiliter*), it never does so necessarily (*necessario*). Although it may be said with infallible certainty that a decent man of good morals will not walk through the public streets in a state of nudity, he nevertheless retains the physical possibility of doing so, since there is no intrinsic compulsion to the maintenance of decency. Similar to this is the efficacy of grace. We may refrain from a criticism of Augustinianism since it never really became a school, and since it has as little in common with true Augustinianism, as Jansenism has. (Cf. Schiffrini, “De gratia divina”, Freiburg, 1901, p. 422 sqq.; also the article AUGUSTINE, SAINT.)

(3) *Molinism*.—The famous work of the Jesuit Molina, “Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis” (Lisbon, 1588), brought in Spain the learned Dominican Bañez to the valiant defence of Thomism. In 1594 the dispute between the Thomists and the Molinists reached a fever heat. Pope Clement VIII in order to settle the dispute convened in Rome a *Congregatio de Auxiliis* (1598–1607), and to this the Dominicans and the Jesuits sent, at the pope’s invitation, their

ablest theologians. After the congregation had been in session for nine years without reaching a conclusion, Paul V, at the advice of St. Francis de Sales, permitted both systems, strongly forbidding the Jesuits to call the Dominicans Calvinists, or the Dominicans to name the Jesuits Pelagians. The deliberations of the congregation are fully set out in the article CONGREGATIO DE AUXILIIS.

It seems fitting to say a few words here concerning the celebrated Spanish Jesuit, Peter Arrubal, who took a leading part in the controversy between the Dominicans and the Jesuits (from 22 Feb., 1599, to 20 March, 1600) as well as in the disputations held before Clement VIII (1602–1606). Peter Arrubal was born in 1559 at Cenicero in the Diocese of Calahorra; he died at Salamanca on 22 Sept., 1608. On 21 April, 1579, he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Alcalá. Later on he taught theology at Alcalá, Rome, and Salamanca. During the disputation on Grace, he distinguished himself by refuting the *Apologia* of the Dominicans, composed by them against the teaching of Molina. In the public disputations held before the Holy Father, he was the leader of the Jesuits. Successfully and impressively he demonstrated in these disputations that the teaching of Molina was altogether removed from Semipelagianism, and that he (Molina) merely taught the holdings of the Council of Trent and in no wise introduced into the Church any new doctrine. The Holy Father forbade the publication of any work on the disputed question by reason of the intense excitement then prevalent, consequently Arrubal’s great work “De auxiliis gratiæ divinæ” remained unpublished. But two folio commentaries, “In primam partem Summæ theol. S. Thomæ” (Madrid, 1619, 1622; 2nd ed., Cologne, 1630), were prepared by him and published through the agency of P. De Villegas and P. De la Paz, both Jesuits.

The fundamental principles of the Molinistic system of grace are the following: efficacious grace and sufficient grace, considered in *actu primo*, are not *in natura* and intrinsically different one from the other (as the Thomists hold), but only accidentally so and according to their external success, inasmuch as sufficient grace becomes efficacious just as soon as the free will corresponds with it. If the will withholds its consent then sufficient grace remains inefficacious and is termed “merely sufficient grace” (*gratia mere sufficiens*). Now since one and the same grace may in one instance be efficacious, and in another inefficacious, it follows that the so-called *gratia efficax* must be conceived according to its essence as *efficax ab extrinseco*. In this conception there is no lessening of the dignity and priority of grace. For since the anticipatory grace invests the created will, quite irrespective of its consent in *actu primo*, supernaturally with moral and physical powers, and since moreover, as a supernatural *concursus*, it influences the *actus secundus* or good act and thus becomes efficacious grace, it follows that the good act itself is the joint product of grace and free will, or rather more the work of grace than of free will. For it is not the will which by its free consent determines the power of grace, but conversely it is grace which makes the free good act possible, prepares for it and co-operates in its execution. The infallibility of the success, which is contained in the very idea of efficacious grace, is not to be explained by the intrinsic nature of this grace, nor by a supernatural *premotio physica*, but rather by the *Theologoumenon* of the *scientia media*, by virtue of which God foreknows from all eternity whether this particular will would freely co-operate with a certain grace or not. But since God by virtue of His *scientia media* has at His own disposal all the sufficient and efficacious grace, the infallibility of the successful outcome remains in perfect accord with the freedom of the will, and furthermore the dogma concerning final perseverance and predestination is entirely preserved.



It is apparent that above all Molinism is determined to throw a wall of security around the free will. The Thomists maintain that this is done at the expense of grace. Instead of making the free will dependent on the power of grace, it is will which freely determines the success or failure of grace. Thus in the last analysis it is human will which decides whether a particular grace shall prove efficacious or not, although revelation teaches that it is God, who with His grace gives both the willing and the doing of a good act. Even friends of Molina, notably Cardinal Bellarmine (*De grat. et lib. arbitr.*, I, 12), saw the force of this difficulty and declined to follow the extreme Molinism, which, by the way, was not taught by Molina. This explains the Instruction issued by Claudius Acquaviva, the General of the Jesuits in the year 1613, directing all the teaching body of the Society to lay increased stress on the fact that efficacious grace differs from sufficient grace not only *ab extrinseco*, but also in its moral (not its physical) nature even in *actu primo*, inasmuch as efficacious grace being a special gift of God has a higher moral value than merely sufficient grace, which according to the infallible foreknowledge of God recoils ineffectively in consequence of the resistance of the will. Thus it remains true that God Himself effects our good deeds, not that He merely supplies us with the potentiality.

(4) *Congruism* is based on an unessentially modified form of Molinism, than which it is more carefully worked out in its details. It was endorsed by the Jesuit General Claudius Acquaviva (d. 1615) and by his successors Muzio Vitelleschi (d. 1645) and Piccolomini (d. 1651), and was made the official system of the Society of Jesus. The system was really originated by Molina himself, but received its definitive form from the labours of Bellarmine, Suarez, Vasquez, and Lessius. It takes its name from the *gratia congrua*, that is, a grace suited to the circumstances of the case, which is opposed to the *gratia incongrua*, a grace namely which is not suited to the circumstances of a certain case. Both of these concepts are purely Augustinian, as a reference to Augustine (*Ad Simplicianum*, I, Q. ii, n. 13) will show.

It is quite obvious that *gratia congrua* corresponds with efficacious grace, and *gratia incongrua* with merely sufficient grace. Accordingly the efficacy of a grace depends upon its peculiar agreement or congruity with the interior and exterior disposition of the recipient, whereby a certain relationship of choice is established between grace and free will, which at the hand of God in the light of His *scientia media* becomes the infallible means of carrying out all His designs of grace in great things and small with certain success and without violence. Even a small grace, which by reason of its congruity is attended with success, has an incomparably greater sanctifying value than an ever so much more powerful grace, which by reason of unfavourable circumstances of inclination, training, and environment fails in its purpose, and therefore as a *gratia incongrua* appears to the Divine foreknowledge as merely sufficient. Concerning the method of operation of the efficacious, or the congruous grace, the Congruists like the Molinists make three divisions: the efficacy of power (*efficacia virtutis*); the efficacy of union (*efficacia connexionis*); the efficacy of infallibility (*efficacia infallibilitatis*). The efficacy of the power to will and to do is peculiar to the efficacious and sufficient grace, that is to say, it is derived neither from the human will nor from the Divine foreknowledge.

The efficacy of the union between act and grace depends upon the free will, because according to the dogma efficacious grace is not irresistible, but can be rejected at any time. The efficacy of infallibility springs not from the physical nature of grace but from the infallible foreknowledge of God (*scientia media*), which cannot be deceived. After due consideration of

all the various phases of the Catholic doctrine of grace, it would seem that the congruistic remodelled Molinism comes fairly near the truth, because it is intelligently adjusted between the anti-grace Pelagianism and Semipelagianism on the one hand, and the anti-free-will Calvinism and Jansenism on the other. Nevertheless there are numerous critics who find much to object to in Congruism, and who fail to see in it a clear solution of the problem of grace and free will. They find it difficult to believe that grace adjusts itself slavishly to all the circumstances of the recipient, when the story of many a conversion shows that grace simply lays hold of man and without much parley leads him whithersoever it would have him go. Thus, grace does not depend for its efficacy on the congruity of the circumstances, but conversely the congruity of the circumstances is shaped and brought about by grace. Like all the other systems Congruism is forced to the confession: "We are standing before an unsolved mystery."

(5) *Syncretism*.—In the conviction that in each of the four systems we have thus far considered there must be in spite of imperfections many grains of truth, the Syncretic system hopes by proceeding in an eclectic manner, by adopting the good points of the various systems and eliminating all that is improbable and secondary, to evolve another or fifth system. The first incitement to the creation of this system came from the Paris Sorbonne (Ysambert, Isak, Habert, Duplessis d'Argentré, Tournely), whose views received a certain consecration from the fact that St. Alphonsus Liguori, the great Doctor of the Church, endorsed them ("Op. dogmat.", ed. Walter, I, 517 sqq.; II, 707 sqq.). Among recent exponents of this system may be mentioned: Godfrey a Graun, Schwetz, Cardinal Katschthaler, Herrmann. The distinguishing trait of the Syncretic system is found in the acceptance of two quite distinct sorts of efficacious grace, namely, the (Thomistic-Augustinian) *gratia ab intrinseco efficax* and the (Molinistic-Congruistic) *gratia ab extrinseco efficax*. Their respective functions are so apportioned, that the intrinsically predetermining grace of the Thomists (i. e. of the Augustinians, as e. g. in the writings of St. Alphonsus Liguori) is employed in the difficult works, e. g. in the patient endurance of great trials, in the overcoming of severe temptations, in the execution of difficult duties, etc.—while on the other hand the non-predetermining grace of the Molinists is reserved for the less difficult good works, such as a short prayer, a slight mortification, etc. Both these graces are given by God for the performance of their respective functions.

Prayer is placed as a link joining the two, and as the proper and practically infallible means of obtaining the Thomistic grace necessary for the performance of the difficult works of salvation. Who prays will secure his eternal salvation; who does not pray will be lost forever. If any one thing is to be specially singled out for commendation in this Syncretic system of grace, it is its insistence on the fact, which cannot be too strongly emphasized, that prayer is our individual duty, an absolute necessity and an infallible means in the attainment of our eternal salvation. Our minds cannot be too thoroughly imbued with the truth of the statement that our present provision of grace is essentially and intrinsically a magnificent economy of prayer. Even though Syncretism had performed no other service than the vigorous proclamation of this great truth, it alone were sufficient to rescue the system from oblivion. The system has not, it is true, solved the real problem of the relation between grace and free will. On the contrary, the linking together of the two kinds of efficacious grace only increases the difficulties found in the other systems. Consequently this system ends like the others in the inevitable conviction that we are confronted by a great mystery.

For general literature, see article GRACE, also: BELLARMINE,

*De Gratia et libero arbitrio* in Opp., ed. FÉVRE (Paris, 1873), V, VI; WÖRTER, *Die christliche Lehre über das Verhältnis von Gnade und Freiheit bis auf Augustinus* (Freiburg, 1856). The literature on special features is so vast as to be almost impossible of examination. We give here only the leading works of each system.

I. THOMISTS.—BAÑEZ, *Comment. in S. Thom.* (Salamanca, 1584—); ALVAREZ, *De auxiliis gratiæ et humani arbitrii viribus* (Rome, 1612); IDEM, *Responsionum libri IV* (Louvain, 1622); LEDESMA, *De divini gratiæ auxiliis* (Salamanca, 1611); GONET, *Clypeus theologiæ thomistiæ* (16 vols., Bordeaux, 1659–69); CONTENSON, *Theologia mentis et cordis* (Lyons, 1673); DE LEMOS, *Panoplia divini gratiæ* (4 vols., Liège, 1676); GOURDIN, *De scientiâ et voluntate Dei* (new ed., Louvain, 1874); GOTTI, *Theologia scholastico-dogmatica juxta mentem dñi Thomæ* (Venice, 1750); GAZZANIGA, *Theologia dogmatica in systema redacta* (2 vols., Vienna, 1776); BILLUART, *De gratiâ* (ed. LEQUETTE), III; IDEM, *Le Thomisme triomphant* (Paris, 1725); DUMMERMUTH, *S. Thomas et doctrina præmotorum physiciæ* (Paris, 1886); IDEM, *Defensio doctrinæ S. Thomæ de præmotione physiciæ* against Father Frins, S.J. (Paris, 1896); MANSSER, *Possibilitas præmotorum physiciæ thomistiæ in actibus liberis* (Fribourg, 1895); FELDNER, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas über die Willensfreiheit der vernünftigen Wesen* (Prague, 1890); PAPAGNI, *La mente di S. Tomaso intorno alla mozione divina nelle creature* (Benevento, 1901); UDE, *Doctrina Capreoli de influxu Dei in actus voluntatis humanæ* (Graz, 1905); DEL PRADO, *De gratiâ et libero arbitrio* (3 vols., Freiburg im Br., 1907).

II. AUGUSTINIANISTS.—NORISIUS, *Vindiciæ Augustinianæ* (Padua, 1677); BERTI, *De theologicis disciplinis* (8 vols., Rome, 1739—); BELLELLI, *Mens S. Augustini de modo reparationis humanæ naturæ* (2 vols., Rome, 1773); THOMASSIN, *Mémoires sur la grâce* (Louvain, 1668).

III. MOLINISTS AND CONGRUISTS.—MOLINA, *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis* (Lisbon, 1588; new ed., Paris, 1876); PLATEL, *Auctoritas contra prædeterminationem physicam, pro scientiâ mediæ historiæ propagatæ* (Lyons, 1665); IDEM, *Scientiâ mediæ historiæ defensa* (2 vols., Lyons, 1674–76); DE ARANDI, *De Deo scientiæ, prædestinationis et auxiliante seu Scholæ scientiæ mediæ* (Saragossa, 1693); SUAREZ, *De concursu, motione et auxilio Dei* (new ed., Paris, 1856); IDEM, *De auxilio efficaci* in Opp. (Paris, 1856), XI; IDEM, *De verâ intelligentiâ auxilii efficaci* in Opp. posthum., X, Append.; LESSIUS, *De gratiâ efficaci* in *Opuscula*, tom. II (Paris, 1878); SARDAGNA, *Theologia dogmatico-polemica* (Ratisbon, 1771); WIRCEBURGENSIS (KILBER), *De gratiâ* (new ed., Paris, 1853); MURRAY, *De gratiâ* (Dublin, 1877); JUNGEMANN, *De gratiâ* (Ratisbon, 1896); DE SAN, *De Deo uno, I: De mente S. Thomæ circa prædeterminationem physicam* (Louvain, 1894); FRINS, *S. Thomæ doctrina de cooperazione Dei cum omni naturâ creatâ, præsertim liberâ, seu S. Thomæ prædeterminationis physicæ adversarius* (Paris, 1890); DE RÉGNON, *Baïez et Molina Histoire, Doctrines, Critique métaphysique* (Paris, 1883); POHLE, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, II (Paderborn, 1909), 452–83.

IV. SYNCRETISTS.—Over and above the works of St. ALPHONSUS, the following may be consulted: TOURNELLE, *De gratiâ* (Venice, 1755); HERRMANN, *De divini gratiâ* (Rome, 1904), 337–501. Portions of the following may be cited here: PECCI, *Sentenza di S. Tomaso circa l'influsso di Dio sulle azioni delle creature ragionevoli e sulla scientia mediæ* (Rome, 1885); ADEODATUS (pseudonym), *J. Peccis Schrift . . . analysiert* (Mainz, 1888). For historical literature, see CONGREGATIO DE AUXILIIS.

J. POHLE.

**Grace, THOMAS.** See SACRAMENTO, DIOCESE OF.

**Grace, WILLIAM RUSSELL,** philanthropist and merchant, b. at Cork, Ireland, 10 May, 1832; d. at New York, 21 March, 1904. His father was originally from Queen's County, where the Graces lived from the days of their ancestor, Raymond Le Gros, who went to Ireland with Strongbow; his mother, a Russell from Tipperary, was a convert to the Catholic Faith. James Grace, his father, went from Ireland to Peru in 1850, but not being successful there, returned to Ireland, while his son, William Russell, remained behind and in time became a partner with the firm of John Bryce at Callao. This firm became Grace Brothers & Co., and W. R. Grace & Co., with offices in New York, San Francisco, and every city of importance on the west coast of South America. Grace also established, at New York, The New York and Pacific Steamship Co., and other financial enterprises. In 1859 he married Lillias Gilchrist of Thomaston, Maine.

He left Peru in the year 1864 and for a time lived in Brooklyn, then in 1878 moved to New York. At the time of the famine in Ireland in 1878 and 1879 his firm contributed to the relief fund one-fourth the cargo of provisions sent in the steamship Constellation for the famine stricken. This fact and others made him so popular that he was nominated for Mayor of New York, and, in spite of much opposition from bigoted sources, elected in 1880. He was the first Catholic

to hold that office. He was re-elected in 1884 and served a second term. An attempt to induce him to accept a nomination for a third term was made, but he declined to run.

A fact that best shows the Christian character of the man is that during his two terms as mayor he went to Mass every morning in the neighbouring church of St. Agnes before going to official work. His chief benevolent work was the foundation of the Grace Institute in May, 1897, which he dedicated to the memory of his parents. The object of this institution was to give free tuition to women in dressmaking, stenography, typewriting, book-keeping, and domestic science. The poor are also generally helped by this institution. He was prompted to found and endow it after a study of the economic conditions of workmen's families during a strike among the employees of one of his enterprises. The institution is non-sectarian, and is under the charge of the Sisters of Charity.

HENRY A. BRANN.

**Grace at Meals.**—In Apostolic times St. Paul counsels the faithful: "Whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God" (I Cor., x, 31). This precept did not cease to be observed. "Before taking nourishment," says Clement of Alexandria, "it is fitting to praise the Creator of all things, and it is fitting also to sing His praises when we take as nourishment the things created by Him" (Pæd., II, iv). Tertullian, a contemporary of Clement, shows us the Christians of the beginning of the third century making the sign of the cross on taking their places at table (De cor. milit., iii). "Our repasts," says he, referring to the Agape, "are in nothing vile or immodest. We do not recline until we have prayed to God. In like manner prayer concludes the feast" (Apol., xxxi). Christian archæology has collected a large number of cup-bases on which may be read a short prayer, e. g., "Drink in Christ," "Drink piously," "To the worthiest of friends, drink and live with all thine and in thy turn make a toast."

One of the most ancient formulæ of prayer at meals is found in a treatise of the fourth century, attributed without foundation to Saint Athanasius. Having made the sign of the cross, the prayer followed: "We give Thee thanks, our Father, for the holy Resurrection which Thou hast manifested to us through Jesus, Thy Son; and even as this bread which is here on this table was formerly scattered abroad and has been made compact and one, so may Thy Church be reunited from the ends of the earth for Thy Kingdom, for Thine is the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen." Apart from its intrinsic interest this formula possesses a certain importance because it reproduces in part the formula of the "Didache". The prayer said on rising from table is a little longer: "The merciful and compassionate Lord has given nourishment to those who fear Him. Glory be to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, now and forever and throughout the ages. Almighty God and Our Lord Jesus Christ, whose name is above all names, we give Thee thanks and praise Thee because Thou hast deigned to give us a portion of Thy goods and nourishment for our body. We pray and beseech Thee to give us in like manner heavenly nourishment. Make us fear and reverence Thy terrible and glorious name, and grant that we may never disobey Thy precepts. Write in our hearts Thy law and Thy justice. Sanctify our mind, our soul, and our body through Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ Our Lord. To Whom with Thee belongs glory, dominion, honour, and adoration for ever and ever. Amen."

It is not difficult to find examples in the writings of the Fathers of the Church, in the collections of canons, and in the liturgical books, notably in the Gelasian Sacramentary and the Bobbio Sacramentary (Muratori, "Liturgia Romana vetus", I, col. 745; II, col. 949).

In the Roman Liturgy the Benedicite and the Graces are compositions in which Psalms cxliv and xxxiii are utilized, several versicles being omitted. From the most ancient times Psalm xxxiii has been pre-eminently the Communion psalm. At the midday meal Ps. I is recited, in the evening Ps. cxvi. The origin of these formulæ is monastic, hence the pious commemoration of benefactors.

On the chief liturgical feasts: Easter, Pentecost, etc., a selection of verses recalling the solemnity of the day is substituted for the formulæ in use at ordinary times. See also THANKSGIVING.

SCUDAMORE in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v.; CABROL, *La Prière antique*, xxv, 364-369; VON DER GOLTZ, *Tischgebete und Abendmahlsgebete in der altchristlichen und in der griechischen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1905).

H. LECLERCQ.

**Gradiska.** See GORZ, DIOCESE OF.

**Grado,** DIOCESE OF. See AQUILEIA; VENICE.

**Gradual** (Lat. *Graduale*, from *gradus*, a step), in English often called *Grail*, is the oldest and most important of the four chants that make up the choir's part of the Proper of the Mass. Whereas the three others (Introit, Offertory, and Communion) were introduced later, to fill up the time while something was being done, the Gradual (with its supplement, the Tract or Alleluia) represents the singing of psalms alternating with readings from the Bible, a custom that is as old as these readings themselves. Like them, the psalms at this place are an inheritance from the service of the Synagogue. Copied from that service, alternate readings and psalms filled up a great part of the first half of the Liturgy in every part of the Christian world from the beginning. Originally whole psalms were sung. In the "Apostolic Constitutions" they are chanted after the lessons from the Old Testament: "The readings by the two (lectors) being finished, let another one sing the hymns of David and the people sing the last words after him" (ἡ ἀποστολὴ ἀποφάλλεται, II, 57). This use of whole psalms went on till the fifth century. St. Augustine says: "We have heard first the lesson from the Apostle. Then we sang a psalm. After that the lesson of the gospel showed us the ten lepers healed . . ." (Serm. cxxxvi, 1). These psalms were an essential part of the Liturgy, quite as much as the lessons. "They are sung for their own sake; meanwhile the celebrants and assistants have nothing to do but to listen to them" (Duchesne, "Origines du Culte chrétien", 2nd ed., Paris, 1898, p. 161). They were sung in the form of a *psalmus responsorius*, that is to say, the whole text was chanted by one person—a reader appointed for this purpose. [For some time before St. Gregory I, to sing these psalms was a privilege of deacons at Rome. It was suppressed by him in 595 (Ibid.).] The people answered each clause or verse by some acclamation. In the "Apostolic Constitutions" (above) they repeat his last modulations. Another way was to sing some ejaculation each time. An obvious model of this was Ps. cxxxv with its refrain: "quoniam in æternum misericordia eius", from which we conclude that the Jews too knew the principle of the responsory psalm. We still have a classical example of it in the Invitatorium of Matins (and the same Ps. xciv in the third Nocturn of the Epiphany). It appears that originally, while the number of Biblical lessons was still indefinite, one psalm was sung after each. When three lessons became the normal custom (a Prophecy, Epistle, and Gospel) they were separated by two psalms. During the fifth century (Duchesne, op. cit., p. 160) the lessons at Rome were reduced to two; but the psalms still remain two, although both are now joined together between the Epistle and Gospel, as we shall see. Meanwhile, as in the case of many parts of the Liturgy, the psalms were curtailed, till only fragments of them were left. This process, applied to the first of the

two, produced our Gradual; the second became the Alleluia or Tract.

I. THE NAME *Gradual* comes from the place where it was sung. In the First Roman Ordo (10) it is called *Responsum*; Amalarus of Metz (ninth century) calls it *Cantus Responsorius*; Isidore (seventh century) *Responsorium*, "quod uno canente chorus consonando respondet" ("De Eccl. Officiis", I, 8; Ordo Rom. II, 7. Cf. Mabillon, "Museum Italic.", II, 9, note f). This name was also used, as it still is, for the chants after the lessons at Matins; so the liturgical *Responsorium* was distinguished later by a special name. The reader who chanted the psalm stood on a higher place, originally on the steps of the ambo. He was not to go right up into the ambo, like the deacon who sang the Gospel, but to stand on the step from which the sub-deacon had read the Epistle (Ordo Roman. I, 10, II, 7: "he does not go up higher, but stands in the same place where the reader stood and begins the *Responsorium* alone; and all the choir answer and he alone sings the verse of the *Responsorium*." Cf. Ordo Rom. III, 9, VI, 5). Later in various local churches, when the ambo was disappearing, other places were chosen, but the idea of a high place, raised on steps, persists. At Reims, the steps of the choir were used, sometimes a special pulpit was erected. Beletth (twelfth century) says that on ordinary days the cantor stands on the altar-steps, on feasts on the ambo (Rationale, II, P. L., CCII); Durandus a little later writes: "Dicitur Graduale a gradibus altaris, eo quod in festivis diebus in gradibus cantatur" (Gradual is so called from the steps of the altar, on which it was sung on holidays.—Rationale, IV, 19). There seems then to be no doubt that the name comes from the place where it was sung; Cardinal Bellarmine's idea that the *gradus* in question are those the deacon is climbing for the Gospel while the Gradual is being chanted (De Missâ, II, 16) is a mistake. We have seen that this psalm was not sung to fill up time during the procession to the ambo. Originally the deacon and all the ministers would wait till it was over before beginning their preparation for the Gospel. The older name *Responsorium* lasted, as an alternative, into the Middle Ages. Durandus uses it constantly and gives a mystic explanation of the word ("Responsorium vero dicitur quia versui vel epistolæ correspondere debet", etc., loc. cit., i. e. "Responsory is so called because it ought to correspond to the verse or epistle").

It is difficult to say exactly when the Gradual got its present form. We have seen that in St. Augustine's time, in Africa, a whole psalm was still sung. So also St. John Chrysostom alludes to whole psalms sung after the lessons (Hom. in Ps., cxlv); as late as the time of St. Leo I (d. 461), in Rome the psalm seems not yet to have been curtailed: "Wherefore we have sung the psalm of David with united voices, not for our honour, but for the glory of Christ the Lord" (Serm. ii in anniv. assumpt.). Between this time and the early Middle Ages the process of curtailing brought about our present arrangement.

II. ORDER OF THE GRADUAL.—If we open a Missal, at most of the days in the year (the exceptions will be described below), we find between the Epistle and Gospel a set of verses with some Alleluias marked *Graduale*. Although the whole text follows this heading, although we usually speak of it all as the Gradual, there are here two quite distinct liturgical texts, namely the first part, which is the old *psalmus responsorius* (now the Gradual in the strictly correct sense), and the Alleluia with its verse, the Alleluiaic verse (*versus alleluiaicus*). We have seen that these two chants came, originally, one after each of the lessons that preceded the Gospel. Now that we have only one such lesson as a rule (the Epistle), the Gradual and Alleluiaic verse (or its substitute) are sung together. But there are still cases of their separation. In Lent, as we shall see, the Alleluia is replaced by the

Tract. A number of Lenten Masses that have kept the old three lessons also keep the old arrangement, by which the Gradual follows the first, the Tract the second (e. g. Wednesdays in the Lenten Ember week and Holy Week), others (e. g. the Ember Saturday) that have more than three lessons have a Gradual after each of the former ones and a Tract after the Epistle. There are again others (e. g. Tuesday in Holy Week), in which there is no Tract at all, but only a Gradual after the first lesson. And even when they are sung together their essential separation is still marked by the fact that they have quite different melodies, in different modes. Thus, on the first Advent Sunday the Gradual is in the first and second modes mixed, the Alleluia in the eighth; the next Sunday has a fifth-mode Gradual followed by a first-mode Alleluia, and so on. The Gradual itself always consists of two verses, generally from the same psalm. There are however many cases of their being taken from different psalms; some, of verses from other books of Scripture (e. g. those for the Immaculate Conception are from Judith); and a few in which the text is not Scriptural. The feast of the Seven Dolours has such verses, "Dolorosa et lacrymabilis es Virgo Maria" . . . and "Virgo Dei Genitrix" . . . So also "Benedicta et venerabilis es Virgo Maria" for the Visitation (July 2) and other feasts of the B. V. M., and the first verse of the Gradual for Requiems ("Requiem æternam . . ."). The first of these two verses keeps the old name *Responsorium*, the second is marked V (for *versus*). It may be that the first represents the former acclamation of the people (like the Invitatorium of Matins), and that the second is the fragment of the psalm originally sung by the lector (Gih, Messopfer, 410; and note 4 from Guyetus, Heortologia, Venice, 1726).

The second chant is normally the *versus alleluaticus* (in this case the shorter one). The use of the word *Alleluia* in the Liturgy is also a very old inheritance from the Synagogue. It became a cry of joy without much reference to its exact meaning in a language no longer understood (as did *Hosanna*). Its place in the Liturgy varied considerably. In the Byzantine Rite it comes as the climax of the Cherubic Hymn at the Great Entrance (Brightman, Eastern Liturgies, Oxford, 1896, p. 379); in the Gallican Rite it was sung at the Offertory (Duchesne, Origines du Culte Chrétien, Paris, 1898, p. 160, n. 1). Its place here before the Gospel is peculiar to the Roman Rite. It appears that before the time of St. Gregory I (d. 604) it was sung only during Eastertide (Ep. ix—see Duchesne, loc. cit.; Atchley, Ordo Rom. I, 78-9). Sozomen goes further: "At Rome, Alleluia is sung once a year, on the first day of the Paschal feast, so that many Romans use this oath: may they hear and sing that hymn!" (Hist. Eccl., VII, xix). This connexion with Easter (unknown in the East) afterwards led to additional Alleluias being scattered throughout the Mass in Eastertide (at the Introit, Offertory, Communion, etc.); but its old and essential place for the normal Liturgy is here, where it has displaced the former second *psalmus responsorius*. It will be noticed that the three great Alleluias that usher in Easter on Holy Saturday come here in the place of the Gradual. The chant consists of two Alleluias sung to exactly the same melody. At the end of the second one its last sound (a) is continued in a long and complicated neum. This musical phrase (called variously *neuma*, *jubilatio*, *jubilus*, *cantilena*) is a very old and essential element of the Alleluia. A great number of medieval commentators insist on it, and explain it by various mystic reasons. For instance Rupert of Deutz (Rupertus Tuitiensis, O. S. B., twelfth century): "We rejoice rather than sing (*jubilamus magis quam canimus*) . . . and prolong the neums, that the mind be surprised and filled with the joyful sound, and be carried thither where the saints rejoice

in glory" (De Officiis, I). So also Sicardus of Cremona: "Congrue quoque in Alleluia jubilamus [this means singing the neum] ut mens illic rapiatur ubi Sancti exsultabunt . . ." (Mitrale, III, 3, P. I., CCXIII); Durandus: "Est etiam Alleluia modicum in sermone et multum in pneauma, quia gaudium illud majus est quam possit explicari sermone. Pneauma enim seu jubilus qui fit in fine exprimit gaudium et amorem credentium", that is, "the Alleluia is short in word and long in neum, because that joy is too great to be expressed in words. For the neum or *jubilus* at the end denotes the joy and love of the faithful" etc. (Rationale, IV, 20; see the whole chapter). The question of the neum is discussed and many authorities quoted in Pothier, "Les Mélodies Grégoriennes d'après la tradition" (Tournai, 1881), xi, 170-9. It should certainly never be omitted. In the case of a figured Gradual a jubilus in figured music should be supplied. After the jubilus of the second Alleluia a verse follows. This verse is by no means so commonly taken from the psalms as the verses of the Gradual, and there are a great many cases, especially on feasts of saints, of a fragment of a Christian poem, or other verse not from the Bible. On St. Lawrence's feast (10 Aug.), for example, the Alleluatic verse is: "Levita Laurentius bonum operatus est, qui per signum crucis cæcos illuminavit" (The Levite Lawrence, who made the blind see by the sign of the Cross, worked a good work). This Alleluatic verse is a kind of continuation of the jubilus with a text fitted to the long-drawn neums. Then a third Alleluia, the same as the second with its jubilus, ends the chant.

There are two exceptions to this order. The first is when the Alleluia is replaced by the Tract. Since this word began to be looked upon as a special sign of joy, most suitable for Eastertide, it followed, as an obvious corollary, that it should not be sung in times of penance or mourning. There is no such idea in the East, where they sing Alleluia always, even in the Office for the Dead, as was once done at Rome too (Atchley, Ordo Rom. I, 78-9). That Latins sometimes avoid it was one of their many preposterous grievances at the time of Cæciliarius's schism (Card. Humbert's Dialogus, LVI-LVII, in Will, "Acta et Scripta de Controv. Eccl. Græcæ et Latine", Leipzig, 1861, pp. 122-3). In the West, from Septuagesima to Easter (even on feasts), on Ember days, most vigils, and at Requiems, the Alleluatic verse disappears. The Vigils in question generally have only the Gradual (but some have the Alleluia, e. g. the eves of Epiphany Ascension, Whitsunday). On the other days the Gradual is followed by the Tract. The Tract (*tractus*) is the second psalm sung between the lessons, which, although later displaced by the Alleluia on most days, has kept its place here. We find it as an alternative to the Alleluia in the First Roman Ordo: "Postquam legerit cantor cum cantatorio adscendit et dicit responsum. Ac deinde per alium cantorem, si fuerit tempus ut dicatur Alleluia, concinitur, sin autem tractum, sin minus tantummodo responsum cantatur", i. e. "After the reading (of the Epistle) the cantor ascends with his book and chants the Response. Then, if it be the proper season, another cantor chants the Alleluia; but if the Alleluia have to be omitted [i. e. in times of penance] the Tract or at times [as still on vigils] only the Response is sung" (ed. Atchley, London, 1905, p. 130, supplemented by Ordo Rom. III). The name "Tract", *Psalmus tractus*, was given to it, because it was sung straight through without any answer by the choir (*in uno tractu*). This was the special note of the second psalm, that distinguished it from the first *psalmus responsorius* (Amalarius of Metz, De eccl. offic., III, 12; Duchesne, op. cit., 108). Later authors explain the word incorrectly as describing the slow and mournful way in which it was sung ("a trahendo, quia lente et lugubriter cantatur", "from trahendo,

because it is sung slowly and mournfully"—De Carpo, "Bibl. liturg.", Pt. I, a. 2, quoted by Gühr, op. cit., 416). Durandus gives this, with other symbolic reasons, for the name: "It is called tract from *trahendo* because it is sung drawn out (*quia tractum canitur*) and with a harshness of voice and length of words; since it implies the misery and labour of our present life" (Rationale, IV, 21. See the whole chapter). The text of the "Ordo Rom. I" quoted above shows that it was sung from the steps of the ambo, like the Gradual. We have still a few Masses in which the *Psalmus tractus* has kept its original nature as a whole psalm. On the first Sunday of Lent it is Ps. xc; on Palm Sunday, Ps. xxi; on Good Friday, Ps. cxxxix. Otherwise the Tract too has been shortened to two or three verses. It is nearly always taken from Scripture, but not seldom from other books than the Psalter; verses from various psalms or other texts often follow one another, connected only by the common idea that runs through them. Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays in Lent are the old *feriae legitima*, the official days of penance, that still keep certain peculiarities (in choir, on these days, the Office for the Dead, the penitential and gradual psalms are said). Except on Wednesday in Holy Week they have the same Tract, a prayer for forgiveness from Ps. cii and lxxviii. All feasts that may come between Septuagesima and Easter and all common and votive Masses have a Tract, to be used in that time. Good Friday has two Tracts, one after the Prophecy and one after the lesson from Exodus that takes the place of the Epistle; it has no Gradual. The first Easter Mass on Holy Saturday, among many other peculiarities, keeps so much of the nature of a Lenten vigil that it has, after the great Alleluia and its verse, a Tract. On Whitsun eve the characters of Eastertide and a vigil are combined. It has no Gradual, but first an Alleluia, then a Tract. It will be noticed that each verse in the Tracts is marked V. This calls attention to the nature of the old *psalmus tractus* that was sung straight through by the cantor. There are no responses for the choir.

The second exception to the usual order is in Eastertide (from the first Easter Mass to the Saturday after Pentecost). During this time the great Alleluia is sung; it has displaced the Gradual altogether. "Rightly during the fifty days in memory of this our most peaceful and happy deed, we are accustomed to sing Alleluia oftener and more joyfully" (St. Bede, II Hom., x). An exception in this season is the Easter octave. The greatest feasts have always kept older arrangements, so on Easter Day and till the Friday following the normal Gradual followed by the Alleluiaic verse (and a sequence) has remained. From White Saturday to the end of paschal time, including all feasts, instead of these two separate chants, one, the great Alleluia, is substituted. Two Alleluias are sung first as a sort of antiphon; the second has a jubilus. Two verses follow, each with an Alleluia and jubilus at the end. These last two Alleluias have the same melody, different from that of the first two. The verses are taken from all parts of the Bible, in the *Proprium temporis* chiefly from passages in the New Testament about the Resurrection. In this case too feasts and other Masses that may occur in Eastertide are provided with this great Alleluia, as an alternative to be used then. Lastly, five occasions (Easter, Whitsun, Corpus Christi, the Seven Dolours, and Requiems) have a sequence after the Gradual. These five are all that Pius V's reform left of the innumerable medieval poems once inserted at this place (see SEQUENCES).

III. THE GRADUAL IN OTHER RITES.—In the East, too, there are fragments of the psalms once sung between the lessons, that therefore correspond to our Gradual. In the Byzantine Rite the reader of the Epistle first chants "the Psalm of David" and then the "Prokeimenon [*προκελεμενον*] of the Apostle". Both are short fragments of psalms. The Prokei-

menon only is now usually read. It is printed before each Epistle in the "Apostolos". After the Epistle the reader should sing Alleluia and another fragment of a psalm (Brightman, op. cit., p. 370-1). This too is now always omitted by both Orthodox and Melchites; even the Prokeimenon seems to be said only on Sundays and feasts in many churches (Charon, Le Rite byzantin, Rome, 1908, 683-4; but I have found churches where it is still used every day). The Armenian Rite, which is only a modified form of that of Constantinople, has however kept the older arrangement of three lessons. Before the Prophecy a fragment called the *Saghmos Jashu* (Psalm of dinner-time) is sung, before the Epistle the *Mesedi* (*μεσέδιον*), again a verse or two from a psalm, and before the Gospel the *Alelu Jashu* (Alleluia of dinner-time) consisting of two Alleluias and a verse (Brightman, op. cit., 425-6). Of the two older rites, that of St. James has the same arrangement as Constantinople (a Prokeimenon before and an Alleluia after the Epistle, Brightman, 36), that of St. Mark has a verse and an Alleluia after it (ibid., 118). The Nestorians have hymns (not Biblical texts) before both Epistle and Gospel which they call *Turgama*, and three verses of psalms each followed by three Alleluias (this group is called *Zumara*) after the Epistle (Brightman, 257-260). The Gallican Rite in the time of St. Germanus of Paris (d. 576) had three lessons. The *Benedicite* canticle (which he calls *Benedictio*) was sung after the second, sometimes by boys, sometimes by a deacon (Duchesne, Origines, 185-7). The place of this canticle was not always the same. At times it followed the first lesson (ibid.). The present Ambrosian Rite sometimes has a Prophecy before the Epistle. In this case there follows the *Psalmellus*, two or three verses from a psalm. After the Epistle, Hallelujah is sung (on feasts of Christ, except in Octaves, twice), then a verse, then again Hallelujah. In Lent, on vigils and fast days, instead of this the *Cantus* (our Tract) is used. After the Gospel follows the *Antiphona post Evangelium*, from various books of Scripture (except in Lent and on fast days). And on certain great feasts there is also an antiphon before the Gospel (Rubr. Gen. Miss. Ambros., §11). The Mozarabic Rite has three lessons. After the Prophecy follows a chant marked *Psallendo*. It has two verses, then a third marked V, then the second is repeated. The priest says: "Silentium facite" and the Epistle is read. Nothing is sung after the Epistle. In the seventh century a Council of Toledo (633) commanded under pain of excommunication that the Gospel should follow the Epistle immediately. After the Gospel follows the *Lauda*, consisting of an Alleluia, a verse, and a second Alleluia (Missale mixtum, P. L., LXXXV, e. g. for the first Sunday of Advent, col. 110, 112).

IV. RULES FOR THE GRADUAL.—The nature and arrangement of the chants that form the Gradual in the Roman Rite have already been explained, so that little need be added here about its use. As a result of the reaction of low Mass upon high Mass (by which everything sung by anyone else must also be read by the priest at the altar), the celebrant at high Mass reads the Gradual with the Alleluia, Tract, or Sequence, according to the form for the day, immediately after he has read the Epistle and at the same place (this is just as at low Mass). As soon as the sub-deacon has finished chanting the Epistle, the Gradual (of course, again, in the complete form for the day) is sung by the choir. There is now no rule for the distribution of its parts. All may be sung straight through by the whole choir. It is however usual (partly for the sake of artistic effect) to divide the texts so that some are sung by one or two cantors. A common arrangement is for the cantors to sing the first words of the Gradual (to the asterisk in the choir-books), the choir continues, the cantors sing the versus and the first Alleluia, the choir the second, the cantors



the Alleluiaic verse, and the choir the last Alleluia. Or, all Alleluias are sung by the cantors, the choir only joining in the neum. Similar arrangements may be made easily for the Tract or the great Alleluia in Eastertide. Normally it is all sung to plain-song and, now that we have the Vatican edition, to the form in that book. But there is no law about this, and the Gradual may be sung to any figured music that satisfies the principles of the "Motu Proprio" of 22 Nov., 1903. There is a useful arrangement of all Propers of the Mass in simple figured music by Tozer (New York, 2 vols., 1906) against which the only objection is that the composer has ignored the jubilus at the end of the Alleluia.

**V. GRADUAL-BOOK.**—The name Gradual (*Graduale Romanum*) is also used for the book that contains the music sung by the choir at Mass. The name comes from this most important chant, but the book contains the plain-song music for the Ordinary (this part is also published alone with the title *Ordinarium Missæ* or *Kyriale*) and all the Propers for the year. This book is one of the three parts of the old Roman Antiphonarium. Originally all the chants of the choir were contained in that. But by the ninth century it was already divided into three, the *Graduale* or *Cantatorium* for Mass, and the *Responsale* and *Antiphonarium* (in a stricter sense) for the Office (Amalaricus of Metz, *De Ordine Antiphonarii*, P.L., XCIX, in prolog.). The history of the book forms part of that of the development of plain-song. An authentic edition (the *Mediceæ*) was issued at Rome in 1614. It is now supplanted by the Vatican edition (1908), of which reproductions are being issued by various publishers.

Among the medieval writers see especially DURANDUS, *Rationale divinarum Officiorum*, IV, 19–21; GIRA, *Das heilige Messopfer* (6th ed., Freiburg in Br., 1897), 408–427; DUCHESNE, *Origines du Culte chrétien* (2nd ed., Paris, 1898), 107–8, 161–3; ATCHLEY, *Ordo Romanus primus* (London, 1905), 73–8; NIKEL, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirchenmusik* (Breslau, 1908), I, 83 sqq., and *passim*.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**Gradual Psalms.**—Fifteen psalms, viz. Pss. 119–133 (in Hebrew 120–134), bear the inscription in Hebrew שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת; Ps. 120 (121) has למַעֲלוֹת, in the Vulgate *canticum graduum*, which is translated in the Douay Version as "a gradual canticle". The Authorized Version calls them "songs of degrees"; the Revised Version, "songs of ascents". Of the various conjectural explanations, the most probable regards them as psalms recited when going up to the annual festivals in Jerusalem, pilgrim-songs (see PSALMS). The days on which the Gradual psalms were formerly recited are still indicated in the Roman Breviary, but the obligation of reciting them was removed by St. Pius V.

JOHN CORBETT.

**Gradwell, ROBERT**, Bishop; b. at Clifton-in-the-Fylde, Lancashire, 26 Jan., 1777; d. in London, 15 March, 1833; went to Douai in 1791. The college being suppressed by the French revolutionists, he was confined for some time, and was not allowed to return to England till 1795. With most of the Douai refugees, he went to Crook Hall, Durham, where he was ordained priest in 1802. He taught poetry and rhetoric for seven years at Crook Hall, and at the new college at Ushaw. About this time, Pius VII decided to reopen the English College at Rome, and on Dr. Lingard's recommendation, Gradwell was appointed rector (1818). Under his prudent administration the establishment flourished exceedingly. He also acted as Roman agent for the English vicars Apostolic, exhibiting tact and diplomacy in this office. In 1821 the pope made him a doctor of divinity. In 1828 he was consecrated Bishop of Lydda, as coadjutor to Bishop Bramston, the vicar Apostolic of the London district, and he came to London soon afterwards to take up his

new duties. His engaging personality soon endeared him to both clergy and people. Had he lived longer, he might have been one of the most eminent of English bishops, but unfortunately his constitution, undermined by the Roman summers, was unable to withstand the rigours of the English climate. After some years of ill-health, he died of dropsy. His writings include: "A Dissertation on the Fable of Papal Antichrists" (London, 1816); "A Winter Evening Dialogue . . . or, Thoughts on the Rule of Faith" (London, 1816); and various journals, letters, and MSS. in connexion with his residence in Rome, his notes on the old archives of the English College there are of some historical interest; all are in the Westminster archdiocesan archives.

COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; PETRE, *Notices of English Colleges*; *Liverpool Almanac*, 1885; BRADY, *Episcopal Succession*, iii, 197; WHITTE, *Preston*, ii, 284; *Gentleman's Magazine*, CIII, 378, 652, *Lady's Directory*.

C. F. WEMYSS BROWN.

**Graffiti**, the term in common usage among archaeologists to designate a class of rude inscriptions scratched on the walls of ancient monuments, generally sepulchral, as distinguished from the formal inscriptions engraved on the tombs of the deceased. The inscriptions of this order traced by pilgrims, between the fourth and ninth centuries, on the walls of the galleries, proved invaluable to De Rossi and later archaeologists in their explorations of the Roman catacombs. At an early stage in his career De Rossi realized the importance of these graffiti. Their absence from the walls of a gallery signified that there was nothing of importance in the vicinity, whereas, on the other hand, their presence meant that the explorer was in the immediate neighbourhood of an important crypt or other sepulchral monument which once contained the relics of a martyr. Here it was that a pious pilgrim of old, before leaving the venerated tomb, would take advantage of the occasion to scratch on the adjoining wall his name, with sometimes the date of his visit, or a pious exclamation or prayer to the saint, as, e. g., that near the papal crypt of the catacomb of St. Callistus: "Sancte Suste in mente habeas in orationes tuas Aureliu Repentinu" (Saint Sixtus, remember in thy prayers Aurelius Repentinus). Outside the catacombs the famous caricature of the Crucifixion found in the imperial palace on the Palatine is accompanied by a graffiti stating that the (supposed) Christian page, Alexamenos, is adoring his God, while, in a chamber adjoining, a second inscription of the same class proclaims Alexamenos a Christian (*Alexamenos fidelis*). In 1897 some Christian graffiti were discovered on the columns of the temple of Antoninus and Faustina, intermingled with pagan inscriptions of the third and fourth century. The great necropolis of the oasis in the Libyan desert also contains a number of interesting Christian graffiti (Kaufmann, *Handbuch der christl. Arch.*, 256). Graffiti are also found on ancient Christian altars of the fifth and later centuries (Le Blant, *Inscriptions Chrétiennes de la Gaule*).

KAUFMANN, *Handbuch der christlichen Archæologie* (Paderborn, 1905); LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1907); NORTHCOTE and BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotterranea* (London, 1878).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

**Grafton.** See LISMORE (AUSTRALIA), DIOCESE OF.

**Graham, CHARLES.** See PLYMOUTH, DIOCESE OF.

**Graham, PATRICK**, first Archbishop of St. Andrews and Metropolitan of Scotland, date of birth uncertain; d. 1478. He was a son of Mary, younger daughter of Robert III, by her third husband, Sir William Graham of Kincardine, ancestor of the dukes of Montrose. He was educated at the University of St. Andrews, where, in 1457, he held the position of dean of the Faculty of Arts. In 1463 he became Bishop of Brechin. In

1466 he succeeded his half-brother, the illustrious Bishop Kennedy, in the See of St. Andrews. He proceeded to Rome to receive the confirmation of Paul II, and remained abroad until 1469 to escape the avowed enmity of certain powerful nobles. While in Rome he obtained the erection of St. Andrews into an archbishopric and metropolitan church, to which the other twelve sees were subjected as suffragans. This was announced to the king, bishops, and diocesan chapters of Scotland by a Bull of Sixtus IV, dated 27 Aug., 1472. The announcement aroused a storm of opposition. The See of York ineffectually appealed against the loss of Galloway, its suffragan for more than five centuries, and the consequent deprivation of all future claim to jurisdiction in Scotland; that of Trondhjem as ineffectually resented the transference of the Dioceses of Argyle and the Isles; the king and the whole episcopate of Scotland set themselves to resist the innovation, rendered still more odious by the nomination of the new archbishop as Apostolic nuncio to raise subsidies for a crusade. James III, bribed by the bishops with an offering of 12,000 marks (according to some writers), joined them in appealing to Rome against his cousin the archbishop. Sixtus IV, in view of the extraordinary charges brought against Graham, sent a nuncio, John Huseman, to Scotland to investigate. The accusation included heresy, schism, simony, disobedience to the Holy See, with reviling and blasphemy against its authority; the claiming by the archbishop of the papacy, as imposed upon him by God for the reform of the Church; the appointment of legates, protonotaries, and suchlike officials; the revoking of papal indulgences, because granted for lucre; the saying of Mass, even thrice a day, when under the ban of excommunication, suspension, and interdict. The nuncio, after examining numerous witnesses, sent a report to Rome, and, after its due consideration by a commission of cardinals, Graham was declared guilty of the alleged charges. He was deprived of all dignities, degraded from orders, and subjected to imprisonment for life. He died in the Castle of Lochleven in 1478, and was buried in the old priory there. Many historians regard him as a zealous and good bishop, a victim to the persecution of his enemies, though this scarcely explains his condemnation. Whether he lost his reason under the stress of trouble, or whether he had become imbued with Lollardism (as Dickson suggests, though the charge concerning Mass seems to contradict this), it is impossible to say, in the absence of all official records except the Bull of deposition, dated 9 Jan., 1478.

BELLESHEIM, *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1890), II, 87-94; LESLEY, *History of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1830), 40; SPOTTISWOODE, *History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1847), I, 115; DICKSON, *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1877), I, Preface, pp. xvi-iii; THEINER, *Vetere monumenta Hibern. et Scotor.* (Rome, 1864), 465-480.

MICHAEL BARRETT.

**Grail**, THE HOLY, the name of a legendary sacred vessel, variously identified with the chalice of the Eucharist or the dish of the Paschal lamb, and the theme of a famous medieval cycle of romance. In the romances the conception of the Grail varies considerably; its nature is often but vaguely indicated, and, in the case of Chretien's Perceval poem, it is left wholly unexplained. The meaning of the word has also been variously explained. The generally accepted meaning is that given by the Cistercian chronicler Helinandus (d. about 1230), who, under the date of about 717, mentions a vision, shown to a hermit concerning the dish used by Our Lord at the Last Supper, and about which the hermit then wrote a Latin book called "Gradale". "Now in French", so Helinandus informs us, "*Gradalis* or *Gradale* means a dish (*scutella*), wide and somewhat deep, in which costly viands are wont to be served to the rich in degrees (*gradatim*), one morsel after another in different

rows. In popular speech it is also called 'greal', because it is pleasant (*grata*) and acceptable to him eating therein" etc. (Tissier, *Biblioth. Cisterc.*, VII, 73 sq.). The medieval Latin word "gradale" became in Old French "grail", "greal", or "greel", whence English "grail". Others derive the word from "garalis" or from "cratalis" (*crater*, a mixing-bowl). It certainly means a dish, the derivation from "grata" in the latter part of the passage cited above or from "agr  r" (to please) in the French romances is secondary. The explanation of "San greal" as "sang real" (kingly blood) was not current until the later Middle Ages. Other etymologies that have been advanced may be passed over as obsolete.

When we come to examine the literary tradition concerning the Grail we notice at the outset that the Grail legend is closely connected with that of Perceval as well as that of King Arthur. Yet all these legends were originally independent of each other. The Perceval story may have a mythical origin, or it may be regarded as the tale of a simpleton (Fr., *m  celot*) who, however, in the end achieves great things. In all the versions that we have of it, it is a part of the Arthurian legend, and, in almost all, it is furthermore connected with the Grail. So the reconstruction of the original Grail legend can be accomplished only by an analytical comparison of all extant versions, and is a task that has given rise to some of the most difficult problems in the whole range of literary history.

The great body of the Grail romances came into existence between the years 1180 and 1240. After the thirteenth century nothing new was added to the Grail legend. Most of these romances are in French, but there are versions in German, English, Norwegian, Italian, and Portuguese. These are of very unequal value as sources, some are mere translations or recasts of French romances. Now all these romances may be conveniently divided into two classes: those which are concerned chiefly with the quest of the Grail, and with the adventures and personality of the hero of this quest; and those that are mainly concerned with the history of the sacred vessel itself. These two classes have been styled respectively the Quest and the Early History versions.

Of the first class is the "Conte del Graal" of Chretien de Troyes and his continuators, a vast poetic compilation of some 60,000 verses, composed between 1180 and 1240, and the Middle High German epic poem "Parzival" of Wolfram von Eschenbach, written between 1205 and 1215, and based, according to Wolfram's statement, on the French poem of a certain Kyot (Guiot) of Provence, which, however, is not extant and the very existence of which is doubtful. To these may be added the Welsh folk-tales or "Mabinogion" known to us only from MSS. of the thirteenth century, though the material is certainly older, and the English poem "Sir Percyvelle", of the fifteenth century. In these latter versions only the adventures of Perceval are related, no mention being made of the Grail. Of the Early History versions the oldest is the metrical trilogy of Robert de Boron, composed between 1170 and 1212, of which only the first part, the "Joseph d'Arimathie", and a portion of the second, the "Merlin", are extant. We have, however, a complete prose version, preserved in the so-called Didot manuscript. The most detailed history of the Grail is in the "Grand St. Graal", a bulky French prose romance of the first half of the thirteenth century, where we are told that Christ Himself presented to a pious hermit the book containing this history. Besides these versions we have three French prose romances, also from the thirteenth century, which, though concerned chiefly with the quest, give also an account of the history of the sacred vessel. Of these the most notable is the "Queste del St. Graal", well known to English readers because it was embodied almost entire in Malory's "Morte d'Arthur". The others are

the so-called "Didot Perceval" or "La petite queste" and the lengthy and prolix "Perceval le Gallois", also known as "Perlesvaus".

The poem of Chrestien, regarded by many as the oldest known Grail romance, tells of Perceval's visit to the Grail castle, where he sees a *Graal* borne in by a damsel. Its accompaniments are a bleeding lance and a silver plate. It is a precious vessel set with jewels, and so resplendent as to eclipse the lights of the hall. All the assembled knights show it reverence. Mindful of an injunction not to inquire too much, Perceval does not ask concerning the significance of what he sees, and thereby incurs guilt and reproach. Undoubtedly Chrestien meant to relate the hero's second visit to the castle, when he would have put the question and received the desired information. But the poet did not live to finish his story, and whether the explanation of the *Graal*, offered by the continuators, is that which Chrestien had in mind, is doubtful. As it is, we are not informed by Chrestien what the *Graal* signifies; in his version it has no pronounced religious character. On the other hand, in the Early History versions it is invested with the greatest sanctity. It is explained as the dish from which Christ ate the Paschal lamb with his disciples, which passed into possession of Joseph of Arimathea, and was used by him to gather the Precious Blood of Our Saviour, when His body was taken from the Cross. It becomes identified with the Chalice of the Eucharist. The lance is explained as the one with which Longinus pierced Our Lord's side, and the silver plate becomes the paten covering the chalice. The quest in these versions assumes a most sacred character, the atmosphere of chivalric adventure in Chrestien's poem yields to a militant asceticism, which insists not only on the purity of the quester, but, in some versions (*Queste*, *Perlesvaus*), on his virginity. In the "*Queste*" and "*Grand St. Graal*", moreover, the hero is not Perceval but the maiden-knight, Galaad. But the other knights of the Round Table are also made to participate in the quest.

The early history of the Grail is intimately connected with the story of Joseph of Arimathea. When he is cast into prison by the Jews, Christ appears to him and gives him the sacred vessel, through which he is miraculously sustained for forty-two years, until liberated by Vespasian. The Grail is then brought to the West, to Britain, either by Joseph and Josephes, his son (*Grand St. Graal*), or by Alain, one of his kin (Robert de Boron). Galaad (or Perceval) achieves the quest; after the death of its keeper the Grail vanishes. According to the version of the "*Perlesvaus*" Perceval is removed, no one knows whither, by a ship with white sails on which is displayed a red cross. In the Guiot-Wolfram version we meet with a conception of the Grail wholly different from that of the French romances. Wolfram conceives of it as a precious stone, *lapis exilis* (i. e. *lapis* or *lapis exilis*?) of special purity, possessing miraculous powers conferred upon it and sustained by a consecrated Host which, on every Good Friday, a dove brings down from heaven and lays down upon it. The angels who remained neutral during the rebellion of Lucifer were its first guardians; then it was brought to earth and entrusted to Titirel, the first Grail king. It is guarded in the splendid castle of Munsalvaesche (*mons salvationis* or *silvaticus*?) by a special order of knights, the Templeisen, chosen by itself and nourished by its miraculous food-giving power.

The relationship of the Grail versions to each other, especially that of Chrestien to those of Robert de Boron and the "*Queste*", is a matter of dispute. Nor is their relative chronology certain. But in all these versions the legend appears in an advanced state of development, the preceding phases of which are not attested by literary monuments, and can, therefore, only be conjectured. The origin of the legend is in-

volved in obscurity, and scholars are divided in their views on this point. An Oriental, a Celtic, and a purely Christian origin have been claimed. But the Oriental parallels, like the sun-table of the Ethiopians, the Persian cup of Jamshid, the Hindu paradise, Cridavana, are not very convincing, and Wolfram's statement, that Kyot's source was an Arabic manuscript of Toledo, is open to grave doubt. It is different with the Celtic theory. There are undoubtedly Celtic elements in the legend as we have it; the Perceval story is probably, and the Arthurian legend certainly, of Celtic origin, and both of these legends are intimately connected with the quest story. Talismans, such as magic lances and food-giving vessels, figure prominently in Celtic myths and folk-tales. According to this theory the "*Mabinogion*", with its simple story of vengeance by means of talismans and devoid of religious significance, would yield the version nearest to the original form of the legend. Back of the quest-story would be some pre-Christian tale of a hero seeking to avenge the injury done to a kinsman. The religious element would then be of secondary origin, and would have come into the legend when the old vengeance-tale was fused with the legend of Joseph of Arimathea, which is essentially a legend of the conversion of Britain.

Those who maintain the theory of a purely Christian origin regard the religious element in the story as fundamental and trace the leading *motifs* to Christian ideas and conceptions. It is derived from the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, which is known to have had a great vogue in the twelfth century, particularly in Britain. There we read how Joseph, whom the Jews had imprisoned, is miraculously fed by Christ Himself. Additional traits were supplied by the "*Vindicta Salvatoris*", the legendary account of the destruction of Jerusalem. Furthermore, Joseph was confused with the Jewish historian, Josephus, whose liberation by Titus is narrated by Suetonius. The food-producing properties of the vessel can be explained, without resorting to Celtic parallels, by the association of the Grail with the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which gives spiritual nourishment to the faithful. The purely Christian legend which thus had arisen was brought into contact with the traditional evangelization of Britain, and then developed on British soil, in Wales, and thus the Celtic stamp, which it undeniably bears, is accounted for. In connection with the legendary conversion of Britain it is noteworthy that the literary accounts of this event are connected with the famous Abbey of Glastonbury, which is also intimately associated with the legend of Arthur, Glastonbury being identified in William of Malmesbury's account with the mythic Avalon. So scholars are inclined to connect this British sanctuary with the origin of the Grail romances. Possibly Walter Map, who died as Archdeacon of Oxford in 1210, and to whom is ascribed the authorship of a Grail-Lancelot cycle, got his information from that abbey. The first Grail romance was then probably written in Latin and became the basis for the work of Robert de Boron, who was an English knight under King Henry II, and a contemporary of Chrestien and of Map.

The fully developed Grail legend was later on still further connected with other legends, as in Wolfram's poem with that of Lohengrin, the swan-knight, and also with that of Prester John, the fabled Christian monarch of the East. Here also the story of Klincksch, the magician, was added. After the Renaissance the Grail legend, together with most medieval legends, fell into oblivion, from which it was rescued when the Romantic movement set in at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The most famous modern versions are Tennyson's "*Holy Grail*" in the "*Idylls of the King*" (1869), and Wagner's music-drama, the festival-play, "*Parsifal*", produced for the first time at Bayreuth in 1882.

A word as to the attitude of the Church towards the legend. It would seem that a legend so distinctively Christian would find favour with the Church. Yet this was not the case. Excepting Helinandus, clerical writers do not mention the Grail, and the Church ignored the legend completely. After all, the legend contained elements of which the Church could not approve. Its sources are in apocryphal, not in canonical, scripture, and the claims of sanctity made for the Grail were refuted by their very extravagance. Moreover, the legend claimed for the Church in Britain an origin well nigh as illustrious as that of the Church of Rome, and independent of Rome. It was thus calculated to encourage and to foster any separatist tendencies that might exist in Britain. As we have seen, the whole tradition concerning the Grail is of late origin and on many points at variance with historical truth.

The "Queste" was edited by Furnivall, "La Queste del Saint Graal" (Roxburghe Club, London, 1864), also the Grand St. Graal under the title "Seynt Graal or the Sank Ryal", etc. (Roxburghe Club, London, 1861-63). The Perlesvaus is in Potvin's edition of Chrestien, I (Mons, 1866); the Didot Perceval in Hucher, "Le Saint Graal" (Le Mans, 1874-78). Robert de Boron's poem was edited by Michel, "Le roman du St. Graal" (Bordeaux, 1841), Malory's "Morte D'Arthur" by Sommer (London, 1889-91), and the Perlesvaus rendered into English by Evans, "The High History of the Holy Grail" (London, 1898). (See WOLFRAM VON ESCHENBACH.)

For a critical discussion and full summaries of the Grail romances consult BIRCH-HIRSCHFELD, *Die Sage vom Gral* (Leipzig, 1877), and NUTT, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail* (London, 1888), and *The Legends of the Holy Grail* (London, 1902); WECHSLER, *Die Sage vom heiligen Gral in ihrer Entwicklung bis auf Richard Wagners Parsifal* (Halle, 1898), contains a complete bibliography of the subject up to 1898. See also HEINZEL, *Ueber die französischen Grailromane in Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie, phil.-hist. Klasse*, XL (Vienna, 1891); HERTZ, *Parsifal* (2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1898), pp. 413-66; DOMANIG, *Parzivalstudien*, II (Paderborn, 1890); RHYs, *The Origin of the Holy Grail in Studies in the Arthurian Legend* (Oxford, 1891), 300-32; GASTON PARIS, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXX (1888), pp. 1-19, 27-29, 39-44, 247-263; PAULIN PARIS, *Les Romans de la Table Ronde*, I-V (Paris, 1868-77), and in *Romania*, I, 1 sq.; BAIST, *Artus und der Gral in Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 19, 326 sq.; GROBER, *Französische Literatur in Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (Strasbourg, 1898), II, i, 502-10, 521-3; WILLY STAERCK, *Ueber den Ursprung der Grallgende* (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1903); NEWELL, *The Legend of the Holy Grail* (Cambridge, Mass., 1902).

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

**Gramigna**, PETRONIUS. See ALLAHABAD, DIOCESE OF.

**Grammont**. See GRANDMONT, ABBEY AND ORDER OF.

**Gramont**, EUGÉNIE DE, religious of the Society of the Sacred Heart; b. at Versailles, 17 September, 1788; d. at Paris, 19 November, 1846. Her father, the Count de Gramont d'Aster, was attached to the Court of Louis XVI; he had married a daughter of the Count de Boisselin, maid of honour to Queen Marie Antoinette. The family was driven into exile by the fall of the monarchy and, after travelling in Germany and Italy, settled at Richmond in England. After the death of the Count de Gramont d'Aster his widow was for a time in straitened circumstances, and maintained herself and her child by teaching. She soon returned to France, where Eugénie learnt, at Amiens, to know the new Society of the Sacred Heart, of which she became a member in 1806. Her mother also joined it a few years afterwards, and made her novitiate under the guidance of her own daughter. In 1815, notwithstanding her youth and the drawback of a slight physical deformity, Mother de Gramont was placed in charge of the first school of the Sacred Heart, opened in Paris, Rue des Postes, afterwards transferred to the Rue de Varenne. The school flourished under her care and, after a short interruption of her work by the revolution of 1830, she was sent back

to govern the house as superioress and continued to do so until her death in 1846. Mother de Gramont's remarkable intelligence and influence were of great value in the important work entrusted to her, and she established the school in the Rue de Varenne so firmly in its position that the only anxiety of the foundress of the society concerning it was the success, almost too brilliant for her love of hiddenness and simplicity, which attended the work. She knew the weak side of Mother de Gramont's character as well as her great gifts, and she was not deceived as to the dangers of a mind which was too receptive of strong influences and very difficult to disillusion. In a time of trial, during the first year of her religious life at Amiens, when the existence of the Society of the Sacred Heart was in great danger, Mother de Gramont was one of those who were misled by the action of M. de St. Estève; and again, in another critical moment in 1839, she took a line of conduct in opposition to the foundress which she afterwards recognized and deplored to the end of her life; her sorrow for her error, it is said, hastened her death. She died in the most perfect union of affection with the foundress, Blessed Madeleine Sophie Barat, asking pardon of her and of the whole society for the errors of judgment into which she had been led—her personal devotedness to the mother general had never wavered.

*Life of Venerable Madeleine Louise Sophie Barat* (Rochampton, 1900); BAUNARD, *Histoire de la Vénérable Mère Barat* (Paris, 1876, 1900), tr. FULLERTON (Rochampton, 1876).

JANET STUART.

**Gran** (Hungarian ESZTERGOM; Lat. STRIGONIUM), ARCHDIOCESE OF (STRIGONIENSIS), in Hungary. From the earliest time of its existence (eighth century) up to the beginning of the eleventh century, the Diocese of Gran embraced the greater part of Hungary, but as early as the beginning of the twelfth century its extent was considerably diminished by the founding of the Archdiocese of Bács. Gran, however, always remained the most important, and the Archbishop of Gran was looked upon as the Primate of Hungary. The jurisdiction of Gran extended originally over the whole of Upper Hungary to the territory of the Cumans beyond the Theiss. In 1766 two more dioceses were established in this territory, Neusohl (Besztercze-Bánya) and Rosenau (Rozsnyó), and in 1804 the Diocese of Erlau was separated from the Archdiocese of Gran, and raised to the archiepiscopal rank, with the suffragan sees of Rosenau, Szepes, Kaschau (Kassa), and Szatmár. In 1776 the Greek Ruthenian Bishopsrics of Eperies, Munkács, and Kreuz (Kőrös) were placed under the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of Gran; but in 1852 Kreuz was transferred to the Archdiocese of Agram, to which it had formerly belonged. The Archdiocese of Gran extends to-day over fourteen counties, and has as suffragans Neutra (Nyitra), Veszprém, Waitzen (Vác), Steinamanger (Szombathely), Stuhlweissenburg (Székes-Fehérvár), Raab (Gyor), Fünfkirchen (Pécs), and Neusohl (Besztercze-Bánya) (Latin Rite), also the Greek Ruthenian Dioceses of Eperies and Munkács. There are three chapters, the metropolitan chapter at Gran with 22 members, the collegiate chapter of Presburg with 13 members, and the chapter at Tyrnau (Nagy-Szombat) with 6 members. The archdiocese is divided into three vicariates, Gran, Tyrnau, and Budapest; 8 archdeaneries, the cathedral deanery of Gran and those of Bars, Hont, Komorn (Komárom), Neograd (Nógrád), Neutra (Nyitra), Presburg (Pozsony), and Sassin (Sasvár); and 46 deaneries, of which 21 belong to the Vicariate of Gran, one to that of Budapest, and 24 to that of Tyrnau. There are also in the archdiocese 13 abbeys, and 24 exempt abbeys. At one time the parishes numbered over a thousand, and as late as the middle of the sixteenth century exceeded nine hundred. On account of the continued advance of the Turks and the spread of Protestantism, this number rapidly de-

creased, so that it was reduced to one hundred at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Under the great Peter Pázmány, the zealous opponent of Protestantism, conditions were improved, and after his death there were 185 parishes. To-day the number is given as 480, and the total number of clergy in the archdiocese 923, of whom 729 are occupied with the cure of souls. There are 5 seminaries for the training of priests, the central seminary at Budapest, that of Gran, the Pazmaneum at Vienna, and the preparatory seminaries at Presburg and Tyrnau. There is also an archiepiscopal gymnasium connected with the Tyrnau seminary. The students number about 262. There are in the archdiocese 134 religious houses of men and women, whose members number collectively 2487. In the three vicariates of the archdiocese (1909) there are 1,480,531 Catholics, and 1,057,282 members of other creeds.

The already existing See of Gran was raised to met-

On account of the part played by its archbishops, the history of the Archdiocese of Gran is closely connected with that of Hungary. Up to the sixteenth century the archbishop resided at Gran, but when the Turks overran Hungary after the battle of Mohács, in which the primate, Ladislaus Szálkán (1524-26), was slain, Paul Várdai (1527-49) removed the seat to Presburg, and when Gran also fell into the hands of the Turks, to Tyrnau, which remained the seat of the archdiocese until 1820. This period is one of the saddest epochs in the history of the see. Ecclesiastical discipline became relaxed, and notwithstanding the efforts of Nikolaus Oláh (1553-68), Protestantism gained more and more territory. After the death of Anton Veranotius (1569-73), the episcopal see remained vacant for twenty-three years. It was the greatest of all the archbishops of Gran, Peter Pázmány (1616-37), who stemmed the decline of Catholicism in Gran. He succeeded in reconciling with the



CHURCH OF THE PRIMATE, GRAN

ropolitan rank by St. Stephen (c. 1000-38), first King of Hungary, who converted the country to the Catholic Faith and organized the Church there. He chose for the metropolitan see Gran, at that time the richest and most important city in Hungary and the royal residence. St. Adalbert, Bishop of Prague and martyr, was chosen patron of the archdiocese. It was Adalbert who converted the royal family to the Catholic Church and evangelized the country. The metropolitan church of Gran is dedicated to him, the titular patron being the Blessed Virgin. The first cathedral was begun by St. Stephen in 998. The foundation stone of the present building was laid by Alexander von Rudnay (archbishop 1819-31), and it was finished under Johann Simor (1866-92). In 1198 the royal palace at Gran was given to the archbishop for his residence. The first archbishop was Astericus Anastasius (Astrik-Anastaz) (990-c. 1036), who was the most loyal co-operator of King Stephen in organizing Catholic Hungary, and who was sent by Stephen to Rome to beg papal approval for the organization of the Church in Hungary, and to ask for the crown. It was also Astericus who, in the year 1000, crowned Stephen as first King of Hungary with the crown sent by Pope Sylvester II.

Church many influential families of Hungary, and thus brought about the ecclesiastical reorganization of the country. A pulpit orator of distinction, he earned imperishable fame by his cultivation of the Hungarian language and won a lasting place in the history of Hungarian literature. For the advancement of the Catholic religion and the promotion of learning, he founded at Vienna the Pazmaneum, a seminary for the training of priests. The University of Tyrnau was also founded by him, but was transferred to Budat (Ofen) by Maria Theresa. In 1891 Klaudius Vaszary was appointed archbishop.

In virtue of his dignity as Primate of Hungary, the Archbishop of Gran possesses a number of extraordinary privileges. Johann von Kanizsai (1387-1418) was the first to be mentioned as Primate of Hungary, though the primacy was connected with the Archdiocese of Gran as early as 1279. The primate is entitled to hold national synods, is Legatus Natus of the Holy Roman Church, has therefore the right, inside of his legation, to have the cross carried before him, and deals directly with the Holy See. As primate he has the right to visit the episcopal sees and the religious houses in Hungary, with the exception of the exempt Archabbey of Pannonhalma (S. Martinus in Monte



Pannoniæ). Since 1715 the primate has also been a Prince of the Holy Roman Empire, having the title of Prince Primate. He is the chief and privy chancellor of Hungary, and therefore keeper of the great seal of the kingdom. Formerly he was also a member of the supreme court, and in still earlier times, governor, viceroy, and First Count (*Erbobergespan*) of the County of Gran. To the primate also belonged the right to superintend the royal mint, and for this he received a certain sum out of its revenues (*ius pseti*). According to an ancient custom, he has the right of crowning the king and of anointing the queen. By a gift of archiepiscopal property he was at one time able to confer nobility (*Pradialadel*). The right to take an oath before a court of justice through his deputy, and not personally, was another privilege of the Primate of Hungary. The primate is also chief priest and chancellor of the Order of St. Stephen, established in 1764. As first banneret (*baro regni*) of Hungary, he is a member of the Upper House.

KNAUZ, *Monumenta ecclesie Strigoniensis*, I, II (Gran, 1861-66); FRANKL, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Entwicklung der Rechte des Erzbischofs von Gran als Primas legatus natus und Grosskanzler* (1866); TOROK, *Die Primase Ungarns* (Budapest, 1859); KARÁSONYI, *Wer waren die ersten Erzbischofe Grans?* in *Szazadok*, XXVI; *Die katolische Ungarn*, II (Budapest, 1902); *Die Komitate und Städte Ungarns*. Komitat Gran (Budapest, 1908); *Schematismus cleri archidiececesis Strigoniensis pro 1909*.

A. ALDASY.

**Granada**, ARCHDIOCESE OF (GRANATENSIS), in Spain, founded by St. Cecilius about the year 64, was made an archiepiscopal see by Alexander VI, 23 Jan., 1493. The history of this city, the long line of its prelates (uninterrupted until the twelfth century and restored in 1437), its illustrious men, and its famous monuments can hardly be summarized within the limits of this brief article. In the Roman period the city appears as Municipium Florentinum Eliberritanum. On its Iberian coins, minted in the Roman republican period, the city is called Ilurir; on Latin coins, Iliber and Florentia; on Visigothic coins, Iliberri, Eliberri, and Liberri. Pliny calls it Eliberri; Ptolemy, Ἰλλίβερις; Herodian, Ἰλλίβηρ. Olerón and Elna, on the other side of the Pyrenees, were similarly called; the name seems derived from the Basque language, in which *iri-berri*, or *ili-berri*, signifies "new town". In the eighth century, under Arab domination, this name was changed to *Granada*, originally the name of that particular quarter of the city inhabited since the third century by the Jews, to whom the Mussulman conquerors entrusted the custody of the city; it is worthy of note that several Palestinian peoples in the Old Testament are called *Rimmon*, "pomegranate" (in Spanish, *granada*).

The famous codex of San Millan (St. Emilian), written in the tenth century, and now preserved in the Escorial Library, supplies us with a catalogue of the bishops of Elliberis, sixty-two in number, from St. Cecilius to Agapius (64 to 957). The names of many of these and the periods of their reigns are also established by the Acts of councils, by their own writings, and by other authors, native and foreign. St. Cecilius, whose feast was kept by the Visigothic and Mozarabic Church on 1 May, was one of the seven Apostolic men sent from Rome by St. Peter and St. Paul to preach the Gospel in Hispania Bética, where they suffered martyrdom. On 15 May, 301, the famous synod known as the Council of Elliberis assembled at Granada (see ELVIRA, COUNCIL OF), forty-three bishops being present, among them, besides Flavian of Granada, the great Hosius of Cordova, Liberius of Mérida, Melantius of Toledo, Decentius of León, and Valerius of Saragossa. The eighty-one canons of this council reflect the state of dogma and church discipline in a time when persecution and antagonism were aroused by Roman imperial authority, the Jews, heretics, and schismatics. St. Gregory, Bishop of Elliberis, who assisted at the Councils of Sirmium and

Rimini, and was the constant antagonist of the Arian heresy, bears witness to the purity of Catholic faith which this see always maintained. Bishop Stephanus (Esteban) assisted at the Third Council of Toledo (589), which extinguished the Arian heresy in Spain; Bishop Bisinus at the Second of Seville (619); Bishop Felix at the Fourth of Toledo (633); the signatures of successive bishops of Elliberis in later councils attest the accuracy of the aforesaid San Millan catalogue. In 777 Bishop Egila was honoured by letters of praise from Adrian I. St. Leovigild, who, in the year 852, suffered martyrdom at Córdoba, was a native of Granada; and, not long after (858), the See of Granada was occupied by the wise Recesmund, memorable for his astronomical and literary achievements, as well as his embassies on behalf of Abd-er-Rahman III, Caliph of Córdoba, to the Emperors of Germany and of Constantinople. It was to him that Liutprand dedicated his history of the kings and emperors of Europe.

The See of Granada remained inviolate until the middle of the twelfth century. The Christian (Mozarabic) population having called to their aid Alfonso the Fighter (*el Batallador*), King of Aragon and Navarre, and conqueror of Saragossa, he led his hosts within sight of Granada; but the expedition being defeated, some of the Christians departed with the king, and the Almohades carried off the remainder by force to Marrucos. Thenceforward the Christian population consisted of captives and foreigners, and no bishop held the title of Granada. Gams, in his "Series Episcoporum", makes St. Pedro Pascual (d. 6 Dec, 1300) a Bishop of Granada in the second half of the fourteenth century, an error which has been corrected since the publication of the "Regesta" of Boniface VIII (Paris, 1884). The new list of Bishops of Granada begins 13 Sept., 1437, and continues until 1492, according to the researches of Eubel in the Vatican registers.

With the surrender of the city to the Catholic sovereigns Ferdinand and Isabella (2 Jan., 1492), began a period of splendour for the See of Granada. A few days after that event, the Catholic sovereigns there ratified with Christopher Columbus the compact which was to result, before the end of that year, in the discovery of the New World. On 30 Jan. they issued the decree of expulsion against all Jews inhabiting their dominions in Spain and Italy.

It is to be noted that the first Archbishop of Granada, the queen's confessor, transferred from the See of Avila, was not hostile to Columbus, but his constant friend, as Don Antonio Sanchez Moguel, Member of the (Spanish) Royal Academy of History, has promised to demonstrate. In this modern period of more than four centuries' duration, Granada has been ruled by many archbishops eminent for learning and virtue, e. g. Cardinal Gaspar de Avalos, who founded the university (1531), Pedro Guerrero, a distinguished member of the Council of Trent, and Manuel Bonel y Orbe, Patriarch of the Indies; it has given birth to innumerable writers, among whom the Dominican Luis de Granada and the Jesuit Francisco Suárez are conspicuous; it was the cradle of the Order of St. John of God. Indeed, it has long been a centre of vigorous spiritual life, proof of which is abundantly furnished by its churches, its conventual buildings, and the vast material resources there devoted to works of charity. Its cathedral contains the tombs of Ferdinand and Isabella, and of the Empress Isabella, wife of Charles V. Early in the present century, that famous monument of Spanish art, the Cartuja (Chartreuse) of Granada, from which its austere anchorites had been driven by the barbarous decree of exclaustation (1835), was acquired and restored by the Jesuits, who have established in it their novitiate for New Castile, Estremadura, and Andalusia, also a school of the sacred sciences, and a seismological and astronomical observatory which publishes a periodical bulletin

highly valued in scientific circles both in the Old and the New World.

HUBNER, *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Latinae* (Berlin, 1869, 1892), 285-292, 382-385; *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae* (Berlin, 1871), 33, 34, *Supplem.* (Berlin, 1900), 53; 99-102; FRA, *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* (Madrid, 1892), XXI, ii; *España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1754), XII, 79-220; GAMS, *Series episcoporum* (1873), 34-36, 38; *Supplem.* 81; EUBEL, *Hierarchia ecclesiastica mediaevi* (Munich, 1901), 178; SIMONET, *Historia de los mozárabes de España* (Madrid, 1897-1903), 938; DE GÁLVEZ, *San Pedro Pascual obispo de Jaén y mártir* (Jaén, 1903), 325-329; *Bulletin de la Société belge d'Astronomie* (Jan., 1908); *Comptes rendus de la primera Asamblea general de Sismología* (The Hague, Sept., 1907).

F. FITA.

**Granada, UNIVERSITY OF.**—The origin of this university is to be traced to the Arab school at Cordova, which, when the city was captured by St. Ferdinand in 1236, was removed to Granada and there continued. When Granada in its turn fell into the hands of the Catholic sovereigns one of their earliest and chief cares was to secure the preservation of letters and the art of imparting knowledge, in which the Arabs had been so well-versed, and the school was taken under their protection. However, it did not receive the status of a university until the reign of Charles V, when a Bull of erection, dated 1531, was issued by Clement VII. The institution is endowed with privileges similar to those enjoyed by the Universities of Bologna, Paris, Salamanca, and Alcalá de Henares. The large building which it occupies was erected by the Jesuits and is admirably suited to its purpose. The curriculum covers a wide field, the faculties including those of law, medicine, social science, etc. The university has a seismological station in the observatory of Cartuja. The magnificent library contains 40,000 volumes, and includes a polyglot Bible, several valuable works of theology, and some Arabic MSS.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

**Grancolas, JEAN**, Doctor of the Sorbonne, theologian, liturgist; b. near Chateaudun, about 1660; d. at Paris, 1 August, 1732. Having received the degree of Doctor of Theology of the faculty of Paris in 1685, he became chaplain to the brother of Louis XIV. He pronounced the funeral oration of this prince, but his panegyric displeased the son of the deceased, the Duke of Orléans, future Regent of France, who dismissed him from his house. His unfortunate essay caused Grancolas to abandon official eloquence, and, having devoted much time to studying liturgical ceremonies and comparing the various usages with the text of the ancient writers who have given an account of them, he undertook to communicate to the public his observations on this head. His first work dealt with the antiquity of the ceremonies of the sacraments. The favourable reception accorded this endeavour led Grancolas to publish the next year a study of the custom of dipping the consecrated bread in the wine. However, the author was desirous of participating in less severe questions, and wished to engage in theological polemics. At that time the matter of Quietism was creating a great stir in the world, and Grancolas conceived the idea of plunging into the quarrel by a refutation of the heresy which he entitled "Le Quietisme contraire au doctrine des sacrements" (Quietism contrary to the doctrine of the Sacraments), and which appeared in 1693.

This work contains a history of the life, doctrine, and condemnation of Molinos. Grancolas herein sets forth the principles of the Spanish mystic and of his followers, which principles he proceeds to refute from Scripture and the tradition of the Fathers. This new work attracted little attention, and shared the fate of so many other theological demonstrations called forth by the Quietist heresy and scarcely remembered to-day. However, from his own point of view, Grancolas is master of his subject and handles it firmly, but he displays the usual qualities and de-

fects found in his other works, namely, an erudition of the first order derived directly from original sources, a profound and wide acquaintance with the question he treats and germane topics, a too evident rudeness of expression and lack of culture, as well as an obvious disdain for composition. His works offend chiefly in this last particular. Grancolas scarcely took the trouble to arrange and connect the points of an argument, being satisfied to throw them into a heap, and deprived them by this disorder of a part of their demonstrative value. Despite these defects all the works of Grancolas retain their value as books of reference. His collections of texts do not do away with the necessity of having recourse to originals, although the translations he gives are generally exact and very clear, but he is useful, inasmuch as he omits nothing essential and also, if necessary, in determining the sense of a word. An original mind, he belongs to the theological school of Thomassin and Petau who readily replace discussion by the exposition of traditional opinions in chronological order, but he scarcely troubles to develop the sense of his texts. His real originality is as a liturgist, although even here he does not rise above the second rank. Ingenious without being systematic, imaginative without being adventurous, the commentary in most of his works is valuable, especially in the "Ancien sacramentaire de l'Eglise" and in the "Commentaire sur le Bréviaire romain".

His principal writings are: "Traité de l'antiquité des cérémonies des sacrements" (Paris, 1692); "De l'Intinction, ou de la coutume de tremper le pain consacré dans le vin" (Paris, 1693); "Le Quietisme contraire à la doctrine des sacrements" (Paris, 1693); "Instructions sur la religion tirées de l'Ecriture sainte" (Paris, 1693); "La Science des confesseurs ou la manière d'administrer le sacrement de Pénitence" (Paris, 1696); "Histoire de la communion sous une seule espèce, avec un Traité de la concomitance, ou de la Présence du Corps et du Sang de Jésus Christ sous chaque espèce" (Paris, 1696); "L'ancienne discipline de l'Eglise sur la Confession et sur les pratiques les plus importantes de la Pénitence" (Paris, 1697); "Heures sacrées ou exercice du chrétien pour entendre la messe et pour approcher des sacrements, tiré de l'Ecriture Sainte" (Paris, 1697); "Tradition de l'Eglise sur le péché originel et sur la réprobation des enfants morts sans baptême" (Paris, 1698); "L'ancien pénitentiel de l'Eglise ou les pénitences que l'on imposait autrefois pour chaque péché et les devoirs de tous les états et professions présents par les saints Pères et par les conciles" (Paris, 1698); "Les anciennes liturgies ou la manière dont on a dit la sainte Messe dans chaque siècle dans les Eglises d'Orient et dans celles d'Occident" (Paris, 1697); "L'ancienne sacramentaire de l'Eglise, où sont toutes les pratiques qui s'observaient dans l'administration des sacrements chez les Grecs et chez les Latins" (2 vols., Paris, 1690-99); "La morale pratique de l'Eglise sur les préceptes du Décalogue: ou la manière de conduire les âmes dans le sacrement de pénitence" (2 vols., Paris, 1701); "La tradition de l'Eglise dans le soulagement des esclaves" [J. G. (?)] (Paris, 1703); "Traité de la Messe et de l'office divin" (Paris, 1713); "Dissertations sur les messes quotidiennes et sur la confession" (Paris, 1715); "Le Bréviaire des laïques ou l'Office Divin abrégé" (Paris, 1715); "Les catechismes de Saint Cyrille de Jerusalem avec des notes et des dissertations" (Paris, 1715); "Commentaire historique sur le Bréviaire romain" (Paris, 1700, and Venice, 1734); "La critique abrégée des ouvrages des auteurs ecclésiastiques" (2 vols., Paris, 1716); "Instruction sur le Jubilé avec des résolutions de plusieurs cas sur cette matière" (Paris, 1722); "Histoire abrégée de l'Eglise, de la Ville et de l'Université de Paris" (Paris, 1728); "L'Imitation de Jésus Christ, traduction nouvelle précédée d'une Dissertation sur l'auteur de ce livre" (Paris, 1729). Grancolas favours the claims of Ubertino of

Casale, a Franciscan who lived shortly before the fourteenth century, to the authorship of the *Imitation*.  
 DU PIN, *Bibliothèque des auteurs eccl.* (seventeenth century);  
 MORERI, *Grand dictionn. historique*, IV, 179-80.

H. LECLERCQ.

**Granderath**, THEODOR, b. 19 June, 1839, at Giesenkirchen, Rhine Province; d. 19 March, 1902, at Valkenburg, Holland. After completing the course in the gymnasium at Neuss, he studied theology in the University of Tübingen, and entered the Society of Jesus at Münster, Westphalia (3 April, 1860). Between 1862 and 1874 he finished his studies in the classics, philosophy, theology, and canon law. In 1874 he was appointed professor of canon law in the college of Dittton Hall, England, where from 1876 to 1887 he taught dogma and apologetics. In 1887 he was sent to the college of the Society at Exaeten, Holland, to succeed Father Schneemann in the preparation of the "Acta et Decreta Concilii Vaticani". In 1893 he was called to Rome, where Leo XIII placed the archives of the Vatican Council at his disposal, with a view to a history of that council. In 1897 and 1898 he replaced the professor of apologetics at the Gregorian University. In 1901 failing health compelled him to retire to the college at Valkenburg, where he prepared the first two volumes of his history of the Vatican Council.

Granderath's name will live for ever among scholars in connexion with his monumental labours on the Vatican Council. In preparation for them he first edited the "Acta et Decreta sacrosancti oecumenici Concilii Vaticani" (Freiburg im Br., 1890), the seventh volume of the "Acta et Decreta sacrorum Conciliorum recentiorum" in the "Collectio Lacensis". This was followed by "Constitutiones Dogmaticæ ss. oecumenici Concilii Vaticani ex ipsis ejus actis explicatæ atque illustratæ" (Freiburg im Br., 1892). The publication of his "Geschichte des vaticanischen Concils von seiner ersten Ankündigung bis zu seiner Vertagung, nach den authentischen Dokumenten dargestellt" was continued after the author's death by his fellow-Jesuit Konrad Kirch. Two volumes of this work, which the author himself prepared for the press, were issued in 1903 at Freiburg im Breisgau, the first dealing with the preliminary history and the second with the proceedings of the council to the end of the third public session. The third and last volume was published in 1906 and treats of the final proceedings. A French translation is being issued at Brussels (1908—). The great merit of Granderath's work consists in his refutation of biased accounts of the council animated by hostility to the Church; he opposes to them a history based upon authentic materials. For the first time the unabridged text of the acts of the council, especially of the discourses delivered in the general congregations, was laid before the public. Granderath was also the author of many apologetic, dogmatic, and historical articles in the "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach" (1874-99), the "Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie" (1881-86), and the "Katholik" (1898). The second edition of the "Kirchenlexikon" contains also several lengthy articles from his pen, among others that on the Vatican Council (XII, 607-33).

LAUCHERT in *Biographisches Jahrbuch* (Berlin, 1904), VII, 265.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

**Grandidier**, PHILIPPE-ANDRÉ, priest and historian, b. at Strasburg, Alsace, 9 Nov., 1752; d. at the Abbey of Luntz (Lucelles), Sundgau, 11 Oct., 1787. This gifted scholar was appointed archivist of the Diocese of Strasburg at the early age of eighteen by the prince-archbishop, Cardinal de Rohan, and at twenty-five had been admitted to twenty-one scientific societies in France and Germany. His forte was critical investigation, but his intense application soon undermined his health, and he died at the early age of thirty-

four. In recognition of his services he was made canon of Strasburg, and, shortly before his death, royal historiographer for Alsace. We owe to him two volumes of the "Histoire de l'église et des évêques-princes de Strasbourg depuis la fondation de l'évêché jusqu'à nos jours" (Strasburg, 1776-78), an account of the early ecclesiastical history of Alsace to 965. From the manuscripts of Grandidier Liblin continued this monumental work under the title: "Œuvres historiques inédites de Ph.-A. Grandidier" (Colmar, 1865-67), in six volumes. Pius VI expressed his admiration of Grandidier's work and encouraged the young savant to further labours. The other canons of Strasburg therefore held themselves slighted and so opposed Grandidier's scientific methods—even questioning the soundness of his faith—that for a while he dropped all historical work. He soon yielded, however, to his love of science, and gave new evidence of his skill in historical research by the "Essais historiques et topographiques sur l'église cathédrale de Strasbourg" (Strasburg, 1782) and by the "Histoire ecclésiastique, militaire, civile et littéraire de la province d'Alsace" (Strasburg, 1787). Recently P. Ingold edited in five volumes the correspondence of this savant: "Nouvelles œuvres inédites; Les Correspondants de Grandidier" (Paris, 1895-97).

SEACH, *Eloge historique de Grandidier* (Colmar, 1851), *IDEM*, *L'Abbé Grandidier dans ses œuvres choisies* (Strasburg, 1865). See also *Notice sur la vie et les œuvres de Grandidier* (Colmar, 1858).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Grandmont**, ABBEY AND ORDER OF, in the department of Hte-Vienne, France. The exact date of the foundation of the order is very uncertain. The traditional story involves serious chronological difficulties, and is based on a Bull of Gregory VII now shown to be a forgery (see Martène and Durand, *Ampl. Coll.*, VI, Praef.). The founder, St. Stephen, is said to have settled in the valley of Muret near Limoges in 1076, but Martène considers that the origin of the order cannot be placed earlier than about 1100. The Order of Grandmont has been claimed by both Benedictines and Canons Regular as a branch of their respective institutes, although the Grandmontines always maintained that they formed a distinct order. Martène considers that St. Stephen modelled his institute upon the life of the Carthusians. The so-called "Rule of St. Stephen" was compiled at the request of the fourth prior, Etienne de Liciac, by Hugh of Laceria, and embodies the customs of Grandmont some 20 or 30 years after St. Stephen's death. The founder himself left no authentic writings. His maxim was: "There is no rule save the Gospel of Christ"; as this was the basis of all rules, to practise its morality was to fulfil all the duties of a good religious. The early Grandmontines were noted for their extreme austerity. Poverty was most strictly observed; the rule forbade the possession of lands, cattle, revenue, or inappropriate churches. Begging was only permitted when there was no food in the house, and even then the local bishop was first to be informed of their state. The law of silence was also very severe, as were the rules of fasting and abstinence.

After the founder's death in 1124 his disciples migrated to the neighbouring rocky desert of Grandmont, owing to a dispute about the ownership of Muret. Under Etienne de Liciac the order spread rapidly, and in 1170 numbered sixty monasteries, mostly in Aquitaine, Anjou, and Normandy. Under his successor, Bernard de Boschiac, eighty new foundations were made, and the "bons hommes" were to be found in nearly every diocese of France. The influence of the Grandmontines reached its height in the twelfth century. Their holy austerity roused the admiration of all beholders, and the kings of England and France vied with one another in bestowing favours upon them. Henry II of England had the monastery rebuilt, and

St. Louis erected a Grandmontine house at Vincennes. The golden age of Grandmont however lasted only some sixty years after the founder's death. From that time onwards the history of the order is an almost uninterrupted series of disputes. Even in the twelfth century the ill-defined position of the lay brothers caused troubles. They were far more numerous than the choir-monks, and were given entire control of all temporalities in order that the latter might be entirely free to carry on their spiritual duties. Gradual relaxation of the rules of poverty led to great possessions, and thus increased the importance of the lay brothers, who now claimed equality with the choir-monks. This led to scandalous scenes. In 1185 the lay brothers at Grandmont rose in open revolt, expelled Prior Guillaume de Trahinac with 200 of the religious, and set up an intruder. The political situation embittered these dissensions, the order being divided into two parties, French and English. Successive popes tried to restore peace, but in vain. In 1219 the prior of Grandmont and forty monks were again expelled by the rebellious lay brothers. In 1244 the papal delegates advised a union of the order with the Cistercians as a means of ending the disputes. This threat and the expulsion of a large number of monks produced a certain degree of peace. Numbers, however, declined; about 1150 the order had over 1200 members, but towards the beginning of the fourteenth century only 800. Moreover, a relaxation of the rule (1224) led finally to the cessation of all observance.

In 1317 John XXII, sometimes said to have been a Grandmontine monk, issued the Bull "Exigente debito" to save the order from complete destruction. Its organization was altered and certain mitigations were approved. The number of houses was reduced from 149 to 39. The prior of Grandmont was made an abbot, and the superiors of the dependent houses, who had hitherto been known as "Correctors", were for the future to bear the title of Prior. The Abbot of Grandmont was to be elected by his own community, and not, as before, by the deputies of the whole order. A general chapter, to be attended by the prior and one monk from each dependent house, was to be held annually. These vigorous measures brought about a slight recovery, but, in spite of the vigilance of the Holy See and the good administration of the first abbots, the improvement was of short duration. The order suffered severely during the Hundred Years War. From 1471 till 1579 Grandmont was held by commendatory abbots; shortly after the latter date there were only eight monks in the monastery. The Huguenots seized the abbey on one occasion, but were expelled by Abbot Rigaud de Lavaur in 1604. In 1643 Abbot Georges Barny (1635-1654) held a general chapter, the first for 134 years, at which Dom Charles Frémon was authorized to found the Strict Observance of the Order of Grandmont. This new branch, which remained under the jurisdiction of the abbot, was conspicuous for the primitive austerity of its observance, but never numbered more than eight houses. By the beginning of the eighteenth century the two Observances together numbered only about 150 members, but the quarrels were as frequent and as bitter as ever. Grandmont was one of the first victims of the Commission des Réguliers. The religious of the Strict Observance were dispersed in 1780, but the struggle for existence was prolonged till 1787, when the last two monks were expelled from the mother-house. The monastery was finally destroyed at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and nothing but a few fragments of wall now remains.

Grandmont never produced any writers of importance. Apart from a number of lives of St. Stephen, the most important work issuing from Grandmont was Gérard Ithier's treatise "De institutione novitiorum"—a favourite spiritual work in the Middle Ages, usually but erroneously attributed to Hugh of

St. Victor. The original habit of Grandmont was a coarse tunic with scapular and hood, brown in the early days but changed later to black. The monks gradually laid aside scapular and hood in favour of rochet and biretta. The original habit was resumed by the Strict Observance. The founder had expressly forbidden the reception into the order of houses of religious women, nevertheless four small nunneries in the Diocese of Limoges were admitted. Outside France the order only possessed five houses, two in Spain and three in England. These latter, situated at Alberbury, Creswell, and Gosmont, never attained any importance and were occupied by a very small number of monks.

BEAUNIER, *Recueil historique des archevêchés*, etc. (Paris, 1900); GUTBERT, *Destruction de l'ordre de Grandmont* in *Bulletin de la Soc. Arch. et Hist. du Limousin*, XXII-XXV (Limoges, 1877); HEIMBUCHER, *Orden u. Kongregationen*, I (Paderborn, 1907); HEIMBUCHER, *Realencyklopädie*, VII (Leipzig, 1890); HÉLYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, VII (Paris, 1718). The rule will be found in P. L., CCIV, and in MARTÈNE, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, IV (Bassano, 1788); MARTÈNE, *Amplissima collectio*, VI; HAURÉAU, *Sur quelques écrivains de l'ordre de Grandmont* in *Notices et extraits des MSS.*, XXIV, pt. II, 247-57.

RAYMUND WEBSTER.

**Grand Rapids, DIOCESE OF (GRANDORMENSIS)**, created 12 May, 1882, out of the Diocese of Detroit, and made to include the lower peninsula of the State of Michigan, U. S. A., north of the southern line of the Counties of Ottawa, Montcalm, Gratiot, and Saginaw, and west of the eastern line of the Counties of Saginaw, Bay, and the adjacent islands, an area of 22,561 square miles. In this section there were then about 50,000 Catholics attended by 34 priests. There were 33 churches, 33 missions, 41 stations, 11 parish schools, and an orphan asylum. In the rural regions colonies of Belgians and emigrants from Holland had settled, with an admixture of Irish; to these Poles have since been added. Henry Joseph Richter, appointed the first bishop, was consecrated at Grand Rapids, 22 April, 1883. He was born at Neuenkirchen, Duchy of Oldenburg, Germany, 9 April, 1838, and ordained priest at Rome, 10 June, 1865. Under his direction the diocese prospered steadily in all directions. Several religious communities of men are located there: Franciscans (both Minorites and Conventuals), Fathers of the Holy Ghost, Redemptorists, and Premonstratensians. The religious communities of women are: Sisters of St. Dominic, Sisters of Mercy, Little Sisters of the Poor, Sisters of Charity (Mt. St. Joseph, Ohio), School Sisters of Notre Dame, Ursuline Sisters, Sisters of Charity (Emmitsburg), Sisters of Providence, Felician Sisters, Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Franciscan Sisters of Christian Charity.

Statistics: Priests 133 (regulars 24); ecclesiastical students 60; churches with resident priests 91; missions with churches 92; stations 38; chapels 18; academies for girls 2; high schools 2, pupils 242; parish schools 66, pupils 13,545; orphan asylums 2, inmates 325; industrial schools 1, pupils 138; total young people under Catholic care 14,108; hospitals 7; home for aged poor 1; Catholic population 126,057.

*Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1909); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. Cath. Hierarchy of United States* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Michigan Catholic* (Detroit), files.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Granjon, HENRY.** See TUCSON, DIOCESE OF.

**Grant, THOMAS**, first Bishop of Southwark; b. at Ligny-les-Aires, Arras, France, 25 Nov., 1816; d. at Rome, 1 June, 1870. He was the son of Bernard Grant, an Irishman who enlisted in the British army, became sergeant, and finally purchased a commission. His mother, Ann MacGowan, was also Irish by birth. In January, 1829, he was sent to Ushaw College, where he studied until 1836, when he went to the English College at Rome. There he was ordained priest, 28 Nov., 1841, was created doctor of divinity and ap-

pointed as secretary to Cardinal Acton, a position in which he acquired a thorough knowledge of canon law, and an intimate acquaintance with the method of conducting ecclesiastical affairs at Rome. In October, 1844, at the early age of twenty-eight, he became rector of the English College, and was made agent for the English bishops. In this capacity he was of great assistance to Dr. Ullathorne, who was then negotiating for the restoration of the English hierarchy. He also translated for Propaganda all English documents relating to the matter, and furnished the materials for the historical preface to the Decree of 1850. A year later, he was appointed to the new Diocese of Southwark, and was consecrated bishop on 6 July, 1851. Though he came to England almost as a stranger, he soon won the confidence of Catholics and others. As the Government was shy of transacting business directly with Cardinal Wiseman, many negotiations were carried on by Dr. Grant, who was specially successful in obtaining from the Government the appointment of military and naval chaplains, as well as prison chaplains.

To the newly appointed hierarchy he was, as Bishop Ullathorne testified, most useful: "His acuteness of learning, readiness of resource and knowledge of the forms of ecclesiastical business made him invaluable to our joint counsels at home, whether in synods or in our yearly episcopal meetings; and his obligingness, his untiring spirit of work, and the expedition and accuracy with which he struck off documents in Latin, Italian, or English, naturally brought the greater part of such work on his shoulders." In the administration of his diocese he proved equal to the task of organization, which was necessary in an age of rapid expansion, while the remarkable sanctity of his private life led to his being generally regarded as a saint, and caused Pius IX, when he heard of his death, to exclaim "Another saint in heaven!" The virtues of charity and humility in particular were practised by him in an heroic degree. The last years of his life were spent in great suffering, caused by cancer, and when he set out to attend the Vatican Council at Rome in 1870, he knew that he would not return. He was appointed member of the Congregation for the Oriental Rites and the Apostolic Missions, but was too ill to take an active part in the proceedings. After death his body was brought back to England for burial. His works were a translation of the "Hidden Treasure" of Blessed Leonard of Port Maurice (Edinburgh, 1855), and "Meditations of the Sisters of Mercy before Renewal of Vows" (London, 1874).

O'MEARA (pseudonym GRACE RAMSAY), *Thomas Grant, First Bishop of Southwark* (London, 1874); ULLATHORNE, *History of the Restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England* (London, 1871); VIRTUE in *The Month*, New Series, II; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; PURCELL, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (London, 1895), II, 56-57, 77, 113, 149, 423; WARD, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (London, 1897), I, 272; II, 338, 346; ULLATHORNE, *Character of Bishop Grant in Letters of Archbishop Ullathorne* (London, s. d.); Thomas Grant, *The Children's Prelate in The Messenger* (New York, 1891), pp. 510-518.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Granvelle**, ANTOINE PERRENOT DE, known in history as CARDINAL DE GRANVELLE (GRANVELLA), b. at Ornans in Franche-Comté, 20 August, 1517; d. at Madrid, 21 September, 1586. He was the son of Nicolas Perrenot, prime minister of Charles V, studied at Padua and Louvain, and at an early age was introduced by his father to political life. Ecclesiastical favours and benefices were showered upon the young man. He became prothonotary Apostolic in 1529, archdeacon of Besançon, archdeacon of Cambrai, and was made Bishop of Arras in 1538 at the age of twenty-one. He resided very little in his diocese and lived at Brussels, where he had an active share in his father's political negotiations. He was charged with addressing the Council of Trent in the name of the emperor (9 Jan., 1543), and took an active part in all the im-

portant affairs of Charles V, e. g. the interview of Nice, the Peace of Crépy (1544), the Interim, and the marriage of Philip II with Mary Tudor of England. In 1550 he succeeded his father as keeper of the emperor's seal, but did not bear the title of chancellor. His influence continued to grow under Philip II. He was named Archbishop of Mechlin in 1559 and cardinal in 1561.

As member of the Council of State of the Low Countries he was the most valued counsellor of the regent, Margaret of Parma; apropos of this it must be remembered that when leaving the country Philip II recommended his sister to refer all important affairs to a council of three, one of whom should be Granvelle. He was in direct correspondence with the king, and freely judged and criticized the regent. So much power aroused the jealousy of the nobility, especially that of the Prince of Orange and the Comte d'Egmont, the chief personages of the Low Countries, who were indignant at seeing Granvelle preferred before them. Every means was employed to stir up popular opinion against him, caricature, song, and pamphlet. The regent and even the king himself were besieged with protests. Finally the nobles declared that they would refrain from assisting at the Council of State as long as they should meet the cardinal there. The king believed it prudent to sacrifice his favourite in the face of such stubborn and fierce hostility. Accordingly Granvelle was "authorized to visit his mother in Burgundy" (1564). He was never to see the Low Countries again, though on his departure he left behind his papers, books, and pictures, in the hope of a speedy return. He withdrew to his native Besançon, whence he continued to correspond with the king. By the latter he was sent to Rome in 1565, where he took an active part in the formation of the Holy League, which resulted in the celebrated victory of Lepanto. In 1571 the king named him viceroy of Naples, which post he held until 1575 and then returned to Rome. In 1577 Philip II offered to allow him to return to the Low Countries under Margaret of Parma, but the cardinal refused to return to a country which he had left under such humiliating circumstances, and where he could no longer be of use. The king then summoned him to Madrid (1579). At Madrid, as at Brussels, Besançon, Naples, and Rome, he was a faithful and valued counsellor, though towards the end his repute seems to have diminished. Having resigned from his Archdiocese of Mechlin, he received that of Besançon in 1584. He died at Madrid, and was buried at Besançon, but his remains were scattered during the French Revolution.

Comely of person, speaking seven languages, liberal, of an even disposition, unswervingly faithful to his masters, possessing great political penetration, and of an astonishing activity, Granvelle was moreover a generous and enlightened patron of arts and letters. He has been reproached with avarice; in fact he was never satiated with riches and honours, but was unskilled in the art of gaining popularity. Exclusively preoccupied with the service of his masters, he scorned to win the affection of the multitude, and was as much detested in Germany as in the Netherlands. Owing to his great influence he was held responsible for everything that was done, even when he had advised against it. Worldly and ostentatious, and more than once accused of laxity of morals, Granvelle possessed the qualities and defects of a prelate of the Renaissance, with a superiority of intellect and sense of his duties as a statesman which deserve respect. His vast correspondence is an inexhaustible source of information concerning the history of the sixteenth century. It might almost be said, writes the celebrated archivist Gachard, that no minister ever wrote as much as the Cardinal de Granvelle. His correspondence has been edited partly in France by Weiss, "Les papiers d'état de Granvelle" (9 vols., 4to, 1841-



52), partly in Belgium, "La correspondance du cardinal Granvelle" (12 vols., 4to, 1878-96), the first three volumes by E. Poulet, the remainder by Ch. Piat.

LEVÊQUE, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle* (Paris, 1753); DE COURCHETET, *Histoire du cardinal de Granvelle* (Paris, 1761; Brussels, 1784); DE GERLACHE, *Philippe II et Granvelle* (Brussels, 1842); GACHARD, *Inventaire des papiers laissés par le cardinal de Granvelle à Madrid*; IDEM, *Inventaire des papiers trouvés à Bruxelles in Bullets de la commission royale de l'histoire*, Ser. III, Vol. IV; IDEM, *La charte du cardinal de Granvelle en 1564 in Etudes et notices historiques concernant les Pays-Bas* (Brussels, 1890); WAUTERS in *Biographie nationale de Belgique*, VIII; PIRENNE, *Histoire de Belgique*, III (1907).

GODEFROID KURTH.

**Grapti.** See THEODORUS AND THEOPHANES.

**Grasse, FRANÇOIS-JOSEPH-PAUL**, Count and Marquess de Grasse-Tilly, lieutenant-general of the naval forces; b. near Toulon, 1723; d. at Paris, 11 January, 1788. His family was one of the oldest of the French nobility. His father, François de Grasse-Rouville, Marquess de Grasse, was a captain in the army. At the age of eleven, François-Joseph entered the naval service of the Knights of Malta (1734), and served during the Turkish and Moorish wars. In 1739 he entered the French navy, and, after serving on several vessels, was, in 1747, captured and taken prisoner to England, where he remained two years. Returning to France, he was made a lieutenant, and served under La Galissonnière during the Seven Years War, and under D'Ache in the East Indies. Promoted to captain in January, 1762, he received the brevet of Knight of St. Louis in 1764.

The treaty of alliance between France and the United States was signed 6 February, 1778. The first naval engagement after the signing of the treaty took place off Ushant, 27 July, 1778, between the French fleet under Count D'Orvilliers and the English under Admiral Keppel. Count de Grasse was in command of the "Robuste", and was severely engaged during the action, which was undecided in its results. Promoted to the rank of rear-admiral, he sailed from Brest in 1779, in command of a squadron, to the West Indies to join the fleet under Count d'Estaing, who was subsequently succeeded in command by Count de Guichen.

Returning to France, he was promoted to lieutenant-général des armées navales (admiral), and sailed from Brest for the West Indies on 24 March, 1781, with a fleet of 23 ships of the line and a large convoy under his command. He arrived off Martinique, 28 April, 1781, and next day had an engagement with the English fleet under Admiral Hood, which resulted in Hood's withdrawal. On 2 June, 1781, he captured the Island of Tobago, and then proceeded to Cape François (now Cap Haïtien), where he found awaiting him a French frigate bearing dispatches from Washington and Rochambeau, urging his co-operation in the proposed movement, by which it was hoped to strike a decisive blow at the English forces in Virginia. De Grasse acted promptly; the frigate that brought the dispatches was sent back to Newport, Rhode Island, and, by 15 August, Washington and Rochambeau knew of the intended coming of the fleet. Three thousand five hundred soldiers under command of Marquess St-Simon were taken on board and also a large sum of money, urgently needed by the Americans. On 30 August, 1781, De Grasse anchored in Lynn Haven Bay, just within the Capes of the Chesapeake, with 28 ships of the line. Three days before (27 August, 1781), the French squadron at Newport, consisting of four frigates and eighteen transports, under Count de Barras, sailed for the rendezvous, making a wide detour to avoid the English fleet then at New York. Immediately on learning of De Barras's departure, the English fleet under Admirals Graves and Hood sailed for the Chesapeake to intercept De Barras before he could join De Grasse. The English fleet arrived off the Chesapeake, 5 September, 1781. De Grasse got under

way, went out to meet them, and, without bringing on a general engagement, managed his fleet so skilfully that many of the English ships were very severely damaged. De Grasse kept the English fleet engaged for five days, and then returning found De Barras safely at anchor.

Graves returned to New York, and with him disappeared all hope of relieving or reinforcing the English forces at Yorktown under Lord Cornwallis. The siege of Yorktown continued, but the control of the sea made only one issue possible, and with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis on 19 October, 1781, the independence of the United States was virtually decided. On receiving the news of the surrender, Congress named 13 December, 1781, a day of thanksgiving, and on 29 October, 1781, the thanks of Congress were tendered to Washington, to Rochambeau, and to De Grasse. It was also voted to present to Rochambeau and to De Grasse two pieces of the field ordnance taken from the British at the capitulation of Yorktown, to be engraved with a short memorandum. The day after the capitulation Washington wrote to De Grasse: "The surrender of Yorktown, the honour of which belongs to your Excellency, has greatly anticipated (in time) our most sanguine expectations".

On 5 November, 1781, De Grasse sailed from the Chesapeake, arriving at Martinique on the 26th. In January, 1782, he captured the Island of St. Kitts. On 8 April, 1782, the fleet under De Grasse was attacked by Admiral Rodney off Martinique, with no advantage resulting to either. On 12 April, however, the greatest naval battle of the century (known as the Battle of the Saints, from the adjacent islands of Les Saintes) was fought. Both fleets engaged in desperate action, which lasted from daylight until after 6 P. M., when De Grasse's flagship, the "Ville de Paris", struck her colours after a brilliant but hopeless defence; the other ships of the fleet, except those captured, scattered and fled for safety.

After the surrender, De Grasse was taken by Rodney to Jamaica, and thence a prisoner to England, where he received a great deal of flattering attention, which he accepted with such complacency as to irritate his countrymen, by whom he was accused of not having maintained the dignity and reserve becoming one who had been vanquished. While a prisoner on parole in London he published a defence of his conduct of the battle, and accused his captains of disobedience, etc., blaming them for his defeat. In 1783, after peace was proclaimed, he returned to France. A court martial was ordered (1784), which entirely exonerated every one whom he had attacked. De Grasse was not satisfied with the finding of the court, protested against it, and demanded a new trial. The minister of marine, in acknowledging the receipt of his protest, replied in the name of the king: "His Majesty, dissatisfied with your conduct in this respect, forbids you to present yourself before him". Viewed with disfavour by the king, De Grasse went into retirement, and his public career was closed. Four years afterwards he died, 11 January, 1788.

He was married three times. His surviving children were driven into exile during the Revolution, and reached the United States. His son, Count Alexander de Grasse, Marquess de Tilly, was appointed by the United States Government engineer of Georgia and the Carolinas, and a pension of one thousand dollars a year was bestowed on his daughters. Two of the daughters died of yellow fever at Charleston, South Carolina, 1799, but the youngest, Madame de Pau, was long a resident of New York. She left two sons and five daughters; the daughters married leading merchants of New York.

BANCROFT, *History of the United States*; WINBOR, *Narrative and Critical History of America* (New York, 1888); MACKENZIE, *Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography* (London); APPLETON'S *Cyclopedia of American Biography* (New York, 1889); MAHAN, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History* (Boston, 1894);

LAROUSSE, *Grand Dictionnaire Universelle du XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1872); *Magazine of American History* (New York, 1881); MARTIN, *History of France* (tr. Boston, 1866); SHEA, *The operations of the French fleet under the Count de Grasse in 1781-83, with sketch of life of De Grasse in Bradford Club Series*, No. 3 (150 copies); *Journal of Congress, Philadelphia*.

JOHN FUREY.

**Grässel**, LORENZ, Coadjutor-elect of Baltimore; b. at Ruemanssfelden, Bavaria, 18 August, 1753; d. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., October, 1793. He was a novice of the Society of Jesus at the time of its suppression and was subsequently ordained priest. In 1787 he left his native land for the American mission at Father Farmer's invitation, and in March, 1787, he was given charge of the German members of St. Mary's congregation in Philadelphia, and of the Catholics scattered through New Jersey. He spent six years in Philadelphia and during that time became noted for his learning, zeal, and piety. When it became necessary, owing to the spread of the Faith, to appoint a coadjutor to Bishop Carroll of Baltimore Father Grässel was chosen for the office and the petition for his appointment was formally made to Rome, 24 September, 1793. The petition was granted, Grässel thus being the first German-born Catholic appointed to a bishopric in the United States, but before the arrival of the Brief naming him titular Bishop of Samosata (8 Dec., 1793), Grässel had succumbed to yellow fever contracted while attending the victims of the plague which that year ravaged Philadelphia.

SHEA, *Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll* (New York, 1888); IDEM, *The Catholic Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1886); U. S. Cath. Hist. Magazine (New York, Jan., 1887); *Woodstock Letters*, II, 102; REUSS, *Biog. Cyclo. of the Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

**Grassis**, PARIS DE, master of ceremonies to Julius II and Leo X; b. at Bologna, about 1470; d. at Rome, 10 June, 1528. He was the nephew of Antonio de Grassis, nuncio to Frederick III, and Bishop of Tivoli. Cardinal Achille de Grassis, his brother, one of the confidential diplomats of Julius II, was appointed Archbishop of Bologna by Leo X, and died in 1523. In 1506 Paris de Grassis succeeded the famous Burchard, master of ceremonies to Alexander VI, and continued his "Diarium" (ed. Thuasne, Paris, 1883-84). The portion of the diary written by de Grassis covers the closing years of Julius II and the pontificate of Leo X, and is a precious reference work for the historian. De Grassis was not a historian, merely a chronicler; with pedantic fidelity he jotted down the minutiae of all pontifical ceremonies, trivial occurrences at the Curia, the consistories and processions, the coming and going of ambassadors, journeys, etc. He had no political prejudices, though he shows that he had but small sympathy for France or for various curial dignitaries. His sole interest was ceremonial and court etiquette. Nevertheless his eye was alert to catch all that went on around him; in consequence we owe him quite a number of anecdotes that throw much light on the characters of the two popes. Moreover, being the almost inseparable companion of both popes on their journeys, e. g. of Julius II during his campaign against the Romagna, he supplies us with many details that fill in or set off the narrative of the historian. Ordinarily his work offers more to the historian of Renaissance culture than to the student of ecclesiastical-political conditions. The sixteen manuscript copies of the "Diarium" are not all complete, the more important codices being those of the Vatican, and of the Rossiana Library at Vienna. Partial abbreviated editions are owing to Dollinger (Beiträge zur Geschichte der letzten sechs Jahrhunderte, 1882, 363) and to Frati (Bologna, 1886). Delicati (Il diario di Leone X, da P. de Grassis, Rome, 1884) edited a lengthy résumé of the work, with notes by Armellini. Some attribute to him an "Historia Leonis X" (Pott-

hast, Bibl. Hist. Med. Ævi, 2d ed., II, 894), and a treatise on papal elections, meant to combat the opinion of Barbatia that the pope was not bound by ante-election capitulations (Souchon, Die Papst-wahlen, Brunswick, 1888, 16). This treatise is in Dollinger's edition, pp. 343-346. To de Grassis also is attributed, perhaps on better grounds, a book entitled "De caeremoniis cardinalium et episcoporum in eorum dioecesebus" (Rome, 1564). In 1515 Leo X made him Bishop of Pesaro, but he retained his office of master of ceremonies until the pope's death.

Besides the sources mentioned above see PASTOR, *Geschichte der Papste* (Freiburg, 1904-7), III and IV, *passim*.

U. BENIGNI.

**Grass Valley**. See SACRAMENTO, DIOCESE OF.

**Gratian**, Roman Emperor, son of Valentinian I; b. at Sirmium, 359; d. at Lyons, 383. Before he had attained his ninth year he received the purple robe and diadem, with the title of Augustus; and on the death of his father (375) he became Emperor of the West. His half-brother, Valentinian II, an infant, was associated with him in the title. He fixed his residence at Trier, and devoted himself to opposing the advance of the Alamanni, whom he routed in the great battle of Colmar (378). His colleague in the east, Valens, was, however, defeated and slain by the Goths in the same year at the battle of Adrianople. Gratian, feeling himself unequal to the task of governing the whole empire alone, assigned the eastern portion to Theodosius I. Up to this time he had shown himself to be a wise ruler and a brave and skilful general, but now he began to neglect his duties and to devote himself to hunting and other sports. A rebellion which arose in Britain under Maximus, one of his generals, spread into Gaul. Gratian, who was residing at Paris, fled to Lyons, and was there treacherously slain (25 Aug., 383). Gratian's reign marks a distinct epoch in the transition of the empire from paganism to Christianity. At the time of his accession (375) he refused the insignia of pontifex maximus, which even Constantine and the other Christian emperors had always accepted. At the instance of St. Ambrose, who became his chief adviser, he caused the statue of Victory to be removed from the senate house at Rome (382). In this same year he abolished all the privileges of the pagan pontiffs and the grants for the support of pagan worship. Deprived of the assistance of the State, paganism rapidly lost influence. Gratian did not go so far as to confer upon the Church the privileges and emoluments which he took from the pagans, but he gave proof of his zeal by undoing the effects of Valens's persecution, and by taking measures for the suppression of various forms of heresy. Though in general his policy was one of toleration, he made apostasy a crime punishable by the State (383). It was for Gratian that St. Ambrose wrote his great treatise "De Fide".

ALLARD, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1898); DE BROGLIE, *Saint Ambrose* (Paris, 1899); GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London, 1815), xxv-xxvii; RICHTER, *Das weströmische Reich, besonders unter den Kaisern Gratian, Valentinian II. und Maximus* (Berlin, 1865); TILLEMONT, *Hist. des Empereurs* (Paris, 1701), V, 136-88, 705-26; BEUGNOT, *Hist. de la destruction du paganisme en Occident* (Paris, 1835); BOISSIER, *La fin du paganisme* (Paris, 1891).

T. B. SCANNELL.

**Gratian**, JEROME, spiritual director of St. Teresa and first Provincial of the Discalced Carmelites; b. at Valladolid, 6 June, 1545; d. at Brussels, 21 Sept., 1614. The son of Diego Gracian de Aldorete, secretary to Charles V and Philip II, and of Jane de Antisco, daughter of the Polish ambassador at the Spanish Court, he received his early education in his native town and at the Jesuit College in Madrid. He afterwards studied philosophy and theology at Alcalá where he took his degrees and was ordained priest in 1569. The position of his family, his talents and virtues would have opened for him the door to the highest dignities, but, having become acquainted with

some Teresian nuns, he took the habit of the Discalced Carmelites at Pastrana, 25 March, 1572, under the name of Jerome of the Mother of God. Even during his novitiate he was employed in the direction of souls and the administration of the convent, and, almost immediately after his profession (28 March, 1573), was nominated pro-vicar apostolic of the Calced Carmelites of the Province of Andalusia. This province, which for many years had given trouble, resented the nomination of one who had only just entered the order, and offered a stubborn resistance to his regulations, even after his faculties had been confirmed and extended by the Nuncio Hormaneto. In virtue of these same faculties Gratian founded a convent of Discalced Carmelites at Seville, of which he became prior, and approved of the establishment of several other convents of friars as well as of nuns.

The chapter of 1575, listening to the complaints of the Andalusians, decided to dissolve the reformed convents, but the nuncio gave Gratian fresh powers, and for a while the reform continued to spread. Hormaneto was succeeded by Segá (June, 1577), who, prejudiced by false rumours, turned against the followers of St. Teresa. Gratian was censured and relegated to the convent of Alcalá, and the other leading members of the reform suffered similar punishments, until at length Philip II intervened. The next chapter general (1580) granted the Discalced Carmelites canonical approbation, and Gratian became their superior. Ever since he had first met St. Teresa (1575), he had remained her director, to whom, at the command of Our Lord, she made a personal vow of obedience, while Gratian in all his works guided himself by the lights of the saint. In her books and in numerous letters she bears testimony to their agreement in spiritual as well as administrative matters; they were also at one in favouring the active life, the care of souls, and missionary work. After St. Teresa's death a party, calling themselves *zelanti*, came into prominence, with Nicholas Doria at their head, whose ideal of religious life consisted in a rigid observance of the rule to the exclusion of exterior activity. Although St. John of the Cross and other prominent men were on Gratian's side, the opposite party came into office in 1585, and Gratian was charged with having introduced mitigations and novelties. In order to give effect to his views Doria introduced a new kind of government which concentrated all power, even in details, in the hands of a committee under his own presidency.

Great was the consternation among the moderate party, greater still than that of the nuns, who resented any interference in their affairs. Through the instrumentality of St. John of the Cross and Father Gratian, the nuns obtained from Rome approval of St. Teresa's constitutions, whereupon Doria resolved to exclude the nuns from the order. He also understood that so long as the opposition was being led by Gratian (St. John of the Cross having meanwhile died) the new government could never come into force. On pretext, therefore, that his writings reflected unfavourably on the superiors, Gratian was summoned to Madrid, and, the informations taken against him having been materially altered by a personal enemy, he—the director and right hand of St. Teresa, the soul of her reform, and for ten years its superior—was expelled from the order on 17 February, 1592. This sentence, based on falsified evidence, was confirmed by the king, the nuncio, and even by the authorities at Rome, who commanded Gratian to enter some other order.

The Carthusians, Capuchins, and the Dominicans would not receive him, but the Augustinians consented to employ him in the foundation of some reformed convents. The ship, however, which was to carry him from Gaeta to Rome, was taken by pirates and he was made prisoner. Working among the Christian slaves in the bagnio at Tunis, he strengthened those who were wavering, reconciled apostates at

the risk of his life, and liberated many with the alms he succeeded in collecting. After eighteen months' captivity he obtained his freedom and returned to Rome. Clement VIII, to whom on a former occasion he had revealed secrets made known to him in prayer, hearing of his works and sufferings, exclaimed: "This man is a saint", and caused the process of expulsion to be re-examined and the sentence to be rescinded (6 March, 1596). But, as his return to the Discalced Carmelites would have revived the former dissensions, Gratian was affiliated to the Calced Friars with all the honours and privileges, and the right to practise the Rule of the Reform. He was sent to Ceuta and Tetuan to preach the Jubilee (1600–1605), proceeded afterwards to Valladolid to assist his dying mother, and was finally called to Brussels by his friend and protector, Archduke Albers (1606). There he continued a life of self-abnegation and apostolic zeal. Buried in the chapter-house of the Calced Carmelites at Brussels, his remains were repeatedly transferred, but finally lost during the Revolution.

The list of Gratian's writings in Latin, Spanish, and Italian fills eighteen columns in ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* (Madrid, 1783), 576 sqq.; the works printed during his lifetime and immediately after his death have become exceedingly rare. Within the last years there appeared for the first time his autobiography (*Peregrinaciones de Anastasio*, Burgos, 1905), and his *Memoirs of St. Teresa* (*Diálogos de Santa Teresa*, Burgos, 1909), while some other important manuscripts are ready for publication. Besides these sources see ST. TERESA, *Book of Foundations* (chapter xxiii), which should be compared with other portions of her writings and the annotations by various editors; *Biblioth. Carmelit.*, 1645; GREGOIRE DE ST. JOSEPH, *Le P. Gratien et ses Juges* (Rome, 1904; also in Italian and Spanish). B. ZIMMERMAN.

**Gratian (GRATIANUS), JOHANNES.**—The little that is known concerning the author of the "Concordantia discordantium canonum", more generally called the "Decretum Gratiani", is furnished by that work itself, its earliest copies, and its twelfth-century "summæ" or abridgments. Gratian was born in Italy, perhaps at Chiusi, in Tuscany. He became a Camaldolese monk (some say a Benedictine), and taught at Bologna in the monastery of SS. Felix and Nabor. Later, it was said that he was a brother of Peter Lombard, author of the "Liber Sententiarum", and of Peter Comestor, author of the "Historia Scholastica". Mediæval scholars united in this way, by a fictive kinship, the three great contemporaries who seemed as the fathers of canon law, theology, and Biblical history. It is no less false to assert that he was a bishop. Nor is it certain at what time he compiled the "Decretum". It did not exist previous to 1139; for it contains decrees of the Second Lateran Council, held in that year. A common opinion places its completion in 1151. Recent research, however, points to 1140, or to a date nearer thereto than to 1151. The "Decretum" was certainly known to Peter Lombard, for he makes use of it in his "Liber Sententiarum". Gratian died before the Third Lateran Council (1179), some say as early as 1160. It is not certain that he died at Bologna, though in that city a monument was erected to him in the church of St. Petronius. He is the true founder of the science of canon law. See CORPUS JURIS CANONICI; DECRETALS, PAPAL.

SARTI AND FATTORINI, *De claris archigymnasiis Bononiensis professoribus*, I (Bologna, 1896); SCHULTE, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1875–80), I, 46 sqq.; LAURIN, *Introduction au corpus juris canonici* (Freiburg im Br., 1889), 10 sqq.; FOURNIER, *Deux controverses sur les origines du Décret de Gratien* in *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, III (Paris, 1898), 97 sqq., 253 sqq.; MOCCI, *Nota storico giuridica sul Decreto di Graziano* (Sassari, 1904); GATDENZI, *L'età del Decreto di Graziano e l'antichissimo Ms. Cassinese di esso* in *Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna*, I (Bologna, 1907); BRANDILONE, *Notizie su Graziano e su Niccolò de Tudeschi*, *ibid.*

A. VAN HOVE.

**Gratianopolis**, a titular see in Casarea Maure-tania, Africa. This city does not figure in a list of the bishoprics of the province preserved in a document of the sixth and seventh centuries, unless it be

disguised under the native name (see "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", 1892, II, 26, 31). Its history, location, and present condition are unknown. Three of its bishops are known: Publicius (Catholic), Deuterius (Donatist), both at the Conference of Carthage in 411; and Thalassius, present at the Conference of 486.

GAMS, *Series episcoporum eccl. Cath.*, 486.

S. VAILHÉ.

**Gratius** (VAN GRAES), ORTWIN, humanist; b. 1475 at Holtwick, near Coesfeld, Westphalia; d. at Cologne, 22 May, 1542. He belonged to an impoverished noble family, and was accordingly received in the house of his uncle Johannes van Graes at Deventer (wherefore he generally called himself Daventriensis), and was educated at the local school, where he received his first scientific instruction from the renowned Alexander Hegius. In 1501 he went to the University of Cologne to pursue his philosophical studies. As a member of the Kuyk Burse he became licentiate in 1505, *magister* in 1506, and *professor artium* in 1507. His salary as professor being insufficient, he accepted the position of skilled adviser and corrector in the world-famous Quentell printing establishment, where many classical authors of the Middle Ages were published under his direction. These, according to usage, he provided with introductions and rhymed dedications. As a disciple of Hegius he was naturally a fanatical humanist and a devoted adherent of Peter of Ravenna; he also enjoyed the friendship of the most prominent scientific minds of his time. But things soon changed. He was attacked bitterly by the younger intellectual element, especially their leader, Hermann von dem Busche, on account of his taking the part of the Cologne University theologians and the Dominicans on the occasion of the Reuchlin controversy, as well as on account of his Latin translations of various writings of the Jewish convert, Pfefferkorn. Gratius had at that time just finished a literary tournament with von dem Busche, and had been made the laughing-stock of the literary world by the venomous "Epistolæ obscurorum virorum", his adversaries succeeding in vilifying him from both the moral and scientific standpoints, denouncing him as a drunkard and guilty of other vices, and as an incompetent Latin and Greek scholar. This procedure was the more effective from the fact that he ignored attacks, and did not defend himself from the beginning. He only attacked his defamers when Leo X excommunicated the author, readers, and disseminators of the "Epistolæ" (1517). His defence, entitled "Lamentationes obscurorum virorum", was very weak and missed its mark, so that the portrayal of his character remained distorted up to modern times and it is only of late that due credit is given him. In 1520 he was ordained to the priesthood and devoted himself thenceforth entirely to literary work. The *magnum opus* of his literary activity is: "Fasciculus rerum expetendarum ac fugiendarum" (Cologne, 1535), a collection of sixty-six more or less weighty treatises of various authors on ecclesiastical and profane history, dogma and canon law, compiled to expose the noxious elements in the Church's organism, and prepare a way for a future council to remedy them. It has been wrongly claimed that this work, put on the index on account of its anticlerical tendency, was not from the pen of Gratius.

CREMANS in *Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein*, XXIII, 192-224; REICHLING, *Gratius, sein Leben und Wirken* (Heiligenstadt, 1884); *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, IX, 600-602.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

**Gratry**, AUGUSTE-JOSEPH-ALPHONSE, French priest and writer; b. at Lille, 30 March, 1805; d. at Montreux, Switzerland, 7 February, 1872. After brilliantly finishing his classical studies, he entered the polytechnic school at Paris. At the end of his course, (1828), he went to Strasburg, spent some months at

the convent of Bischenberg, and decided to become a priest. He was ordained at Strasburg on 22 December, 1832, and remained there for several years with Bautain. In 1841, Gratry became director of the Collège Stanislas in Paris, but, in 1846, accepted the position of chaplain of the "Ecole normale supérieure". It was then that he published his first work: "Demandes et réponses sur les devoirs sociaux".

When Vacherot, director of studies at the Ecole normale, published the third volume of his "Histoire de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie", a polemic took place between him and Gratry; Vacherot was obliged to leave the school, and Gratry himself resigned his charge one year later (1851). After a year spent at Orléans as vicar-general of Bishop Dupanloup, Gratry united his efforts with Abbé Pétitot, in Paris, for the restoration in France of the Oratory under the name of Oratoire de l'Immaculée Conception. In 1863, Gratry was appointed professor of moral theology in the faculty of theology of Paris; and in 1867 he was elected a member of the French Academy, succeeding Barante in the *fauteuil* once occupied by Voltaire. At the time of the Council of the Vatican (1870), he declared himself against the papal infallibility in several letters, edited under the title: "Monseigneur l'Evêque d'Orléans et Monseigneur l'Archevêque de Malines".

AUGUSTE-JOSEPH-ALPHONSE GRATRY

These were condemned by the Bishop of Strasburg, and Gratry, who had already lived for almost ten years outside of his community and had been publicly reproved by his superior in 1869 for his participation in a certain association, formed under the name of the International League for Peace, had to sever his connexion with the Oratory. After the proclamation of papal infallibility, Gratry gave his full and sincere adhesion to the dogma, and, when Archbishop Guibert had taken possession of the See of Paris in December, 1871, he wrote him a public letter wherein he retracted all that he had written against the infallibility of the pope. He was then suffering from an abscess on the neck; he went to Montreux, near the Lake of Geneva, and died there in 1872. Among the chief works of Gratry, besides those already named are: "Une Etude sur la sophistique contemporaine, ou Lettre à M. Vacherot" (Paris, 1851); "De la Connaissance de Dieu" (2 vols., Paris, 1853); "Logique" (2 vols., Paris, 1855); "De la Connaissance de l'âme" (2 vols., Paris, 1858); "La Philosophie du Credo" (1861); "Les Sources" (1862); "Commentaire sur l'Evangile de Saint Matthieu" (2 vols., 1863); "Les Sophistes et la Critique" (Paris, 1864); "Henri Pereyve" (Paris, 1866); "La Morale et la Loi de l'Histoire" (2 vols., Paris, 1868); "Les Sources de la Régénération sociale" (a reprint with some changes of his first work); "Souvenirs de ma Jeunesse" (1874); "Méditations inédites" (1874).

Gratry exercised a great influence during his life by his personality—distinguished for greatness of thought, generosity of heart, and optimistic enthusiasm—and, after his death, by his works. In the last twenty years his books have been frequently reprinted. Among those who came under his influence, we may mention especially, Charles and Adolphe (later Car-



dinal) Perraud, Heinrich, de Margerie, Nourrisson, H. Pereyve, and Léon Ollé-Laprune. Concerning Gratz's philosophical conceptions we may say that the pregnant truth which underlies his philosophy is to be found in two of his fundamental principles: (1) that we must seek the truth with our whole soul, that is, with all the faculties and helps given to us by God—our sensibility, imagination, reason, love, and the light of revelation—and with the necessary moral condition. (2) That a thing is truly known only through its relation to God, its author and ruler, as man is truly developed only through his ascent toward God, his creator and his end. But when he comes to determine the respective values and relation of these faculties, Gratz, with a soul naturally sensitive, seems to yield too much to feeling and love, and the relations between reason and faith are not always clearly respected. God, for him, is felt or experienced rather than thought or known through reasoning; He is felt by the "divine sense" through the dialectical process which is analogous to the inductive process in physics and the infinitesimal process in mathematics; in presence of a certain degree of beauty and perfection perceived in nature, the soul develops in itself a capacity for exaltation, which raises it from the finite to the infinite. These indeed are high and inspiring thoughts, but the clear statement of truth requires a stricter analysis and a more vigorous treatment. These characteristics, however, explain the feeling of attraction mixed with anxiety one feels on perusing Gratz's works; they help one to understand the ideal grandeur of the moral inspirations and the vague Utopian dreaminess one meets in such close juxtaposition on many of his pages.

*Souvenirs de ma Jeunesse*; PERRAUD, *Le P. Gratz, Les derniers jours, son testament spirituel* (Paris, 1872); IDEM, *Le Père Gratz, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1900); CHAUVIN, *Le Père Gratz* (Paris, 1901); OLLÉ-LAPRUNE, *Éloge du P. Gratz* (Paris, 1896).

GEORGE M. SAUVAGE.

**Gratz, PETER ALOYS**, schoolmaster and exegete, b. 17 Aug., 1769, at Mittelberg, Allgäu, Bavaria; d. at Darmstadt, 1 Nov., 1849; received his elementary training in the monastic school at Fussen, studied classics in Augsburg, and in 1788 entered the clerical seminary at Dillingen, to take up the study of philosophy and theology. His student years were characterized by deep piety and an intense love of study. After his ordination to the priesthood, in 1792, he held the office of private tutor, and in 1796 was placed in charge of the parish church of Unterthalheim, near Horb, on the Rhine. In spite of his manifold parochial duties he found time to prepare several textbooks and other small works on Christian instruction, for use in elementary schools. Besides, being of a literary turn of mind and urged, no doubt, by the spirit of the age, he at the same time turned his attention to other occupations, choosing for his special field of labour New Testament exegesis. In 1812 he published "Neuer Versuch, die Entstehung der drei ersten Evangelien zu erklären" (Stuttgart, 1812), in which he adopted the hypothesis of a Hebrew original as the basis of one of the synoptic Gospels. The learning and critical skill exhibited in this work attracted the attention of scholars, and won for him on 28 September of the same year the chairs of Greek language and Biblical hermeneutics in the University of Ellwangen. Recognizing his abilities and future usefulness, the University of Freiburg, in 1813, conferred on him the doctorate in theology.

During his professoriate in Ellwangen he published: (1) "Kritische Untersuchungen über Justins apostolische Denkwürdigkeiten" (Stuttgart, 1814); (2) "Ueber die Interpolationen in dem Briefe des Apostels Paulus an die Römer" (Ellwangen, 1814); (3) "Ueber die Grenzen der Freiheit, die einem Katholiken in der Erklärung der Schrift zusteht" (Ellwangen, 1817); (4) "Dissertatio in Pastorem Hermæ", in "Constanzer

Archiv", 1817, II, 224 sqq. On the amalgamation of the University of Ellwangen with that of Tübingen, in 1817, he accompanied the theological faculty thither, and continued his lectures on hermeneutics. Here he published his "Kritische Untersuchungen über Marcions Evangelium" (Tübingen, 1818), and with the co-operation of his friends Drey, Herbst, and Hirscher, founded in 1819 the Tübingen "Theologische Quartalschrift", a publication which from its inception has enjoyed an uninterrupted existence.

The same year he received an invitation to the chair of Sacred Scripture in the newly erected faculty of theology in the University of Bonn. His reputation attended him here, and he lectured with great success. This, however, was of short duration. The university, though now free from the Rationalism and Febronianism which characterized the first period of its existence, was gradually undergoing the influence of a new movement known as Hermesianism, the originator of which was Georg Hermes, professor of theology and an intimate friend of Gratz. The high reputation of Hermes, the popular character of his lectures, as well as the fact that they were devoted to the examination of the philosophical systems of Kant and Fichte, induced Gratz to sympathize with his distinguished friend and associate himself with the new movement. The step was a fatal one. He regretted it deeply and desired to abandon his position in the university. All efforts to this effect failed, however, and at the instance of his more trustworthy friends he continued to lecture at Bonn till 1823. He remained a member of its theological faculty till 1826, and in 1828 was called to Trier, there to become a member of the municipal council and also of the school board. His success in this new field of activity was remarkable. He devoted all his time and energy to the reorganization of the studies, and to placing the schools generally on a higher scale of efficiency than they had hitherto attained. While in Bonn he published: (1) "Apologes des Katholicismus, Zeitschrift für Freunde der Wahrheit und der Bruderliebe" (Mainz, 1820-24, 9 fasc.); (2) "Novum Testamentum græco-latinum" (Tübingen, 1820; Mainz, 1827); and (3) "Kritischer Commentar über das Evangelium des Matthäus" (Tübingen, 1821-23). This commentary, owing to the extensive use the author made of Protestant works, was severely attacked by Binterim and Görres. Gratz replied in the sixth fascicle of his "Apologeten", while his friends published in his defence "Drei öffentliche Stimmen gegen die Angriffe des Pastors Binterim auf den Commentar des Professors Gratz, nebst drei Beilagen" (Bonn, 1825). He also undertook the continuation of the "Thesaurus juris ecclesiastici" of Aug. Schmidt, S.J., which, however, remained unfinished.

SCHULTE in *Allgem. deut. Biogr.*, IX, 602; HURTER, *Nomenclator*; WERNER, *Gesch. d. kath. Theologie*, 206, 401, 484, 528; *Theologische Quartalschr.* (Tübingen, 1824), 293, 316, 464-505; *Katholik*, XIV (1824), 16-26.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

**Gravier, JACQUES**, a Jesuit missionary; b. 1651 at Moulins, where he studied classics and philosophy under the Jesuits; d. in Louisiana in 1708. He joined the Jesuit order in 1670, studied theology at the college of Louis-le-Grand, Paris, and was sent to Canada in 1685. In 1686 he went to Michilimackinac. In 1689 he succeeded Allouez in the Illinois mission begun by Marquette. He is the true founder of that mission, where he spent ten years of incredible hardship and suffering. He was the first to master the Illinois idiom, and reduced it to grammatical form. He grouped Kaskaskia and Peoria Indians at the *Rocher*, near Fort St. Louis, and despite the machinations of the medicine-men he moulded his flock into a model Christian Church. In his task he was seconded by a saintly woman, daughter of a Kaskaskia chief. In 1696 he was superior at Michilimackinac, with the title of vicar-general of Bishop St. Vallier. In



1700 he returned to the Illinois mission. In 1706 the ungrateful Peorias attacked and cruelly wounded the missionary. An arrow-head imbedded in his arm could never be extracted even by surgeons in Paris. In 1708 Gravier returned to Louisiana, where he died of his wound that same year.

ROCHEMONTÉIX, *Les Jésuites à la Nouvelle France* (Montreal, 1896); SHEA, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1889).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

**Gravina**, DOMINIC, theologian; b. in Sicily, about 1573; d. in the Minerva, at Rome, 26 Aug., 1643. He entered the Dominican Order at Naples, and made his classical and sacred studies in the order's schools. As professor of theology in the Dominican college of St. Dominic (Naples), in the Minerva, and in other schools of his order, he became the most celebrated theologian of his time in Italy. He was made master of sacred theology by a general chapter of the order held at Rome in 1608, and then became dean of the faculty of the theological college of Naples. In the pulpit also he gained great renown, and was frequently called upon to conduct Lenten courses and to preach before Pope Paul V. He displayed, moreover, a tireless activity in the administrative offices of prior and provincial in his own province, and of procurator general and vicar-general of the entire order. While discharging the duties of these two offices, to the latter of which he was raised by Pope Urban VIII, who had caused the general to be removed, he was also Master of the Sacred Palace. Of his many writings on theological subjects, chiefly of an apologetic character, a large number have never been published. Of the published works the most important are: "Catholicæ præscriptiones adversus omnes hæreticos" (7 vols., Naples, 1619-39); "Pro sacro ordinis sacramento vindiciæ orthodoxæ" (Naples, 1634; Cologne, 1638); "Apologeticus adversus novatorum calumnias" (Naples, 1629; Cologne, 1638); "Lapis Lydius ad discernendas veras a falsis revelationibus" (2 vols., Naples, 1638), a mystical writing.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Scrip. Ord. Præd.*, II, 532-3; REICHERT, *Monumenta Ord. Præd. Historica*, XI, 106, 152, 341; XII, 139.

ARTHUR L. McMAHON.

**Gravina**, GIOVANNI VINCENZO, Italian jurist and *littérateur* of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; b. at Rogliano, Calabria, 21 January, 1664; d. at Rome, 6 January, 1718. At the age of sixteen years he went to Naples to study Latin, Greek, and law, not neglecting, however, his mother-tongue. He went to Rome in 1689, where he taught civil and canon law. He had just been called to an important chair of law at the University of Turin when he was attacked by the illness of which he died. The juristic studies to which he devoted himself with more ardour than taste did not cause him to forget poetry. In 1690 he was co-founder, under the name of Opico Erimanto, of the "Accademia degli Arcadi" of Rome, specially devoted to poetry. Later he quarrelled with the members of this academy, and tried unsuccessfully to establish an "Anti-Arcadia". The freedom with which he spoke of everyone, the good opinion he entertained of himself, and the scorn he exhibited for many literary persons, made him many enemies. But he had the merit of having been the patron of the poet Metastasio. His work on canon law: "Institutiones canonicæ" (Turin, 1732, 1742, etc.; ed., Rome, 1832) is a clear, but very elementary handbook. His chief work on civil law is "Originum juris civilis libri tres" (Naples, 1701, 1713; Venice, 1730). This was translated into French under the title "Esprit des lois romaines" (Paris, 1775). Another work is "De imperio Romano liber singularis", published in the editions of his "Originum juris civilis libri tres". Among his literary works the following are deserving of mention: "Delle antiche favole" (Rome, 1696); "Della Ragione Poetica libri due" (Rome, 1709; Naples, 1716); "Tra-

gedie cinque" (Naples, 1712); "Orationes et Opuscula" (Naples, 1712; Utrecht, 1713); "Della tragedia libro uno" (Naples, 1715).

NICERON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres* (Paris, 1734), XXIX, 233 sq.; PASSERI, *Vita des Gravina in Raccolta di opuscoli scientifici e filol.* (Venice, 1768); SCHULZE, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1875-1880), III, 501; SCHERER in *Kirchenlexicon*, s. v.

A. VAN HOVE.

**Gravina and Montepeloso**, DIOCESE OF (GRAVINENSIS ET MONTIS PELUSII).—Gravina is a town in the Province of Bari (Southern Italy) on a river of the same name, since the ninth century an episcopal see, suffragan of Acerenza and Matera. In 1818 it was united *æque principaliter* with Montepeloso, which dates back to the twelfth century (some say the fifteenth) and was suffragan of Potenza. Montepeloso is situated on a hill in the Province of Potenza. In 975 it was defended against the Saracens, in 999 Gregorio Tracomonte, a native of Bari, defeated there the Byzantines. The cathedral of Gravina treasures in a splendid reliquary an arm of St. Thomas à Becket obtained by Bishop Roberto in 1179. The first known Bishop of Gravina is Leo; other bishops of note are: Samuele (1215), who built at his own expense the church of the Madonna di Altamura, afterwards an archiepiscopate *nullius* (i. e. exempt from the jurisdiction of the neighbouring bishop; see EXEMPTION); Giacomo II (1302), who altered the rite from Greek to Latin by order of the Archbishop of Acerenza; Vincenzo Giustiniani (1593), a Genoese nobleman, who founded the seminary, the church of the Madonna delle Grazie, and the Capuccinelle convent; Domenico Cennini (1645), who built the episcopal residence; Fra Domenico Valvassori (1686), a patron of learning and founder of an "accademia teologica". The united dioceses, directly subject to the Holy See, contain 9 parishes and 28,000 souls, 7 convents for women, and 2 girls' schools.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (1870), XXI; PALIZZOLO-GRAVINA, *La Casa Gravina* (Palermo, 1888).

U. BENIGNI.

**Graz**, UNIVERSITY OF, located in the capital of the Province of Steiermark, owes its establishment to the Counter-Reformation and the efforts of Archduke Karl von Steiermark, who, in 1584, requested Pope Gregory XIII to grant autonomous university privileges to the Jesuit college of Graz, which had been founded in 1573 and was already possessed of a theological and philosophical school. The documents of the archducal foundation and of papal recognition are dated 1 January, 1585. The latter, however, was not made public until 15 April, 1586, the occasion being the dedication exercises of the institution as a university, and it bore the signature of the new pope, Sixtus V. The letter of recognition of Emperor Rudolf II followed soon after. The archduke endowed the seat of learning with a yearly income and set aside for its benefit a certain proportion of the products yielded by Government lands. The papal Bull directed the Jesuit priests in charge to give public instruction in theology, philosophy, and the liberal arts, as was customary in other advanced schools of a similar character. The first scholastic year of the university began in 1586.

Subsequent to the Counter-Reformation, Archduke Ferdinand signed on behalf of the institution which his father had created a second document of foundation, in which he confirmed its purpose as set forth in the original decree, declaring it to be "the service of the Holy Roman Catholic Religion", and placed it on a solid material basis. He enriched it with new buildings and presented it with the revenues and full ecclesiastical supremacy of Mühllstatt, in Carinthia, and of other estates of the Crown, including the right of independent jurisdiction and exemption from the

payment of duties and taxes. He obtained from Pope Clement VIII a confirmation of the Muhlstatt grant, with which the college of Graz had been given diocesan rights over the whole of that principality. He founded a bursae for poor students, which was called the *Ferdinandeum*. Another and similar foundation was the *Josephinum*, which was raised by private subscriptions (1743-49). It was not long before the cathedral chapter of Salzburg claimed for itself diocesan powers in the district of Muhlstatt; but a settlement was reached at a trial held in 1659, whereby on the one hand the ordinariate powers and independent jurisdiction of the college of Graz were recognized, while on the other certain concessions were made to the Diocese of Salzburg. Legal proceedings with the Karnten authorities regarding the exemption of the Muhlstatt district from property taxes, which proceedings lasted more than one hundred years, resulted in a defeat for the Jesuit Order in 1755.

This institution of Graz was the Jesuits' centre of activity in their labours for the reclaiming of Steiermark to Catholicity. Here was prepared all the material necessary for such a mission, here Catholic influence found a new source of strength in the founding of academic sodalities of Mary and other societies of like import. Its school festivals were celebrated with dramas of a spiritual as well as profane character and with farces and comedies in Latin and German, which were produced in the college theatre. The chief aim of these plays was to awaken sentiments of faith and patriotism, and they formed a notable addition to the dramatic literature of the day.

As early as the year 1604, Georg Stobäus von Palmburg, Bishop of Lavant, advocated the further broadening of the University of Graz by the addition to its staff of a faculty of jurisprudence. But though negotiations were undertaken to this end between the institution and the Government, the former's insistence that its autonomy should remain unimpaired caused these negotiations to be suspended until the dissolution of the Jesuit Order. After the establishment, in Graz, of private courses in jurisprudence outside of the university, and the execution of a reform in theological and philosophical studies by the appointment of State Directors of Studies and the altering of examination methods, the university was placed in 1760 under the supervision of a State Commission of Studies designated for this purpose, and therefore lost almost entirely its monastic character of the Josephine period. The year 1773 proved to be, owing to the suppression of the Jesuits, the last school year of the Jesuit college at Graz. The university became a State institution, its material possessions were seized upon for the public treasury, and its course of instruction was remodelled to conform with that laid down by the newly-established imperial Commission of Studies for the University of Vienna. The winter of 1778 saw the inauguration of a faculty of jurisprudence which consisted of two professors, while higher instruction in medicine was likewise introduced, which received gradual development. At the end of 1782 Joseph II issued a decree converting the university into a lyceum with four faculties and the right to award degrees in theology and philosophy. The number of instructors was restricted to twelve. But the Lyceum of Graz recovered in the summer of 1827 its former rank and name as a university, through a grant of the Emperor Francis. Its faculty of philosophy grew steadily, and a duly organized faculty of medicine was added by an imperial decree of January, 1863. The Alma Mater *Gracensis* has since then occupied the third place among the institutions of learning in German-speaking Austria. The technical high school which had been founded in 1814 was taken over by the State in 1874.


KRONES, *Geschichte der Karl-Franzens-Universität in Graz* (1886).

KARL HOEBER.

**Great Council.** See SANHEDRIN.

**Great Falls, DIOCESE OF (GREATORMENSIS)**, created by Pope Pius X, 18 May, 1904, comprises the following counties in the State of Montana: Carbon, Cascade, Chouteau, Custer, Dawson, Fergus, Park, Rosebud, Sweet Grass, Valley, and Yellowstone. It is in the eastern part of the State of Montana, U. S. A.; total area is 94,158 square miles.

The titular city, Great Falls, is most appropriately named, as the Missouri River at this point falls 533 feet in a series of cascades, giving an equivalent of 340,000 h. p., and thus ranking next to Niagara, both in scenic beauty and mechanical value. This cheap power is utilized by large manufacturing plants—flour mills, plaster mills, iron works, smelting and reduction works, etc. The annual output of one smelter alone is over 100,000,000 pounds of copper, with large quantities of gold, silver, and lead as by-products. Over 5,000,000 acres of rich farmland are tributary to the city; 1,000,000 acres being irrigated by the U. S. Reclamation Service and private enterprises. The region adjacent to the city is also rich in minerals—copper, sapphires, gold, silver, lead, iron, gypsum, limestone, and bituminous coal (the output of this last for 1907 being 1,240,000 tons). Besides its importance as a manufacturing centre, Great Falls ranks next to Butte as the most populous city in Montana, and is generally regarded as pre-eminently the home city of the Rocky Mountain region.



ST. ANN'S CATHEDRAL, GREAT FALLS, MONTANA

In the year 1850 Father De Smet, S.J., and his companions were the first missionaries to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in the territory now covered by the Diocese of Great Falls. This notable event took place at Fort Benton, the head of navigation of the Missouri River, 2600 miles from its mouth, at its junction with the Mississippi. The Jesuit Fathers established missions to the Indians in Montana as early as 1841, and most of these missions are still in a flourishing condition. At St. Peter's Mission, which is now the mother-house of the Ursuline Order of Montana, 2732 baptisms of Indians were recorded in the Baptismal Register from 1855 to 1879. The early missionaries made many converts among the different tribes of Indians, and established among the white settlers a healthy Catholic influence the effects of which are still noticeable. The non-Catholics are respectful, and most generous in contributing towards the erection of churches and charitable institutions. The Catholics are well represented in different sections, in the social, commercial, and professional life of the community. The Very Rev. Mathias Clement Lenihan, vicar forane and missionary rector, of Marshalltown, Iowa, was appointed first Bishop of Great Falls, 20 May, and consecrated 21 September, 1904, at St. Raphael's Cathedral, Dubuque, Iowa. He was born 6 October, 1854, at Dubuque, Iowa, U. S. A., was educated at St. Joseph's College, Dubuque, where he

was a charter student, and at St. John's College, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, conducted by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and made his theological studies at the Grand Seminary, Montreal, Canada, where he was ordained priest 21 December, 1879. Bishop Lenihan was the first native of the State of Iowa to be raised to the priesthood. His first appointment was at Vail; his second, at Marshalltown, where he built, besides a school and church, the St. Thomas Hospital in memory of his brother, the late Rt. Rev. Thomas M. Lenihan, D.D., Bishop of Cheyenne, Wyoming. Immediately after his installation Bishop Lenihan devoted his energies to temperance reform, to the installation of a parochial school system, and to the erection of a cathedral. The fine cut-stone edifice which now serves as the cathedral of Great Falls was completed and dedicated, 15 December, 1907, to St. Anne, the mother of the Blessed Virgin. Two more churches are now building at Great Falls, as well as a large orphans' home that will be conducted by the Sisters of Charity of Providence, who also have charge of Columbus Hospital and Maternity Home. The diocese is in a prosperous condition, both spiritually and materially. New parishes are being created and new churches are being erected in nearly every city.

*Statistics.*—At the creation of the diocese (1904) the Catholic population was 10,000; the number of the clergy was 17 (12 diocesan, 5 regular). At present (1909) there is a Catholic population of 15,052; the number of clergy has doubled (24 diocesan, 8 regular); there are 45 churches, 44 stations, 9 chapels; 12 ecclesiastical students; 8 brothers; 98 religious women; 5 academies for young ladies (400 pupils); 5 parochial schools (680 pupils); 4 Indian schools (420 pupils); 4 hospitals (3200 patients annually). The religious communities in the diocese include: Jesuit Fathers, four charges; Brothers of the Christian Schools (Province of Quebec); Sisters of Charity of Providence (Montreal, Canada), three charges; Sisters of Charity, Leavenworth; Sisters of the Holy Humility of Mary (Ottumwa, Iowa); Daughters of Jesus; Ursuline Nuns, five charges.

PALLADINO, *Indian and White in the Northwest* (Baltimore, 1894); *The Iowa Catholic Messenger* (Davenport, Iowa, 1904); WILTZUS, *The Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1908).

JOSEPH MEDIN.

Greece will be treated in this article under the following heads: I. The Land and the People; II. The Church in Greece before the Schism; III. The Orthodox Church in Greece; IV. Constitution of the Church of Greece; V. The Catholic Church in Greece; VI. Protestants and Other Sects; VII. The Church in Enslaved Greece.

I. THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE.—The Greeks are a people who appear first in history as separated in various small States, but bound together by a common language, religion and civilization, in the south of the Balkan Peninsula, the islands around, and the coast of Asia Minor opposite. For about three centuries these States attained a perfection in every form of civilization that gives them the first place in the history of Europe. Then the Greek ideal—Hellenism—spread over Asia, Egypt, and westward to Italy. The original race gradually sinks in importance; the States have disappeared. But the power of the Greek language, Greek learning, Greek art is never exhausted; the magic of the old memories still works in every age; while political changes cause the rise and fall of other governments, Hellenism never ceases from its conquests. The great Roman Empire, having become too unwieldy, is divided, and Greece gradually swallows up the eastern half. For nearly ten centuries again Greece reigns from Constantinople. The flood of Islam sweeps over the lands she had moulded; instead of destroying her, this brings her to fresh conquests across the distant West. Last of all, chiefly because of the magic of her name, the land where Hel-

lenism was born has succeeded in shaking off the tyrant and we have again a free Greece. But Hellas means more than this small country. It is that mighty force, undying from Homer to the present Phanar at Constantinople, that, through all changes of government, has been expressed in the same language, has evolved its own ideals, and, unbroken in its continuity for nearly thirty centuries, has moulded to its own likeness nearly every race it met. The barbarous tribes of Asia Minor—Macedonians, Christian Arabs, Egyptians and Slavs, Phœnicians and Italians, Wallachians and even some branches of the great Turkish race—met this ideal in turn, learned to talk Greek and to call themselves Hellenes. And at the knees of this mother all Europe has stood.

It is not the object of this article to tell again the long story of Greece. One or two salient points only will clear the ground for an account of Christianity among this people.

First of all, what is Greece?—The question may easily be answered now. The Conference of London, in 1831, and the Treaty of 1897 have arranged the frontier of the modern kingdom. In the past it is less easy to answer. Greece was not united as one State even in classical times; Alexander's empire included all manner of nations; under Rome the scattered Greeks gradually learned to call themselves Romans. The only answer that can be given for any period is that Greece is the land where Greeks live; any country, any city where the people in the great majority spoke Greek, were conscious of being Greeks, was at that time at any rate a part of Hellas: Syracuse and Halicarnassus as much as Athens and Corinth. This only removes the question one step, since one now asks: What is a Greek? To demand evidence of pure descent from one of the original Dorian, Ionian, or Æolian tribes would be hopeless. It has been the special mission of Hellas to impose her language and ideals, even the consciousness of being a Greek, on other races. Of the enormous number of people since Alexander who spoke Greek and called themselves Greeks the great majority were children of Hellenized barbarians. Moreover districts were inhabited by mixed populations. The great towns—Antioch and Alexandria, for instance—were more or less completely Hellenized, while the peasants around kept their original languages.

One must use the names *Greek* and *Greece* as comparative ones. Where a certain degree of Greek consciousness (shown most obviously in the use of the language) prevails, there we may call the people Greeks, more or less so according to the measure of their absorption by Hellas. The old Greek States covered about the territory included in the modern kingdom and the islands, with colonies around the coast of Asia Minor, Sicily, Southern Italy, Northern Egypt, even Southern Gaul. Alexander (336–23 B. C.) upset these limits altogether. Himself a Hellenized Macedonian, descended from people whom the old Greeks certainly considered barbarians (though Macedonians seem to have been akin to the Æolians), his empire spread the Greek ideal and language throughout Asia and Egypt. When Rome conquered Greece (146 B. C.) there was no longer any question of a Greek political nation. But the race goes on, and the language never dies. Constantine (A. D. 324–37) meant his new city to be Roman. But here, too, Hellas gradually absorbed her conquerors. At least from the time of Justinian I (527–65) the Eastern Empire, in spite of its Roman name, must be counted a Greek State. The Byzantine period (roughly from 527 to 1453) is the direct continuation of the older Greek civilization. It is true that Byzantine civilization was influenced from other sides (from Rome and Asia Minor, for instance); but this would apply to the old Greek ideals too, on which Egypt, Persia, and Asia had their influence; it is the normal process of the

development of any civilization to absorb foreign influences gradually, without breaking its own continuity. Only, in this period the centre of gravity has moved from Athens to Constantinople. It was a special characteristic of the Turkish conquest that it neither destroyed nor absorbed the races subject to the sultan. The difference of religion, involving in this case an entirely different kind of life and different ideals in everything, prevented absorption; and the subject Christians were too valuable an asset as taxpayers to be wiped out by the Arabs. So, after 1453, except for the loss of independence and the persecution in a more or less acute form that they suffered, the older European races in the Balkans went on as before. No doubt numbers of Greeks did apostatize, learn to speak Turkish and help to build up that artificial confusion of races which we call the Turks. But the enormous majority kept their faith in spite of grievous disabilities. They kept their language, too, and their consciousness of being Greeks. They never called themselves Turks (a word that in the Balkans is still commonly used for Moslem), nor thought of themselves as part of the Turkish State. They were Greeks (which is what their name *Ῥωμαῖοι* really meant), their land was Greece still, though unhappily held by a foreign tyrant, for whose removal they never ceased to pray.

The real danger to the ideal of Greater Greece covering all the Balkans was not, is not now, the Turk, who remains always only an unpleasant incident in the history of these lands; it is the presence of other Christian races, Slavs, who dispute the Greek ideal with their languages and national feeling. Were it not for these Slavs we could count Greece as having absorbed Macedonia and Thrace by the time of Alexander, and as covering nearly all the Balkans to the Danube ever since. But the Bulgar, the Serb, the Wallachian—and Albanian too—are there with their languages and nations to oppose the "Great Idea" of which every Greek dreams. So we must still count Greece as a scattered and relative element among others. Under the Turk Constantinople was still the centre of this element. The œcumenical patriarch took the place of the emperor; his court, the Phanar, was the heart of Hellenism, where the purest Greek was spoken, the memory of the old Greek States most alive.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century the wave of enthusiasm for liberty started by the French Revolution reached the Rayahs, as the Christian subjects of the sultan were called by the Turks. The Rayahs had never ceased to hope for the day when "this so glorious and noble race should no longer have to submit to a goddess turban" (Ph. Skuphos in his *Δέησις πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν*); the Klephts and Armatoles had kept up a ceaseless, if hopeless, rebellion against the pashas and kaimakams. In 1814 the "Hetairia Philike" was founded at Odessa, to work for the freedom of Greece. In the revolution that followed, from 1821 to 1833, Greeks joined equally all over the Turkish Empire, in the islands and the coast towns of Asia Minor, in Constantinople and Salonica as much as in Attica and the Peloponnesus. The treaty that finally gave freedom only to the lower part of the peninsula was a bitter disappointment to thousands of Greeks still subject to the Turk. No doubt a more generous concession was impossible; but one must remember that the modern Kingdom of Greece is only a fraction of what has an equal right to the name of Hellas. The merchants of Smyrna and Salonica, the Phanariots of Constantinople, the peasants of Crete, and even of distant Cyprus, hang out the blue and white flag on feast days, talk Greek to their wives, and are just as much conscious of being Greeks as the citizens of Athens. Outside of "free Greece" (*ἡ ἐλευθέρα Ἑλλάς*), "captive Greece" (*ἡ αἰχμαλωτὴ Ἑλλάς*) waits and hopes. Of this scattered fatherland, considered as one country, whether now free or still cap-

tive, the real centre is still the Phanar at Constantinople. It is here, even more than at Athens, that the "Great Idea" of a Greece that shall cover the Balkans is cherished; it is hither, to the Phanar and the patriarch, that the eyes of all Greeks are turned. King George, with his Danish family, takes his stipend and enjoys such slight authority as his turbulent Parliament allows to him, but the head of the nation, as a Greek told Dr. Gelzer in 1898, is not the king at Athens, but the œcumenical patriarch at Constantinople. (Gelzer, *"Geistliches und Weltliches aus dem türk.-griech. Orient"*, Leipzig, 1900. See Fortescue, *"The Orthodox Eastern Church"*, 240-244, 273-283.)

Something must be said about the name. The land and the people that we call Greece and Greeks are in their own language Hellas and Hellenes. *Greek* is a form of the Latin *Græcus*, which in various modifications (*grieche, grec, greco*, etc.) is used in all Western languages. *Græcus* is *Γραικός*, an older name for the people. *Γραικός* was a mythical son of Thessalos. Or, since this should rather be understood as derived inversely (the person as an eponymous myth from the race), various other derivations have been proposed. *Γραικός* (a form *Ῥαικός* also exists) is said to have meant originally "shaggy-haired", or "freeman", or "dweller in a valley" (W. Pape, *"Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen"*, 3rd ed., Brunswick, 1870, s. v. *Γραικός*). The first people so called were the people of Dodona in Epirus, then the Greeks in general. After the common use of the other name, *Hellene*, this one still survived. It occurs occasionally in classical writers; after Alexander it became common, especially among Greeks abroad (in Alexandria, etc.). From them it was adopted into Latin. But in Greek, too, it lasts through the Middle Ages as an alternative name for the Hellenes of classical times (Stephen of Byzantium, about A. D. 400: *Γραικός, ὁ Ἕλλην*, quoted by Sophocles in "Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods", New York, 1893, s. v. *Γραικός*). Latins and other foreigners, as well as Greeks writing to such people, use it not seldom for any Greek, as "*Græcus*" in Latin.

The other names; *Hellas* (*Ἑλλάς*) and *Hellene* (*Ἕλλην*) are the classical ones. *Hellas* was a city of Phthiotis in Thessaly. From there the name *Hellene* spread throughout Thessaly. Herodotus distinguishes in Thessaly "two chief people: the older Pelasgic, the other the Hellenic race", and tells how the Hellenes invaded that land under Dorus, son of Hellen—another eponymous mythical hero (I, lvi, cf. lviii). The elder Pliny applies the name further: "From the neck of the Isthmus [going north] Hellas begins, which is called by our people *Græcia*" ("Ab Isthmi angustiis Hellas incipit, nostris *Græcia* appellata. In ea prima Attice, antiquitus Acte vocata"—Nat. Hist., IV, vii). Long before the New Testament the names were used by every one in our sense of Greece and Greek. So in I Mach., viii, 9 and 18. *Ἑλλάς* occurs once (Acts, xx, 2), *Ἕλλην* many times (e. g., Rom., x, 12), in the New Testament. In the partitions of the Roman Empire neither *Græcia* nor *Hellas* appears. The Peloponnesus and the land up to Thessaly formed the Province of Achaia, then came Thessalia and Epirus, then Macedonia and Thracia. But popular use kept the older name (e. g., Pausanias, VII, xvi); a Greek still called himself *Ἕλλην*. As Christianity spread *Hellene* began to suggest *pagan*—a worshipper of the Hellenic gods. Eventually this evil flavour absorbed the word altogether. In the Greek Fathers it always means simply "a heathen". St. Athanasius wrote a treatise against the heathen and called it: *Δόγος καθ' Ἑλλήνων*, so all the others. Julian, in his hopeless attempt to revive the old gods, always uses it in this sense and makes the most of its honourable sound. But Christianity was stronger than the memory of Hellas, so from this time the name falls into discredit till quite modern times.


All through the Middle Ages Greeks called themselves *Ῥωμαῖοι*, meaning citizens of the Roman Empire brought by Constantine to his new capital. This strange adaptation of their conquerors' name lasted till the nineteenth century. Even now peasants call themselves *Ῥωμαῖοι*, and (except in towns and among schoolmasters) the Greek for "Do you speak Greek?" is, *Ὁμιλῇτε Ῥωμαϊκά*; It was during the great revival of political national feeling at the beginning of the nineteenth century that the classical name began to be used again, almost as a war-cry, by the people whose imagination was full of Pericles and Socrates. When the Morea, the islands, and part of the mainland succeeded in throwing off the Turk, the first provisional independent government naturally called its territory neither after the Turkish vilayets nor Roman province, but went back to the glorious name *Hellas*. And when things were settled by the London Conference, in 1832, the new kingdom was the *Βασιλεῖα τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, and Otto of Bavaria became (title unknown to history) *ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων*.

II. THE CHURCH IN GREECE BEFORE THE SCHISM (52-1054).—Greece possesses by the most undisputed right an Apostolic Church. St. Paul, in his second missionary journey (52-53, with Silas and Timothy), while he was at Troas in Mysia, saw the vision ("Pass over into Macedonia, and help us", Acts, xvi, 9) that brought him for the first time to Europe. At Philippi in Macedonia he founded the first Christian Church on European soil (*ibid.*, 12 sq.). Thence he came to Thessalonica (xvii, 1), Berea (xvii, 10), and, travelling southwards, to Athens (xvii, 15). Here he preached about "the unknown God" on the Areopagus (xvii, 22-31), and went on to Corinth (xviii, 1). At Corinth he was brought before Gallio, "proconsul of Achaia" (xviii, 12); from Cenchræ, the port of Corinth, he sailed back to Ephesus with Priscilla and Aquila (xviii, 18). In the third journey (54-58) he came again to Macedonia (about the year 57—Acts, xx, 1), thence "to Greece" (*εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα*, xx, 2), and stayed three months at Corinth (xx, 3), then back to Asia Minor (Troas) by Macedonia (xx, 4, 5). In all these places St. Paul preached, according to his custom, first to the colonies of Jews and then to Gentiles too; in all he left Christian communities from which others in the neighbourhood were formed by his disciples: "I have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase" (I Cor., iii, 6). So that he could say: "From Jerusalem round about as far as unto Illyricum, I have replenished the gospel of Christ" (Rom., xv, 19). Among the Pauline Churches of Greece two stand out as the most important—those of Athens and Corinth. This is what one would expect from the Apostle's general practice of bringing his message first and most completely to the great cities. From these it would spread more easily to the country round. Athens, in St. Paul's time no longer of first importance politically or economically, still held a great place through her immortal memories. A number of Romans had settled there, such as T. Pomponius Atticus, Cicero's friend. These are apparently the "foreign dwellers" (*οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι*) of Acts, xvii, 21. There was also a colony of Jews, to whom St. Paul preached first. "He disputed, therefore, in the synagogue with the Jews, and with them that served God [*τοῖς σεβουμένοις*], and in the market-place, every day with them that were there" (the heathen—Acts, xvii, 17). Of far greater practical importance was Corinth, then one of the chief commercial centres of the empire, the residence of Gallio, Proconsul of Achaia (Acts, xviii, 12). Corinth became the centre of the Apostle's work, the chief centre of Christianity in Greece. It is supposed that he wrote here his Epistle to the Romans (J. Belser, "Einleitung in das Neue Testament", Freiburg im Br., 1901, p. 507), both those to the Thessalonians (*ibid.*, 461 and 468), perhaps that to the Galatians (so Zahn). His care for the Church of Corinth is shown in

VI.—47

his two Epistles to the Corinthians. For an account of this, the most typical of the Pauline Churches, see Belser, *op. cit.*, V, xl (pp. 476-489).

The alleged mission of other Apostles to Greece rests on a less firm footing. St. Andrew is said to have preached in Scythia, Thrace, Epirus, Macedonia, and Achaia, and to have been crucified (on a cross of the shape to which he has given his name) at Patras, by order of the Proconsul Ægeas. The story of his mission and martyrdom is as old as the second century. It formed part of a work on the Apostles written then by a heretic, Leucius Charinus (Leukios Chareinos.—cf. Epiphanius, "adv. Hær.", lxi, 1; lxiii, 2). There is an alleged contemporary encyclical letter



CHURCH OF ST. ELEUTHERIUS, ATHENS

of the priests and deacons of Achaia which tells the story, including speeches made by the saint in verse:—

O bona crux diu desiderata,  
Iam concupiscenti animo præparata,  
Securus et gaudens venio ad te,  
Et tu exsultans suscipias me,  
Discipulum eius qui pependit in te.

The whole text is published by Tischendorf, "Acta Apostolorum apocrypha" (Leipzig, 1851, p. 105-131), and Lipsius, "Die apokryph. Apostelgeschichten" (1883, I, 543 sq.), where the question of its origin is discussed. The lessons, antiphons, and responses for St. Andrew's day (30 Nov.) in the Roman Breviary are taken from this document. On account of the tradition that St. Andrew preached in Thrace, the Patriarchs of Constantinople claim him as their first predecessor; the Russians have enlarged his mission in Scythia into the conversion of their country (he came and preached as far as Kiev). St. Thomas and St. Matthew are also said to have visited Greece on missionary journeys.

The Church spread rapidly in Greece. We hear of bishops in various cities during the persecution. Under the Emperor Hadrian (117-38), Publius, Bishop of Athens, was martyred (Euseb., H. E., IV, xxiii). A certain Philip was Bishop of Gortyna (*ibid.*). Eusebius writes of Dionysius of Corinth and his works (*ibid.*). Publius at Athens was succeeded by Quadratus the apologist (Bardenhever, "Altkirchl. Literaturgeschichte", I). Aristides of Athens was also a famous apologist (*ibid.*).



In this first period in Greece, as everywhere, the bishops of the chief towns have a certain precedence, even jurisdiction, over their fellow-bishops ("Orth. Eastern Church", pp. 7-8). Heraclea was the ecclesiastical metropolis of Thrace, Thessalonica of Macedonia, Corinth of Achaia. Domitius of Heraclea, under Antoninus Pius (138-61), witnessed the martyrdom of St. Glycera; his successor, Philip, was burnt to death at Adrianople under Diocletian (284-05). Pinytus, Bishop of Crete, corresponded with Dionysius of Corinth (Euseb., H. E., IV, xxiii). After Constantine (324-337) the local Churches were organized more systematically, according to Diocletian's division of the empire (Orth. Eastern Church, pp. 21-23). Greece became part of the Prefecture of Illyricum, Thrace belonged to the "East" (*Præfectura Orientis*). The Prefectures of Gaul, Italy, and Illyricum made up the Roman Patriarchate (ibid., p. 21), so that, legally, Greece became part of that patriarchate. Normally it should have used the Roman Rite and belonged to Western Christendom. But Illyricum was an endless source of dispute between East and West, till the Great Schism (ibid., pp. 44-45, Duchesne, "L'Illyricum ecclésiastique", in "Eglises séparées" (Paris, 2nd ed., 1905, pp. 229-79). In Thrace, Constantinople succeeded in displacing the old metropolis, Heraclea, and then in becoming a patriarchate, eventually claiming even the second place after Rome, at the Second and Fourth General Councils (Orth. Eastern Church, pp. 28-47). Since the Council of Ephesus (431) Cyprus has been an autocephalous Church (ibid., 47-50); Crete was part of Illyricum and shared in the disputes about it. In 379, under Gratian and Theodosius, Illyricum was divided politically into Eastern and Western Illyricum. The western half (Pannonia Prima and Secunda, Pannonia Ripariensis, Dalmatia and Noricum Primum and Secundum) remained joined to the Italian prefecture; the eastern part (Macedonia, Thessalia, old Epirus, Achaia, New Epirus, Crete, Prævalitana—which is now Albania—Dacia Mediterranea, and Dardania—i. e. our Serbia) became part of the eastern half of the empire, then of the Eastern Empire. The Patriarchs of Constantinople claimed this Eastern Illyricum as part of their patriarchate, and eventually, in spite of the popes' protests, succeeded in asserting their jurisdiction over it. Eastern Illyricum then included part of what we call Greece, the rest was occupied by the (civil) diocese of Thrace and Cyprus.

Lequien, in his "Oriens Christianus", I and II (Paris, 1740), gives lists of the Churches of these lands with their arrangement in provinces and the names of all their bishops, as far as they were known in his time. The Byzantine Patriarchate consisted of the (civil) diocese of Pontus (I, 351-662), Asia (I, 663-1090), Thrace (I, 1091-1246), Eastern Illyricum (II, 1-26). Of these the diocese of Thrace, to some extent, and the diocese of Eastern Illyricum, entirely, cover our Greece.

The diocese of Thrace had seven ecclesiastical provinces: (1) Europe, with Heraclea as metropolis (I, 1101-1154). This province once had twenty, in Lequien's time only five, sees, Rhedæstus, Parium, Metra-and-Athyra, Tzurloes and Myriophyta. (2) Thrace (as distinct from the diocese) with Philippopolis as metropolis (I, 1155-1170). (3) Hæmimontum, metropolis Adrianople (I, 1171-1192). (4) Rhodes, metropolis Trajanople (I, 1193-1210). (5) Scythia, metropolis Tomi (Τόμις or Τόμος, now extinct, I, 1211-1216). (6) Moesia (or Mysia) Inferior, metropolis Marcianople (Preslav Πρέσλαβα), I, 1247-1251). (7) Walachia, metropolis Tergovite, is no longer in any sense Greek. Compare with this list the metropolitan sees (74) of the patriarchate, arranged in three classes, according to their place in the synod, in Silbernagl, "Verfassung u. gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients", Regens-

burg, 2nd ed., 1904, pp. 33-35. The title *metropolitan* is now given to almost every bishop.

In Lequien's list the second great diocese, Eastern Illyricum, whose capital was Thessalonica (vol. II, 1-318), covers practically all Greece. Before the division of Illyricum its capital was Sirmium. We have seen that Western Illyricum remained part of the Roman patriarchate and was in no sense Greece. The eastern diocese had nine provinces (see above); of these only the first seven can be called Greek, and in many of them the Slav element was very powerful. The Slav invasions of the empire began under Anastasius I (491-518) in 493; various Slav tribes and the non-Aryan Bulgars (who soon adopted a Slav language and became practically Slavs too) pressed southward into Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, even Achaia, in increasing numbers, throughout the whole period of the empire at Constantinople; so that always, and still in our own time, they form a rival influence to the Greeks throughout these lands. The old sees of these seven more or less Greek provinces are, according to Lequien: (1) Province of Macedonia (II, 27-102), metropolis Thessalonica, with suffragan sees of Philippi, Berrhœa, Dium (Δίον), Stobi (Στόβοι), Parthicopolis, Doberus, Cassandria, Edessa, Pydna or Citrum, Heraclea Sinica, Amphipolis, Lemnos (the island), Thassus, Serra, Bargala, Theorium, Campania or Castrum, Poliana, Pogoiana, Zichnæ, Drygobitzia, Melenias, Drama, Ardamerium, Rhendina, Deabolis, Hierissus, Lycostomium and Servia. (2) The Province of Thessaly (II, 102-132) had as metropolis, Larissa, as suffragan sees, Demetrias, Zetunium (Ζητοῦνιον or Ζητόνιον), Cæsarea in Thessaly, Gomphi (Γόμφοι), Echinus, Pharsalus Lamia, Scopeus, Tricca (Τρίκκη, now Trikala), Hypata (neut. plur.), metropolis, Thebes of Phthiotis, Sciathus, New Patras, Ezerus, Demonium-and-Elasso, Stage, Thaumacrus, Litza-and-Agraphorum, Phæræ, Lœdoricium, Marmaritizium, Bezena, Peparethi. (3) Old Epirus (II, 133-154) had for its metropolis Nicopolis, and for suffragan sees, Anchiasmum (or Onchisimus), Phœnices, Dodona, Butthrotus, Adrianople (in Epirus), Photica, Eurea (Εὔροια), Coreyra (the island, Corfu), Ætus, Ioannina (now Janina), Leucas, Achelous. (4) Hellas (II, 155-239) had as metropolis, Corinth, and for suffragan sees, Cenchræ (Vulg. Cenchræ, Κερχρηά, the port of Corinth), Old Patras, Argos, Nauplia, Megalopolis in Arcadia, Lacedæmon, Coronea (Κορώνεια in Boeotia), Elis, or Elea, in Achaia, Tegea in Arcadia, Messene in the Peloponnesus, Carystus in Eubœa, Naupactus, Arta (now Larta, formerly Ambraçia), Oreus (Ὀρεός), Porthmus, Marathon, Elatea, Megara (neut. plur.), Opus (Ὀρούς), Platea, Thebes in Boeotia, Thespiæ, Tanagra (both fem. sing. and neut. plur.), Scaphia, Chalcis, Monembasia (fem. sing.), Strategis, Pyrgus (or Pyrgium), Trœzen, Elis in the Peloponnesus, Ægina (the island), Aulon, or Solon (the old Delphi), Amyclæ, Olena, Methone, Scyrus (Σκύρος, the island), Zacynthus (Zante), Cephalenia, Diaulia, Pylus, Brestene, Andrusa, Mendinitza, Tzerinitza, Ceos (the island). (5) New Epirus (II, 240-255) had for metropolis, Dyrrhacium (Δυρράχιον), and for suffragan sees, Scampe, Apollonia-and-Bullidis, Amantia, Decatera (neut. plur., in Dalmatia), Aulon (Ἀῶλον), Lистра (neut. plur.), Dribastus, Stephanicum. (6) Crete (II, 256-274) had for metropolis Gortyna (of which St. Titus was first bishop), Gnossus, Arcadia, Hiera Petra, Lappa, Phoenix, Hieracleopolis, Subrita, Apollonia, Eleutheræ, Chersonesus, Cydonia, Cissamus, Cantani.—The other provinces (Prævalitana, Dacia Mediterranea, and Dardania) do not concern Greece.

The remnants of these sees left to the œcumenical patriarch, after Turkish spoliation and the independence of the modern Greek Church, will be seen in Silbernagl's list.

III. THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN GREECE.—The

Patriarchs of Constantinople had succeeded in asserting jurisdiction over all this vast territory, as well as over Asia Minor and the purely Slav lands to the North. After the schism of Cæcarius (1054) these metropolitans and bishops followed their patriarch by striking the pope's name from their diptychs. They, too, like their chief, learned to abhor Latin customs, to look on the Latin Church under the pope as a fallen branch and a synagogue of Satan. There is no trace of independent action in any of these local Greek Churches. They all used the Byzantine Rite and followed the Byzantine Patriarch faithfully. During the short-lived unions of Lyons (1274) and Ferrara-Flourance (1439) they became Uniats too. They cared for the union as little as did their leaders at Constantinople and fell away again as easily as they had joined. The Latin conquest of their lands (after the Fourth Crusade, in 1204) brought about a rival Latin hierarchy and something very like persecution for the Greeks. Naturally, they hated and scorned the Latin bishops and groaned under the disabilities they suffered from the Frankish princes and from Venice. The Slavs invaded their lands, destroyed many of their cities, so that Greek dioceses disappear because there are no more Greeks left in great tracts of what they still affect to call Greece; but the remnants that maintain themselves still look to Constantinople for orders and still keep the Byzantine Rite in Greek. The Turkish conquest brought about still greater hardships. Invited in the first instance as allies by the fatal policy of the Emperor John VI (Cantacuzene, 1341-55), the Turks first took hold of European soil by seizing Gallipolis (in the Thracian Chersonese) in 1356. From this time they steadily advanced, taking city after city, ravaging and plundering what they could not keep. In 1361 they took Adrianople and made it their capital in Europe till the fall of Constantinople. Then, moving north, they conquered the remnants of Stephen Dushan's great Servian Empire (Battle of Kossova, 1389). Lastly, nearly a century after they had first landed in Europe, they finished their work by taking Constantinople (29 May, 1453). From this time till the nineteenth century the Greeks and the Orthodox Church in Greece were subject to a Moslem government. The Sultans applied the usual terms of Moslem law regarding non-Moslem Theists to the Christian population of their empire (Orth. Eastern Church, 233-244). There was to be no active persecution. Christians suffer certain disabilities. They may not serve in the army, and they have to pay a poll-tax; they must dress differently from their masters, may not have as high houses, may put no sign of their faith (crosses) outside their churches, nor ring church bells, nor bear arms, nor ride on horses. Their evidence may not be accepted in a court of law against a Moslem. To convert a Moslem to their faith, seduce a Moslem woman, speak openly against Islam, make any treaty or alliance with people outside the Moslem empire is punished with death. As long as they keep these laws they are not to be molested further, and they are quite free with regard to their religion. Of course any Christian may turn Moslem at any time; if he does so it is death to go back. (During the last century the European Powers have forced the Porte to modify most of these laws.) The Orthodox were organized into a subject community under the name of *Roman Nation* (*rum millet*, a strange survival of the name of the old Roman Empire which the Turks had destroyed). Their civil head was the oecumenical patriarch. During the century after the Turkish conquest this patriarch reached the height of his power; then, in 1591, Russia became an independent Church—an example followed later by one branch of the patriarchate after another, till he is now the merest shadow of what his predecessors were. During the centuries between the fall of Constantinople and the beginning of Greek independence the Greek Church

(although it was certainly not happy) has no history, unless one counts as such the affairs of the patriarchate (Cyril Lucaris and the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672, for instance, *op. cit.*, 264-268). The other Greek bishops paid their heavy fees to the patriarch and the government; the parish priests paid their heavy fees to the bishops. The hideous oppression of the Turk overshadowed all their lives. For the Turk has never kept his own fairly tolerant law. The tribute of children for the Janissary guard was levied till 1638. The Christians were always in a state of simmering rebellion and the Turks were always punishing their attempts by wholesale massacre. In Crete 50,000 Christian children, in the year 1670, were torn from their parents, circumcised, and brought up as Moslems; in Asia Minor thousands of Greeks had their tongues torn out for not talking Turkish (*op. cit.*, 237-238). Meanwhile the clergy celebrated the Holy Liturgy on Sundays, worked in the fields, and kept wine-shops on week-days. But for the *kamelaukion* (or *kalemaukion*—the tall hat without a brim) there was little to distinguish them from other peasants. But they kept alive faith in Christ and Hellas, prayed for better days, were generally at the bottom of each attempt at resisting the pasha's abominations, and bore silent but heroic witness for Christ during those dark centuries. And who can reproach them for being poor and ignorant? The schism (not the fault of these poor *Papades* at any rate) had cut them off from the West. Europe had forgotten them. They had everything in the world to gain by turning Turk; and yet they kept the Christian faith alive among their people, in spite of pashas, and soldiers, and massacres. Their little dark, dirty churches were the centres not only of Christianity but of Hellenism too. And while their wives poured out the strong resinous wine for whispering conspirators, their sons were out on the hills, *klephts* and *armatoloi* keeping up the hopeless war for Greece.

The Greek War of Independence brought a great change to the Church of the free kingdom. The clergy had taken a leading part in the revolution. In 1821, at the beginning of the movement, when Alexander Hypsilanti was making his absurd attempt to rouse the Vlachs, Gregory V of Constantinople, forced by the Turkish government, denounced the "Hetairia Philike" and excommunicated the rebels. But the Metropolitan of Patras, Germanos, the Archimandrite Dikaios (Pappa Pheleas), and other leading ecclesiastical persons openly took the side of the Greeks, helped them with their counsels, and in many cases even joined in the fighting. Dikaios made a heroic stand with 3000 men against Ibrahim Pasha's Egyptians at Maniaki on Mount Malia. In 1822 the Turks began their series of reprisals by barbarously murdering the Patriarch Gregory V in his vestments, after the Liturgy of Easter Day (22 April), although he, so far from being responsible, had obeyed them by excommunicating his fellow-countrymen. Throughout the war the Greek Church showed that the cause of her children was her cause too. But, in spite of Greek enthusiasm for Gregory V (his relics were buried with great honour at Athens in 1871), the court of the patriarch (the Phanar) was too much under the power of the sultan for the free Greeks to submit to its jurisdiction. The example of Russia showed that a national Church could remain Orthodox and keep the communion of the patriarch while being itself independent of his authority. As soon as the affairs of free Greece began to be settled, one of the first acts of the national party was to throw off the jurisdiction of the Phanar. Alexander Koraes wrote at the time: "The clergy of that part of Hellas that is now free cannot submit to the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who is under the power of the Turk; it must rule itself by a Synod of freely elected prelates" (*Πολιτικά Παράνομοις*, quoted by Kyriakos,

Ἑκκλ. Ἱστορία, Athens, 1898, III, ¶42, p. 154). The first National Assemblies (at Epidaurus and Trœzen) in 1822 and 1827, while declaring that the Orthodox faith is the religion of Greece, had pointedly said nothing about the oecumenical patriarch. In July, 1833, the Greek Parliament at Nauplion drew up a constitution for the national Church. Imitating Russia, they declared their Church autocephalous—independent of any foreign authority—and proceeded to set up a "Holy Directing Synod" to govern it. They also suppressed, of the great number of almost deserted monasteries in Greece, all that had less than six monks as inmates. In 1844 the same thing was repeated, and copies of the law were sent to Constantinople and to the other Orthodox Churches. The patriarch was exceedingly indignant at what he, not unnaturally, described as an act of schism. The Greek Government had put off the evil moment of announcing to him its new arrangement as long as it dared. Between 1822 and 1844 the Greek Church considered itself autocephalous, managing its own affairs by its synod, but had sent no notice of the change to the Phanar. So the patriarch affected to ignore the change. But he showed his anger plainly enough in 1841, when he received notice from the Greek Church that she had excommunicated for heresy Theophilos Kaïres, the founder of the "Theosebismos" sect, an imitation of French Deism. The patriarch (Anthimos IV) refused to accept, or even to answer, this letter. So also did his successor, Germanos IV, refuse to notice the declaration of their independence that he received from his former subjects in 1844. In 1849 the Greek Synod made another attempt. James Rizos, the Greek minister at Constantinople, had just died and the patriarch buried him with great honour. The Greek Government sent the Archimandrite Misael, then president of the synod, to Constantinople with the new Order of the Holy Saviour and a message of thanks to the patriarch (Anthimos IV restored) from the autocephalous Church of Greece. Anthimos took the order and then said that he knew nothing of an autocephalous Greek Church. The Greek Synod sent another circular to him and to all the other Orthodox Churches, explaining what had been done and proclaiming their independence. At last, in 1850, Anthimos IV summoned his synod to consider the matter. The result of its consultation was the famous Tomos. The Tomos at last acknowledged a certain limited independence of the Greek Holy Synod, but proceeded to lay down a number of rules for its guidance. Any sort of interference of the State is absolutely forbidden, there is to be no royal commissioner in the synod, the patriarch is to be named, as before, in the Holy Liturgy, the chrism is to be procured from him, and all important matters must still be referred to his judgment. The tone of the Tomos is still that of absolute authority; each clause begins with the words: "We command that . . ."

This document produced an uproar in Greece. Afraid of a formal schism, the Synod was at first disposed to accept it. There was also a conservative party led by Oikonomos (d. 1857), who were opposed to any change and inclined to submit to the patriarch in everything. But the feeling of the majority was strongly against any sort of submission. The free Greeks had determined to have nothing more to do with the Phanar at all. Pharmakides (d. 1860), the leader of the Liberal party (with a distinct Protestantizing tendency), answered the Tomos by an indignant protest: "The [patriarchal] Synodical Tomos, or concerning Truth" (ὁ Συνδικαὶκὸς Τόμος ἡ περὶ ἀληθείας, Athens, 1852). And the Parliament (always the last court of appeal for these independent Orthodox Churches) rejected every kind of interference on the part of the patriarch. Eventually the Greek Church admitted two points from the Tomos: that the Metropolitan of Athens should be *ex officio* President of the

Synod; and that the holy chrism should be sent from Constantinople. The first of these points has become a fixed rule, the second obtains so far, but there is in Greece a strong movement in favour of consecrating the chrism at Athens. For the rest the patriarch's rules were rejected. The royal commissioner sits in the Holy Synod, and the Greek Church is as Erastian as that of Russia. The Holy Synod is named in the Liturgy instead of the patriarch. Forced by Russia, the Phanar had to give in and to acknowledge yet another loss to its patriarchate and another "Sister in Christ", the "Holy Directing Synod" of the autocephalous Church of Hellas. Since then there has been no more question about this point; the common cause of all Greeks against Slavs in the Balkans has restored very friendly feeling between the free Greeks and their Phanariot brothers. Two political changes further diminished the jurisdiction of the patriarch and enlarged that of the Greek Synod. In 1866 England ceded the Ionian Isles to Greece. True to the now acknowledged principle that the Church must reflect the political situation, the Greek Government at once separated the dioceses of these islands from the patriarchate and joined them to the Church of Greece. The Phanar made an ineffectual protest, and for a short time there was an angry correspondence between Athens and Constantinople. But once more the patriarch had to give in and submit to his loss. In 1881 Thessaly and part of Epirus were added to Greece, and again their dioceses were made subject to the Greek Synod by the government. This time the patriarch did not even trouble to protest.


IV. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF GREECE.—The laws that fix the establishment, organization, and regulations of the Greek Church are those of 1852, in which the parliament, having finally rejected the patriarch's Tomos, repeated and codified the arrangements made by various governments since 1822:—

"The dominant religion in Hellas is the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ. Every other known religion may be practised without hindrance and shall enjoy the protection of the laws, only Proselytism and all other attacks on the dominant Religion are forbidden."

"The Orthodox Church of Hellas acknowledges as her Head our Lord Jesus Christ. She is indissolubly united in faith with the Church of Constantinople and with every other Christian Church of the same persuasion [as Constantinople]. She is autocephalous, uses her sovereign rights independently of any other Church, and is ruled by the members of the Holy Synod" (Arts. 1 and 2 of the Constitution of 1864).

There are now 32 sees in Greece of which the first is Athens, which includes the *Nomos* (political department) of Attica; further, (2) Corinth, (3) Patras, (4) Larissa, Pharsalus and Platamon, (5) Monembasia and Lacedæmonia, (6) Arta, (7) Corfu (Kerkyra), (8) Cephalonia, (9) Thebes and Livadia, (10) Demetrias, (11) Syros, Tenos and Andros, (12) Mantinia and Cynuria, (13) Chalcis and Carystia (for the island of Eubœa), (14) Zante (Zakynthos), (15) Argolis, (16) Akarnania and Naupaktos, (17) Photis, (18) Tricala (Tricca, or Trikke) and Stagai, (19) Messenia, (20) Leucas and Ithaca, (21) Triphyλία and Olympia, (22) Gytheios and Oitylos, (23) Phokis, (24) Ilia, (25) Phanarios and Thessaliotis, (26) Ereytania, (27) Kalabryta and Aigialia, (28) Gortys and Megalopolis, (29) Kytherai, (30) Hydra and Spetzai, (31) Thera, (32) Paronaxia. Hitherto the bishops of all these sees have borne the quite meaningless title *Metropolitan*. The Government has declared that as the present incumbents die out their successors shall be called simply bishops; only Athens is to be a permanent metropolitical see.

The Holy Synod, to which all bishops are subject, meets at Athens. The Metropolitan of Athens is always president for life. Four other bishops are chosen



THE ACROPOLIS, ATHENS





by the Government as members from the hierarchy, in turn, according to the dates of their consecrations. They sit for one year, from the 1st of September, then return to their dioceses. But the Government may keep not more than two as members for a longer time. If the president is prevented from attending, the bishop next in seniority is to take his place. All members of the Synod must take an oath of fidelity to the king at their appointment. Besides these five bishops, the Synod is attended by a royal commissioner (a layman appointed by Government). He has no vote, but no act is valid unless he is present and signs the document. The Synod has two secretaries, two writers, and a servant, all appointed by Government. The secretaries and writers are clerks in Holy Orders. All affairs of the Synod with foreign Churches are controlled by the Government's Minister for Foreign Affairs. In questions that are not purely religious (ecclesiastical seminaries, marriage, divorce, etc.) the consent of the Government is required. The President of the Synod receives 3600 drachmai (\$720), the other bishops 2400 drachmai (\$480) yearly, besides their episcopal salaries. The first secretary has 4800 drachmai, the second 2880 drachmai a year, the first writer 120 drachmai a month, the second 90 drachmai a month. The royal commissioner receives 6000 drachmai a year. The acts of the Synod are sealed with its official seal bearing a cross (practically the arms of the kingdom: Azure a cross couped argent) and the inscription: Ἀγία Σύνοδος τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἑλλάδος. Its jurisdiction is described as extending over questions of faith (only, of course, in the sense of preserving the Orthodox Faith of the Seven Councils), rites and canon law, religious instruction, duties of clerks in Holy orders, ecclesiastical discipline, examinations for ordination, consecration of churches, celebration of feasts and services. The Synod can appeal to the Government to put down heretics and refractory clergy (there have been cases of imprisonment for heresy among the Orthodox clergy), and dangerous books against faith or morals. Other matters, such as public processions, building of seminaries, extraordinary feasts on weekdays (involving public holidays), and all the points mentioned above that are described as "mixed" (ecclesiastical and political), must be arranged by the united action of the Synod and Government. In all services in the kingdom the Holy Synod is prayed for after the king and queen (instead of the patriarch). But when the Metropolitan of Athens celebrates in Synod, all the patriarchs are prayed for. The royal commissioner is of course an imitation of the Russian "Procurator of the Holy Synod". The manner of appointing members to the Synod, the need of the Commissioner's signature for its acts, its dependence on the Government generally, as well as the way of appointing bishops and deciding all really important matters, show that, in spite of Diomedes Kyriakos's indignant protest (Ἐκκλ. Ἱστορία, III, 155-156), the Greek Church is quite hopelessly Erastian.

Bishops are appointed by the king (advised, of course, by his ministers). The Synod presents three names, of which he chooses one. A bishop must be thirty-five years old, a doctor of theology, and must have taught theology or preached for some time. Before consecration he takes an oath of obedience (and of his episcopal duties) to the Synod, after it an oath of allegiance to the king. He can only be deposed by the Synod with the royal consent. The Metropolitan of Athens receives an income of 6000 drachmai (\$1200), all other bishops 4000 drachmai. Besides this there are various stole-fees (see sub-title ALTARAGE, Vol. I, p. 359). Each bishop has a curia of eight members, namely, his *oikonomos* (who is responsible for property and financial questions), *sakellarios* (who looks after the monasteries), *chartophylax* (to take care of archives), *protekdikos* (lawyer), *skeuophylax* (Sacristan), *sakellion* (responsible for the man-

ners of the clergy), *hypomnematographos* (secretary), and *hieromonachos* (master of ceremonies). These persons, who are all priests, form an advising council. All are paid by Government. When a see is vacant the Holy Synod recommends, and the State appoints, one of them to administer the diocese (vicar capitular) till the successor is appointed. A bishop who has resigned from old age or infirmity receives a pension of 200 drachmai a month. Parishes are divided officially into those of cities, small towns, and villages. Each group of from 25 to 70 families makes up a village parish, towns of 151 to 200 families form a parish of the second class, and those of 301 to 1000 families one of the first class. Parishes of the first and second class have at least one deacon and one parish priest. Larger areas are subdivided. The people elect, and the bishops appoint, the clergy. The priests have only their stole-fees as income, so that in the villages they nearly always have a trade or keep an inn as well. The last religious census, made in 1897, is published by Kophiniotou ('Ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἐν Ἑλλάδι, Athens, 1897) At that time there were 4025 parishes, with 5423 married and 242 unmarried priests. For their education there are four elementary seminaries: at Athens, Tripoli, Corfu, and Larissa. These satisfy the not very high demands of the village clergy, and 4116 priests had received only this amount of education, according to the census of 1897. A smattering of classical Greek, a little general education, knowledge of the catechism (it can hardly be called theology), and enough liturgical knowledge to perform their functions is all that any one expects of the village priests. They have no books except their service-books and perhaps a New Testament. What they read is one of the endless number of newspapers, and what they care about is the change of ministry and the wretched local politics that excite the passionate interest of all Greeks.

In 1856 the Government established higher schools for the clergy at Syros, Chalcis and Tripoli, in 1875 a fourth was begun at Corfu. It appears that all these institutions came to an end for want of students (Kyriakos, op. cit., III, §50). Still higher in the scale is the Athenian seminary called the Rhizarion (founded by the brothers Rhizares in 1843) whose students attend lectures at the university besides those of their own institution. This is the only seminary that in any way comes up to our standard. Its students form the aristocracy of the clergy and become archimandrites, professors, and bishops.

There are a great many monasteries in Greece. In spite of the suppression, in 1833, of the small ones, 80 remained. There are now 250, with 1322 choir monks and 545 lay brothers, also 9 convents, with 152 nuns and 68 novices (census of 1897). The head of each monastery is the archimandrite, or *hegumenos* (abbot), elected by the monks and confirmed by the bishop of the diocese. He must be a priest-monk (*τερομναχος*). He is assisted by two counsellors, also elected by the community from among the monks who made their religious profession not less than six years ago. There is a new election of counsellors every five years. Over each convent an *oikonomos* is placed, a priest not less than sixty years old, chosen by the Synod; he is the real superior of the convent, keeps its keys, and is responsible for its state. Under his presidency the nuns elect an abbess (*ηγουμένησα*). All monasteries and convents have endowments controlled and administered by consent of the Synod and Government. Monasteries whose revenues exceed 5000 drachmai a year have to spend part of it on the support of schools and preachers. Some monasteries are very rich. The first, the *laura* of the Falling Asleep of the Mother of God, at Pentelis, in the Diocese of Athens, has an income of 166,085 drachmai. A full list of monasteries and convents is given by Silbernagl, "Verfassung u. gegenw. Bestand," 2nd ed., pp. 78-85.

The political census of 1895 was destroyed in the war of 1897. The former one of 1889 counted 2,172,148 Orthodox Greeks out of a total population of 2,217,000. Though this number is certainly very much exaggerated (the Catholics alone claim more than the difference between the two figures), the Orthodox are the overwhelming majority. Their Church does much, according to its own ideas, for the better instruction and moral improvement of the laity. In 1875, the professors of the theological faculty at Athens formed a society called the "Brotherhood of the Friends of Christ" (*Ἀδελφότης τῶν φιλοχριστῶν*) for this purpose. Other societies of the same kind are the "Society of St. Paul", "The Holy Union" (*ὁ ἱερός Σύνδεσμος*) and "The Reform" (*ἡ Ἀνάπλασις*). They publish popular works of religious instruction, prayer-books, and cheap editions of the Liturgy in great numbers, books of controversy, religious newspapers; and they hold meetings with free lectures and instructions. Almost every publisher in Greece (where every bookseller is a publisher) produces such little books of religious knowledge, accounts of Church History, anti-Roman controversy, and so on. And every Greek has read some little pamphlet of 32 pages against the pope or the Bulgars, so as to garnish his conversation with very loose references to the Byzantine Empire, Photius, and Pope Joan. One of the best popular compendiums is Nicholas Ch. Ambrazes: *Ἡ Ὁρθόδοξος Ἐκκλησία* (constantly reprinted, e. g., Athens, 1906, etc.). Demetrios S. Balanos (*Μπαλανός*), *Ἡ Ἐκκλησία μας· πῶς καὶ πότε λατρεύεται ὁ Θεός*; (Athens, 1907), in the series "Useful Books", gives a good popular account of the Liturgy and Church Service generally.

Among the almost infinite number of Greek newspapers a great number are religious periodicals. The "Reform" society publishes a monthly with the same title: *Ἡ Ἀνάπλασις* (edited by M. Galanos). Some of the best known are the *Εὐαγγελικὴ Σάβιτις*, *Εὐαγγελικὸς Κήρυξ*, *Ἱερομνημον*, *Ὁρθόδοξος Ἐπιθεώρησις*, *Θρησκευτικὴ φωνή*, *Ἐχὼ τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας*, *Σιών*, *Σωτήρ*, *Ἀγάπη*, *Φιλανθρωπία*, *Χριστιανικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, etc.

For the more prominent theologians and writers of the Greek Church since its foundation see Kyriakos, op. cit., III, §§51, 52. The most important are the conservative Oikonomos (d. 1857) and the Liberal Theoklitos Pharmakides (d. 1860).

V. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GREECE.—With the exception of a very few scattered Uniat congregations, all Catholics in Greece are Latins. This is explained partly historically and also by the strictly legal position. After the Great Schism the first restoration of the Catholic Faith was made by the crusaders, the Frankish princes who ruled as their successors, and Venice. None of these authorities cared at all about the Byzantine Church or its rights. Wherever their power extended they set up Latin bishops, just as at home, and tried to persuade the people to turn Latin by harassing disabilities that often became real persecution. Whatever native Catholic communities now exist are the successors of those set up by the Franks and Venetians. They are strengthened by foreigners (French and Italian merchants, etc.) who are naturally Latins too. The legal justification of what seems an anomalous situation is that Greece is part of Illyricum, and Illyricum, according to the ancient right never abandoned by the popes, belongs to the Roman patriarchate. According to the general (but by no means quite universal) principle, that rite follows patriarchate, all Greeks should be not only Catholics but also Latins. On the other hand, there is no doubt that this circumstance is a great hindrance to the conversion of Greece. It would be much easier to persuade Greeks simply to return to the old allegiance of the first see, as Uniat have done elsewhere, than to make them go through so radical an upsetting of their lives as is involved in turning Latin. Throughout the East people are abnormally attached to their rites, the

obvious visible things that they see mean more to them than remote questions of jurisdiction and the actual names that may occur (whether *pope*, or *patriarch*, or *synod*) in the intercessory prayers. The foreign character of all Catholic missions in Greece is the great difficulty always; the authorities of these missions are nearly always not only Latins but foreigners—Italians. Undoubtedly the institution of a native Uniat hierarchy using the Byzantine Rite would be the first step towards converting Greece. Nor is the technical objection a really serious one. The Italo-Greeks show that people can use the Byzantine Rite in the Roman patriarchate. Or why not waive the whole question of Illyricum, as Rome eventually waived her objection to the rank of Constantinople, and set up a Uniat Byzantine Patriarch of Constantinople with jurisdiction all over the Balkans and Asia Minor? It was said that Leo XIII contemplated such a step before he died. The first great revival of Catholicity in the Levant was after the Fourth Crusade (1204). It is well known that the crusaders established not only a Latin emperor but a Latin patriarch and Latin bishops all over their empire. When the legitimate line of emperors took the city back (1261) the Latin patriarch fled. But the Latin bishops went on under the protection of the Frankish States that lasted till the Turkish conquest. A complete and most satisfactory history of these Frankish States has now been written by Mr. William Miller (*The Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908). A mere glance at the maps of this volume will show the fluctuations of the various little principalities. In 1214 (p. 81) there were a principality of Achaia, a lordship of Athens, three baronies of Eubœa, a duchy of the Archipelago and a county palatinate of Cephalonia. Venice held Modon in the Peloponnesus, and Chalcis in Eubœa. By 1278 the Greeks have got back Eubœa, Venice has Crete. In 1388 part of the Peloponnesus has returned to the emperor; Venice has taken part of Eubœa. In 1462 the Turks have nearly all the mainland, the pope holds Monembasia, Venice keeps Crete, all Eubœa (as a vassal state), and some islands of the Archipelago. In all these lands, then, there were Latin bishops; and parts of the population (notably in Syros and the Ionian Isles) had become Latin. Innocent III (1198-1216) established a Latin Archbishopric of Athens with eleven suffragan sees. Of these, three—Andros, Chios and Syros—remained, the others soon become titular sees. Till 1834 Catholics in the Peloponnesus were subject to the Bishop of Zante, all others to the patriarchal vicar at Constantinople. Gregory XVI, in 1834, established Aloysius M. Blancis, Bishop of Syros, as "Apostolic Delegate for the Kingdom of Greece". He had jurisdiction over all the kingdom, including the parts of Thessaly added in 1832. The Turks gave the same toleration to the "Latin Nation" as to the "Roman [Orthodox] Nation". Since the independence of Greece Latin missionaries, especially Jesuits and Sisters of Charity, have opened schools all over the kingdom. Corfu forms a kind of basis, since here the population is very considerably Italianized and Catholic. Other schools are at Athens, Syros, Tenos, Naxos, etc. In 1890 the Latin Bishop of Athens opened a secondary school for boys that has had a great influence. The Italian Government has also founded schools in many of the chief towns. In 1869 and 1870 there were violent debates in the Greek Parliament about these schools. Many members wanted to close them and forbid all Catholic schools in the kingdom. Eventually the Government insisted that an Orthodox catechist should be appointed in all schools where there are any Orthodox children.

There are a number of laws in Greece made to hamper the work of Catholic missionaries. In 1830 the Parliament declared that the toleration granted to all religions does not involve allowing any damage to the state Church—a vague statement that opens the way

to forbidding any proselytizing. In 1833 a law was passed requiring all papal Bulls, Briefs, etc., to be submitted to the Minister for Foreign Affairs before their publication. Five Catholic bishops (of Syros, Tenos and Mykonos, Naxos, Thera, and Corfu) are recognized by the Government; no other sees may be erected without its consent. The Latin Archbishop of Athens is not recognized by the State.

The present Catholic hierarchy is: (1) Archdiocese of Athens, established in 1875, when Bishop Marankos of Syros took up his seat there, in spite of the protest of the Government. By this act the metropolitan jurisdiction of Syros was practically transferred to Athens. In this diocese are 14 parishes, 13 priests, and about 18,000 Catholics. (2) Archdiocese of Corfu (*Corcyra*, *Kerkyra*), with 7 churches, 10 priests, and 4000 Catholics. (3) Zante (*Zakynthos*) and Cephalonia united (suffragan of Corfu), including the islands of Zante, Cephalonia, S. Maura, Ithaca, Cerigo, with 3 parishes, 7 priests, 1000 Catholics. (4) Archdiocese of Naxos with 1 parish, 6 priests, 350 Catholics. (5) Andros (suffragan of Naxos), administered by the Bishop of Tenos and Mykonos. (6) Santorin (Thera), suffragan of Naxos, with which is united the administration of Melos, 1 parish, 8 priests, 460 Catholics. (7) Chios (suffragan of Naxos), 3 churches, 8 priests, 300 Catholics. (8) Syros (now suffragan of Naxos), 6 parishes, 25 priests, 7000 Catholics. (9) Tenos and Mykonos (suffragan of Naxos), 26 churches, 26 priests and 5000 Catholics (Werner, "Orbis Terrarum Catholicus", Freiburg im Br., 1890, pp. 131-133).

These figures give a Catholic population of 36,110. Another census (quoted by W. Götz, "Griechenland, Kirchliche Statistik", in "Realencykl. für prot. Theologie", 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1899, VII, 168) gives 50,000 Catholics. On the other hand we have seen that the Government, in 1889, admitted only 14,687 other (not Orthodox) Christians altogether. A few congregations of Byzantine Unians in the kingdom, served by priests of their own rite, depend on the Latin bishops (*Echos d'Orient*, 1906, p. 336).

VI. PROTESTANTS AND OTHER SECTS.—There are a few small communities of Greeks who have left the Orthodox Church, either converted by Protestant missionaries or following some new protestantizing or rationalizing leader of their own. English and American missionaries have been at work here, disseminating bibles and holding prayer-meetings, since 1810. Protestant schools were opened by a certain Hildner in Syros in 1827, by King and Hill at Athens in 1832. At first the Orthodox seem to have watched their movements without suspicion. The British and Foreign Bible Society had even arranged with the Patriarch of Constantinople for the sale of their bibles. But these were found to exclude the deuterocanonical books and to be done into Modern Greek from the Massoretic text without reference to the Septuagint, the official text of the Orthodox Church. The missionaries also, not content with selling their bibles, held prayer-meetings in opposition to the liturgical services and preached against sacraments and ceremonies. So the Orthodox, led by the great conservative Oikonomos, became suspicious of them; they were denounced as disturbers of the public peace, and in some places their schools and conventicles were closed. King was expelled from Athens in 1852, but he soon came back and went on with his work. He formed a number of native Greek preachers and missionaries to propagate his ideas (Kalopathakes, Sakellaris, Konstantinos, and so on), and died in 1869. The end of this disturbance about the missionaries was that the Government granted entire toleration, but the Orthodox Church formally excommunicated them and their adherents. At first it had been a question of selling bibles and preaching to the Orthodox rather than of forming a new sect. Now the issue is quite clear; the Orthodox are forbidden to attend

the missionaries' meetings, so these have built up regular congregations with ministers. People who join these leave the established Church and become Protestants. The first church of these Greek Protestants was opened at Athens in 1874. They call themselves *Εὐαγγελικοί* and *Διαμαρτυρούμενοι*. The church at Athens has about 100 attendants. In 1880 an attempt to build one at the Piræus ended in a riot in which the building was destroyed. A few scattered Greek Protestants attend foreign Protestant churches. At Athens there is a Lutheran Church founded by King George to satisfy his religious needs and those of his Danish attendants. Its pastor (now a German, Hofprediger v. Schierstadt) preaches to about 200 Danes, Germans, and Swiss. There is an Anglican church with about 100 English and American attendants and another little meeting-house of an American sect nearly opposite Hadrian's Arch; also a Salvationist meeting-house. The number of Greeks attracted by all these people put together is infinitesimal.

There are also a few small sects that have arisen out of the Orthodox Church without the help of foreign Protestants. Theophilos Kaïres, a priest, founded a kind of Deism on the lines of the French Encyclopedists which he called "God-worship" (*θεοεστέρσις*). In 1849 he published his Gospel, which he called *Γνωστική*. He was considerably persecuted for a time, and twice put in prison, where he died in 1853. Andrew Laskaratos and one or two other writers made a desultory campaign against the established Church in favour of what they considered to be primitive Christianity. A Papadiamantopoulos started a Positivist movement. The question of Darwinism brought about friction between the Holy Synod and the Government on one side, and certain university professors at Athens on the other. Plato Drakoules wrote an amazing mystification of a Gnostic and Cabbalistic kind that he called "Light from within" (*Φῶς ἐκ τῶν ἐνδόν*). Except that of Kaïres, these movements did not form organized sects. In the other direction a monk, Christopher Papulakis, and a layman, Makrakis, excited the people against the Holy Synod, the Government, and the university, in the name of the old faith. Papulakis (1852) was put into a monastery; Makrakis, after a long career of opposition, was excommunicated by the Holy Synod (1879) and imprisoned for two years by the Government. He had opened a church served by priests of his way of thinking; this was shut up. As soon as he came out of prison he began again a propaganda that now produced a formal sect, was again tried for heresy and sedition, and imprisoned. He has since his second release continued to form his sect and to lead a campaign of extreme opposition against the "apostate" State Church. His followers number about 5000; they follow lines very like those of the Russian Ras-kolniks (q. v.)—the official Church has fallen, her priests have lost all power of administering sacraments, her rites are schismatical; they, the Makrakists, alone are the really orthodox.

There are about 6000 Sephardim Jews in Greece, and in 1889 the census counted 24,165 Moslems, living chiefly in Thessaly. It is to the credit of the Government that these Moslems have always been treated with perfect toleration. They are excused from serving in the army under a flag marked with the cross. They have their mosques wherever they want them, and the *muezzin* still cries from the minaret, as loudly as when the sultan reigned here, that Mohammed is the prophet of God. Nevertheless, great numbers of Moslems crossed the frontier into Turkey when Greece became free; the addition of more territory in 1881 led to another great emigration, and the Moslem population of Greece is still steadily diminishing. Naturally, they find the changed conditions humiliating. At Larissa and thereabouts one finds Turkish quarters with their mosque, as across the frontier, but many

more such villages are now deserted, and their mosques in ruins.

VII. THE CHURCH IN ENSLAVED GREECE.—Greeks outside the kingdom are practically all Orthodox. They form a great part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the aristocracy of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, and the whole Orthodox population of Cyprus. In all these parts except Cyprus the same evolution is taking place. For many centuries the Greeks had it all their own way. All the important offices—those of patriarchs, metropolitans, archimandrites—were never given to the native Orthodox Christians, but were kept in the hands of a little group of Greeks generally sent out by the Phanar. In each case the awakening of national sentiment during the nineteenth century has produced this result: the natives (Slavs, or Wallachians, or Arabs) are making tremendous, and now always successful, efforts to throw off the yoke of these Greeks and to have bishops of their own races, the Liturgy in their own tongues. And everywhere the Greeks are waging a hopeless war in the name of Conservatism to keep their predominance. Russia steps in everywhere, always on the side of the natives; so each year the Greek element has to retire, and the Greeks get more and more angry. This has produced the appalling combination of schisms and the degrading wrangles that rend the Orthodox Church.

In the Patriarchate of Constantinople the Bulgars have made a formal schism since 1872. They have an exarch at Constantinople, and his exarchist bishops dispute the jurisdiction of the Greek (patriarchist) hierarchy all over Macedonia. There are now exarchist bishops at Ochrida, Uskub, Monastir, Nevrokop, Veles, Strumitza, Debra. In all the other dioceses, save five, they have priests and churches. This is the greatest schism. The Greek does not like Latins or Protestants; but he hates the Bulgarian schismatics far the most of all. For this question see R. von Mach, "Der Machtbereich des bulgarischen Exarchats in der Türkei" (Leipzig, 1906); D. M. Branco, "La Macédoine et sa population chrétienne" (Paris, 1905); Fortescue, "Orth. Eastern Church", pp. 316-323. At Alexandria things are better. The Orthodox patriarch, Photios, is of course a Greek (he has had a stormy career—"Orth. East. Church", 285-286); but he has taken the trouble to learn Arabic and allows the Liturgy to be celebrated in Arabic to some extent; also he hates the Phanar and is unceasingly engaged in quarrels with his brother of Constantinople. So his subjects are fairly content. There is a schism at Antioch. After a long line of Phanariot patriarchs, the Arabs at last succeeded in getting an Arab patriarch, Meletios, in 1899. He was at once excommunicated by Constantinople, apparently for not being a Greek. He died in 1906 and again, in spite of the frantic efforts of the Greeks, another Arab, Gregory Hadad, succeeded him. Gregory is excommunicate, too, for the same reason; and the See of Antioch, to the infinite scandal of all respectable Orthodox Christians, is still in schism with Constantinople ("Orth. E. Church", 287-288). The trouble at Jerusalem may be read in all the newspapers. The Patriarch Damianos is a Greek; he has always been disliked by the Arabs, now he has begun to try to conciliate them, so his Greek Synod has deposed him for being civil to Arabs, and the Arabs will not have him because he is a Greek. The latest reports say that he is still in the palace, guarded by Turkish soldiers; and his monks and Synod consider him no longer patriarch (op. cit., 289-290). In Cyprus, though they are all Greeks, they have a schism too. Since 1900 the quarrel of the two pretenders to the archiepiscopal see, Cyril of Cyrenia and Cyril of Kiton, has disturbed the whole Orthodox world. There are endless ramifications of this quarrel. For eight years every Cypriote newspaper has had a daily leader about *Τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν Ζήτημα*; the ludicrous

scandal gets worse every month, and is likely to last so long as both the claimants survive.

In conclusion, it is just to say a word about the state of Greece now, compared with what it was under the Turk. Western Europeans are disappointed with the kingdom. They seem to have expected it to leap to our level at once. The muddled, and not always honest, finances of the Government, the ludicrous internal politics, a widespread and not altogether unjust suspicion of Greek honesty and the odious type of Levantine Greek that one meets, have produced a strong reaction since the burst of Philhellenism at the time of the War of Independence. Much of this is no doubt deserved. If one lands in Greece from Europe one will notice many things that excite one's indignation or laughter. But let anyone go to Greece after spending some time under the sultan's government; in spite of all Greek faults, the difference is simply enormous. Coming back from Asia or European Turkey, the traveller in Greece feels that he is in Europe. However unsatisfactory things may still be, he has crossed the chasm that separates Europe and Christendom from Asia and Islam. Greece may be a long way behind France or England, in the same class of country; she is simply part of another world compared with Turkey.

POHLMANN, *Grundriss der griechischen Geschichte nebst Quellenkunde* (Munich, 1896, 3rd ed.—has excellent bibliography); LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus* (Paris, 1740, 3 vols.—still the standard work for the history of the sees); HERTZBERG, *Geschichte der Byzantiner und des Osmanischen Reiches* (Berlin, 1883—tells the story of Byzantine times); KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1897—contains an admirable summary of the political history by H. Gelzer, pp. 911-1087, biographical notices of all writers and exhaustive bibliography); FARGOIRE, *L'Eglise byzantine de 527 à 847* (Paris, 1905).

For the schism, HERGENROTHER, *Photius* (3 vols., Ratisbon, 1867) is still the most complete and reliable account. BRÉHIER, *Le Schisme oriental du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1899); WILL, *Acta et scripta quæ de controversiis eccl. græcæ et latinæ sæc. XI composita extant* (Leipzig, 1861—gives the documents).

The Orthodox have now a rival to Hergenrother in KREMOS, *Ἱστορία τοῦ σχίσματος* (Athens, 4 vols., two of which are published, 1905, 1907); KYRIAKOS, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία* (Athens, 3 vols., 1898) in the third volume tells the story of the established Church of Greece.

SCHMIDT, *Kritische Geschichte der neugriechischen und der russischen Kirche* (Mainz, 1854—not very critical; a vehement attack on the Ecumenical Holy Synods of these Churches); SIEBERNAGL, *Vermassung u. gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (Ratisbon, 2nd ed. by SCHNITZER, 1904—for the Greek Church see pp. 66-84); PRZTUPIC, *L'Eglise Orientale* (Rome, 1855).

For the Greek Revolution and establishment of the kingdom, PHILLIPS, *The War of Greek Independence* (London, 1897); PHILEMON, *Δοκίμιον ἱστορικὸν περὶ τῆς ἀλλοιότητος Ἑπαναστάσεως* (Athens, 4 vols., 1859).

Statistics in KIKINOTIS, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἐν Ἑλλάδι* (Athens, 1897); WERNER, *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg im Br., 1890—for the Catholic see, op. xv, pp. 117-119); BRAILSFORD, *Macedonia* (London, 1906—for the situation between Greeks and Slavs); *Echos d'Orient* (six times a year since 1897, published by the Augustinians at Constantinople; gives always the latest news about the Orthodox Church); FORTESCUE, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907), and further bibliography there, pp. xv-xxvii; the Greek Church, pp. 312-316.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Greek Catholics in America.—The Uniat churches of the Byzantine or Greek Rite were almost unknown to the United States some twenty-five years ago. Occasionally a priest of that rite from Syria came to America to ask assistance for his people who were struggling amid the Moslems, but while his visit was a matter of curiosity, his rite and the peoples who followed it were wholly unknown to American Catholics. To-day, however, emigration has increased to such an extent and is drawn from so many lands and peoples that there are representatives of most of the Eastern rites in America, and particularly those of the Greek Rite. These have lately arrived in large numbers and have erected their churches all over the country. The chief races which have brought the Greek Rite with them to the United States are the various Slavs of Austro-Hungary, and they are now approaching such a position of material

well-being and intellectual development as to be reckoned with as one of the factors of Catholic life in the United States. Other races have also brought the Greek Rite with them and established it where they have settled. The advent of the Slavs into the United States really commenced about 1879-1880. Those of the Greek Rite came from the north-eastern portion of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, where they inhabited chiefly the northern and southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains, which form the boundary line between Galicia and Hungary. The first of the new-comers were miners in the coal districts. During the troublous times in Pennsylvania, from 1871 to 1879, when the "Molly Maguires" terrorized the mining districts and practically defied the authority of the State, the various coal companies determined to look abroad for foreign labour to replace their lawless workmen, and so they introduced the Austrian Slav to the mining regions of Pennsylvania. His success in wage-earning induced his countrymen to follow, and the coal companies and ironmasters of Pennsylvania were quick to avail themselves of the new and less costly labour. This was before any of the present contract labour laws were enacted. The Slav was willing to work for longer hours than the English-speaking labourer, to perform heavier work, and to stolidly put up with inconveniences which his predecessor would not brook. He came from a land in which he had originally been a serf (serfdom was abolished in Austria-Hungary in 1848, and in Russia in 1861), then a degraded poverty-stricken peasant with hardly anything to call his own, and it was no wonder that America seemed to offer him boundless opportunity to earn a living and improve his condition. At first he was a cheap man; but in the course of a very short time the Slav became not a mere pair of strong hands, but a skilled worker, and as such he drove out his competitors, and his success drew still more of his countrymen across the sea. In the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania there were in 1880 but some 1900 Slavs; in 1890, over 40,000; and in 1900, upwards of 81,000. The same proportion holds good of the bituminous coal-mining districts and of the iron regions in that and other states. Taking simply the past four years (1905-1908), the immigration of the Slovaks and Ruthenians, both of the Greek Catholic Rite, has amounted to 215,972. This leaves out of consideration the immigration (147,675) of the Croats and Slavonians for the same period, though a considerable portion of them are also of the Greek Rite. These Slavs brought with them their Greek Catholic rites and practices, but they were illiterate, ignorant, the poorest of the poor, and knew nothing of the English language. Herding together in camps and settlements, and working like serfs at the most exhausting labour, they had but little opportunity to improve themselves or to learn the language, customs, and ways of the Americans around them, while both American and foreign-born Catholics failed to recognize in them fellow-Catholics, and so passed them scornfully by, and the American of the older stock and anti-Catholic prejudices too often held them in supreme contempt. Yet as soon as they gathered some little substance and formed a settled community they sent for their clergy. When these arrived, they, too, were often imbued with national and racial prejudices, and knew too little of the English language and American ideas and customs to initiate immediately the progress of their people, yet they created for them churches, schools, and a branch of their native literature upon American soil, and gradually brought them into touch with the people around them. In this they were seconded by many educated laymen who also followed their countrymen, and the result has been that the Greek Rite has now been established in the United States much more solidly and with greater virility than it is in many of the dioceses in south-

eastern Europe. Other races and nationalities have also established themselves besides the Slavs; and there are in America also the Rumanians, the Syrians, and the Italians who follow the Greek Rite. But the people who have been foremost and most enthusiastic in the support of and devotion to their Oriental Rite are the so-called Ruthenians, a name used to designate the Ruthenians proper and also those Slovaks who are their immediate neighbours. In order to understand fully their position and relations in America, some of their history and peculiarities should be given.

I. RUTHENIAN GREEK CATHOLICS.—The word Ruthenian is derived from the later Latin *Ruthenia*, the former name for Russia, and of course the Ruthenians might well be called Russians. Indeed, the present Ruthenians declare that they are the original Russians, and that the present Russia and Russians owe their name and nation to the accident of successful conquest and assimilation. Their own name for themselves is *Rusini*, and it is probable that Ruthenian was merely an attempt to put this word into Latin. The word *Rutheni* is first found in the writings of the Polish annalist, Martinus Gallus (1190), and the Danish historian, Saxo Grammaticus (1203). The original word *Rusini* is derived from *Rus*, the abstract word for Russian fatherland or dwelling-place of the Slavic people; and the English word "Russian" may therefore mean a derivative from the word *Rus*, as denominating the race, or it may mean a subject of the Russian Empire. The former is *russky*, the latter *rossiysky*, in the Russian and Ruthenian languages, and hence, while the first word is translated either as *Russian* or *Ruthenian*, it carries no special reference to the Russian Empire. These people are also called "Little Russians" (an expression chiefly used for them in the Russian Empire), originally an allusion to their stature as contrasted with the Muscovites. Their language is known as Ruthenian or Little Russian, and is spoken in Northern Hungary, Galicia, Bukovina, and in the Provinces of Volhynia, Podolia, Chelm, and Kiev in Russia. It is quite similar to the Russian language of the Russian Empire (sometimes called Great Russian), bearing about the same relation to it as Lowland Scotch does to English, or *Plattdeutsch* to German, and rather closer than Portuguese does to Spanish. The Ruthenians (in Austria) and Little Russians (in Russia) use the Russian alphabet and write their language in almost the same orthography as the Great Russians of St. Petersburg and Moscow, but they pronounce it in many cases very differently, quite as the French and English might pronounce differently a word written the same in each language. This fact has led in late years to a recension of the Russian alphabet in Galicia and Bukovina by the governmental authorities, and by dropping some letters and adding one or two more and then spelling all the words just as they are pronounced, they have produced a new language at least to the eye. This is the "phonetic" alphabet and orthography, and as thus introduced it differentiates the Ruthenian language of these provinces more than ever from the Russian. The phonetic system of orthography is still fiercely opposed at home and in America, and as an Austrian governmental measure it is regarded by many as an effort to detach the Ruthenians from the rest of the Russian race and in a measure to Polishize them. This battle of the reformed phonetic spelling rages as fiercely in the United States as in Austria. Indeed the Greek Catholic bishop here has found it necessary to issue his official documents in both the phonetic and the etymologic spelling (as the older form is called), so as to meet the views of both parties. The phonetic spelling has never been introduced among the Ruthenians in Hungary, and their section of the language is still written in the customary form, there and in the United States. Besides the Ruthenians there are also the Slovaks who live in Northern




and North-western Hungary, close neighbours to the Ruthenians, who are Greek Catholics, and who speak a language almost like the Bohemian, yet similar to the Ruthenian. It is written, however, with Roman letters, and the pronunciation follows the Bohemian more than the Ruthenian. These people seem to have been originally Ruthenian, but became gradually changed and moulded by the Bohemians and their language and for a long time wrote their language in the same manner as the Bohemian. The Bohemians, however, are in the Austrian part of the empire, while the Slovaks are in Hungary. They have emigrated to the United States in large numbers, and are about equally divided between the Greek and Roman Rites. This again necessitates the publication of church matters, prayer books, journals, etc., in the Slovak language. It illustrates the difficulties of the Greek Catholic priests in the United States, since they are likely to have in their parishes Ruthenians (of the old and new orthographies), Slovaks, and even those who speak only Hungarian, having lost their Slavic tongue. It is no uncommon thing to find a Greek Catholic priest capable of speaking five languages: Ruthenian, Slovak, Hungarian, German, and English. It is these people as a whole who are comprehended under the term Ruthenian, although that term applies strictly to those speaking Russian and using the Russian alphabet. After the eleventh century the larger portion of Russians fell away from the unity of the Church in the schism of Constantinople, while a minority continued faithful to the Catholic Church, and later many more returned to unity. The Holy See, therefore, made use of the ancient word *Ruthenian* to designate those Russians who followed the Greek Rite in unity with the Holy See, in order to distinguish them from the Northern Russians who adhered to the schism. Later on, those Russians who joined the union under the Polish kings received the same name, and the word *Ruthenian* is to-day used exclusively to designate the Russians of Austro-Hungary, who are Greek Catholics, in contradistinction to the Russians of the Russian Empire, who are of the Greek Orthodox faith.

The language of the Mass and the other liturgical services according to the Byzantine Rite is the ancient Slavonic (*staroslavianski*), and the Greek Liturgy was originally translated by Sts. Cyril and Methodius about the year 868, and it has remained substantially the same ever since. It is curious to notice that the Ruthenian language is much closer, both in spelling and pronunciation, to the church Slavonic than the present Russian language of St. Petersburg and Moscow. The letters in which the church books are printed are the Cyrillic, or *Kirillitsa*, said to have been invented or, rather, adapted by St. Cyril from the Greek alphabet, together with some additional letters of his own invention. It consists of forty-three letters of archaic form as used in the church books, but has been altered and reduced in modern Russian and Ruthenian to thirty-five letters. In the year 879 Pope John VIII formally authorized the use of the Slavonic language forever in the Mass and in the whole liturgy and offices of the Church, according to the Greek Rite, and its use has been continued ever since by the Catholic and the Orthodox (schismatic) Greeks of the Slavic races. This is the language used in the *Sluzhebnik* (Missal), *Trebnik* (Ritual), *Chasoslov* (Book of Hours), and other church books of the Ruthenian Greek Catholics in America.

After the schism of Constantinople (1054) most of the Russians became estranged from the unity of the Church. (See under GREEK CHURCH, Vol. VI, pp. 760-62.) In 1595 the Russian bishops of Lithuania and Little Russia determined to return to unity with the Holy See, and held a council at Brest-Litovsk, at which a decree of union was adopted, and where they chose two of their number, Ignatius Potzey and Cyril Terietzki, to go to

Rome and take the oath of submission to the pope. They declared that they desired to return to the full unity of the Church as it existed before the schism of Photius and Carularius, so as to have in Russia one united Catholic Church again. No change in their rites or their calendar was required by Rome, but the whole of the ancient Greek Liturgy, service, and discipline (excepting a few schismatic saints' days and practices) was to go on as before. In December, 1595, Clement VIII solemnly ratified the union of the two Churches in the Bull "Magnus Dominus". On 6 October, 1596, the union between the Eastern and Western Churches was proclaimed and ratified in the Russian part of the Kingdom of Poland. A large number of the Russian bishops immediately went over to the union. In Helm the Russian Bishop Zbiruiski led the way with his whole diocese, and his successor, Methodius Terietzki, was a valiant champion of the Uniat Church. This Greek Uniat Church even produced a martyr for the Faith, St. Josaphat, Archbishop of Polotzk, who was slain by the Orthodox partisans in 1633. In Galicia, however, the union was slower. While priests and congregations became Uniat, the Bishops of Peremysl and Lemberg stood out for nearly a century. But on 23 June, 1691, Innocent Vinnitzki, Bishop of Peremysl, joined the union, and in 1700 Joseph Shumlanski, Bishop of Lemberg (it was afterwards restored to metropolitan dignity by the pope in 1807), also took the oath of union with the Holy See. From that time till now the Russians on the northern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains and on both sides of the River Dniester have been united with Rome. On the southern side of the Carpathians the Russians also accepted the union. In the year 1636 Vassili Tarasovitch, Bishop of Munkács, acknowledged the pope as the head of the Church and for it he was persecuted, imprisoned, and forced to resign his see. But union with the Holy See could not be stayed by such means, and on 24 April, 1646, it was accomplished in the city of Ungvar by Peter Rostoshinski, the then Bishop of Munkács, and George Yakusitch, Bishop of Agri (Erlau). These two bishops in solemn council, with sixty-three priests, abjured the schism and confessed themselves Greek clergy holding the Faith of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in communion with Rome. Since that time the Ruthenian people (including the Greek Slovaks) in the Kingdom of Hungary have acknowledged the pope as the visible head of the undivided Catholic Church.

These Ruthenians have continued to practise their ancient Greek-Slavonic rites and usages, and their forms of worship introduced into the United States seem strange to the Catholic accustomed only to the Roman Rite, and have made them objects of distrust and even active dislike, so that a few of the most salient differences may be pointed out, although a full statement will be found in the various articles on the Eastern rites, ceremonies, and vestments. The Mass itself is said in ancient Slavonic, the altar is separated from the body of the church by a high partition called the *iconostasis*, upon which the pictures of Christ and His Mother, as well as various saints, are placed, and the vestments of the Mass are quite different. The stole is a broad band looped around the neck and hanging straight down in front, the chasuble is cut away at the front and closely resembles the Roman cope, and instead of the maniple two broad cuffs are worn, while a broad belt takes the place of the girdle or cincture. Married men may be ordained to the diaconate and priesthood; but bishops must be celibate, nor can a deacon or priest marry after ordination. Priests impart the Sacrament of Confirmation to children immediately after baptism, and Communion is given to the laity under both forms, the consecrated species being mingled together in the chalice and administered to the communicant with a spoon. Organs are not used in their churches, and

their church year follows the Julian Calendar, which is now thirteen days behind the Gregorian Calendar in use in the United States and Western Europe. Besides this, the Ruthenians (and the Russian Orthodox likewise), display the so-called "three-armed" (or Russian) cross  fashioned in this manner upon their churches and use it upon their missals, prayer-books, paintings and banners, as well as other objects. They make the sign of the cross in the reverse direction to the Roman method, and in their religious services the men and women are segregated from each other upon different sides of their churches.

It is from these people, inhabiting Galicia, Bukovina, and Hungary, that the Ruthenian Greek Catholic population has come. Their earliest immigration to the United States began in 1879, from the western portion of Galicia near the Carpathian Mountains, the so-called Lemkovschini, and then spread throughout the Galician and Hungarian sides of the mountains. At first it was hardly noticed, but it grew year by year, the earliest immigrants coming from Grybow, Gorlice, Jaslo, Neu Sandec, Krosno, and Sanok in Galicia, and from Szepes, Saros, Abauj, and Ung in Hungary, until finally the governmental authorities began to notice it. At the post offices in many of the mountain places in the Ruthenian portion of Galicia it was observed that the peasants were receiving large sums of money from their fathers, sons, or brothers in America. The news spread rapidly, the newspapers and officials taking it up, and so emigration was at once stimulated to the highest degree. Every year it has increased, and Ruthenian societies are formed here to assist their newly-arrived brethren to find employment and to give information to those at home about America. It is impossible to tell exactly how many Ruthenian and Slovak Greek Catholics have come to the United States, because no statistics have been kept by the United States Government in regard to religious faith of immigrants, and not always accurate ones in regard to race or nationality. Still the immigration reports show that immigration from Austria-Hungary from 1861 to 1868 was annually in the hundreds; and from 1869 to 1879 it ranged from 1500 to 8000 annually; and in 1880 it suddenly rose to 17,000. From 1880 to 1908 the total immigration from Austria-Hungary to the United States amounted to 2,780,000, and about twenty per cent of these were Ruthenians and Slovaks. Within the last four years (1905-1908) the immigration of the Slovaks and Ruthenians has amounted to 215,972. To this must be added the Croats and Slavonians (117,695), a large proportion of whom are of the Greek Rite. It is estimated that there are at present in the United States between 350,000 and 400,000 Greek Catholic Ruthenians, including as such the Greek Catholic Slovaks and Croato-Slovenians. The largest number (over one-half) are in Pennsylvania, while New York, New Jersey, and Ohio have each a very large number of them, and the remainder are scattered all through the New England and Western states. From the best information obtainable in advance of the coming census of 1910 their distribution is as follows:—

Pennsylvania	190,000	Indiana	6,000
New York	50,500	Minnesota	3,000
New Jersey	40,000	Colorado, Dakota,	
Ohio	35,500	Nebraska, and	
Connecticut	10,000	Montana, about	8,000
Illinois	8,000	West Virginia, Vir-	
Massachusetts	7,500	ginia and the	
Rhode Island	1,500	Southern States,	
Missouri	6,500	about	5,000

After the Ruthenian immigration had begun in considerable numbers, it was but natural that they should desire to establish a Church of their own rite. At

Shenandoah, Pennsylvania, the Ruthenian settlement had so increased that towards the end of 1884 they sent a petition to Archbishop (afterwards Cardinal) Sylvester Sembratovitch, Metropolitan of Lemberg, praying that a Greek Catholic priest might be sent to them to found a parish of the Greek Rite at that place. The petitioners promised to build a church for him if he were sent. In the following year (1885) Rev. Ivan Volanski, of the Diocese of Lemberg, arrived in the United States, the first Greek Catholic priest to take up work among his people here. On his arrival he presented himself in Philadelphia with his letters, but, being a married priest, he encountered great difficulty in being recognized as a Catholic priest in good standing. However, he proceeded to Shenandoah, where under great difficulties and discouragements he organized his congregation and for about a year celebrated Mass and other services in a hired hall, for he was unable to obtain the use of the local Latin churches for Greek services. The matter of his regularity and his acceptance as a priest in Pennsylvania for the Ruthenians was finally arranged through Cardinal Sembratovitch. Early in 1886 he completed at Shenandoah a little frame church dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel, the first Greek Catholic church in America. He then organized there the first Greek Catholic Society, that of St. Nicholas, built and organized a small parochial school, and then proceeded to form congregations and to found churches in other places where the Ruthenians were thickly settled. During his stay he organized congregations and started churches at Hazleton (1887), Kingston (1888), and Olyphant (1888) in Pennsylvania, at Jersey City, New Jersey (1889), and at Minneapolis, Minnesota (1889). Finding his Ruthenian people without any reading-matter in their own language, he sent to Galicia for Russian type, and in the latter part of 1886 he obtained a few fonts from the Shevchenko printing office at Lemberg. He then commenced the publication in "phonetic" Ruthenian of a small paper issued every two weeks at Shenandoah under the name of "America". This paper lived until about 1890, but got involved in the labour troubles in the mining districts which destroyed much of its usefulness. In the spring of 1887 the Metropolitan of Lemberg sent him another priest, Rev. Zeno Lakovitch (unmarried), and a lay teacher, Volodimir Semenovitch from the University of Lemberg. Father Lakovitch laboured at Kingston and at Wilkesbarre, where he died a year later. In 1888 Rev. Constantine Andrukovitch was sent from Lemberg, and, in addition to his parochial work, he, with Father Volanski, undertook to establish a series of stores in several towns in Pennsylvania to sell goods to the Ruthenians and thus avoid the enormous prices which the mining companies charged them. The business venture was unsuccessful, and, with other matters, it caused the recall of Father Volanski to Galicia. He remained there some time, then was sent as a missionary to Brazil, where his wife died, when he returned to Galicia, where he was a parish priest until his death in 1905. This business venture also caused the suspension of Father Andrukovitch, who returned to Galicia in 1892. The next three Greek clergymen were Rev. Theophan Obushkevitch (of Galicia), Rev. Cornelius Laurisin, and Rev. Augustin Laurisin (of Hungary), who took up their missionary work energetically. The first two are still Greek Catholic parish priests in this country. Since their coming there has been a constant accession of Ruthenian Greek priests from Galicia and Hungary, and the building of churches and schools has gone on with increasing success. Even quite costly churches have been built. In Jersey City the old church has given way to a fine stone and brick church, which is an excellent specimen of Russian architecture, while at Homestead and Shamokin, Pennsylvania, there are quite costly churches erected. Many of the Greek churches are purchases from Protestant denominations

altered and rearranged for the necessities of their rite, while one or two are churches brought over from the schismatics. The first Greek Catholic Mass in New York City was celebrated in the basement of St. Brigid's church on Avenue A (which was put at the disposal of the Greeks by the late Archbishop Corrigan), on 19 April, 1890, by the Rev. Alexander Dzubay, who is still in active parish work in America. This Greek congregation afterwards bought a church in Brooklyn (St. Elias, 1892), and there was no Ruthenian church in Manhattan until the Greek Catholic church of St. George was opened in 1905. In February, 1909, the Greek Bishop Soter bought a Protestant Episcopal church in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, re-fitted it, and consecrated it as the Greek Cathedral of St. Mary of the Immaculate Conception, and in the adjoining parish house and rectory will also open a seminary for the education of American priests of the Greek Rite. Of course many Ruthenian settlements in various localities are too poor to build and maintain a church, nor are there just at present sufficient priests in America to attend to their spiritual needs. Still there are at present (1909) about 140 Ruthenian Greek Catholic churches in the United States, and there are also ten more new ones projected for waiting congregations. Their churches are distributed as follows:—

Pennsylvania	80	Indiana	3
New York	14	Missouri	3
Ohio	12	West Virginia	2
New Jersey	10	Minnesota	2
Connecticut	4	Rhode Island	1
Illinois	4	Virginia	1
Massachusetts	4		

The Ruthenian Greek Catholic clergy in the United States consists (1909), of one bishop and 118 priests, originating from the following dioceses:—

Diocese	Monks	Secular Clergy		
		Celibates	Married	Widowers
Lemberg	4	8	5	5
Przmysl		6	12	2
Stanislau		2	2	1
Eperies		1	13	10
Munkács	2	1	30	5
Kreutz		1		
Scranton		1	2	
Philadelphia		4		
Pittsburg		1		
	6	25	64	23

Several of these priests are converts from the Orthodox Greek Church in the United States. As has been said, men who are already married are ordained to the diaconate and priesthood in the Greek Church, and so it naturally followed that married priests were sent to America. While a married priesthood seems repugnant to a Catholic of the Latin Rite, yet it is strongly adhered to by the Greek Catholics as vaguely a part of their nationality and Eastern Rite. All American Greek Catholic priests will hereafter be ordained from celibate candidates only, according to the provisions of the Apostolic Letter "Ea semper", which will be referred to later. The growing importance of the Greek Rite in America, the dissensions arising out of old-country political factions among the Ruthenians, which will be mentioned later on, and which occasioned serious interference with the normal growth of the Greek Church, and the increasing intensity of the efforts of the Russian Orthodox to detach the Ruthenians in America from their faith and unity (see GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH IN AMERICA) caused the Holy Father in 1907 to provide a

Greek Catholic bishop for America. Previous to this (1902) the Holy See had sent the Right Rev. Andrew Hodobay, titular abbot and canon of the Greek Diocese of Eperies, as Apostolic visitor to the Ruthenians in America, who examined the conditions of the Catholics of the Greek Rite in all parts of the United States and returned to Europe in 1906 with his report. The choice of a bishop for the Ruthenian Greek Catholics fell upon the Right Rev. Stephen Soter Orzynski, a Basilian monk, hegumenos of the monastery of St. Paul, Michaelovka, Galicia. On 12 May, 1907, he was consecrated titular Bishop of Daulia by the Most Rev. Andrew Roman Ivanovitch Scheptitzky, Greek Metropolitan of Lemberg, and the other Greek bishops of Galicia, and he arrived in America on 27 August, 1907. Shortly after his arrival (September, 1907) the Apostolic Letter "Ea semper", concerning the new bishop for the Ruthenian Greek Catholics in the United States, his powers and duties, and the general constitution of the Greek Rite in America was published. It created considerable dissatisfaction among the Greek clergy and laity inasmuch as it did not provide for any diocesan power or authority for the new bishop, but placed him as an auxiliary to the Latin bishops, and as it modified several of their immemorial privileges in various ways. The Sacrament of Confirmation was thereafter to be withheld from infants at baptism, and was not to be conferred by priests, but was reserved for the bishop only (as in the Latin Rite and among the Greeks in Italy), and married priests were not thereafter to be ordained in America or to be sent thither from abroad, while the regulations as to the marriage of persons of the two rites were also modified. The Greek Ruthenian laity saw in it an attack upon their Slavic nationality and Eastern Rite, an idea which the Russian Orthodox Church eagerly fostered and magnified. They were told by the Orthodox that the whole letter was a latinization of their Greek Rite in regard to confirmation and Holy orders, and was a nullification in America of the Decrees of the popes that their rite should be kept intact. This resulted in some losses (about 10,000) from the Ruthenians to the Russian Church, but already many of them are coming back. Matters, however, adjusted themselves, and the work of the new bishop is having good results. The whole matter of a Greek bishop in America is so far in an experimental stage, and it rests upon the extent of the current and future immigration, the stability and solidarity of the Ruthenians in their adherence to their faith and rite, as to what powers and authority their bishop shall ultimately have. Where there is an evident and actual need for it the Holy See has always granted the erection of Oriental dioceses, but where a minority of a population seems bound to become assimilated with, and eventually absorbed into, the surrounding population the case may be entirely otherwise. The newly appointed bishop has had success in establishing churches and parochial schools and in inducing his Ruthenian flock to become American citizens and identify themselves with American life while not abandoning their faith and their Eastern Rite. He aims to establish English-Ruthenian schools in each Greek parish and to open a Ruthenian-American seminary at Philadelphia for the education of American-born Ruthenians as priests of the Greek Rite. There is already one American-Ruthenian priest, lately ordained. In purely theological matters they will be educated as in Latin seminaries, if not actually sent there for lectures, but in the Oriental church rites, discipline, liturgical language, music, and customs the proposed seminary will fill a place for the Ruthenians which our present diocesan seminaries do not fill. The number of church or parochial schools of the Ruthenians is about fifty, where instruction in English, Ruthenian, church catechism, and the elements of a general education is given. No organized

Sunday-school system has as yet been established amongst them, nor are there any nuns or religious engaged in teaching in the United States.

In order to understand somewhat clearly the situation of the Ruthenians in America, account must be taken of their national home politics, which they bring with them and fight out often quite bitterly in this country. As already said, they are from the northern and southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains. The northern Ruthenians derisively call their southern brethren "Hungarians" (*Madyari*), while the latter return the compliment by calling the former "Poles" (*Poljaki*). The point of this lies in the fact that each of the nationalities named is cordially detested by the Ruthenians on either side. But these are merely surface divisions between the two bodies of the same race. Their actual factional differences are much deeper. There may be said to be, broadly speaking, three Ruthenian parties or factions in the United States: (1) The *Moscophiles*, or *Moskalophiles* (*Moskal* is the Little Russian word for a Great Russian), who aim at an imitation, if not an actual adoption, of all things Russian as found in the present Empire of Russia, looking towards Moscow as the seed and kernel of Russian or Slavic development, and who are strong supporters of Pan Slavism; (2) the *Ukrainci*, or *Ukrainians* (the Ukraine is the adjoining borderland provinces of Russia and Galicia), who stand for the interests of the Ruthenian people in Austria and of the Little Russians in Russia, as distinct and apart from the Great Russians, and who desire to develop the Ruthenian (Little Russian) language, literature, and race along their own lines, entirely distinct and apart from that of the present-day Russian Empire; and (3) the *Ugro-russki*, or Hungarian Ruthenians, who keep all the old Russian racial traditions, reverencing their Russian language, literature, and ancestry as models to follow in their development, but at the same time refusing to follow the ideas of Moscow and St. Petersburg in such development, either in Hungary or in the United States. The first two parties are Galicians, the last one Slovaks and Hungarian Ruthenians. These parties are sometimes divided into smaller factions, perplexing for an outsider to understand, such as those who desire to introduce the Hungarian language and customs, even using Hungarian in the liturgy of the Church. It is needless to say that none of these larger parties ever agree upon any one subject other than their Slavic nationality and Greek Rite. The *Moscophiles* often unite with the Greek Orthodox and Russian societies upon the slightest pretext when Russo-Slavic ideals are to be proclaimed, and are fiercely against everything that does not look Russiaward, for Russia is their big brother. On the other hand the *Ukrainci* will have nothing to do with modern Russia; it is behind the age and lags in the march of civilization; and they have besides offended both the other parties by adopting the "phonetic" style of spelling. This offence seems to be intensified because the new Greek bishop is somewhat of their way of thinking. The *Ugro-russki* are violently opposed to whatever does not accord with the racial views and traditions of the Ruthenian and Slovak people within the borders of Hungary, and do not agree with the views and actions of either of the other two parties. Consequently, the Greek Catholic bishop has to publish his official communications in Ruthenian, both phonetic and old-style, and in Slovak, in order to reach all his people.

Of course these Greek Catholics of such varied views have organized into societies. Each church has its own local religious and singing societies, but there are other and larger bodies known as "brotherhoods" or lodges (*bratstva*), which have been of great assistance in building up the Ruthenian churches. They are usually of the nature of mutual benefit societies, assist in finding work, helping in religious

matters and the like, having always the Greek Rite and the Ruthenian race as their main inspiration. Some of them provide that their members must show that they have made their Easter communion or forfeit membership, and provide for the dropping of a member when he ceases to be a Catholic. These brotherhoods or lodges are combined into a general federation or union which takes in the whole United States. It has its annual convention composed of delegates from the various brotherhoods, and always has some well-known Greek Catholic priest as its spiritual director. The largest and oldest of these federated societies is the "Soyedineniya Greko-Katoliceskikh Russkikh Bratstv" (Russian Greek Catholic Union), which was founded in Pennsylvania in February, 1892. It is almost wholly composed of Slovaks and South-Carpathian Ruthenians. It now (1909) has 542 brotherhoods and 22,490 members, and has besides a junior organization for young people in which there are 163 brotherhoods and 5400 members, and is in a flourishing condition in every way. It also publishes a weekly Greek Catholic newspaper at Homestead, Pennsylvania—the "Amerikansky Russky Vjestnik" (American Russian Messenger), printed both in the Russian and the Slovak languages. In Ruthenian politics it is the representative of the Ugro-russki party. The second of these federations is the "Russky Narodny Soyus" (Russian National Union), which was founded in 1894 and is a Galician offshoot from the preceding society. It is chiefly composed of Galicians who are Ukrainians, and who express themselves strongly against the Russian Empire and the Orthodox Church. It now has 249 brotherhoods and 12,760 members, and it likewise publishes a weekly newspaper, the "Svoboda" (Liberty), which is printed in New York City, in "phonetic" Little Russian. The third of these federations is the "Obshchestvo Russkikh Bratstv" (Society of Russian Brotherhoods), which was founded 1 July, 1900. It is composed almost wholly of Galicians of the *Moscophile* party, and a small minority of its membership is also made up of Galicians who are either Greek Orthodox or of Orthodox proclivities, for it is quite pro-Russian and opposed to the Ukrainians. It has now 120 brotherhoods and 6530 members, and publishes its weekly newspaper, *Pravda* (Truth) at Olyphant, Pennsylvania, in the Ruthenian old-style spelling. There is also the "Rimsko a Greko Katolicka Jednota" (Roman and Greek Catholic Union) of Pennsylvania, a Slavic organization which has some 175 brotherhoods and about 9000 members, and it is estimated that about one-third of these are Greek Catholic. This federation also publishes a weekly paper, "Bratstvo" (Brotherhood) in the Slovenian language. Besides these publications there is also the "Dushpastyr" (The Pastor), published in New York, which is exclusively a religious periodical and devoted solely to the affairs of the Greek Catholic Church in America. In it the official utterances of the Greek bishop are usually published. There are also many other American Ruthenian papers and periodicals which have nothing whatever to do with church matters, but are devoted to labour questions, national issues, and to Socialism. Unfortunately, many of these publications, even the Catholic ones, exhibit too much of a tendency to attack their opponents in strong language and to belittle the efforts of those not of their party, and their usefulness for good is thereby lessened. From time to time various religious works and a number of booklets on church and national topics have been published in Slovak and Ruthenian, and every year there are issued a number of year-books or calendars containing a variety of information and illustrations concerning the Ruthenian Greek Catholics in America and abroad.

The immigration of the Ruthenian Greek Catholics

into the United States and the organization of their churches and rite has been too recent to properly speak by name of any distinguished representatives of their clergy or laity. Nearly everyone who took a prominent part in their settlement and development is still alive and engaged in active work, while a vigorous younger generation born on American soil is now growing up. Among the Greek priests here in America are several who are authors of learned works upon the church language and ritual, others who have filled posts of considerable distinction in the dioceses in Hungary and Galicia whence they came, and many who have constantly employed their tongue and pen in the education and improvement of their fellow-countrymen in this country. There is, however, no religious order of women of the Greek Rite, nor any association whatever of women devoted to church service in the United States, nor has any attempt been made so far, either on the part of the clergy or laity, to establish here anything of the kind.

In addition to the Ruthenian Greek Catholics in the United States, there are a large number of them in Canada. They are principally settled in the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, where they have devoted themselves to agricultural pursuits. It is said that a Ruthenian often works hard in the United States, saves up his money, and emigrates to Canada, where he can obtain cheap land under the homestead acts. There is besides a considerable direct immigration from Galicia and Hungary, but the majority of the Canadian Ruthenians are Galicians. Their first church (St. Nicholas) in Canada was built about 1900 at Winnipeg by the Basilian monks who are in charge of the Greek missions of the northwest. The Very Rev. Platonides Filas, O. S. B. M., who is now (1909) the superior of the order in Galicia, was the first missionary sent there. Afterwards, in 1905, another church (St. Josaphat) was built at Edmonton. Later on a monastery was established in Winnipeg, with a branch at Monaster, Alberta. From these central points, there are now (1909) over sixty missionary stations established with small Greek chapels at Oaknook, Swan River, Barrows, Ethelbert, Garland, Grand View, Minatonas, Yorkton, Beaverdale, Rabbit Hill, Star, Lamont, Nundare, and Skaro. In this section the Ruthenians have to contend with the Russian Orthodox missions, which are well provided for, and with certain schismatics from the Russian Orthodox known as the "Seraphimites", or independent Græco-Russian Church. There are three missionary communities of the Basilian monks: at Winnipeg, Edmonton, and Monaster. The Greek clergy in Canada consist of eight monks and four secular priests. The number of Ruthenian Greek Catholics is between 45,000 and 50,000, widely scattered through these northwest territories. In Canada there is a religious order of women of the Greek Rite, the Servants of Mary (14 in number), whose mother-house is in Lemberg, Galicia. They have schools at Winnipeg, Edmonton, Monaster, and in some outlying districts. The Canadian Ruthenians publish a small paper (Canadian Farmer) and have several societies on the pattern of those in the United States.

**II. RUMANIAN GREEK CATHOLICS.**—These people come from the eastern provinces of Hungary known as Transylvania. They are of a nationality which claims to come down from the Roman colonists who were settled there by the Emperor Trajan, and hence they still call themselves *Romani*. These Transylvanians are really of an older political order and settlement than the independent country known as Rumania, which bounds Transylvania on the east. The inhabitants of both lands are of the same stock, but those in Hungary were organized and in possession of a fair amount of education and political rights under Hungarian rule whilst the present Kingdom of Rumania was still oppressed under Turkish rule. The

latter only obtained its independence after the Russo-Turkish war of 1878, and in turn began the education and enlightenment of its people.

The Rumanian language is a Latin tongue, somewhat similar to Italian, but with a considerable mixture of Slavic, Greek, and Turkish words in it. It is also the language of the Mass and liturgical offices according to the Greek Rite among the Rumanians, and is an instance where the Church has made a modern tongue the liturgical language. Owing to Slavonic influences, the Rumanian language was formerly written in Slavonic or Russian characters, and this continued until about 1825, when the Roman alphabet was adopted, first by the Catholic Rumanians and then by the Orthodox, and it has been used for the Rumanian language ever since. Even for church books the Slavonic letters (the Cyrillic alphabet) had to give way to the Latin letters, just as the Slavonic Liturgy in the church services had given away to the Rumanian, and now both the Catholic and the Orthodox Mass-books and Office-books are printed beautifully in Latin letters and modern Rumanian, whether for use in the churches of Transylvania or Rumania. The Rumanian Church, although Greek in rite, was originally under the jurisdiction of Rome up to the ninth century, when Constantinople assumed jurisdiction over it, and later on, when Constantinople fell into schism, the Rumanian Church went with it. Frequently, however, during the centuries that followed, partially successful attempts were made towards reunion. At the time of the so-called Reformation in Western Europe the Calvinists endeavoured to persuade a portion of the Rumanian clergy and their flocks to embrace the new doctrines. This naturally led to an examination of matters wherein the Roman Church differed from the Calvinists, and also to the points wherein it was in harmony with the Greek Church, and later to a desire for union with it. The union of the Rumanian Greek Church in Hungary (for the other Rumanians were subjects of Turkey) with the Holy See dates from 1700. The preliminaries for union had been in progress for several years before, and once or twice had been on the eve of success. In the year just mentioned the Metropolitan Athanasius held a general synod of the clergy of Transylvania at Alba Julia (Gyulyafehervar), which declared, on 5 September, 1700, that "freely and spontaneously moved thereto by the impulse of Divine Grace, we have entered upon a union with the Roman Catholic church". This decree was signed by the metropolitan, 54 arch-priests, and 1563 priests. The act of union was confirmed at Rome in the following year, and the Greek Catholic hierarchy was for a long time the only Greek hierarchy in Transylvania. Towards the middle of the last century the Greek Orthodox Rumanian hierarchy was also established. The Rumanian Greek Catholics are very proud of their union with Rome, and church documents are often dated not only by the year of our Lord (*pre anul Domnului*), but also by the year of the union (*pre anul de la santa unire*).

The Rumanian immigrant does not seem to have begun to come to the United States until about the beginning of the present century. In the year 1900 Rumanian immigration from Transylvania and Northern Hungary began to flow towards the United States, and lately has been followed by immigration from Rumania itself. It has steadily increased until now (1909) there are between 60,000 and 70,000 Rumanians in the United States. Nearly all these have come from Hungary; only a small minority are from the Kingdom of Rumania. Those from Hungary are from the southern and western counties of Transylvania, chiefly the counties of Szatmar, Szilagy, Fogaras, Bihar, and Temes. The Greek Catholics among them number about 45,000, and they are scattered through the United States from the Atlantic to



the Pacific. The chief places where the Rumanian Greek Catholics are settled are Cleveland, Youngstown, Columbus, Newark, and Cincinnati, Ohio; Sharon, Erie, Pittsburg, Windber, and Scalp Level, Pennsylvania; Aurora, Indianapolis, Indiana Harbor, and Terre Haute, Indiana; Trenton, New Jersey; St. Louis, Missouri; and New York City. They are all quite poor and are generally found, like all recent immigrants, in the humblest and poorest walks of life. They lack sufficient missionary priests of their own rite, and at present many additional priests would be welcome. The Rev. Dr. Epaminondas Lucaciu was the first Greek Catholic Rumanian priest to come to this country. He was sent here in 1904 by the Greek Catholic Bishop of Lugos, at the request of the late Bishop Horstmann of Cleveland, who was asked for a priest of their own rite by the Rumanians settled in Cleveland. When he came, he set about forming a congregation and building a church for his people of the Greek Rite. His energy and ability among his countrymen led to the erection and dedication, on 21 October, 1906, of the church of St. Helena in Cleveland—the first Rumanian Greek Catholic church in America. His zeal also led to the formation of congregations in other localities which he visited regularly. In 1908 the second Rumanian church was built and dedicated at Scalp Level, Pennsylvania, which serves as the central point for missionary work among the Rumanians of Pennsylvania. In 1909 the third Rumanian church was completed and dedicated at Aurora, Illinois, and it serves in its turn as the centre of Greek Catholic work among the Rumanians of the Western States. A fourth has just been constructed at Youngstown, Ohio. There are now (1909) four Rumanian Greek Catholic priests in the United States, and more are shortly expected to arrive. Greek Catholic congregations have been formed in many localities, and they are regularly visited by the Greek Catholic priests who are here, and regular parishes will be formed and churches erected as soon as possible. A Rumanian Greek chapel is now in course of formation in New York City and awaits a priest from Transylvania. While they have a small Catholic church paper, "Catholic American", they also publish a fine eight-page weekly, "Romanul", at Cleveland and New York, which gives a great deal of church news, and they also publish a little monthly magazine and an illustrated year-book in which many details of their churches, societies, and progress are given. The weekly paper was originally founded by Father Lucaciu to provide reading-matter and general news for his people, but it has since passed into other hands. Their societies are not strictly speaking church organizations, but are rather mutual benefit societies for Rumanians, and some even have a limited membership of the Orthodox, for the Rumanians of Hungary, whether Greek Catholic or Greek Orthodox, are very closely united upon racial and national feelings, and do not exhibit the hostility sometimes shown between the two Churches elsewhere. The principal societies are "Dacia Romana", "Ardealana", "Unirea Romana", and "Societatea Traian", numbering altogether about 3000 members, and generally identified with the church congregations.

III. SYRIAN (MELCHITE) GREEK CATHOLICS.—About 1886 the first immigration from the Mediterranean coasts of Asia began to reach the shores of the United States, when the Armenians, Greeks, and Syrians began to swell the numbers of our immigrants. Among them came the Syrian Greeks, or those Syrians who were of the Byzantine Rite, whether Catholic or Orthodox. The name *Melchite* (see under GREEK CHURCH, Vol. VI, p. 755), is occasionally used to designate a Syrian of the Greek Orthodox Faith, but now it rarely has that meaning, since the schismatics prefer to be known as Syro-Arabbians, at least in the United States, where they are largely

under Russian influence, for it is nearly always applied to the Catholics. After the Council of Chalcedon the Melchites followed the fortunes of the Greek Church of Constantinople. When it separated from Rome they also gradually became separated, merely through inertia. Occasionally a bishop became Catholic, and there were sporadic attempts to reunite them with the Holy See. Cyril V, who was elected Patriarch of Antioch about the year 1700, decided to come back to unity and made his submission and profession of the Catholic Faith to Pope Clement XI, and his example was followed by the Archbishop of Tyre and Sidon, the Bishop of Beirut, and other prelates. From that time on the Syrian Greek Catholics have had a restored Catholic line of Patriarchs of Antioch. Strangely enough, the word *Melchite*, which had been used to designate those who adhered to the doctrines of the Church of Constantinople when it was Catholic and in unity, and who even followed it when it left the unity of the Church, came eventually to mean, after the union of Cyril V and his fellow-bishops, almost exclusively those Syrians of the Greek Rite who were Catholics and united with the Holy See. Their rite, of course, is the same as that of the other Greek Catholics, but the language used in the Mass and the administration of the sacraments and in the church offices is the Arabic, with the exception of certain prayer-endings and versicles of the Mass, which are still intoned in the original Greek. Still a Melchite priest may celebrate entirely in Greek if he so desires, and the Catholic Missal is printed in parallel columns in each language as to the parts which are to be intoned or said aloud.

At first these Syrians were in small numbers and were not distinguishable from the Arabic-speaking Maronites or from the Syro-Arabian Orthodox Greeks, all of whom began to come to this country about the same date. This Syrian immigration, as compared with that from other lands, has never been very large. The Greek Catholics came at first from the same localities as the Maronites—Beirut and Mount Lebanon; but now they come from Damascus and other parts of Syria as well. In 1891 Rev. Abraham Bechwate, a Basilian monk of the Congregation of the Holy Saviour, from Saida in the Diocese of Zahleh and Farzul, Mount Lebanon, was sent to this country by the Patriarch of Antioch to take up missionary work among his countrymen. So far he has been instrumental in establishing missions and congregations in various cities and in having other priests sent to assist him. His first efforts were confined to New York City, and at present the Melchites in New York City use the basement of St. Peter's church on Barclay Street, but they have bought ground in Brooklyn with a view to erecting a Syrian Greek Catholic church there. After Father Bechwate other priests were sent to take up the work at various places throughout the United States. At the present time (1909) there are altogether fourteen Melchite churches or congregations in the United States and just across the border in Canada. Besides these there are many mission stations which the Melchite Greek priests visit periodically. These churches are situated at the following places: New York City; Boston and Lawrence, Massachusetts; Omaha, Nebraska; Cleveland, Ohio; Dubois and Scranton, Pennsylvania; Chicago and Joliet, Illinois; Rockley, South Dakota; La Crosse, Wisconsin; Pawtucket, Rhode Island; and Montreal and Toronto, Canada. So far they have erected four fair-sized churches in Lawrence, Cleveland, Dubois, and La Crosse. The cost of land in the large cities has prevented them from building, so that their congregations in the other places are assembled either in the Latin churches or in rented premises. The number of the Syrian Greek Catholics in the United States (1909) is between 8000 and 10,000, and they are to be found chiefly in the New England States, Pennsylvania,

Ohio, and Illinois. For their spiritual needs there are thirteen Syrian Greek (Catholic priests, seven of them Basilian monks of the Congregation of the Holy Saviour from the Diocese of Zahleh and Farzul, four of them Basilian monks of the Congregation of St. John (Soarite) from the Dioceses of Aleppo and Zahleh, and two secular priests from the Diocese of Beirut. Owing to the poverty of most Syrian congregations, they have not maintained any schools and have no Sunday-school instruction, and the majority of the Syrian children attend the nearest Latin parochial school, if there be one. They have a small Arabic paper "Al-Kawn" (The Universe), published in New York City, and have the church society of St. George.

IV. ITALIAN GREEK CATHOLICS.—In the extreme southern part of Italy and in the Island of Sicily the Greek Rite has always flourished, even from Apostolic times. Three of the popes (Sts. Eusebius, Agatho, and Zacharias) were Greeks from that region. Many of the Greek saints venerated by the Church were Southern Italians or Sicilians, and the great Greek monastery of Grottaferrata near Rome was founded by St. Nilus, a native of Rossano in Calabria. The Greek Rite in Southern Italy never fell into schism or separated from unity with Rome at the time of the great Schism of Constantinople. Although they held to their faith and rite, yet the fact that they were not thereafter closely allied with their fellow-Greeks of Constantinople caused the followers of their rite to diminish. After the schism an idea grew up among the Italians of the Roman Rite that the Greek language and ritual were in some indefinable way identified with the schism. This was intensified upon the failure of the Greeks after the Council of Florence (1428) to adhere to the union. Therefore, as the Greek language died out among the southern Italians, they gradually gave up their Greek Rite and adopted the Roman Rite instead. While the Greek Rite thus became gradually confined to monasteries, religious houses, and country towns, and would perhaps never have died out on Italian soil, yet it was reinforced in a singular manner by immigration from the Balkan peninsula in the period between 1450 and 1500. The Albanians, who were converted to Christianity and followed the Greek Rite, using the Greek language in their liturgy, were persecuted by the Turks, and, by reason of the many Turkish victories over the Albanians under their chieftain, George Castrioti, also known by his Turkish name of Scanderbeg (Alexander Bey), were forced to leave their native land in large numbers. Scanderbeg applied to Pope Eugene IV for permission for his people to settle in Italy, so as to escape the Moslem persecutions. From time to time they settled in Calabria and Sicily, and received among other privileges that of retaining their Greek Rite wherever their colonies were established. Since that time they, like the Greek inhabitants of Southern Italy, have become entirely Italianized, but, together with them, have retained their Greek Rite quite distinct from their Latin neighbours down to the present day. All the Italians who follow the Greek Rite in Southern Italy are known as Albanese (Albanians), although only the older generations of that race retain their knowledge of the Albanian tongue. The Mass and all the offices of the Church are of course said in Greek according to the Rite of Constantinople, although a few Latinizing practices have crept in. The smaller churches do not have the *iconostasis*, priests do not confer confirmation, but it is given by the bishop, and they follow the Gregorian calendar instead of the Julian calendar followed by all the other Greeks.

When the immigration to America from the south of Italy and from Sicily began in large proportions, the Italo-Greeks came also. They are from Calabria, Apulia, and Basilicata in Italy, and from the Dioceses of Palermo, Monreale, and Messina in Sicily. They are settled in the United States chiefly in New York,

Philadelphia, and Chicago, and throughout the States of Pennsylvania and Illinois. It is claimed that the Greek Catholic population of Italy has sent a third of its number to America, and some well-informed Albanese have even declared that there are perhaps more. They estimate that there are 20,000 of them in the United States, the greater part of whom are in the vicinity of New York and Philadelphia. As a rule they have not shown themselves in any wise as devoted church-attendants, but that may be because they have been in a measure neglected, for everyone assumes that an Italian must be of the Roman Rite and ought to go to a Latin church. They have neither the means to construct churches of their own rite nor do they care to frequent churches of the Latin Rite, although their societies usually attend the Italian Catholic churches and celebrate their festivals according to the Latin Rite. In many places they attend the churches of the Ruthenian Greek Catholics, and in some few instances some have gone to the Hellenic churches of the Greek Orthodox, where the language of the ritual is Greek. During the year 1904 the first (and so far the only) Italian Greek Catholic priest, *Papas* (Rev.) *Ciro Pinola*, was sent from Sicily by Cardinal Celsia of Palermo to the United States, to look after the scattered flock of Greek Catholics here, and he is now a priest of the Archdiocese of New York. He found that these Italians, being accustomed to the language and rites of the Greek Church, as well as infected by the inertia of so many of the newcomers to these shores, had not attended the Latin Catholic churches, and that they had become the prey of all sorts of missionary experiments to draw them away from their allegiance to the Faith. Besides, they were among the poorest of the Italian immigrants and had been unable to establish or maintain a chapel or church of their rite. He took energetic steps to look after them and on Easter Day, 1906, had the pleasure of opening the first Italian Greek Catholic chapel on Broome Street in the City of New York. This has progressed so far that he has now a larger missionary chapel (*Our Lady of Grace*) on Stanton Street, with a congregation of about 400, where the Greek Rite in the Greek language is celebrated. He has also various missionary stations in Brooklyn and on Long Island, which he visits at regular intervals, but he has been unable to do anything for the Italian Greek Catholics in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. Other priests of their rite are needed. There is a small school attached to the Greek Catholic chapel in New York where the Church Catechism and Greek singing is taught, as well as several Italian and English branches, and children are instructed in their church duties. There is quite a large society of men, the "Fratellanza del Santissimo Crocifisso", a society for mutual benefit, religious instruction, and the building of an Italian Greek church. There are some ten or twelve Italo-Albanese societies, having branches in various parts of the United States, but devoted mostly to secular objects. There is also a small weekly Italian paper, "L'Operaio", for the Italo-Albanese and their Greek Rite, but it is also devoted to Socialism and the wildest labour theories, so that its usefulness is doubtful.

Nothing, except a few newspaper and magazine articles, has been written in English or the Western European languages about the Greek Catholics in America; their own publications must be consulted.

*Amerikansky Russky Kalendar* (New York and Pittsburgh, 1896-1909); *Russko-Amerikansky Kalendar Soyusa* (Scranton, 1897-1902); *Matrosoff, Zoakeanskaya Rus in the Istoriichesky Vestnik*, LXVII (St. Petersburg, 1897); *Kalendar dlia Amerikanskikh Rusinov* (New York, 1907-1909); *Messiasoslov* (Ungvar, 1890-1909); *Charities*, XVI (May, New York, 1906); *Calendarul Ziarului Romanul* (Cleveland, 1909); *Annual Reports of Commissioner of Immigration* (Washington, 1890-1908); *The Messenger*, XLII (Sept.-Dec., 1904); XLV (Feb., 1906, New York); and the files of *Vestnik*, *Pravda*, and *Svoboda*.

ANDREW J. SHIPMAN.

**Greek Church.**—This subject will be treated under the following heads: I. Explanation of Terms; II. The Greek Orthodox Church and Its Divisions; III. Greek

Uniat Churches; IV. Greek-Church History, subdivided into: (1) The First Five Centuries; (2) Decay of the Greek Churches of the East and Rise of the Byzantine Hegemony (451-847); (3) The Greek Schism; Conversion of the Slavs (ninth to eleventh century); (4) Efforts towards Reunion; the Crusades (eleventh to fifteenth century); (5) From 1453 to the Present Time—Relations with the Catholic Church, the Protestants, etc. Under (2) will be found: (a) Internal Organization of the Byzantine Churches; (b) The Emperor, Relations between East and West; Liturgy. Under (4): (a) Internal Organization; (b) Hesychasm.

I. EXPLANATION OF TERMS.—In the East, when a Church is spoken of, four things must be kept distinct: the race to which the adherents of the Church belong; the speech used in their everyday life, and in their public devotions; the ecclesiastical rite used in their liturgy, and their actual belief, Catholic or non-Catholic. It is because these distinctions have not been, and are not, even now, always observed that a great confusion has arisen in the terminology of those who write or speak of the Eastern (Oriental) Churches and of the Greek Church. As a matter of fact, the usual signification attached to the words *Eastern Churches* extends to all those Churches with a liturgical rite differing from the Latin Rite. Let them reject the authority of the pope or accept it, they are none the less Eastern Churches. Thus the Russian Church, separated from Rome, is an Eastern Church; in the same way the Greek Catholics who live in Italy, and are known as Italo-Greeks, make up an Eastern Church also. The expression *Eastern Churches* is therefore the most comprehensive in use; it includes all believers who follow any of the six Eastern rites now in use: the Byzantine, Armenian, Syrian, Chaldean, Maronite, and Coptic.

What, then, do we mean when we speak of the Greek Church?—Ordinarily we take it to mean all those Churches that use the Byzantine Rite, whether they are separated from Rome or in communion with the pope, whether they are by race and speech Greek or Slavs, Rumanians, Georgians, etc. The term *Greek Church* is, therefore, peculiarly inappropriate, though most commonly employed. For instance, if we mean to designate the rite, the term Greek Church is inaccurate, since there is really no Greek Rite properly so called, but only the Byzantine Rite. If, on the other hand, we wish to designate the nationality of the believers in the Churches following the Byzantine Rite, we find that out of fifteen or twenty Churches which use that rite, only three have any claim to be known as *The Greek Church*, viz., the Church of the Hellenic Kingdom, the Church of Constantinople, the Church of Cyprus. Again, it must be borne in mind that in the Church of Constantinople there are included a number of Slavs, Rumanians, and Albanians who rightly refuse to be known as Greeks.

The term *Orthodox Greek Church*, or even simply the *Orthodox Church*, designates, without distinction of speech, or race, or nationality, all the existing Churches of the Byzantine Rite, separated from Rome. They claim to be a unit and to have the same body of doctrine, which they say was that of the primitive Church. As a matter of fact, the orthodoxy of these Churches is what we call heterodoxy, since it rejects the Papal Infallibility, and the Papal Supremacy, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, that of Purgatory, etc. However, by a polite fiction, educated Catholics give them the name of *Orthodox* which they have usurped. The term Schismatic Greek Church is synonymous with the above; nearly everybody uses it, but it is at times inexpedient to do so, if one would avoid wounding the feelings of those whose conversion is aimed at.

The term *United Greek Church* is generally used to designate all the Churches of the Byzantine Rite in communion with the See of Rome. Thus the Ruthenian Church of Galicia, the Rumanian Church of

Austria-Hungary, the Bulgarian Church of Turkish Bulgaria, the Melchite Church of Syria, the Georgian Church, the Italo-Greek Church, and the Church of the Greeks in Turkey or in the Hellenic Kingdom—all of them Catholic—are often called the United Greek Churches. Again, the term is inappropriate, and belongs of right only to the last two Churches. As a matter of fact the Ruthenians and Bulgarians are Slavs who follow the Byzantine Rite, but use a Slavonic translation; whereas the Rumanians are Latins who follow the Byzantine Rite, but in a Rumanian translation, etc.

Instead of *United Greek Church*, the term *Uniat* (or *Uniate*) Church is often used; and in like manner the word *Uniat* is used instead of *United Greeks*. These words are by no means synonymous. *Uniat Church*, or *Uniat*, has a much wider signification than *United Greek Church* or *United Greeks*, and embraces all the Eastern Churches in communion with Rome, but following another than the Latin rite, whether it be Byzantine, Armenian, Syrian, Chaldean, Maronite, or Coptic. The *Uniat Church* is therefore really synonymous with *Eastern Churches united to Rome*, and *Uniat* is synonymous with *Eastern Christians united with Rome*.

II. THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH AND ITS DIVISIONS.—The Greek Orthodox Churches are Churches separated from Rome and following the Byzantine Rite, i. e. the rite developed at Constantinople between the fourth and tenth centuries. In the beginning, the only language of this rite was Greek. Later, however (the exact date is uncertain), it was introduced among the Georgians, or Iberians, of the Caucasus and was translated into the Georgian vernacular of the country. In the ninth century, through the efforts of Sts. Cyril and Methodius and their disciples, the Moravians and the Bulgarians were converted to Christianity, and as the missionaries were Byzantines they introduced their own rite, but translated the Liturgy into Slav, the mother tongue of those nations. From Bulgaria this Byzantine-Slav Rite spread among the Servians and the Russians. In recent times the Byzantine Rite has been translated into Rumanian for use by the faithful of that nationality. Lastly, the Orthodox Syrians of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt have adopted a hybrid Byzantine Rite in which, according to the whim of the celebrant, either Greek or Arabic is used. Hence we have five divisions of the Byzantine Rite, and consequently five divisions of Orthodox Greek Churches:—

(1) The Greek-Byzantine Rite, which includes the pure Greeks subject (a) to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, (b) to the Holy Synod of Athens, and (c) to the Archbishopric of Cyprus.

(2) The Arabic-Byzantine Rite, which includes the Christians under the Patriarchates of (a) Antioch, (b) Jerusalem, and (c) Alexandria, and (d) the Archbishopric of Sinai.

(3) The Georgian-Byzantine Rite, which, up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, included the Churches of the Caucasus Range now absorbed by the Russian Church and obliged to use the Slavonic Liturgy instead of their own native Georgian.

(4) The Slavonic-Byzantine Rite, comprising (a) the Russian, (b) the Servian, and (c) the Bulgarian Churches.

(5) The Rumanian-Byzantine Rite used by the Rumanian Churches.

(1) *Pure Greeks*.—(a) Patriarchate of Constantinople.—This Church is governed by a patriarch, a Holy Synod consisting of twelve metropolitans, and a mixed council of four metropolitans and eight laymen. It numbers in all 101 dioceses, of which 86 have metropolitan rank, and 15 are suffragan sees. Such were the official figures and were accurate until the month of October, 1908. As we write, however, this is no longer so. Since the proclamation of Bulgarian independence the five Greek metropolitans in their

country have been suppressed by the Bulgarians. Bosnia-Herzegovina had four metropolitans depending more or less on Constantinople, but since Austria-Hungary has annexed that country they will no longer be dependent. Lastly, the Island of Crete is now almost independent of Turkey, and in consequence its metropolitan and his seven suffragan bishops have gone over to the Holy Synod of Athens. From the 101 dioceses, therefore, we may deduct 17, viz., 10 metropolitan sees and 7 suffragan sees, which leaves a total of 84 dioceses, 76 being metropolitan and 8 suffragan. Of these 84 dioceses, not including Constantinople, 22 are in Asia Minor, 12 in the Archipelago, and 50 on European soil. For want of reliable statistics, it is difficult to form an estimate of their population. The Greeks in the Ottoman Empire claim to number 6,000,000, but this figure is exaggerated. We shall be nearer the truth in computing 1,000,000 Greeks in Asia Minor, 400,000 in the Archipelago, 1,500,000 in Turkey in Europe, including the Albanians and Bulgarians. There are, moreover, 600,000 Slavs, either Bulgarians or Servians, who belong to the œcumenical patriarchate. All this gives a grand total of 3,500,000 souls. In consequence of the independence of Bulgaria, of the annexation of Bosnia by Austria-Hungary, and the secession of Crete to Greece, the œcumenical patriarchate has recently lost nearly a million subjects—namely, 700,000 in Bosnia, 200,000 in Crete, and from 70,000 to 80,000 in Bulgaria.

(b) The Church of Greece.—This Church dates back to 1833, when 36 bishops proclaimed their independence of Constantinople and established a Holy Synod; its authority was not recognized until 11 July, 1850, by the œcumenical patriarch. At the present time this Church is controlled by a Holy Synod of five members: the Metropolitan of Athens as president and four bishops chosen in regular succession. The Hellenic Kingdom contains 32 dioceses, of which one—that of Athens—is a metropolitan see; it is not, however, rare to find one-third of the sees vacant for economic reasons. The Church of Greece numbers 2,500,000 members in Greece and many thousands of believers in other countries, especially in the United States. By an arrangement arrived at between Athens and Constantinople in 1903, all the Greek Churches of the dispersion, save that of Venice, must look to Athens as their head.

(c) The Church of Cyprus.—Ever since the Council of Ephesus, in 431, recognized its autonomy, which was confirmed in 488 by the Emperor Zeno, the Church of Cyprus has remained independent. The hierarchy consists of the Archbishop of Constantia and his three suffragans, the Bishops of Paphos, Cytlon, and Cyrenia. Nearly ten years ago the archbishop died, and so far his successor has not been agreed on. The Church has about 200,000 adherents.

(2) *Arabic Byzantines*.—(a) Patriarchate of Antioch.—The Orthodox population of this patriarchate is hardly Greek any longer. They are a Syrian race whose speech is Arabic, and as a rule the liturgical offices are celebrated in Arabic. Since 1899 the Greek element, which had up to then monopolized the superior clerical positions, has been definitively driven out of Syria. The patriarch lives at Damascus and governs with the aid of a Holy Synod and a mixed council. At the present time this Church has 13 dioceses, all of metropolitan rank, and numbers 250,000 souls.

(b) Patriarchate of Jerusalem.—This patriarchate was cut off from that of Antioch in 451. If it were not for the sanctuaries of the Holy Places, which draw so many pilgrims and such considerable alms, its importance would be nil. All the superior clergy are Greek, and, in accordance with a rule made in the early part of the eighteenth century, the clergy of Syrian birth and Arabic speech are eligible for the

lower clerical positions only, although the whole membership of this Church is Syrian. There has been a revolt recently against this slavery, and it is not unlikely that before long the Greeks will be expelled from Jerusalem as they have been already driven from Antioch. The only extant dioceses are Jerusalem, Nazareth, and St. Jean d'Acre, but a number of titular metropolitans and archbishops aid the patriarch in the administration of his Church. The liturgical languages in use are Greek and Arabic; the number of subjects of this patriarchate cannot exceed 50,000 souls.

(c) Patriarchate of Alexandria.—This patriarchate is made up of only one diocese under the personal care of the patriarch. According to decisions arrived at in 1867 he ought to be assisted by a Holy Synod composed of four members who were to be honorary Metropolitans of Pelusium, the Thebaid, Pentapolis, and Lybia. This synod is being formed. Church-membership numbers about 80,000 persons, made up mostly of strangers from Syria and Greece, among whom far from harmonious relations prevail. The liturgy is celebrated in either Greek or Arabic, but for the most part in Greek.

(d) Archbishopric of Sinai.—The titular of this see has jurisdiction over the convent of St. Catherine and about fifty Bedouins. Its autonomy was proclaimed in 1575 and confirmed in 1782. At the present time the tendency is to consider it rather as a diocese in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem.

(3) *Orthodox Georgians*.—The various national Churches of Iberia, Mingrelia, and Imerethia no longer exist since Russia has extended her dominion over the Caucasus provinces. In the Liturgy the Georgian tongue has been replaced by the Slavonic. The number of dioceses was formerly twenty, but is now only four, all in the hands of the Russians. It has a metropolitan, with the title of Exarch of Georgia and three suffragan bishops. The number of the Orthodox in Georgia, including the Russian colonists, is reckoned at about 1,600,000.

(4) *Orthodox Slavs*.—(a) The Synodal Church of St. Petersburg.—This is but a continuation since 1721 of the Patriarchate of Moscow, which had been established in 1589 by the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremias II, who up to that time had ruled the Russian Orthodox Church. The Holy Synod instituted by Peter the Great and composed of seven members, is the head of this Church. The Russian Church counts 63 dioceses, ruled by 3 metropolitans, 13 archbishops, and 47 bishops. In many of the dioceses, where the distances are enormous, it is customary for the bishop to take one or more auxiliary bishops, known as episcopal vicars, for the governing of parts of the diocese. At the present time there are 44 of these episcopal vicars. The number of members of this Church must be about 70,000,000, or half the population of the Empire. There are at least 25,000,000 more believers who separated from the official church in the seventeenth century and make up the great Raskol sect (see RUSSIA). The remainder of the population of Russia is made up of about 12,000,000 Catholics, together with Protestants, Armenians, Jews, Mussulmans, Buddhists, and even pagans.

(b) The Servian Church of Servia.—It was not till November, 1879, that this Church secured its independence of the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Since then it has been governed by a Holy Synod comprising the Metropolitan of Belgrade and the four suffragan Bishops of Nich, Uchitzé, Timok and Chabatz. Its members number about 2,500,000 souls, and its liturgical language is the Slavonic.—The Servian Church of Montenegro.—It is ruled by the Metropolitan of Cetinje, who goes to Russia for consecration. Until 1852 the bishop, or *Vladika*, was temporal as well as spiritual head of the principality. Since then the authority has been

divided. The membership is about 250,000.—The Servian Patriarchate of Carlovitz in Hungary.—This Church was founded in 1691 by Servian emigrants from Turkey. It became a patriarchate in 1848. Besides the patriarchal diocese, there are six others: Bracs, Buda, Carlsstadt, Pakray, Temescaz, and Versecz. Its membership numbers about 1,080,000 souls. It is governed by a Holy Synod and a national Parliament, or Assembly, of which one-third of the members are clerics and the remainder laymen. It meets every three years.—The Servian Church of Bosnia-Herzegovina.—Theoretically this Church still belongs to the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople, but since the annexation of these provinces by Austria-Hungary (6 October, 1908) it may be looked on as autonomous. It has four metropolitan sees, Sersaiero, Mostar, Dolnja-Touzla, and Banialouka, and numbers 700,000 souls.—Two other Servian groups have not yet acquired autonomy. That in Dalmatia belongs to the Rumanian Metropolitan of Tchernovitz; it has two dioceses, Zara and Cattaro, and numbers 110,000 souls. The other group, in Turkey, in the vilayet of Uskub, acknowledges the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. It has two dioceses, Prizrend and Uskub, and numbers 250,000 souls.

(c) The Bulgarian Exarchate.—After having concurrently two patriarchates, one at Timovo, suppressed in 1393, and another at Ochrida, suppressed in 1767, the Bulgarians have organized an independent Church, recognized by the Sublime Porte, 11 March, 1870. The exarch, head of all Bulgarians in Turkey and Bulgaria who may be disposed to admit his authority, resides in Constantinople. He has subject to him in Turkey 21 dioceses, of which about two-thirds are still waiting for the nomination of their bishops, and in Bulgaria 11 metropolitan dioceses. The faithful of the exarchate number about 4,000,000, of whom 2,900,000 are in the Kingdom of Bulgaria, and 1,000,000 in Turkey in Europe. The proclamation of Bulgaria as an independent kingdom will bring about modifications in the ecclesiastical domain, for it is hardly likely that Turkey will accept an outsider as spiritual head of its Ottoman subjects.

(5) *Orthodox Rumanians*.—(a) The Church of Rumania.—This church has existed since 1864, though it was not recognized by the Phanar as independent until 13 May, 1885. It obeys a Holy Synod composed of two metropolitans and six bishops—its whole episcopate. Its membership numbers 4,800,000 souls.—

(b) The Rumanian Church of Sibiu.—This Church, formerly under the Servian Patriarchate of Carlovitz, secured its independence in 1864. It is governed by a national Assembly composed of 90 members (30 ecclesiastics and 60 laymen) who meet every three years. The Metropolitan of Sibiu has two suffragans, the Bishops of Arad and of Karambes. Its computed membership is 1,750,000. (c) Servo-Rumanian Church of Tchernovitz.—This Church secured independence in 1873. It comprises three dioceses; Tchernovitz, the metropolitan see, situated in Bukovina, Zara and Cattaro in Dalmatia (its two suffragan sees). The population of this Church, which in Bukovina is mainly Servo-Rumanian and in Dalmatia Servian, is about 520,000 souls.

To sum up, there are seventeen Orthodox Churches of various tongues and nationalities, knit together more or less by a common Byzantine Rite and a vague basis of doctrine that becomes more and more imbued with Protestant ideas. Their total membership does not exceed 100,000,000 souls; the exact figure is 94,050,000, of whom about three quarters (70,000,000) are in the Russian dominions.

III. GREEK UNIAT CHURCHES.—Nearly every one of the Orthodox Churches of the Byzantine Rite has a corresponding Greek Catholic Church in communion with Rome. As we saw in the majority of the Orthodox Churches, so in the case of the Uniat Churches,

they are Greek only in name. Altogether eight divisions are recognized: (1) Pure Greeks, (2) Italo-Greeks, (3) Georgians, (4) Græco-Arabs (or Melchites), (5) Ruthenians, (6) Servians, (7) Bulgarians, and (8) Rumanians. The total membership of these various Churches does not exceed 6,000,000 souls; the exact figure is computed at 5,564,809, of whom 4,097,073 belong to the Ruthenians and Servians, 8488 to the Bulgarians, 1,271,333 to the Rumanians, 138,735 to the Melchites, and 49,180 to the Italo-Greeks and Pure Greeks. The number of Catholic Georgians is unknown, but it is small. These are the figures furnished by the 1907 edition of "Missiones Catholicæ", published at Rome (p. 743).

(1) *Pure Greeks*.—Their Church has not yet been organized, it is under the Apostolic Delegate at Constantinople. Parishes and missions exist at Constantinople, Cadi-Keui, Peramos, Gallipoli, Malgara and Casarea in Cappadocia. The faithful number about 1000, under the care of a dozen priests, of whom seven are Assumptionists. There are also Catholics of this rite in Greece. They are subject to the Delegation at Athens.

(2) *The Italo-Greek Church*.—These Catholics are of Greek or Albanian origin, and use the Byzantine Rite. They live mainly in Sicily and Calabria, and have some fixed colonies in Malta, at Algiers, Marseilles, and Carghese in Corsica. Their number is not more than 50,000. Ecclesiastics in Calabria and Sicily are ordained by two Italo-Greek bishops. Their liturgical language is Greek, but for the most part the vernacular of the faithful is Italian.

(3) *Georgian Churches*.—Russia, unwilling to tolerate within her dominions an Orthodox Georgian Church distinct from the Russian, is all the more opposed to the creation of a Catholic Georgian Church. Out of from 30,000 to 35,000 Georgian Catholics, about 8000 follow the Armenian Rite, the remainder having adopted the Latin Rite. The only Catholic Georgian organization in existence is at Constantinople.

(4) *Græco-Arabs (or Melchites)*.—All these are under a patriarch who bears the titles of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, and who, moreover, has jurisdiction over all the faithful of his rite in the Ottoman Empire. Their number amounts to about 140,000 and they are subject to twelve bishops or metropolitans. The liturgical language is either Arabic or Greek.

(5) *Ruthenians*.—The Uniat Church of Russia has disappeared. Its last two bishoprics, those of Minsk and Chelm, were suppressed in 1869 and in 1875 respectively. Since the disorders of 1905 many have availed themselves of the liberty of returning to the Catholic Church, but as a precautionary measure they have adopted the Latin Rite.

(6) *Servians*.—In Austria-Hungary the ancient Ruthenian Church has survived with a little more than 4,000,000 members. It has six dioceses, of which three are in Galicia (the Archbishopric of Lemberg, and the Bishoprics of Przemyśl and of Stanislawow) and three in Hungary (the Bishoprics of Munkacs and of Eperies under the Latin Archbishop of Grau, and the Bishopric of Crisium, or Kreutz, in the archiepiscopal province of Agram, and of which the Catholic population is mainly Servian).

(7) *Bulgarians*.—The movement for union with Rome, very strong in 1860, was, owing to political reasons, not a success. To-day there are hardly 10,000 Catholics between the two Apostolic vicariates of Thrace and Macedonia. The seminary of Thrace is under the care of the Assumptionists, that of Macedonia under the Lazarists.

(8) *Rumanians*.—The Rumanian Catholic Church uses the Byzantine Rite, but the liturgical language is Rumanian. It is established only in Hungary and counts four dioceses, viz., the Archdiocese of Fogaras with the suffragan Dioceses of Armenopolis, Gross-Wardein, and Lugos, having in all 1,300,000 members.



The Uniat-Rumanians of the Kingdom of Rumania have no ecclesiastical organization. In this summary I have omitted the other Oriental Churches in communion with Rome, e. g. the Armenian, the Coptic, the Abyssinian, the Syriac, the Maronite, the Chaldean and Malabrian Churches, because they do not use the Byzantine rite, and have no claim to be considered as Greek Churches, even in the wider meaning of the word.

FORTESQUE, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907); FAMIN, *Histoire de la rivalité et du protectorat des églises chrétiennes en Orient* (Paris, 1853); PISANI, *A travers l'Orient* (Paris, s. d.); BETH, *Die Orientalische Christenheit der Mittelmeerländer* (Berlin, 1902); SILBERNAGL, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (Ratisbon, 1904); DE JEHAY, *De la situation légale des sujets ottomans non musulmans* (Bruxelles, 1906); D'AVRIL, *Les hiérarchies en Orient in the Revue de l'Orient chrétien* (1899), pp. 145-149; KOHLER, *Die katholischen Kirchen des Morgenlandes* (Darmstadt, 1896); *Missiones Catholicae* (Rome, 1907), 771-800; JANIN, *Les groupements chrétiens en Orient in Echos d'Orient* (1906), 330-337; (1907), 43-49, 107-112, and 136-139 (in this same article will be found an ample complementary bibliography for sections II and III above).

IV. GREEK-CHURCH HISTORY.—(1) *The First Five Centuries*.—The Gospel, preached by the Apostles and by their disciples, who were converts from Judaism, spread first of all among the Jewish communities of the Roman Empire. These Jewish settlements were mainly in the towns, and as a rule spoke the Greek tongue; and thus it came to pass that the earliest Christian communities were in the towns and used the Greek tongue in their liturgical services. Gradually, however, Christian converts from among the Gentiles began to increase and, as the author of the so-called Second Epistle of Clement says, "The children of the barren woman outnumbered those of the fruitful one". The original differences between the Judæo-Christian and Helleno-Christian communities quickly disappeared, and soon there existed only Christians, with a certain number of heretical sects which either held aloof of their own accord or were constrained to do so. At the end of the fourth century, at least in the East, nearly all the cities were Christian, but the villages and country places, as in the West, offered a more stubborn resistance to the new religion. The government of the Church was monarchical; as a rule every city had its bishop, and the priests were his assistants; the deacons and lower ministers attended to the ceremonial and to charitable works. Even before the Council of Nicæa (325) ecclesiastical provinces had begun to appear, each having a metropolitan and several suffragan bishops. The size of these provinces generally corresponded to the extent of the civil provinces.

The fourth canon of Nicæa expressly refers to such provinces. But were there also Churches whose high jurisdiction was recognized by a number of ecclesiastical provinces, and did they correspond with the future patriarchates and exarchates? We must reach the third century before we find conclusive proof of this. At that time the Bishop of Alexandria was looked up to as the Primate or Patriarch of all Egypt. In a somewhat similar way, though in a lesser degree, the Bishop of Antioch had authority in the provinces of Syria and Asia Minor. For instance, at the end of the second century Serapion of Antioch exercised his authority at Rhossos, a town of Cilicia, and this same Serapion appears to have ordained Palout, the third Bishop of Edessa. During the latter half of the third century we see assembled at Antioch the bishops of all Syria and eastern Asia Minor, soon to become the civil diocese of Pontus. As early as 251 we know of a synod that was to be held at Antioch because Fabius, the bishop of that town, seemed to be leaning towards Novatianism. The promoters of this meeting were the Bishops of Tarsus, Cæsarea in Palestine, and Cæsarea in Cappadocia. A few years later, in 256, Dionysius of Alexandria, treating of the Eastern Churches that had been disturbed by this quarrel, mentions Antioch, Cæsarea in Palestine, Ælia (Jerusalem), Tyre,

Laodicea in Syria, Tarsus and Cæsarea in Cappadocia. Somewhat later, again, from 264 to 268, the affair of Paul of Samosata was the occasion of many meetings of bishops at Antioch, and in the interests of that Church. They always came from the same provinces, viz., those extending from Polemoniac Pontus (Neocæsarea) and Lycaonia (Iconium) to Arabia (Bostra) and Palestine (Cæsarea and Ælia). "Immediately after the persecution of Galerius and Maximianus a celebrated council was held at Ancyra, presided over by the Bishop of Antioch, at which some fifteen bishops from the same countries, were again present; this time, however, the Provinces of Galatia, Bithynia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia are represented, but Asia, properly so called, still remained outside the group" (Duchesne, "Christian Worship", London, 1904, p. 20). On the other hand, in Proconsular Asia no Church had yet succeeded in asserting authority over the others; Ephesus, the most famous of them, had merely a primacy of honour over its rivals in influence and wealth, Smyrna, Pergamus, Sardis, and others.

To sum up, then, during the opening years of the fourth century we find three principal ecclesiastical groups in the Eastern Empire: (1) that of Alexandria, with authority over the whole of Egypt; (2) that of Antioch, with a more or less recognized jurisdiction over the whole Greek world, with the exception of Asia proper, and even over lands beyond the frontiers of the Roman Empire, e. g., Armenia and Persia; (3) Proconsular Asia, forming a group apart. The Councils of Nicæa (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451) legalized the existing state of things, created new Churches and established the ecclesiastical hierarchy as it has remained ever since. But in order to understand the situation properly, we must first briefly review the civil organization of the Roman Empire, which had such an influence over early Church organization.

From Diocletian to the accession of Theodosius the Great (379) the Empire of the East included the civil dioceses of Egypt (after its separation from Antioch), Asia, Pontus, and the two Mysias, or Thrace. The remaining dioceses formed part of the Empire of the West. On 19 January, 379, Gratian, Emperor of the West, ceded to his colleague, Theodosius I, the Prefecture of Eastern Illyricum, which included the dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia. Soon afterwards, between 424 and 437, Western Illyricum, or the diocese of Pannonia, became part of the Empire of the East.

Among the canons of Nicæa (325) that do not specifically deal with the ordinary ecclesiastical provinces, canons 6 and 7 confirm the rights accorded by immemorial custom to certain great Churches, such as Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and the other eparchies. It is not easy at first sight to determine what rights the council referred to. Nevertheless it is a general opinion that the sixth canon aimed at securing to the Bishop of Alexandria an exceptional rank, and at endowing him with powers over the metropolitans and bishops of the four civil provinces of Egypt, Thebaid, Libya, and Pentapolis, as ample as those exercised by the Bishop of Rome over the various provinces of the Patriarchate of the West. Thus the Bishop of Alexandria had the right to consecrate all the metropolitans and bishops of Egypt, and from this some historians and canonists would have us conclude that he was, as a matter of fact, the only metropolitan in Egypt, and that his entire patriarchate was a single diocese. This is an evident exaggeration. At the Council of Nicæa there were four Egyptian metropolitans, one for each of the civil and ecclesiastical provinces; later their number rose to nine, or even ten, according as the emperors increased the number of civil provinces. The number of suffragan bishops rose at one time to a hundred. The organization of the Egyptian Church really followed the same lines as the others. But the Patriarch, or Bishop, of Alex-

andria had the right of consecrating all his bishops, once their election had been confirmed by the metropolitan, whereas in the other greater Churches the metropolitan himself discharged this function.

Although the sixth canon, in as far as it refers to Antioch, is far from clear, it would seem that the Nicene Council recognized and granted to the Bishop of Antioch the same jurisdiction over the provinces of the civil diocese of the East (*Diæcesis Orientis*) that it had recognized and granted to the Bishops of Rome and of Alexandria over the Provinces of the West and of Egypt respectively. Therefore it attributes to Antioch a supremacy over many provinces, each having its own metropolitan, in such a way as to constitute them into a patriarchate. It is thought that the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch was co-extensive with the aforesaid civil diocese of the East, but it may very likely have extended also over certain provinces in Pontus and Asia Minor.

The same canon requires that the rights of the other eparchies be maintained. The meaning of the word *eparchies* is not clear and has been variously interpreted. According to some, it refers to ordinary ecclesiastical provinces, but this is hardly probable, seeing that the council had already dealt with them in its fourth canon. Others are of opinion that the council intended to grant the Bishops of Heraclea, Ephesus, and Cæsarea the same privileges and rights over the provinces of the civil dioceses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus that the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch enjoyed over the provinces of the civil dioceses of Egypt and the East. The second canon of the Council of Constantinople (381) seems to support this interpretation, where it says: "The Bishops of the Diocese of Asia must watch over the concerns of Asia only; those of Pontus, over what concerns Pontus, and those of Thrace over what concerns Thrace." Perhaps the council simply meant to enfranchise the provinces of these three civil dioceses from the jurisdiction of Antioch, Alexandria, or any other Church, without, however, raising any particular rank—Ephesus for instance, or Cæsarea—to a particular rank like that of Antioch or Alexandria.

As for Jerusalem, or Ælia, according to the seventh canon, it remained a simple bishopric under the jurisdiction of Cæsarea Maritima, its metropolitan see, but enjoyed the right to certain honours on the occasion of œcumenical councils, when its bishops sat next to those of the greater Churches of the empire.

The Council of Constantinople (381) confirmed and defined, in its second canon, what the Council of Nicæa had attempted to outline. It was understood that the Bishop of Alexandria should be the head of the Church of Egypt, and the Bishop of Antioch head of the Church of the East. As for the remaining two Asiatic dioceses, those of Pontus and of Asia, the ambiguous phrases of the second canon, and the interpretation thereof given by the historian Socrates (Hist. Eccl., V, c. viii, in P. G., LXVII, 580), do not permit us to infer the supremacy of any one Church over all the other Churches of a civil diocese. That Ephesus in Asia and Cæsarea in Pontus held privileged positions is certain, but that either Ephesus or Pontus was at the head of the episcopate of Asia or of Pontus, as Antioch was at the head of the Eastern episcopate, is a position which we have no documentary evidence to support. The third canon of this council of Constantinople brings another Church on the scene, that of the imperial capital itself, to which Nicæa had made no reference. The silence of the First Œcumenical Council is easily understood when we remember that in 325 Byzantium, or Constantinople, was still an undistinguished bishopric, with Heraclea, in Thrace, as its metropolitan, and that its first bishop, St. Metrophanes, had died as recently as 314. In consequence of the transfer of the seat of imperial government to Byzantium, the city increased in importance, even

from an ecclesiastical point of view; in 339 and 360 we find two Arian bishops, Eusebius and Eudoxius, leaving their metropolitan Sees of Nicomedia and Antioch to occupy this bishopric, which they had already begun to consider the first episcopal see of the Empire. The Council of 381 encouraged this attitude, and its third canon asserts that "the Bishop of Constantinople ought to have a pre-eminence of honour next to the Bishop of Rome, for that city is the new Rome".

It would be hard to protest too strongly against the spirit of this canon, which attempts to measure the ecclesiastical dignity of a see by the civil importance of the city. But although the popes refused to recognize it, all the bishops of the East accepted it, and Constantinople considered itself henceforward as the premier see of the Empire of the East.

Novella cxxxi of Justinian approved this decision of the council: "Ita sancimus . . . veteris Romæ papam primum esse omnium sacerdotum . . . archiepiscopum Constantinopolis, novæ Romæ, post sanctissimam apostolicam sedem veteris Romæ secundum locum habere." Did this honorary pre-eminence carry with it a wider jurisdiction? and can the Bishop of Constantinople be henceforward looked on as a patriarch? We have no juridical text in support of such a thing, but Socrates (Hist. Eccl., V, viii) assures us that Constantinople did exercise authority over Thrace, while Theodoret of Cyrhus (Hist. Eccl., V, xxviii) attributes to St. John Chrysostom (398–404) a superior's authority over twenty-eight provinces. Now the "Notitia dignitatum", a document dating from about 410, reckons six provinces in Thrace, eleven in the diocese of Asia, and eleven in that of Pontus. Constantinople was actually at the head of these three dioceses, whose twenty-eight provinces officially made up its patriarchate in 451. In any case, if a superior jurisdiction over these twenty-eight provinces did not belong *de jure* to the Bishops of Constantinople from 381 to 457, it is quite certain that *de facto* they exercised such jurisdiction. (For a number of instances in proof of this see the article "Constantinople" in Vacant and Mangenot, "Dictionnaire de théologie catholique", II, 1323–25.) Furthermore, their aim at this time was to have only one Eastern Church, only one patriarchate, of which they should be the chiefs, and this was to be brought about by the annexation of the provinces of Illyricum, subject to the pope, and the suppression of the rights enjoyed by the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria. Thus, on 14 July, 421, the Emperor Theodosius II issued a law whereby Illyricum was brought under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Byzantium (Cod. Just., I, ii, vi; Cod. Theod., XVI, ii, xlvii), but in consequence of the protests of Pope Boniface I and of Honorius, Emperor of the West, this law never was enforced.

Again, according to Socrates (Hist. Eccl., VII, xxviii), Bishop Atticus of Constantinople obtained from Theodosius II a decree forbidding the consecration of a single bishop in the East without the consent of the Bishop of Constantinople, but, owing to the opposition it encountered, this decree was hardly ever observed, except in the civil dioceses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus. The struggle undertaken against the See of Alexandria brought nothing but disaster for Constantinople. In less than fifty years three of its bishops, St. John Chrysostom in 403, Nestorius in 431, St. Flavian in 449, were deposed by the primates of Egypt, Theophilus, St. Cyril, and Dioscurus. On the other hand, in the Patriarchate of Antioch the Byzantine interference became more and more successful, as was proved in the case of Ibas, in the partition of Phœnicia, and at the time of the consecration of the Patriarch Maximus. In 431, at the Council of Ephesus, a fourth Greek Church, that of Cyprus, took its place side by side with Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch. Its subjection to Antioch never having been clearly defined, it had profited by the Arian dis-

putes and the famous schism of Antioch (330–415) to proclaim its own autonomy. Once the schism ended, the Patriarchs of Antioch tried to reassert their authority; Cyprus resisted and even took advantage of the absence of the Syrian patriarch to have its independence recognized by the oecumenical council. Later, this independence was reaffirmed by the Emperor Zeno and by a council held at Constantinople in 488. The head of the Cypriot Church has never had the title patriarch, but only that of Archbishop. The acknowledgment of an independent Cypriot Church was a serious loss for the Patriarchate of Antioch; following on this blow came two others in quick succession, the one beyond the frontiers of the Roman Empire, the other within those boundaries, which greatly diminished the influence of Antioch and the extent of its jurisdiction. Beyond the frontier, in the Persian kingdom of the Sassanides, were many Christians of Syrian speech, governed by a number of bishops. The Gospel had come to them from many points, principally from Edessa and other Churches subject to Antioch. There was, therefore, a certain bond of affection and gratitude between these Syrian Churches of the Persian Empire and those of the Roman Empire. In order to impose his authority on all the bishops of Persia, Papa bar Aggai, Bishop of Seleucia Ctesiphon, the capital of the kingdom, had recourse to the Syrian bishops of the Roman Empire during the early years of the fourth century. They hastened to aid him, and by methods whose nature is unknown to us succeeded in placing the Bishop of Seleucia Ctesiphon at the head of the Persian Church, and in bringing that Church under the jurisdiction of Antioch. The bishops of the other important sees in Persia accepted very unwillingly the primacy of the Bishop of Seleucia, and there were continuous revolts against it. The Bishop of Seleucia always fell back on the support of the western Syrian bishops subject to Antioch, especially in 410, when Marutas of Maiphergat in this way overcame all opposition. The Bishops of Seleucia had had recourse to Antioch only as an expedient for imposing their supremacy upon their Persian brethren; that end once attained, they, in their turn, shook off the tutelage of Antioch. The Council of Seleucia, held in 424 laid down that the bishops of Persia "could bring no complaint against their patriarch before the patriarch of the Westerns (Antioch), and that every cause which could not be settled by their own patriarch was to be reserved for the tribunal of Christ". That ended the matter. By this council the Church of Persia cut itself off definitively from the Greek Churches. The pity is that a few years later, by adopting Nestorianism as its national doctrine, it also cut itself off from the Catholic world.

In 451, at the Council of Chalcedon, another Church was set up to the detriment of Antiochene prestige, viz., that of Jerusalem. The bishop of the Holy City had obtained from the Council of Nicaea (325) the purely honorary rights which his successors had endeavoured to turn into tangible realities. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and especially Juvenal, tried to shake off the yoke of Caesarea Maritima, the religious capital of Palestine, and, after Caesarea, the yoke of Antioch, the patriarchal see of the East. Juvenal, elected in 424, acted, indeed, as if he were already independent. Afterwards he sought official approbation for the usurpations he had been guilty of. He applied first to the Council of Ephesus (431) and put forward forged documents, which St. Cyril of Alexandria refused to admit. Next he turned to the "Robber Council" of Ephesus (449), and his demands were conceded. At the same time he extorted a decree from Theodosius II granting his Church jurisdiction over the three provinces of Palestine, also over Arabia, and a part of Phoenicia. Two years later, at Chalcedon, through fear of losing more, Maximus, Patriarch of Antioch, came to an understanding with Juvenal

whereby the Church of Jerusalem was to remain in possession of the three provinces of Palestine. In consequence of this agreement, which was ratified by the council, Juvenal became patriarch of Jerusalem.

The same Council of Chalcedon, by its twenty-eighth canon, drawn up in the absence of the papal legates, regularized the situation at Constantinople; it promulgated anew the third canon of the Second Oecumenical Council, which had made Byzantium the first see of the East and the second of the Christian world, giving it effective jurisdiction over the twenty-eight provinces of the three dioceses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, whose metropolitans it was to have the right of consecrating, and further authorizing it to ordain bishops for barbarian lands, which was the germ of its subsequent policy towards the Slav nations. Moreover, the council reserved to the bishop of the capital the right to decide on all appeals brought to his tribunal by the clergy of the three Eastern patriarchates and of the Archdiocese of Cyprus.

Beginning from the year 451, then, we find four Greek patriarchates (Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem) and one autocephalous Church (Cyprus) under the rule of an archbishop. Beyond and within the limits of the Roman Empire two other Churches had secured autonomy and broken with the Greek Churches; these were the Persian and the Armenian Churches, offshoots from the Church of Antioch. Lastly, in Europe the majority of the Greek-speaking Churches looked to the pope as their patriarch.

HARNACK, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig, 1902); BURKITT, *Early Eastern Christianity* (London, 1904); BATIFFOL, *L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme* (Paris, 1909); LUBECK, *Reckseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients bis zum Ausgang des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Münster, 1901); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* (2 vols., Paris, 1906–08); DUCHESNE, *Eglises séparées* (Paris, 1896); LABOURET, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse* (Paris, 1904); VAILHÉ, *L'érection du patriarchat de Jérusalem in Revue de l'Orient chrétien* (1899), 44–57; VAILHÉ, *L'Ancien patriarchat d'Antioche in Echos d'Orient* (1898–99), 216–227; *Id.*, articles *Alexandrie, Antioche, Chypre, Constantinople in Dict. de théol. cath.*; GULDENPENNIG, *Geschichte des ostromischen Reiches unter den Kaisern Arcadius und Theodosius II* (Halle, 1881); EPHTALOTES, *Ἱστορία τῆς Παλαιστίνης* (Athens, 1901); ATHANASIADES, *Die Begründung des orthodoxen Staates durch den Kaiser Theodosius den Grossen* (Leipzig, 1902).

(2) *Decay of the Greek Churches of the East and Rise of the Byzantine Hegemony (451–847).*—The definition of faith of the Council of Chalcedon (451) had curiously agitated the Byzantine Empire. The condemnation of Eutyches, Dioscurus, and their adherents amounted in the eyes of many to a condemnation of St. Cyril of Alexandria and of the Council of Ephesus, if not to a victory for Nestorius. It happened that these religious disturbances reached their climax in the remotest provinces of the empire, in those which, while willingly or unwillingly subject to the Byzantines, had still retained a lively memory of their former national independence and glory, together with their own language, liturgy, art and literature. Egypt, Syria, Armenia became for the most part Monophysite; Palestine also. Even the episcopate of Asia Minor, with the Metropolitan of Ephesus, who resumed, about 474, the title of Patriarch, was bitterly opposed to the new definition; in the end, however, order and orthodoxy prevailed in Asia Minor. Until the reign of Justinian (527–65) the doctrine for or against the two natures in Christ was officially triumphant according as the emperor happened to be Monophysite or Dyophysite, and lent to the accepted doctrine the support of his sword. Justinian, the Byzantine Louis XIV, finally caused Dyophysitism to triumph, but the violence he had to use lost him the support of all the Eastern and African portions of the empire. The Church of Alexandria and that of Antioch nominated Monophysite patriarchs, and thus began the Coptic and Jacobite Churches which exist even

yet. In Egypt nine out of every ten of the faithful declared against the faith of the imperial Court; in Syria the proportion was not so great. It may be said that about one-half of the subjects of Justinian accepted the faith of Chalcedon. Efforts to impose a heterodox patriarch on Palestine were in vain; except in the region of Garza, the monks were powerful enough to successfully resist the Monophysites. To sum up, then, we find that, as early as the sixth century, of the Greek patriarchates in the East, one (Alexandria) had lost nearly all its subjects, another (Antioch) retained but one-half, while the third (Jerusalem) was too inconsiderable ever to dispute the primacy with Constantinople. The latter thus became the only real Greek patriarchate, to which the other three, surnamed Melchites (Imperialists), looked for favours and protection against Monophysite competition and later against the threatening domination of the Arabs.

This leads us to a consideration of the second cause that completely ruined the hopes of the three Greek Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, namely, Islam. It came from Arabia and spread like an oil-stain over Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, and finally Egypt. It even made great efforts to cross the Taurus range and enter the Greek world, but in this was everywhere defeated. For the moment its conquests were limited to provinces where the country folk had remained for the most part aloof from Hellenic speech and civilization. Thus the Syrian Jacobites gladly welcomed the Arab conquerors as their brethren in race and in speech, and, it would seem, often aided them in their conquests. Their complaisance towards the new régime brought them many favours not shown to the Melchites, who, because of their origin, or at least because of their relations with foreign Byzantium, were everywhere watched, hunted down, and proscribed. Without the help of Constantinople and Rome, from whom they begged help and assistance, it is very probable that these Melchite Churches would have disappeared. At the very time when the great Arab invasion and the spread of Islam was taking place, Byzantium was emerging from a disastrous war with Persia which had almost brought about the ruin of the Christian power, and its emperor was occupied in rallying the various Monophysite Churches to the official Church by means of the *ad captandum* formula of one will and one energy in Christ. The attempt failed owing to the splendid resistance set afoot by St. Sophronius of Jerusalem and St. Maximus of Constantinople; its net result was a fresh loss for the Melchite Patriarchate of Antioch, from which the monks of the convent of St. Maro on the Orontes seceded, to found, with the aid of the villagers of Syria and the Lebanon, the Maronite Church, Monothelite in doctrine, but which at a later date accepted Catholicism.

The growing weakness of the three eastern patriarchates and of the Archbishopric of Cyprus, whose titular had for a while to take refuge in Cyzicus, soon forced them to seek the moral and material support of Constantinople. It was eagerly granted, and Constantinople, thus freed from a rival in the East, turned its attention towards Rome in the West. As we have seen, the civil diocese of Thrace was the only one in Europe subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople; the provinces of Achaia, Macedonia, Thessalia, Epirus (old and new), which formed the civil dioceses of Macedonia, Dacia, and Pannonia, were included in the Patriarchate of Rome. Over these remote provinces the pope exercised his spiritual supremacy through the Bishop of Thessalonica, appointed vicar Apostolic about 380, and the Bishop of Justiniana Prima (Uskub), appointed in 535. Until the eighth century this arrangement worked without much opposition on the part of Constantinople, and the ecclesiastical provinces of Illyricum were considered as forming

part of the Roman Patriarchate. The Emperor Leo III, the Isaurian, seems to have been the first to interfere with the custom, when, in 733, after his excommunication by the pope, he increased the tribute from Calabria and Sicily, confiscated the patrimony of the Roman Church in those regions, and aimed a blow at the authority of the pope by depriving him of the obedience of Illyricum and Southern Italy, which were thenceforth attached to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Such, at least, is the usual interpretation of an obscure text in the Chronicle of Theophanes (Hubert in "Revue Historique" (1899), I, 21-22); it is confirmed by an observation of the Armenian ecclesiastic Basil, who, in the ninth century, speaking of the metropolitan cities of Illyricum and Italy, asserts that they had been made subject to the authority of Constantinople "because the pope of ancient Rome had fallen into the hands of the Barbarians" (Georgii Cyprii Descriptio Orbis Romani, ed. Gelzer, p. 27). The popes protested against this high-handed robbery, but no attention was paid to their protests, and since about 733 Illyricum has been attached to the Byzantine Patriarchate. In this way it gained about one hundred bishoprics, nor was this all: starting with the principle that no bishopric in the Byzantine Empire could be in any way dependent on an outside patriarch, the Iconoclast emperors took away from the Patriarch of Antioch, on the plea that he was a subject of the Arab caliphs, the twenty-four episcopal sees of Byzantine Isauria, and from the pope of Rome the fifteen Greek bishoprics in Southern Italy. Consequently, the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople became co-extensive with the limits of the Byzantine Empire.

Besides this increase of jurisdiction, the establishment of a permanent synod (*σύνδος ἐνδημοῦσα*) and the addition to his title of the adjective (*Œcumenical*) rapidly placed the Patriarch of Byzantium in the front rank. The permanent synod dates most probably from the patriarchate of Nestorius (381-97). It was a sort of ecclesiastical tribunal permanently in session at Constantinople, made up, as a rule, of many bishops whom business or ambition had called to the capital; the patriarch himself presided over the tribunal. It attended to the solution of all ecclesiastical affairs submitted to the judgment of the emperor, so that the Patriarch of Constantinople, as its president, became *ex officio* arbiter between the Court and the bishops of the empire; it was a privileged position due to the very force of circumstances, and in the last resort it subjected all the great metropolitans, and even the patriarchs, of the East, to the judicial authority of the Byzantine Bishop. The ninth and seventeenth canons of Chalcedon confirmed and consolidated this state of things, and the insertion of those canons in the Civil Code gave them thenceforward equal authority with any other imperial decrees. The title *Œcumenical* was granted for the first time at the Robber Council of Ephesus (449) to the Patriarch Dioscurus of Alexandria, and at the time it looked like a dangerous innovation, and was repudiated at the Council of Chalcedon. Soon afterwards we find it applied to Popes St. Leo I, Hormisdas, and Agapitus, and to the Patriarchs of Constantinople, John II (518-520), Epiphanius (520-535), Anthimus (536), Menas (536-552). It was in 588, on the occasion of a council, that the Patriarch John VI, surnamed the Faster, seems to have restricted the use of the honorary title to his own see. This gave rise to a fresh quarrel with Rome, which saw therein a new evidence of ambition. Pope Pelagius II annulled the acts of this council and his successor, St. Gregory the Great (590-604), began a lengthy correspondence on the matter with the Byzantine Patriarchs John IV and Cyriacus, but nothing ever came of it. The popes went on protesting, but the Byzantine patriarchs, supported by the Court, the bishops, and the clergy, also by the other Greek patri-

archs, refused to forego the title, which they have borne ever since, and which has given them a colour of honorary supremacy over all the Churches of the East.

(a) Internal Organization of the Byzantine Churches.—The superior hierarchy of a Greek Church at the period we are treating of, viz., from the fourth to the tenth century, was composed of a patriarch, a catholicos, the greater metropolitans, the autocephalous metropolitans, the archbishops and the bishops. The patriarch is at this period the highest prelate, at the head of a whole Church, and, as we have seen, there were only four such: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The catholicos exercised jurisdiction over a portion of the Church on an equality with the patriarch, save for the fact that he must originally have been consecrated by the patriarch. Such, we are told, was the position of the Catholicos of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and of the Catholicos of Armenia, with reference to the See of Antioch, and towards the same see, but at a later period, of the Catholicos of Romagryis, of Irenoupolis, and of Georgia. The other patriarchates, except perhaps Alexandria, never had such an ecclesiastical dignitary.

The greater metropolitans ruled each an ecclesiastical province and had under their authority a certain number of suffragan bishops. Their position was similar to that of the Latin archbishops. The number of these metropolitans varied in the various patriarchates according to the actual number of ecclesiastical provinces. For a long period Jerusalem had three, in the sixth century Antioch had twelve, in the fifth century Alexandria had ten, in that same century Constantinople had twenty-eight, which rose to thirty-two about 650, and to forty-nine about the beginning of the tenth century. The "autocephalous" metropolitans had no suffragan bishops, and depended directly on the patriarch. Latin canon law knows no such dignity. These prelates had each his own diocese; they were not metropolitans *in partibus infidelium*. The number of these prelates, small at first, increased in the East to such a degree that at the present time one rarely meets with any of another rank. In the sixth century there was only one, that of Chalcedon, in the Patriarchate of Constantinople; in the tenth century only two, those of Chalcedon and Catania. We have no documentary evidence as to how things stood in this respect in the Patriarchates of Alexandria and of Jerusalem. The archbishops do not differ from autocephalous metropolitans, except as being inferior to them in the hierarchy. They depend directly on the patriarch, and have the real government of a diocese. This title, which corresponds to the exempt archbishoprics, was formerly very common in the Eastern Church. About 650 the Church of Constantinople reckoned thirty-four archdioceses of this sort; in the tenth century, we know, on the evidence of three documents, it had fifty-one; at the end of the eleventh century the number stood at thirty-nine, and since then it has gone on decreasing in the East, so that at present the Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem alone possesses this institution.

The position of suffragan bishops is too well known to require any explanation. In the sixth century there were fifty-six of them in the three provinces of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, one hundred and twenty-five in the twelve provinces of Antioch. About 650 there were three hundred and fifty-two in the thirty-two provinces of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and in the early part of the tenth century, when the number of its provinces rose to forty-nine, Constantinople had five hundred and twenty-two suffragan sees. As in the West, the number of suffragan sees in a province was not always the same in the same patriarchate. Thus, in 650 the provinces of Asia and of Lycia had each thirty-six such sees, but the province of Europe, or Rhodope, had only two. In the sixth century, again, in the Patriarchate of Antioch, the Metro-

politan of Dara had three suffragans, while the Metropolitan of Seleucia in Isauria had twenty-four. To gain a collective idea of this hierarchy it should be remembered that in 650 the Patriarchate of Constantinople counted thirty-two metropolises, or capitals of ecclesiastical provinces, one autocephalous metropolis, thirty-four autocephalous archbishoprics, and three hundred and fifty-two bishoprics—a grand total of four hundred and nineteen dioceses. A century earlier the Patriarchate of Antioch could boast of twelve metropolitans, five autocephalous metropolitans, two exempt bishoprics (a peculiar institution of this Church), and one hundred and twenty-five bishoprics—a grand total of one hundred and forty-four dioceses. For want of accurate information it is impossible to give similar details for the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria.

Below the bishops came the other ecclesiastical dignitaries—priests, deacons, deaconesses, subdeacons, lectors, cantors, and others. Ecclesiastical functionaries were very numerous. After the patriarch in the capital, and in their dioceses after the metropolitans and bishops, the chief dignitary was the archdeacon, a sort of vicar-general having direct control over the clergy, if not over the faithful of the diocese. The title soon disappeared and was replaced by that of protosyncellus, which has remained to our own times. There were, moreover, referendaries who carried important messages and looked after the business of the diocese in the bishop's name; *apocrisarii* (in the Latin Church *responsales*, i. e. nuncios), or representatives of the patriarchs at the emperor's Court, of the metropolitans to their patriarch, and of the bishops to their metropolitans; *economoi*, or bursars, who looked after church property and who entrusted the administration of such property in outlying districts to delegates of various names and titles: a *kimeliarchos*, in charge of the church treasury and also known as the *skeuophylax*; a *chartophylax* or archivist; a chancellor, or master of ceremonies, etc.

During this period the Greek episcopate was, as a general rule, recruited by election. The notables united with the clergy drew up a list of three candidates which they submitted to the choice of the patriarch, the metropolitan, or the bishops, according as the see to be filled was a metropolitan see or a simple bishopric. In practice, the patriarch and, most of all, the emperor interfered in these elections. The nomination of a patriarch belonged in the first instance to the clergy of Constantinople, then to a committee of metropolitans and bishops; in reality the choice was always settled by the emperor. From the list of three candidates presented by the bishops he selected one as patriarch, and if none of the names presented was agreeable to him he put a new name before the electoral college, which the bishops could only confirm.

The status of the lower clergy was much the same as now. In the cities and populous centres there were many learned and often exemplary priests, who, for the most part, had been through the monastic schools; but in the rural districts they were generally ignorant and of evil repute. Because of their exemptions and their civil privileges, the clergy were numerous. Churches and chapels abounded everywhere, especially in the cities; every *Basileus* (emperor), even the least religious-minded, was lavish with money for their construction. An idea of the personnel employed at this time in serving a church may be gathered from two churches in Constantinople. A law of Justinian (535) fixed the number of clerics at St. Sophia and its three adjacent churches at 425—viz., 60 priests, 100 deacons, 40 deaconesses, 90 subdeacons, 110 lectors, 25 cantors, to which we must add 100 doorkeepers. From Justinian's reign to that of Heraclius this number increased, and in 627 the latter emperor was obliged to put a limit to the number of clerics serving this church. Unless subsequent en-



dowments authorized otherwise, the regular number was to be 525, viz., 80 priests, 150 deacons, 40 deaconesses, 70 subdeacons, 160 lectors, 25 cantors, besides 75 doorkeepers, 2 syncelli, 12 chancellors, and 40 notaries. The little church of Blachernæ had a personnel at this period of 75 members, viz., 12 priests, 18 deacons, 6 deaconesses, 8 subdeacons, 20 lectors, 4 cantors, and 7 doorkeepers. From these two examples we may infer what the other smaller or larger churches must have required.

Benevolent institutions claimed a proportionate number of functionaries and titles; in Christian antiquity few social bodies were as much concerned with the diminution of social ills as was that of Constantinople. There were special charitable institutions to succour every form of physical and moral suffering; from the emperor to the humblest citizen all were interested in their maintenance. Hospices and shelters were found everywhere; there were also *zenodochia*, or hostels for strangers; *gerontocomia*, or homes for the aged; *ptochotrophia*, or asylums for the poor; *nosocomia*, or hospitals for the sick; *orphanotrophia*, or founding hospitals; *brephotrophia*, or crèches; and even *lobotrophia*, or homes for lepers. These institutions were mostly conducted by monks, which fact brings us to a consideration of the monastic system.

If we consider their rules, the monks may be divided into two classes: solitaries and cenobites. The solitaries had various names, according to their habitations or the exercises which they practised. They were known as hermits or recluses if they provided their own necessities of life or accepted them from strangers; *styliotes* or *dendrites*, if they chose a pillar or a tree as the scene of their mortifications; *lauriotes* or *kellioties*, if they lived together in a *laura*. These last belong rather to the Eastern world properly so called (Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia) than to the Greek, or Byzantine, world. On the other hand, the Greek Christian world was famous for its cenobites, who always and everywhere followed a community life. Solitary and cenobite had each a special dress, the names and uses of which are well known. The *lauræ*, and convents, had each its own superior, sometimes called archimandrite, and sometimes hegumenos, terms synonymous in the beginning, but soon differentiated. Gradually *archimandrite* came to mean the head of all the monasteries of a city or of a diocese. Below him came the *deutereuon* or prior, at least until the sixth century; after that the place was taken by the *æconomos*, or bursar. In the ninth century every diocese (presumably the cenobites of every diocese) or district formed a sort of federation under the presidency of a hegumenos known as the exarch or archimandrite. In the Archdiocese of Jerusalem this presidency over the laurites and hermits devolved on the Hegumenos of St. Sabas, and that of the cenobites on the Hegumenos of St. Theodosius. In the archdiocese of Constantinople the superior of the convent, or monastery, of Dalmatia exercised this function. As soon as peace was definitively granted to the Church, and especially after the reign of Theodosius I (378-95), the religious life had its period of greatest splendour. Emperors, empresses, consuls, patricians, senators, patriarchs, bishops, private individuals vied in building conventual homes for "those who had put on the robe of the angels" and who had become "citizens of heaven". As early as 518, we find a petition to Pope Hormisdas signed by fifty-four superiors of monastic houses for men in Constantinople; in 536 no fewer than sixty-eight superiors of monasteries from the same city assisted at the council which deposed the patriarch Anthimos, while the neighbouring Diocese of Chalcedon alone sent forty more. In Palestine the Archdiocese of Jerusalem had at least 100 monasteries. And it must not be imagined that the number of their inmates was small. The *laura* of St. Sabas had 150 inmates; the convent of St. Theodosius, 400; the

New Laura more than 600. It is true that all of the monasteries were not so populous, but if we place the average number of monks for each monastery at 50 we shall not be far from the truth. Let it not be forgotten that 10,000 monks of Palestine assembled at Jerusalem in 516 to demand that the Council of Chalcedon be observed. It is worth noting that there never existed a religious congregation, properly speaking, in the Greek world; this Western form of monasticism was unknown to the East. There every convent was independent of its neighbour, and where many convents had the same founder their union rarely lasted beyond his lifetime. Again, in spite of a still prevalent Western belief, the Greek monks never had a religious rule, in the canonical sense of the word. Even the Rules of St. Basil, St. Anthony, and St. Pachomius were not canonical rules. The monks obeyed a whole series of precepts, or monastic regulations, either written or, more often, preserved by oral tradition, which were the same everywhere. But if they had no rule properly so called, they had an infinity of *typica* or regulations. In the liturgical offices the customs of St. Sabas at Jerusalem, i. e. the Palestine customs, were combined with those of the Studium at Constantinople or some other monastery, and thus all desired variations were obtained. For the monastic life itself the "Typica", i. e. original charters or constitutions of the monastery, were the guide. The most ancient of these "Typica" known to us is that of St. Athanasius the Athonite (or of Mount Athos), which dates from 969. In matters of jurisdiction all Greek monasteries were subject to the bishop or to the patriarch; the latter known as *slawropegiai*, because the patriarch asserted his rights over the monastery by placing a wooden cross (*σταυρός*) behind the altar. It was in the cloister almost exclusively that the more eminent ecclesiastics of all ranks were trained, and to it dethroned emperors and disgraced courtiers fled for refuge. The monks were the historians, the theologians, the poets of that time; the leaders of all heresies and their opponents were monks; councils were convened or prevented as the monks thought good. They assisted the bishops by their learning and disturbed the empire by their quarrels. In short, they held the whole foreground of the ecclesiastical stage, and absorbed all the intellectual and religious life of the Greek Church. And while their extensive possessions, exempt from taxes, drained the finances of the empire, the thousands upon thousands of young men who flocked to their monasteries robbed the land of its agricultural class and the army of its recruits. As it existed in the Greek world, the monastic life caused perhaps more evil than good, and it is undoubtedly to it we owe that narrow pietism, that formalism and ritualism in devotion, consisting altogether in the externals of religion, which is even now so characteristic of the East.

LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus in IV patriarchatus digestus* (3 vols., Paris, 1740); PARGOIRE, *L'Eglise byzantine de 527 à 847* (Paris, 1905); MACAIRE, *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie* (Cairo, 1894); ROSE, *Die byz. Kirchenpolitik unter Kaiser Anastasius I* (Wohlau, 1888); KRUGER, *Monophysitische Streitigkeiten im Zusammenhang mit der Reichspolitik* (Jena, 1894); PFANNMUELLER, *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung Justinians* (Berlin, 1902); KNECHT, *Die Religionspolitik K. Justinians* (Berlin, 1902); DIEHL, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine* (Paris, 1901); DUCHESNE, *Vigile et Pélage in Rev. des questions hist.* (Paris, 1884); DIEKAMP, *Die orientalistischen Streitigkeiten im VI Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1899); DRAPETRON, *Héraclius* (Paris, 1869); PERNICE, *L'imperatore Eracleo* (Florence, 1905); SCHWARZLOSE, *Der Bilderstreit* (Gotha, 1890); BRÉHIER, *La querelle des images* (Paris, 1904); LOMBARD, *Constantin V* (Paris, 1902); SCHLOSSER, *Geschichte der bildensurkundenden Kaiser des oströmischen Reiches* (Frankfurt, 1812); MARIN, *Les moines de Constantinople* (Paris, 1897); FERRADOU, *Les biens des monastères à Byzance* (Bordeaux, 1896); GELZER, *Der Streit über den Titel des ökumenischen Patriarchen in Jahrbuch für prot. Theologie*, XIII, 549; VAILLÉ, *Le titre de patriarche œcuménique avant Saint Grégoire le Grand, et Saint Grégoire le Grand et le titre de patriarche œcuménique in Echos d'Orient* (1908), 65-69; 161-171; TERNOSKI, *L'Eglise grecque à l'époque des conciles œcuméniques* (a Russian article, Kiev, 1883); OUSPENSKI, *Esquisses pour l'histoire de la civilisation byzantine* (Russian, St. Petersburg,

1892); BURY, *A History of the Later Roman Empire from 395 to 500* (London, 1889).

(h) The Emperor; Relations between East and West; Liturgy.—In the foregoing sketch of the ecclesiastical body the Byzantine emperor has not appeared. Yet no one has a greater right to a place in that body. Heir of the Roman emperors, the Basileus had inherited also the office of *pontifex maximus*, and, though after the fifth century that title no longer appears on public documents, yet every Greek looked up to the Basileus as the head of the national religion. Moreover, the emperor was the chosen of God, who had raised him above humanity in order to draw him nearer to Himself. As Eusebius of Cæsarea tells us, "His intelligence is a reflexion of the Divine intelligence, he is a partaker of the power of the Almighty." In his "Instruction" to the "most divine" Justinian, the deacon Agapetus reproduces under another form these ideas so prevalent at Byzantium: "It was a sign from God that pointed out the Basileus for the empire; he was predestined in the designs of God to rule the world, even as the eye is set within the head to control the body. God has need of no one; the emperor needs only God. Between the Deity and the emperor there is no intermediary." (P. G., LXXXVI, 1177). The Divine call to the empire gave the emperor a sacred character, and the anointing, the sign of priesthood, became his by Divine right. To take the life of the Basileus or attack his authority was to resist the will of heaven and to commit a sacrilege, unless the one who did so happened to be, like David of old, also the chosen one and the anointed of the Lord. This anointing and the priesthood which it conferred gave the emperor a high place among the ministers of the altar. He became the *Isarórolos*, the equal of the Apostles, or even the thirteenth Apostle. Hence he held a special position between lay society and the ecclesiastical body. He dominated, and belonged to both, uniting in himself both elements of the social order, the civil and the ecclesiastical. Moreover, this special *sacerdotium* reserved for the emperor secured him special rights and powers. "I also am a bishop", said Constantine to the prelates of his day. "You are the bishops assigned to look after the domestic affairs of the Church; I am appointed by God to oversee all that lies outside." And Leo III, the Isaurian, wrote to Gregory II: "Do you not know that I am both priest and king?"—Priest, bishop, *Isapostolos*, Apostle himself, the Basileus was placed there to guard the purity of dogma; he gave legal sanction to the decisions of councils and inserted their canons in the public code. He convened general councils, was present at their sessions, or sent his representative to them; he controlled their discussions, and only permitted the bishops to leave when they had defined and legislated according to the Faith and the canons, or even according to his own wishes. If he frequently chose patriarchs and bishops, he was not remiss in deposing them as soon as they stood in his way. Orthodox and virtuous patriarchs were the victims of wicked emperors, while immoral or heretical ones were cast out by orthodox emperors. But it was always a matter of politics, and the Church was merely a pawn in the despotic hands of the State. This condition has been happily described by an expressive barbarism as the rule of Cæsaropapism.

The relations that grew up between Rome and the Greek Churches during the long period from the death of Constantine the Great to the end of the Iconoclast persecutions (337–843) were far from cordial. In principle East and West were united; in fact they were separated during most of that time. During those 506 years the Greek Church was in open schism with Rome during seven periods aggregating at least 248 years. The sum total is reckoned thus: (1) The schism in connexion with St. Athanasius and Arianism, from the Council of Sardica (343) to the accession

of St. John Chrysostom to the See of Constantinople (398)—55 years; (2) in connexion with the condemnation of St. John Chrysostom by the episcopate of the East (404–15)—11 years; (3) in regard to the Byzantine patriarch Acacius and the Emperor Zeno's "Henoticon" edict (484–519)—35 years; (4) arising out of the Monothelite movement of Sergius and Heraclius (640–81)—41 years; (5) arising out of the first Iconoclastic conflict, begun by Leo III, the Isaurian (726–87)—61 years; (6) arising out of the adulterous marriage contracted by the Emperor Constantine VI (795–811)—16 years; (7) in connexion with the second Iconoclastic persecution (814–43)—29 years. This gives a total of 248 years of schism and heresy out of a period of 506 years, i. e. nearly one-half the time. Again, it must not be forgotten that divisions vexed certain individual Churches—e. g. the Schism of Antioch (330–415), which had its effect not only on the Churches of the East but also on those of the West. It must also be confessed that when circumstances demanded strength of will and determination the Greek bishops were very often culpable. Of all these heresies and schisms they might at least have lessened the duration and importance, if not altogether avoided them, had they better understood and realized their duty. In the patriarchal See of Constantinople, the premier see of the Greek Empire, we find nineteen heretical patriarchs, whom the first seven Ecumenical Councils, all held in the East, condemned by name, or who vehemently opposed the decisions of such councils. These nineteen were: Eusebius of Nicomedia, Macedonius, Eudoxius, Demophilus, all four Arians; Nestorius, Acacius, Timotheus, Anthimus, of whom the last three were Monophysites; Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, John VI, all Monothelites; Anastasius, Constantine II, Nicetas, Theodotus Cassiteras, Anthony, John VII Lecanomantos, all Iconoclasts. And this list might be increased, if we were to include the patriarchs who, though not formally heretics, would not condemn their heretical predecessors, and because of this weakness were unable to obtain communion with the Holy See. If in the two patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch the number of excommunicated patriarchs is less, it is because there an almost immediate rupture took place between the Catholics and the Monophysites or Monothelites. Hence we meet fewer heretics in these patriarchal sees for the very good reason that in these places the heretics quickly set up their own separate churches, whereas in Byzantium, the seat of the central power, both Catholics and heretics either could not or did not dare set up ecclesiastical bodies distinct from the State Church, but were constrained to accept orthodox or heterodox teaching according to the bias of the emperors. Often were the Greek bishops constrained to stifle the voice of conscience. Probably no Church can furnish so many examples of the kind. In 449 more than two hundred bishops at the Robber Synod of Ephesus defined Monophysitism as a dogma, while two years later, at the Council of Chalcedon, six hundred and thirty bishops approved the dogma of the two natures. In 476 the Basileus made five hundred bishops sign a retraction of the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon, while in 458 Emperor Leo I obtained an equal number of signatures in favour of that same council. The same bishops said Yea and Nay within a few years of each other with a facility that, to say the least, is disconcerting. In 681 at the Sixth Ecumenical Council the whole Greek episcopate pronounced itself in favour of the two wills in Jesus Christ, yet, in 712, the same episcopate, with the exception of a few bishops, solemnly approved the condemnation of the former council pronounced by the Emperor Philippicus, and retracted its disapproval one year afterwards. In 753, at the conciliabulum of Hiera, near Chalcedon, 388 Greek bishops applauded the Iconoclast edicts of Constantine Copronymus, and in 787, at the Seventh

General Council, they condemned his memory and restored the cultus of images.

Degradation of will, and slavery of the whole episcopate to the whims of the emperors—such are the main causes of these wretched tergiversations. No doubt there were some noble, though rare, exceptions among the bishops and among the monks. Be it understood, their knowledge is not in question. On this score bishops and monks, as a rule, were ahead of their brethren in the West. This is one of the things that startle the student of the ecclesiastical literature of the two Churches during this same period. In the East there is no such suspension of literary activity as we know to have lasted in the West from the period of the Germanic invasions to the magnificent efflorescence of the Middle Ages. But the Latin Church had one incontestable superiority over its rival: it had one centre of gravity, Rome, and always recognized the papacy as the visible head of the Church. The ecclesiastical doctrine of the Eastern Church, on the contrary, is very rudimentary; they do not appeal to Rome, and recognize its imprescriptible rights only very rarely and in extreme cases. With the exception of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Theodore the Studite, and a few other rare examples, the bishops and theologians of the Greek Church never touch on the primacy of Rome, except when they are imploring the pope's help to bring a dangerous adversary to reason. The danger past—the shock avoided—they have forgotten everything.

The primitive Church, Græco-Syriac in speech, as we have said, adopted the liturgy of the synagogue, which consisted of readings from the Bible, hymns, homilies on some subject furnished by the reading, and prayers. To this was added the sacred banquet of the Supper instituted by Christ, with prayers and ritual forms borrowed for the most part from the synoptic Gospels and from St. Paul. We first find somewhat precise indications of this liturgy in the "Teaching of the Apostles", the Epistle of Pope St. Clement, and the First Apology of St. Justin. "From these", says Duchesne (*Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 53), "we must descend at once to the fourth century. It is about this period that we come upon documents, of a kind that may be made use of, bearing upon the liturgical usages which were afterwards completed and diversified until they became what we see them." This same author adds that from that period it is possible to classify all known liturgies under "four principal types: the Syriac, the Alexandrian, the Roman, and the Gallican. . . . The Syriac had already given way to many sub-types, each having its distinct characteristics." We shall here deal only with the Syriac and Alexandrian types, the only ones used in the East.

The Syriac type, properly so-called, followed in the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, as well as in the Church of Cyprus, is mainly represented by the Greek or Syriac Liturgy of St. James and other analogous liturgies. Up to the Arabic invasion Mass was said in Greek, except in the country churches, where Syriac was used. This latter speech was adopted by the Jacobites as their liturgical language when they separated from the official Church. In our day these heretics and the Uniat Syrians are the only ones who retain the Syriac rite, with some modifications especially noteworthy in the Maronite Church.

A sub-type of the Syriac rite is represented by the liturgies used in the Syriac Churches of Mesopotamia and Persia; the liturgy of Sts. Addeus and Maris, still in use among the Nestorians and the Uniat Chaldeans, is another example. Another sub-type is represented by the Armenian Liturgy, also derived from that of Antioch, but modified since 491, when the Armenians separated from the Greek Churches and marked the separation by adding to the divergencies of their rites. Lastly, a third sub-type is represented by the Cappa-

doco-Byzantine liturgy which is in the main a copy of the Syriac. It was by bishops who were natives of Syria or Cappadocia—Eusebius, Eudoxius, Gregory Nazianzen, Nectarius, John Chrysostom, and Nestorius—that the Church of Constantinople was governed at the time of its foundation and definite organization, and it is this Byzantine liturgy that has survived in all Greek Churches, whether Orthodox or Uniat, in the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Jerusalem, in the Churches of Cyprus, Servia, Greece, Bulgaria, Russia, Rumania, and others, just as the Roman Liturgy has predominated in all the Latin Churches. It should be noted, however, that in the majority of these Churches Greek is not the liturgical language, but Arabic, or Slavonic, or Rumanian, into which the text of the Greek Liturgy has been literally translated. For the Byzantine liturgy there exist, besides the Mass of the Presanctified, known to have existed since the year 615, two complete liturgies: that of St. Basil, in almost universal use in the East about the year 520 (P. L., LXV, 449), and that of St. John Chrysostom, which is the one mainly followed at present.

Of the Alexandrian Liturgy, omitting certain later or doubtful copies, we have three complete texts: the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark, which seems to have been drawn up by St. Cyril; the Coptic Liturgy, said to be by St. Cyril of Alexandria, and the Abyssinian Liturgy of the Twelve Apostles. Each of these represents a different group of the same rite, and all are fundamentally alike.

BEURLIER, *Sur les vestiges du culte impérial à Byzance in Revue des Questions Historiques* (1892), LI, 5-56; GASQUER, *L'Autorité impériale en matière religieuse à Byzance* (Paris, 1879); GEI-ZER, *Das Verhältniss von Staat und Kirche in Byzanz in Historische Zeitschrift* (1901), 195-252; BRIGHTMAN, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1906); ROBERTSON, *The Divine Liturgies of our Fathers among the Saints, John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified* (London, 1894); FORTESCUE, *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the Saints, John Chrysostom* (London, 1908); RENAUDOT, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio* (Frankfort, 1847); HABERT, *Archævocation, Liber pontificalis Ecclesie Græcæ* (Paris, 1843); GOAR, *Euchologion, sive Rituale Græcorum* (Paris, 1847); DENZINGER, *Ritus orientalis, in administrandis sacramentis* (Würzburg, 1883); DANIEL, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiarum orientalis et occidentalis* (Innsbruck, 1896); CHAIRON, *Les saintes et divines liturgies de Jean Chrysostome, Basile le Grand, et Grégoire le Grand* (Paris, 1904); MEESTER, *La divine liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome* (Paris, 1907); DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1898); tr. *Christian Worship* (London, 1904); PROBER, *Liturgie des vierden Jahrhunderts und deren Reform* (Münster, 1893); CLUGNET, *Dictionnaire grec-français des noms liturgiques en usage dans l'église grecque* (Paris, 1895). See also LECLERCQ in *Dict. d'archéol. chrétienne et de liturgie*, s. vv. *Alexandrie; Antioche*.

(3) *The Greek Schism; Conversion of the Slavs (Ninth to Eleventh Century).*—The Greek Schism, about which space permits us to say very little (see PHOTIUS; MICHAEL CALUBARIUS), was caused by something that must have seemed trivial at Constantinople. On 23 November, 858, the Patriarch Ignatius was deposed, and on 25 December in the same year Photius succeeded him. Ignatius was deposed because he had refused Communion to the Emperor Bardas, who was living openly in sin with his daughter-in-law. It was not the first time at Byzantium that for more or less lawful actions an orthodox patriarch had been deposed and another appointed in his place. Thus, among other examples, Macedonius II had succeeded Euphemius in 496; John III had succeeded Eutychius in 565; Cyrus had succeeded Callinicus in 706, and John VI had replaced Cyrus in 712, without causing any great commotion. Ignatius might then have let things take their course and waited in his retreat till fortune turned his way once more. This he did not do, and, if he was somewhat lacking in suppleness, his right was incontestable. Once he had refused to consent to his deposition, Pope Nicholas I was bound to uphold him and to condemn Photius, who was an outright usurper. Photius was clever enough to see that a rupture with Rome on this point would not satisfy even the Greeks, so he cast

about for another issue. He took, one by one, the many causes for separation that had been in the air for centuries and united them into a body of doctrine: then, confident in his learning and prestige, he decided to give battle. The insertion of the "Filioque" clause in the Creed, the procession of the Holy Ghost *ab utroque*, etc., were so many reasons which were bound to have their effect upon the leading minds when the question of the separation came up. Then again the popes' acknowledgment of the Frankish kings as Emperors of the West was bound to carry weight in Byzantine political circles. Moreover, it was evident by this time that between the Latin and Greek worlds there existed a chasm which must grow broader with the years. However, the Photius affair was arranged. Ignatius forgave his rival and, it appears, on his death-bed designated him as his successor. Pope John VIII sanctioned this choice, and if subsequent popes excommunicated Photius it was for special reasons not yet sufficiently known.

In 886, Photius was deposed by the Emperor Leo VI, who disliked him, and, between 893 and 901, a reconciliation of the two Churches was effected by Pope John IX and the Patriarch Antonius Cauleas. During the entire tenth century, and the first part of the eleventh, relations between the Roman and the Greek Churches were excellent. There were, no doubt, occasional difficulties, always unavoidable in societies different in customs, speech, and civilization, but we may almost go so far as to say that the union between the Churches was as deep and sincere as it was during the first three centuries of Christianity. Michael Cærularius, however, desired a schism for no other reason, apparently, than to satisfy his pride, and in 1054 he succeeded in making one at the very time when everything seemed to promise a lasting peace. For this purpose he brought forward, besides the theological reasons stated by Photius, many others that Photius had neglected or merely hinted at, and which were judged particularly fitted to catch the popular fancy. The use of azyms, or unleavened bread, in the liturgy, the celibacy imposed on all priests in the West, the warlike manners of Western bishops and priests, the shaven face and the tonsure, the Saturday fast, and other such divergencies of practice were used to discredit the Latin Church. Thoughtful men may not have been misled by these specious arguments, but the mass of the people and the monks were certainly influenced, and at Constantinople it was they who made up public opinion. For this very reason the policy of Michael Cærularius, petty and superficial as it was, was better fitted than that of Photius to bring about permanent results. Indeed, so thoroughly did it cut off the Greek peoples from Rome that since then she has never won them back.

Unfortunately, this movement of separation under Photius and Michael Cærularius was on foot at the very time when the Slavs were being converted to Christianity, a fact in the history of the evangelization of the nations second only in importance to the conversion of the Germanic races. The Servians and Croats, settled by the Emperor Heraclius (610-41) on the lands they still inhabit, had adopted the Christian teaching of Roman priests and bishops. But the progress of the new religion was so slow that a second conversion was deemed necessary. It took place under the Emperor Basil the Macedonian (867-86); as it was entrusted to Byzantine missionaries the Greek Rite of Constantinople was adopted. This had no small weight in detaching from Rome whole provinces that were formerly subject to it, and when these numerous Servian Churches broke away from Byzantium, it was to organize autonomous ecclesiastical bodies independent of both Rome and Constantinople. In this way a whole region was lost to Catholicism. The Bulgarians, who had crossed the Danube about the same time as the Servians, formed a more or less

homogeneous nation with the Slavs and became a warrior people that more than once struck terror into the heart of the Byzantine Basileus. Towards the end of 864, or in the opening months of 865, their king, Boris, was baptized by a Greek bishop and took the name of Michael after his godfather, the Emperor of Byzantium. Photius, who was patriarch at the time, did not see his way to granting all the demands of King Boris, so, like a cunning politician, the latter turned to Rome and succeeded in obtaining successively several missionaries to organize the new-born Church within his territory. His next step was to send away all the German and Byzantine missionaries whom he found there. His real ambition was to have a patriarch of his own who would anoint him emperor just as the Greek patriarch anointed the Basileus at Constantinople, and as the pope anointed the Germanic emperor of the West. Whether he got his patriarch from Rome or from Constantinople mattered little; the main thing was to have one at any cost. Rome did not fall in with his plan, and Boris turned again to Constantinople, thereby initiating a serious misunderstanding between Rome and Constantinople which considerably added to the strain occasioned by the affairs of Ignatius and Photius. Rome claimed the Bulgarians as inhabitants of ancient Illyricum (her former ecclesiastical territory) and as having been baptized by her missionaries; Constantinople claimed that its priests had converted the Bulgarians, that the land was once imperial territory, and that the Council of Chalcedon had given Constantinople the right to consecrate bishops for all barbarian countries. Between the two Churches the Bulgarians did not know which way to turn. They retained the Byzantine Rite, which, with its elaborate ceremonial, made a deep impression upon their child-like imaginations, and, formally, they submitted to Greek bishops, until they should have bishops and a patriarch of their own. When, in 886, the disciples of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, expelled from Moravia by King Swiatopluk, took refuge in Bulgaria, they were received with open arms. The newcomers introduced into Bulgaria the Byzantine Liturgy, but in the Slavonic tongue, whereas hitherto the Bulgarian priests had used the Greek language. From Bulgaria this Byzantino-Slavonic Liturgy spread among the Servians, the Russians, and all the Slav peoples.

The first Bulgarian patriarchate was originally established at Pereiaslaw, then was transferred to various centres in Western Bulgaria, finally to Ochrida (see ACHRIDA). In 1019 it was suppressed, when the town of Ochrida fell into the hands of the Byzantines, or rather it was converted into an independent archbishopric. As such it lasted until 1767, when it was definitively suppressed. However, independent patriarchate or autonomous archdiocese, the Bulgarian Church was from its foundation powerfully influenced by Constantinople; the long series of its Greek or Hellenistic archbishops shared at all times the anti-Roman feelings of that city. The Russian Church is also a spiritual daughter of Constantinople (see RUSSIA). We need not relate here the conversion of that nation; it probably took place about 853, perhaps a little earlier, and both Latins and Greeks probably participated in it. Progress was very slow, however, and when the Czarina Olga wished to become a Christian she had to go to Constantinople for instruction and baptism, on which occasion she took the name of Helena (c. 956 or 957). Olga's conversion had no great influence; the czar, Swiatoslav (964-972), refused to yield to her wishes that he should also be a Christian. It was not till 989 that Prince Vladimir allowed himself to be baptized, and ordered that his subjects should ever afterwards receive baptism.

The Russian Church was probably organized at this time, and a Greek metropolitan sent by the Byzantine patriarch was installed at Kiev, the Russian capital.

Unfortunately, we have no "Notitia Episcopatum" of the Byzantine Church contemporary with this event. The "Notitia" of 980 naturally makes no reference to Kiev, and the next "Notitia" extant goes from 1081 to 1118 only; in that year the metropolitan See of Kiev appears as number 60; similarly, in the "Notitia" of Manuel Comnenus which appeared about 1170. In this document Kiev appears as presiding over eleven suffragan sees, and this is the earliest information we have concerning the hierarchy of the Russian Church. The head of this Church had a rather inferior place in the Byzantine hierarchy, but exercised the prerogatives of an exarch (q. v.) and, once installed, administered freely his ecclesiastical province. He consecrated its bishops, crowned its czars, and he usually resided at Kiev. Generally, a Greek was chosen for the office, so that the medieval Russian Church was but an extension of the Byzantine Church, sharing the liturgy, the dogmatic teaching, and the ecclesiastical antipathies of the latter.

VASILIER, *Byzantium and the Arabs* (Russian, St. Petersburg, 1900-02); ПОПОВ, *The Emperor Leo VI, the Wise, and His Government from the Ecclesiastico-historical Point of View* (Russian, Moscow, 1892); RAMBAUD, *L'empire grec au X<sup>e</sup> siècle. Constantin Porphyrogénite* (Paris, 1870); LEONHARDT, *Kaiser Nicephorus II, Phocas, and die Hamdaniden, 960 bis 969* (Halle, 1887); SCHLUMBERGER, *Nicéphore Phocas* (Paris, 1890); IDEM, *L'Épopée byzantine aux X<sup>e</sup> et XI<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1896-1905); MÄDLER, *Theodoros, Michael Stratigotikos, Isaac Comnenos* (Plozen, 1894); HERGENROTHER, *Photius* (Ratisbon, 1869); JAGER, *Histoire de Photius* (Louvain, 1845); LAPÔTRE, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque Carolingienne* (Paris, 1895), I, 30-170; ЛЕБЕДЕВ, *Story of the Separation of the Churches in the Ninth-Eleventh Centuries* (Russian, Moscow, 1900); PRICHLER, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident* (Munich, 1864-65); ALLATOUS, *De ecclesiis occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione* (Cologne, 1894); ALTIMURA (pseudonym of LE QUIEN), *Panoplia contra schisma Graecorum* (Paris, 1718); LAEMMER, *Papst Nicolaus I und die byzant. Staatskirche seiner Zeit* (Berlin, 1857); MAMBOURG, *Histoire du schisme des Grecs* (Paris, 1677); DEMETRAKOPOULOS, *History of the Separation of the Latin Church and the Greek Orthodox Church* (Greek, Leipzig, 1887); VLASTOS, *Historical Essay on the Schism of the Western Church from the Orthodox East* (Greek, Athens, 1896); WILL, *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo XI composita extant* (Leipzig, 1861); СОРОВОВ, *Cæcularius, the Byzantine Pope* (Russian, Moscow, 1902); BRÉHIER, *Le schisme oriental du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1899).

(4) *Efforts towards Reunion; The Crusades (Eleventh to Fifteenth Century).*—In spite of the emperor and the Court, who favoured an understanding with Rome and the West, Michael Cæcularius proclaimed his schism in 1054. He was followed by most of the clergy, also by the monks and the Greek people. Peter, the Patriarch of Antioch, held aloof from this violent measure, but died soon afterwards, and his successor went over to Cæcularius. The Patriarch of Alexandria, usually resident at Constantinople, sided with the bishop of the capital; the Greek Archbishop of Ochrida was devoted to Cæcularius and was one of the first to stir up the question of the azymes as a grievance against Rome. Lastly, the head of the Russian Church was only a metropolitan dependent on the Byzantine Church. Therefore, with the exception of the insignificant Patriarch of Jerusalem, who at first tried to agree with both parties, all the Greek Churches had taken sides against Catholicism about the end of the eleventh century. In the years that elapsed from the death of Photius (891) to the fall of Constantinople (1453) the anti-Roman doctrine of the Greek Church took definite shape. Photius was the first who attempted to co-ordinate all possible reasons of complaint against the Latins. He enumerated seven chief grievances: the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, the insertion of the "Filioque" clause in the Creed, the primacy of the pope, the reconfirmation of those confirmed by Greek priests, the Saturday fast, the use of milk foods during the first week of Lent, the obligation of celibacy on the priests. The last three do not in any way affect dogma, and as much might be said of the second. The reconfirmation of those already confirmed seems to

have been a false accusation, unless some Latin missionaries sinned through excess of zeal. The primacy of the pope had always been recognized by the patriarchs of the East, and by Photius himself, as long as the pope was willing to condescend to their wishes. The first letter of Photius to Pope Nicholas I does not differ from those of his predecessors, save for its more submissive tone and more humble diction. Appeals to the pope from the East between the second and ninth centuries are very numerous. And as for the Greek theory of the procession of the Holy Ghost, it was no new thing in the ninth century; St. John Damascene and St. Maximus of Chrysopolis had favoured this doctrine long before Photius and were never accused of heresy. It would, therefore, have been easy to find a common ground or compromise that would have harmonized the teaching of both schools. Passing from Photius to Michael Cæcularius, we find only one new complaint directed against the Latins, and that liturgical: the use of unleavened bread (see AZYMES). On this point the dispute was impossible of settlement, since each Church had been using its own particular kind of bread from time immemorial. Fresh differences in the meantime arose: the placing (about the thirteenth century) of the Epiclesis before the Consecration; Purgatory, which the Greeks would not admit, although they prayed for the dead and mortified themselves in their behalf; the full glorification of the just prior to the general judgment; the general judgment itself, which they rejected, as did also some Latin medieval theologians; the giving of communion to the laity under one species; baptism by infusion. To all these differences were to be added in the nineteenth century the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and that of Papal Infallibility. Merely for the sake of recording them, we may mention liturgical differences, as the manner of fasting in Lent, the adoption of a new calendar, the manner of making the sign of the cross—causes of offence which the Greek clergy took pleasure in keeping alive, and which made a deep impression on a people devoted to trifles and, generally, very ignorant.

*Papal Efforts at Reunion.*—The breach declared in 1054 has never been repaired. Yet this has not been the fault of the popes. As early as 1072 we find Alexander II eager for reunion. This attempt failed because of the unflinching opposition of the philosopher Michael Psellos, the Patriarch Xiphilinos, and their fanatical friends. Thenceforth until the fall of Constantinople (1453) the popes multiplied letters, embassies, and paternal advice to win back the erring Greeks to the fold of orthodoxy, and to keep them there on their return. All in vain. The two reconciliations effected by the Councils of Lyons (1274) and of Florence (1439) were solely due to the efforts of the popes and the Byzantine emperors. At Lyons Michael VIII, Palæologus, a clever politician, proclaimed himself and his people Catholics in order to save his crown and to stay the formidable armament of Charles of Anjou. At Florence John VII, Palæologus, came to beg men and arms from Europe to save his capital from the threatening Turks. It would be difficult for an impartial historian to affirm the sincerity of their desire for religious union. One thing is certain, their clergy followed them with the greatest reluctance, and at Lyons the Greek clergy kept aloof from any union with Rome, and would not listen to it at any price. Michael Palæologus was hardly dead (1282) when his son Andronicus undid all that he had accomplished, and even denied religious burial to his father; moreover, the Catholic patriarch, John Veccos, was deposited together with all his friends.

John VII, Palæologus, who had agreed to the union at Florence, either could not, or did not dare, proclaim it in his capital. He feared either the anathemas or the intrigues of men like Mark of Ephesus, or George Scholarios. His brother, Constantine Dragases, the



last of the Byzantine emperors, died heroically for his country. He, also, feared at the beginning of his reign to impose the union on his clergy and people. He had to wait until 12 December, 1452, hardly six months before the entry of the Turks into the capital, when Cardinal Isidore solemnly proclaimed the union of Florence in the church of Saint Sophia. Admiral Notaras cynically observed that the Greeks preferred the turban of the prophet to the tiara of the pope. It must, however, be acknowledged that the seeds of union sown by the missionaries and by the envoys of Rome have never been completely stifled. There have always been Greeks who were sincerely Catholics, even in the darkest days of their country's history. Among them some have always defended with their pens, and often at the risk of their lives, the unity of the Church and the primacy of Rome. Demetracopoulos, it is true, has published a lengthy list of the principal anti-Roman writers among the Greeks, but it would be easy to prepare another very large work of the same kind exhibiting the pro-Catholic activity of many Greeks. John Veccos (Beccos), George Acropolites, Isidore of Kiev, Bessarion, Arcudius, Allatius, are names that carry weight with any unbiased historian, and they had many disciples and imitators.

With few exceptions the popes have always leaned to the religious policy of recovering the East by every means of pacification and, when necessary, by theological controversy. This last means, however, was as a rule foredoomed to failure. Polemics have rarely converted anyone, and when carried on, as in the Middle Ages, with syllogisms and, above all, with insults and outrages, then, instead of conciliating and calming angry souls, they leave behind them only bitterness, asperity, and sometimes hate. If the popes, however, were misled in their choice of weapons, or rather, if their religious representatives in the East abused controversy and polemic, it must be conceded that the popes stopped there. The violent solution of the Eastern question by the sword—the crusade which was to profit only the Westerns—was no doing of the popes. In his stirring appeal at Clermont-Ferrand that set afoot the first armed enterprise, Urban II exhorted the Christians of the West to save their brethren in the East, even before undertaking to free Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre. Moreover—it is almost too well known to need repeating here—Innocent III denounced vigorously the diversion of the Fourth Crusade to an attack on Zara and Constantinople for the almost exclusive profit of Venice. From 1261 to 1282 (the Sicilian Vespers) Charles of Anjou was hindered from making war on Michael Paleologus and recapturing Constantinople solely by the influence of the Roman Curia. It would therefore be an injustice to blame the popes for the abortive issue of the Crusades. Had they been supported earnestly by East and West alike, Christendom would have fared immeasurably better. Unfortunately, the Catholic States, especially the Italian Republics, were too selfish to grasp the high moral and religious significance of the conduct and aims of the popes. As a rule, the only success of contemporary politicians was in embarrassing the popes. The East, moreover, it must be admitted, did its share in frustrating the work of the Crusades. Far from assisting the generous West in its sublime effort to save Christendom, the Greeks saw in the Crusades only sources of profit for themselves or attempted to hinder their success. While their theologians and polemical writers showed more rudeness and spleen in controversy than did the Latins, their princes and emperors were likewise less disinterested than the leaders of the Crusades. It is to be carefully noted that the crusading movement was by no means a complete failure. At the time of the First Crusade, in the eleventh century, the Turks were in possession of Nicaea, within a

stone's throw of Constantinople. Before the Frankish knights Islam retreated, or at least ceased its conquests, in Asia Minor, in Syria, and even in Egypt. And if in the fourteenth century it was enabled to resume its conquering march and cross into Europe, a menace to Christian civilization, it was in consequence of the cessation of the Crusades. Nor must the foundation of the many Catholic institutions in the East, which long outlasted the Crusades, be reckoned as useless. It was their slow but continuous efforts that paved the way for the emancipation of many Christian peoples from the Turkish yoke, and brought about in those countries that increasing influence of the Catholic religion which we now behold. "More important perhaps", says M. Bréhier in *L'Eglise et l'Orient au moyen âge: les Croisades* (Paris, 1907), p. 354, "are the results which the Crusades never dreamed of and which sprang from the contact of Christendom and the Orient. The very complex question as to what European civilization owes to the East cannot be discussed here; yet every day we find traces of the charm which the culture of the East exercised on Europe before and during the Crusades. What we are most concerned with is the advance thus made in geographical knowledge and, in consequence, in the spread of European civilization by expeditions and travels in the East. Asia was really discovered in the thirteenth century by those Italian missionaries and merchants who were the guests of the Mongolian Khans. For the first time since the expedition of Alexander, countries which until then had remained in the penumbra of legend appeared as a reality." Literature, finally, owes much to the Crusades, which, by the literary relations they established between the Latin and Greek worlds, called forth the magnificent movement of the Renaissance.

For general reference works relating to the Schism, see the foregoing bibliography.—NORDEN, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (Berlin, 1903); ARSENI, *Relations between the Latin and Greek Churches at the Time of the Crusades in Journal of the Ministry of Public Education* (Russian, St. Petersburg, 1867), CXXIX, 499-534; BRÉHIER, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au moyen âge: les Croisades* (Paris, 1907); LÉBÉDEV, *Sketch of the Byzantine Church from the end of the Eleventh to the Middle of the Fifteenth Century* (Russian, Moscow, 1902); THEINER, *Monumenta spectantia ad unionem Ecclesiarum graecae et romanae* (Vienna, 1872); DELISLE in *Notes et extraits des manuscrits* (Paris, 1879), XXVII, pt. II, 87-167; DRÄSEKE in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie* (1891), XXXIV, 325-55; OMONT in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* (Paris, 1892), 254-57; GAY, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (Paris, 1904); HALLER, *Concilium Basiliense* (Basle, 1896); ZEISHMAN, *Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen der Orient und der römischen Kirche seit dem Ausgange des XV Jahrhunderts bis zum Concil von Ferrara* (Vienna, 1858); VAST, *Le Cardinal Bessarion* (Paris, 1878); ROCHOLL, *Bessarion* (Leipzig, 1904); PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste* (Freiburg, 1901), I, 303 and passim; CARRA DE VAUX in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, II, 69-93; DRÄSEKE, *Zum Kirchengenehmungsversuch des Jahres 1193 in Byzanz*, *Zeitschrift*, V, 572-86; DIAMANTOPoulos, *Marcus Eugenius and the Council of Florence* (Athens, 1899). See also for further bibliography the article CRUSADES.

(a) *Internal Organization of Byzantine Churches.*—

We have already spoken of the Bulgarian Patriarchate of Ochrida, which about 1020 was changed into an autonomous Graeco-Bulgarian archbishopric more or less Hellenized, and which, until its suppression in 1767, remained under the influence of Constantinople. Another Bulgarian patriarchate, that of Tirnovo, was established in 1204 by legates from Innocent III and remained Catholic for a long time. Gradually, however, it began to lean towards the Greeks, till it finally disappeared in 1393, and its bishops all passed under the authority of the oecumenical patriarch. Something similar happened to the Servians. Up to about 1204 they were on the most cordial relations with Rome, although it is probable that they recognized the jurisdiction of Constantinople. In 1217 Sabas the Younger crowned his brother king in the pope's name, and established a Servian Church which was at first composed of six dioceses. It was recognized by the Byzantines in 1219. In 1346 King Stephen Douchan threw off all

ecclesiastical dependence on Constantinople and set up the Servian Patriarchate of Ipek, which, after many changes of fortune, was suppressed in 1766 and incorporated in the Byzantine Church. The Russian Church continued to depend on Constantinople through its metropolitans at Kiev and at Moscow until 23 January, 1589, when the Byzantine patriarch, Jeremias II, publicly recognized its autonomy, and consecrated Job the first patriarch of Moscow. From that date the Russian Church passes out of the purview of this article. It was not till the fourteenth century that the Church of Constantinople succeeded in imposing upon the Rumanian people, who occupied the north bank of the Danube, a Greek ecclesiastical hierarchy subject to itself. This was done through the metropolitan sees of Alania and Bitzania, or Soteropolis, with the later sees of Hungaro-Wallachia, Mauro-Wallachia (Moldavia), and Wallachia.

During that troubled period which saw the establishment of the Franks in the East, the Greek patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem suffered especially. As long as the Latins remained undisputed masters of these regions, their Latin patriarchs stubbornly opposed the coexistence of Greek patriarchs, so that the latter had no choice left but to take refuge in Constantinople at the Byzantine Court and to govern their Churches from there as best they could. This method soon became customary, and even after 1453 the patriarchs continued to reside at the Phanar. The Patriarch of Antioch alone returned soon afterwards to his own territory. In the seventeenth century the Patriarch of Jerusalem ventured into Palestine, but it was not till the nineteenth century that the Patriarch of Alexandria left the shores of the Bosphorus. It must also be remembered that Cyprus and Crete (the latter being directly under Constantinople) were unable to have Greek bishops during the long centuries that those islands remained in the hands of the Latins. It would be impossible within the limits at our disposal to give an exact description of the hierarchy of the patriarchate of Constantinople from the tenth to the fifteenth century. A "Notitia Episcopatum" drawn up soon after 1453 reckons 72 metropolitan sees, 8 autocephalous archbishoprics, and 78 suffragan sees divided among 21 ecclesiastical provinces or a grand total of 158 dioceses. This relatively small number of dioceses is explained by the fact that Asia Minor was then but an immense ruin, and that in Europe, in the majority of the Venetian or Frankish possessions, the presence of Greek bishops was not tolerated.

Space forbids us saying more than a few words on the domestic history of the Greek Church. The election of the patriarch belonged by right to the Holy Synod; *de facto*, as we have seen, it was the Basileus or emperor, who elected him. Limited as was the authority of the Holy Synod, it could not always exercise what authority it had, and, on the death of a patriarch, the Basileus often appointed his successor without any previous consultation with the Synod. Nicephorus Phocas attempted to nullify any ecclesiastical nomination not approved by him, an abuse of power which lasted during his lifetime only. The metropolitans were elected by the Holy Synod, the bishops by the metropolitan and his suffragans, if they were sufficiently numerous, or, if not, with the assistance of bishops from another province. The clergy had undergone no change since the earlier period, except that after the twelfth century we hear of no more deaconesses, though some religious women bear that title without any right to it. Moreover, with the exception of Thebes and Bœotia, religious women no longer wore a lay habit or dress. "Commendation" and "charisticariats" were as common as in the West, with their train of simony and vices still more hideous. The *mensa episcopalis* often found its way to the officials of the treasury or some other court functionary,

and servility towards the State was the order of the day in all the ranks of the clergy. The patriarchs were obedient tools of the emperors. Yet there were not wanting patriarchs formed in the monastic schools who had the courage to defend their rights and the rights of the Church against the encroachment of the civil power.

Monasticism was more and more popular throughout the Greek world. In Constantinople there were hundreds of monasteries, and every provincial town tried to rival the capital, so that the Byzantine empire became one vast Thebaid. Outside of Byzantium the monasteries formed into groups which surpassed the fame of the ancient solitudes of Egypt and of Palestine. Without speaking of Southern Italy, rich in Greek convents, we must not omit to mention the famous monasteries of Mount Ossa, of the Meteora, of Phocis, and of the Peloponnesus. On Mount Olympus in Bithynia (the neighbourhood of Broussa, Nicea, and Ghemlek) many religious centres sprang up. On a little corner of land, with a maximum length of 63 miles and a width of from 12 to 20 miles, a veritable oasis of monasticism came into existence, comprising at that time more than a hundred convents. These convents, usually very well filled, sheltered a number of saints and ecclesiastical celebrities. Beginning from the tenth century, the peninsula of Athos saw the rise of monasteries properly so called, and saw the cenobitic usage (community life) supplant the haphazard methods of earlier days. Then it was that vocations abounded, and the holy mountain was transformed into an earthly paradise of monks. The convents known to have existed at Mount Athos between the tenth century and the thirteenth numbered more than a hundred. It was at this period, too, that the holy mountain played a preponderating part in the religious history of Constantinople, and in the fourteenth century the Hesychastic controversy, stirred up by its religious, became the dominating preoccupation of the time. There were many other active, though not so well-known, monastic centres—e. g. Mount Latrus near Miletus, Mount Ganus, and Mount Galesius, Mount St. Auxentius near Chalcedon, the islands of the Archipelago and of the Gulf of Nicomedia, the region of Trebizond, and especially the vicinity of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, with its picturesque *lauræ* clinging to the slopes of the hills.

The constant controversies with the Latins did not prevent the rise of other controversies that sometimes divided the Byzantine Empire into opposing camps just as in the heart of the Arian and Monophysite conflicts. We shall mention but a few. In 1082 a council condemned the philosopher Italos, a subtle logician whose errors had been refuted by the Emperor Alexius I, Comnenus. Four years later, Leo, metropolitan of Chalcedon, was accused of giving to images the cultus of *latría*, due only to the Deity. In reality he had merely defended the property of his Church and prevented the emperor from carrying off the ornaments of beaten gold and silver from the statues and images. After Leo came Nilos, a monk who had expressed some heterodox views concerning the mystery of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ. In a council of 20 August, 1143, the Bogomiles were condemned, together with many bishops who favoured them. In 1156 and 1157 two councils anathematized Sotericus Pantengenius, Patriarch-elect of Antioch, who maintained that the Sacrifice of the Mass was not offered up to the Word, but only to the Father and to the Holy Spirit. Two other councils, held in 1166 and in 1170, explained the text, "The Father is greater than I", apropos of which many bishops were again falling into the errors of Arius. The monk Irenicus, suspected of various dogmatic errors, was condemned in 1170. The thirteenth century is filled with the quarrel of the Arsenites or partisans of the Patriarch Arsenius, who had been deposed for condemning the assassination of young

Lascaris by Michael VIII, Palæologus. Originally a personal affair, it grew eventually into a theological and canonical controversy.

(b) *Hesychasm*.—With the fourteenth century we come upon *Hesychasm* (ἡσυχία, "quiet"), the greatest theological conflict of the Greek Church since the old times of Iconoclasm. Gregory Sinaita first spread this doctrine, which he had learned from Arsenius of Crete. Intrinsicly, it offers nothing very remarkable. It is based upon the well-known distinction between the practical religious life, which purifies the soul by cleansing it from its passions, and the contemplative life, which unites the soul to God by contemplation, and is thus the ideal and end of religious perfection. Four or five successive stages lead the disciple from the practical to the contemplative mode of life. But while there was nothing startling in the theological principles of the new teaching, the method pointed out for arriving at perfect contemplation recalled the practices of Hindu fakirs, and was no more than a crude form of auto-suggestion. The alleged Divine splendour which appeared to the hypnotized subject, and was identified with that which surrounded the Apostles on Thabor, was really nothing but a commonplace illusion. Yet this Thaboric brightness, and the omphalopsychic method of inducing it, gave a widespread reputation to the Hesychasts. No doubt the leaders of the party held aloof from these vulgar practices of the more ignorant monks, but on the other hand they scattered broadcast perilous theological theories. Palamas taught that by asceticism one could attain a corporal, i. e. a sense view, or perception, of the Divinity. He also held that in God there was a real distinction between the Divine Essence and Its attributes, and he identified grace as one of the Divine *propria* making it something uncreated and infinite. These monstrous errors were denounced by the Calabrian Barlaam, by Nicephorus Gregoras, and by Acthyndinus. The conflict began in 1338 and ended only in 1368, with the solemn canonization of Palamas and the official recognition of his heresies. He was declared the "holy doctor" and "one of the greatest among the Fathers of the Church", and his writings were proclaimed "the infallible guide of the Christian Faith". Thirty years of incessant controversy and discordant councils ended with a resurrection of polytheism.

Among the medieval Greek theologians the most famous are the ninth-century Photius, well-known for his anti-Latinism; Michael Psellos, in the eleventh century, an all-round capable writer, theologian, exegete, philologist, historian, scientist, poet, and, above all, philosopher; Euthymius Zigabenus, who composed, at the request of Alexius Comnenus, his "Dogmatic Panoply, or Armoury, Against all Errors"; Nicholas of Methona, Andronicus Cameterus, anti-Latin polemical writers, particularly Nicetas Acominatus (Akominatos), noted for his "Treasure of Orthodoxy". John Veccos (Beccos) and George Acropolites tried to reconcile the teachings of both Latins and Greeks while other Greeks opposed the Latins with all their might. Among the opponents of Palamas were Barlaam, Gregoras, Akyndinos, John the Cypriot, and Manuel Calecas. The theological conflict went on both before and after the Council of Florence (1439); Mark of Ephesus and George Scholarios repudiated the Roman theology, which on the other hand, was adopted and upheld by Bessarion, Isidore of Kiev, Joseph of Methone, and Gregory Mammias.

BOIS, *La controverse Hésychaste in Echos d'Orient* (Paris, 1900-01), 1-11; 65-73; 353-382; (1901) 50-60; HOLL, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum* (Leipzig, 1897); LE BARBIER, *St. Christodule et la réforme des couvents grecs au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1863); MEYER, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athos Klöster* (Leipzig, 1894); BLACHOS, *La Presqu'île de l'Athos, ses monastères et ses moines d'autrefois et d'aujourd'hui* (Paris, 1903); OUSPENSKI, *History of Athos* (Russian, Kiev, 1877-92); PETT, *Actes de Xenophon; Actes du Pantocrator; Actes d'Esphigmenou* (3 vols., St. Petersburg, 1903-1905).—For a further bibliography concerning Athos, see VAILLÉ in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (1900), s. v. *Constantinople*,

*Eglise de*; BARDENHEWER, *tt. SHAHAN, Patrology* (St. Louis, 1908); BATIFFOL, *La littérature grecque* (Paris, 1897); FESSLER-JENGMANN, *Institutiones Patrologæ* (Innsbruck, 1890); NICOLAÏ, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte: Die nachklassische Literatur* (Mädgeburg, 1878); HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien* (Leipzig, 1876); FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Græca* (Hamburg); KREMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzant. Literatur* (Munich, 1897).

(5) *From 1453 to the Present Time*.—*Relations with the Catholic Church, the Protestants, etc.*—The capture of Constantinople by the Turks marks the apogee of the œcumenical patriarchate and the Greek Churches subject to it. By establishing Gennadius Scholarius as the only patriarch of the Orthodox Churches within the Ottoman Empire, Mohammed II placed all the other peoples—Servians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, and Anatolians—under the exclusive domination of Greek bishops. No doubt the Servian and Bulgarian Churches of Ipek and Ochrida still existed, but, pending their final suppression in 1766 and 1767 respectively, they were hellenized and under Greek control, so that they were in reality but an extension of the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople. Moreover, the conquest of Egypt and Syria by Sultan Selim in the sixteenth century enabled the Greeks to control the honours and emoluments of the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch. In the seventeenth century the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was hellenized, and that of Antioch in the opening years of the eighteenth century. As for Alexandria, where the faithful were very few, its Greek titular always resided at Constantinople. In this way the Greek Church gained gradual possession of the immense Ottoman Empire; as the Turks extended their conquests the jurisdiction of the Greek patriarchs extended with them. This situation lasted until the first half of the nineteenth century. The whole Orthodox world was at that time Greek, save in Russia, whose religious autonomy had been recognized in 1589, and in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, where Servians and Rumanians constituted, from the end of the seventeenth century, autonomous Churches, either Catholic or Orthodox. During the greater part of the nineteenth century the principle of nationality—long cherished at Constantinople, which had employed it against the popes when robbing them of jurisdiction over Illyricum and at one time over Southern Italy—was turned against the Greeks themselves, especially against the Church of Constantinople. Every province or kingdom that shook off the Turkish suzerainty freed itself at the same time from the ecclesiastical yoke of the Phanar. Curiously enough, it was the Greeks of the Hellenic Kingdom who first set up, in the nineteenth century, an autonomous Church. The Servians and Rumanians were not slow to imitate them. The Bulgarians went farther and, while remaining Ottoman subjects *de jure* until October, 1908, they established about forty years ago an exarchate of their own, independent of the Phanar, with jurisdiction not only over all Bulgarians in Bulgaria, but also over Bulgarians in Turkey. It is to be expected that the recent proclamation of a Bulgarian kingdom will modify this state of things. A Bulgarian Church may be established within the limits of that kingdom, and a second Bulgarian Church within the limits of Turkey in Europe. The creation of a Servian Church for the Servians in Turkey is also projected, so that the œcumenical patriarchate seems on the eve of dismemberment. In recent times, also, the rivalry of nationalities has passed over from Europe into Asia. In 1899 the Greeks were ejected by the Syrians from the Patriarchate of Antioch; in the same way they may soon lose Jerusalem. In Egypt similar divisions exist between the Greek- and Arabic-speaking elements; the latter, aided by their Mussulman fellow-countrymen, may eventually cast off the ecclesiastical control of the Greeks. In short, at no very distant date the Greeks, who have so long ruled the Orthodox world, will have to be content with the

Church of Athens, that of Cyprus, and the sadly weakened Church of Constantinople.

If we look at the domestic situation of the Greek Church during the period from 1453 to 1901, the year of the present titular's accession, we find that, of a total of one hundred and two patriarchs, only twenty-nine have died in possession of their see, and that the seventy-three others either resigned or were deposed. It is a strange phenomenon, seldom met except among the Greeks, that, whereas a patriarch was nominated for life, as a rule he was deposed or forced to resign. It sometimes happened that the same man became patriarch more than once. In this way, while between 1453 and 1901 there were only one hundred and two patriarchs, there were some one hundred and sixty patriarchal elections; thirty-five patriarchs having been elected several times (twenty-one twice, nine three times, two four times, two five times, and one seven times). The last of these records is that of Cyril Lucaris, the famous seventeenth-century Calvinistic patriarch. These continual changes gave rise to some amusing incidents. Thus on 19 October, 1848, Anthimus IV succeeded Anthimus VI, who was deprived of office the day before; at present Joachim III is œcumenical patriarch for the second time, twenty-three years after the death of Joachim IV, who had succeeded him. This confusion is by no means peculiar to the Church of Constantinople. In the hellenized Church of Ochrida, we find between the years 1650 and 1700 no fewer than nineteen forced resignations or depositions of archbishops. The two main causes of these sudden changes are the cupidity of the Turks and the ambition of the Greek clergy covetous of the patriarchal throne. The cupidity of the Turks might never have been a factor, had it not been for the intrigues and cabals of the Greek clergy themselves, who put up their patriarchate at auction. On 20 November, 1726, Paisios paid out 145,000 francs for the office of patriarch, and in 1759 the Sultan Mustapha III fixed the tax on the office at 120,000 francs. And yet in many instances the patriarchs did not remain even a year in office. Later, when the Turks had taken off the tax, depositions and resignations went on, and go on to this day as in the past, so much so that the laity now come forward and ask that the duration of a patriarch's term in office be limited, e. g. to three or four years. However, in the Kingdom of Greece, where the Church depends mainly on the State, these scandals do not occur. What has been said of the patriarchs might be even more truly said of the metropolitans and bishops. Though, according to Greek canon law, transfers from one diocese to another are forbidden or ought to be very rare, as a matter of fact every bishop has administered before his death four or five different dioceses. Either the bishops did not find their dioceses suited to their dignity or the people did not find the bishop suited to their taste. Of late the custom of lay interference in the nomination of bishops is growing, and hardly a year goes by in which seven or eight bishops are not removed at the request of their flocks. Nor must it be forgotten that the bishops busy themselves mainly with anti-Bulgarian or anti-Servian politics and other secular affairs. The Turkish government often has to request the withdrawal of some over-compromised prelate.

It may be noted that the Greek bishops—those of to-day at least—have received a fairly good education in the secondary schools, followed by a very ordinary course of theology in the seminary of Halki or that of Santa Croce, near Jerusalem. Some of them have spent a few years in the Protestant universities of Germany, or in the ecclesiastical academies of Russia. Their theology is usually limited to a knowledge of the points of controversy between Latins and Greeks from the beginning of their Church until recent times; they use it to bias the minds of their people against the

missionary efforts of Catholics. They are more tolerant of Protestants. With the exception of the clergy in the towns, who aim at the higher offices, the Greek priesthood is very ignorant; the priests can hardly get through the Mass and the other services in a fitting manner. Although married, they retain great influence over the illiterate but pious members of their flocks, who are attached to Christianity by tradition or patriotism, and whose ill-instructed religious sense shows itself mainly in ritual observances and superstitious practices. With the exception of two or three seminaries, having about fifty pupils in all, there is no training school for the lower clergy.

The dioceses are divided, as with us, into parishes of various classes. Preaching is neglected and in many places is omitted altogether. For this reason, in 1893 some laymen at Smyrna founded the Eusebia Society for the diffusion and explanation of the Word of God. This example has been followed in other places, especially at Serræ, Magnesia, and Constantinople, where laymen preach in the churches as is the custom in some Protestant sects. The higher clergy, far from favouring this movement, which is a reproach for them, do all they can to hinder it. Feast days are the same as in the Latin Church; so are the sacraments. The latter are rarely received, and rather as a matter of custom than of genuine conviction. Communion is received four times a year after the four great fasts: at Easter, on St. Peter's day, on the Assumption, and at Christmas. Confession ought to precede this solemn act, but as a rule it is omitted or treated so slightly by priests and people that it is better not to speak of it. The priests and bishops do not go to confession. Mass is heard on Sundays and Feast-days, or, rather, on those days the people go and say some prayers before the icons, or holy images, the services being generally so long that very few remain to the end. In any case there is no definite teaching on this point any more than on others, everything remaining vague and uncertain in the minds of the people.

(For Feasts and Fasts of the Greek Church, Service Books, Vestments, Church Furniture, etc., see, under CONSTANTINOPLE, THE RITE OF, Vol. IV, pp. 315 sqq.)

The music of the Greek Church began with the ephphonic chant, a sort of recitative based on the laws of accent in prosody. Through the early melodists, or Syriac liturgical poets, this musical notation may reach back to the ancient liturgical chant of the Jews. The musical characters or signs are Greek. The notation, known as that of St. John Damascene, is merely a development of ephphonic notation. It increased the number of signs from nineteen to twenty-four. In medieval times a monk of Athos, John Koukouzeles, raised it to sixty or more; but in the early part of the nineteenth century Chrysanthos modified or simplified this excessively complicated notation; his "Theoretikon", a very instructive work, has become the basis or guide for all liturgical chants and scientific works thereon. Gregory Lampadaros and Chourmouzos aided Chrysanthos in his reform, which can hardly be called successful. It seems that all three misinterpreted certain old musical signs; moreover, they are responsible for the horrible nasal intonation so abhorrent to Europeans. However, musical reform is in the air; during the past thirty years it has been talked of, and plans have often been submitted, but so far without results. The religious music of the Russians is the only one that expresses any true piety. Its gravity, unction, and sweetness are beyond question. If a religious music truly Christian ever existed, the Russians have inherited it. Between Russian and Byzantine music there is no connexion whatever. (See also under CONSTANTINOPLE, THE RITE OF, Vol. IV, p. 316.)

ЛѢБѢДОВ, *History of the Greek-Oriental Church under Turkish domination since 1453* (Russian, Sergievsk Posad, 1896); RAUSCH, *Geschichte der orientalischen Kirchen von 1453-1898* (Leipzig,

1902); IDEM, *Kirche und Kirchen im Lichte griechischer Forschung* (Leipzig, 1903); PAPADOPOULOS, *The Present Hierarchy of the Orthodox Church of the East* (Greek, Athens, 1895); SOKOLOV, *The Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century* (Russian, St. Petersburg, 1907); DELICANES, *Three volumes of texts on the relations of the Church of Constantinople with Mount Athos and the various autocephalous Churches* (Constantinople, 1902-05); LOPOCKHINE, *History of the Christian Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Russian, St. Petersburg, 1901), I, 1-216; GELZER, *Geistliches und Weltliches aus dem Orient* (Leipzig, 1900); KYRIAKOS, *Das System der autokephalen selbständigen orthodoxen Kirchen in Revue Internationale de Théologie* (Berne, 1902), 99-115; 273-286; ZHISILMAN, *Die Synoden und die Episcopalmutter in der morgenländischen Kirche* (Vienna, 1867); PETIT, *Règlements généraux de l'Eglise orthodoxe en Turquie in Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, III, 393-424; IV, 227-46, SÉMÉNOF, *Collection of Ecclesiastical Regulations in the Patriarchate of Constantinople* (Russian, Kazan, 1902); GREDEON, *Πατριαρχικὸν Πρωτοκολλόν* (Constantinople, 1890).

On the domestic arrangements of the Greek churches, see the various reviews, e. g. *Echos d'Orient*; *La Terre-Sainte*; *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*; Bessarione, etc.

On music: GAISSER, *Le Système musical de l'Eglise grecque* (Maredsous, 1901); REPOUCES, *Traité de psalmodie: Théorie et pratique du chant dans l'Eglise grecque* (Paris, 1906); THIBAUT, *Origine byzantine de la notation neumatique de l'Eglise latine* (Paris, 1907).—A fuller bibliography of Byzantine Chant will be found in *Echos d'Orient*, I, 366-68.

Even after the taking of Constantinople by the Turks and the apostasy of the Greeks, the one aim of the popes was to drive back the Turks into Asia and to save the Byzantines in spite of themselves. Nicholas V, Callistus III, Pius II, Paul II, Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, and Alexander VI all followed this policy. Julius II sought to convert the Shah of Persia, and to draw him into an alliance against the Sultan; the struggle against the Turks was the great concern of the whole pontifical life of Leo X. If the plan to drive back the Turks into Asia finally failed, the fault lay not with the popes, but with the nations of Christendom, jealous of each other and attentive to their own private gain rather than the interests of Christianity. It must not be forgotten that the victory of Lepanto (1571) was the work of a pope; that a pope worked for the preservation of Candia (1669), and that, had it not been for another pope, John Sobieski would never have relieved Vienna (1683).

From 1453 until the French Revolution the relations between the popes and the Greek patriarchs were very different from what we find to-day. Cordial letters passed frequently between them; priests of either rite were recommended to one another's care, and the popes often intervened in the internal affairs of the Greek Church. Many Greek Patriarchs of Constantinople—among others, Cyril II—and the Greek Archbishops of Ochrida, Porphyrius about 1600, Athanasius in 1606, Abraham in 1629, Melecus in 1640, Athanasius about 1660, professed the Catholic Faith; at different times many Greek bishops did in like manner. It would be impossible to say how far their conversion was sincere. Possibly the need of monetary help or the wish to make a stand against Protestantism was the motive power. It must at least be acknowledged that their conduct and attitude towards Catholics gave evidence of genuine good will. Thus, to take some well-known examples, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Jesuits and Capuchins were allowed to preach and hear confessions in the Greek Churches, by the express permission of the patriarch and the bishops. That they made use of this privilege we learn from their correspondence. It is hard to explain the exact reason for the changed attitude of Catholic missionaries since the end of the eighteenth century. Perhaps the change came with the suppression of the Jesuits and the outburst of the French Revolution, which led to the substitution of a new body of missionaries in the East. To-day, as a matter of fact, missionaries of all religious orders and every nationality observe rigidly the rules of Propaganda concerning *communicatio in sacris*. They practically ignore the higher Greek clergy—not the best way, perhaps, to break down prejudice and win esteem. It is no doubt true that as a rule the

higher Greek clergy are noted for their anti-Catholic fanaticism and are never weary of railing against Roman missionaries and of insulting Catholics. Then, too, the Greek people do not distinguish between religion and nationality, a confusion mainly due to the teaching of their clergy; consequently, a Greek will refuse to become a Catholic lest he should cease to be a Greek. Yet great progress has been made during the past twenty or thirty years, thanks to the schools of the French congregations which have been opened in nearly every town in Turkey. In spite of the anathemas of the Greek clergy, boys and girls flock to these Catholic schools, and the consequence is a growing spirit of toleration and sympathy towards Catholics everywhere.

Pius IX and Leo XIII tried to reopen official relations with the Greeks, but unsuccessfully. The reply of the Patriarch Anthimus VI to the Encyclical of Pius IX (1848) was far from friendly; the invitation to assist at the Vatican Council the Patriarch Gregory VI refused even to accept. During his long pontificate Leo XIII was unceasing in his efforts to bring back the Greeks to unity, but they remained unmoved, and when, on 20 June, 1894, in the Encyclical "Præclara", he invited the Greek Church in all charity to recognize the successor of Peter, the answering encyclical from the Patriarch Anthimus VII was remarkable for its rudeness. The present patriarch, Joachim III, opened a purely theoretical consultation with his subjects on the matter a few years ago, but his attempt was not well received.

The first Protestants with whom the Greek Church sought to unite were the Lutherans. About 1560 the Greek deacon Demetrius Mysos visited Wittenberg to learn at first hand the doctrines of Luther, but his visit had no result. In 1573 two professors of Tübingen, Andreae and Crusius, assisted by the chaplain, Gerlach, opened a correspondence with the Greek patriarch Jeremias II, which lasted until December, 1581. The patriarch and his theologians set forth over and over again very courteously and very fully the many dogmatic differences between their Church and that of the Reformers. At last Jeremias II refused to answer further letters, and wrote to Pope Gregory XIII in June, 1582, that he "detested those men and their like as enemies of Christ and of the Catholic and Apostolic Church." Later on Calvinist doctrines found favour with the patriarch himself, Cyril Lucaris, who occupied the oecumenical throne seven times between 1612 and 1638. The French and Austrian Embassies sided with the Orthodox Greeks; Geneva and Holland favoured the Calvinisers. The conflict lasted through the greater part of the seventeenth century. The main quarrel was over Lucaris's confession of faith, drawn up in Latin, which appeared at Geneva in March, 1629, and in the West stirred up both Catholics and Protestants. Many councils of the Greek Church, especially those of Constantinople in 1638 and 1642, of Jassy in 1642, and of Jerusalem in 1672, extirpated the Calvinist heresy from the Orthodox Churches. Through Peter Mohila, Metropolitan of Kiev, the Russian Church took an active part in the controversy. The personalities that disfigured these disputes embittered the whole of the seventeenth century, and made it the most repulsive in the existence of the Church of Constantinople. Four patriarchs at least were strangled, while in the space of one hundred years there were twenty-nine patriarchs and fifty-four patriarchal elections, i. e. an average of one election every twenty-two months.

After the Lutherans and Calvinists came the Anglicans, or that section of them known as the Non-jurors. Negotiations set on foot with the Greek and Russian Churches lasted from 1716 to 1725, but nothing ever came of them. Then came Zinzendorf, founder of the Moravian Brethren (1740). Finally, in



the nineteenth century we find the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and of the United States coquetting with the Greeks. In several Anglican synods—e. g., 1866, 1867, 1868—a desire for union with the Greeks was expressed, and the Patriarch Gregory VI showed sympathy, but did not hide the difficulties in the way of its immediate realization. At the Synod of Bonn (1874) the Anglicans resolved to remove the "Filioque" from the Creed, to insert the formula "the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son", to recognize tradition as a source of revelation, to maintain that the Eucharist was a sacrifice, to admit prayers for the dead, and other points. But the Greeks would not make any concessions. In 1897 the 36th decision of the synod assembled at Lambeth Palace (London) charged the chief representatives of Anglicanism to seek an understanding with Constantinople. The Bishop of Salisbury, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Gibraltar (who pays an annual visit to the oecumenical patriarch) were to be the principal negotiators. But the much-desired union is not yet a fact, the great drawback being the difficulty which both Churches find in defining exactly what they hold to be of faith, and what is only theological truth. In 1902 the Patriarch Joachim III consulted the Orthodox Churches as to the usefulness of an understanding with the Protestant Churches; nearly all those who thought it worth while to reply were opposed to the suggestion. Nevertheless there are several union societies in existence—e. g., the Anglo-Continental Society, founded in 1862, the Eastern Church Association, and others similar—but so far they have effected nothing. On the other hand, Evangelical societies of various countries have been very active in the East, and have often called forth protests from the higher Greek clergy. While their success among the Greeks has not yet equalled their success among the Armenians, their unceasing propaganda in Asia Minor has ended by creating Greek centres of Protestantism, something hitherto unheard of.

The Old-Catholics from the beginning aimed at union with the Orthodox Church. Theological conferences were held at Bonn in 1874 and 1875 with that object in view, and both parties made concessions, but nothing came of these efforts. Although frequent conferences have since been held, an Old-Catholic Committee instituted at Rotterdam, and the "Revue Internationale de Théologie," established at Berne (1893), the negotiations for union have not made the slightest advance.

With all the Orthodox churches, except the Bulgarian exarchate and the Syrian Patriarchate of Antioch—both of them considered schismatic for substituting a native episcopate to a Greek one—the Greek Churches are on terms of union arising from a common faith and a common orthodoxy. By the canons of the oecumenical councils of 381 and 451 the Church of Constantinople enjoys a sort of pre-eminence over the other Churches. But this must not be understood to mean a pontifical primacy so that the head of the Orthodox Church may command with authority the faithful of all other Churches. The Byzantine patriarch has a primacy of honour but not of jurisdiction; he is foremost among his equals—*primus inter pares*—and no more. This oft-repeated declaration was renewed at the Council of Jerusalem in 1867, which proclaimed that the Orthodox Churches recognized only an oecumenical council as their supreme master and sovereign judge. When Joachim III, in 1902, wished to consult the other Churches on matters concerning the whole Orthodox party—e. g., union with the Catholics or Protestants or Old-Catholics, the reform of the calendar, and other matters—out of thirteen Churches five were not consulted, being in schism or manifestly unfavourable; two did not reply; six replied in the negative. Again in Cyprus, since 1900,

the attempts of the oecumenical patriarch to put an end to the schism of that Church are resented; at the present time (1909) his authority is being overthrown at Jerusalem, just as at Alexandria. There is therefore no unity of authority among the Orthodox Churches. Nor is there any unity of faith or discipline. The Bulgarians and the Syrians of Antioch, who are looked on as schismatics by the various Greek Churches, are not such in the eyes of the other Orthodox Churches. The Russians uphold the validity of baptism administered by Catholics or Protestants; the Greeks say such baptism is invalid. The Russians do not admit the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament, but the Greeks, until quite recently, accepted them. It would be easy to multiply examples. Formerly the Church of Constantinople claimed the right to send the chrism to all Orthodox Churches as a sign of Orthodox unity and of their dependence on Constantinople. But since the seventeenth century, at least, the Russian Church blesses its own chrism, and sends it in our day to the Churches of Montenegro, Bulgaria, and Antioch. The three Orthodox Churches within the Austro-Hungarian Empire bless their own chrism, as does also the Rumanian Church since 1882. So that the only Churches now receiving the chrism from Constantinople are those of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Greece, and Servia. The moral authority of the oecumenical patriarch over the other Churches is null; consequently it stands to reason he has no dogmatic privileges. The decrees of the first seven oecumenical councils alone have force of law. As a rule, a number of creeds are also considered as instructive concerning faith, e. g., the confession of the Patriarch Gennadius, that of Peter Mohila, the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem in 1672, the confession of Metrophanes Critopoulos. At present these confessions are not held to be infallible, but merely guides in matters of faith.

Greek religious literature since 1453 is mainly polemical, against Catholics and Protestants. Literary interests, once so popular at Byzantium, have long been quite secondary. Greek theologians re-edit continually the most fiery controversial treatises, accentuate the causes of separation between the two Churches, and on occasion invent others. Such, in the fifteenth century, are the writings of Maximus of Peloponnesus and George Scholarius; in the sixteenth century, of Maximus Margunius, Bishop of Cythera, and of Gabriel Severus, Archbishop of Philadelphia; in the seventeenth century of the Calvinist, Cyril Lucaris, of George Coresios, Theophilus Corydaleos, half pagan and half Protestant, Meletius Syrigos, Dorotheus of Jerusalem, Nicholas Kerameus of Janina, and Palsios Ligarides; in the eighteenth century the writings of the brothers Joannikios and Sophronius Lichoudes, who laboured especially in Russia, Chrysanthus of Jerusalem, Elias Miniates, Eustratios Argentis, etc. Apart from this truculent school, always fairly numerous among the Greeks, there are but few historians and chroniclers, e. g., Manuel Malaxos, who wrote a history of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 1458 to 1578; Dorotheus of Monembasia, who drew up a chronological table from the creation to 1629, and Meletius of Janina or of Athens (d. 1714), their only historian of note. The monks were the most conscientious workers and tireless editors: Nicodemus the Hagiographer, of amazing productivity; Agapios Landos, his rival; Eugenios Bulgaris, the most learned Greek of the eighteenth century; Eeonomos, Meletius Typaldos, Gregory of Chios, and many others.

There are few living theological writers of note in the Greek church. Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, who rediscovered and edited the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles", is the only one deserving of mention. It is no less strange than true, that within nearly a century only one manual of dog-

matic theology has appeared in Greek, a volume of about 450 pages published at Athens in 1907 by a layman, M. Androutsos—an index of the esteem that theology enjoys in the Greek Churches. They have, however, translations of Russian, German, or English works, and in this way Protestant ideas are creeping in. The same might be said of other branches of ecclesiastical knowledge. The only good manual of canon law is by a Servian bishop, Mgr. Milasch; the manuals of church history by an Athenian layman, Diomedes Kyriakos, and by Mgr. Philaretos, Metropolitan of Dimotika, are merely translations or adaptations of Protestant works. Among the laity there are some learned men, e. g., Spiridon Lambros, C. Sathas, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, and M. Gedeon. The clergy take no interest in theology, nor, as a rule, in anything intellectual. Politics and dull personal intrigues are their only concern. In this respect the coming generation will perhaps differ from their predecessors. Two reviews have been started: the "Nea Sion" (New Sion) at Jerusalem, and the "Church Beacon" at Alexandria, but both are carried on in a spirit of controversy, and the impartiality and scientific honesty of many of the editors are not above question. The Phanar review, "Ecclesiastical Truth", is only a church weekly.

I have not touched on the religious spirit of the Greek clergy, for as a rule it is sadly deficient; nor on its missions, for there are none; nor its present monastic life, confined to Athos and no more than a recitation of endless prayers interspersed with local intrigues. Other religious houses exist only in name; they are now, for the most part, farms managed by a so-called monk and supplying funds to Athos or elsewhere. Owing to the energy of the lay element, who take an active interest in education, there are many well-conducted primary schools. We have only praise for the efforts of both sexes to create and support works of charity and of benevolence. On this score the Greeks are inferior to no people.

SCHULSTRATE, *Acta orientalis ecclesie contra Lutheri hæresim* (Rome, 1739); FIEBLER, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in der orient. Kirche* (Berlin, 1862); RENAUDIN, *Luthériens et Grecs orthodoxes* (Paris, 1903); SERMOZ, *Les dernières années du patriarche Cyrille Lucar in Echos d'Orient* (Paris, 1903), 97-107; MANSI, *Conciliorum collectio*, XXXVII, 369-824; ARMON, *Monuments authentiques de la religion des Grecs et de la fausseté de plusieurs confessions de la foi des chrétiens orientaux* (The Hague, 1708); TRIVIER, *Cyrille Lucar* (Paris, 1877); OSVIANIKOV, *Cyril Lucaris and his Struggle with the Roman Catholic Propaganda in the East* (Russian, Novotcherkostk, 1903); WILLIAMS, *The Orthodox and the Non-Jurors* (London, 1868); KIMMEL, *Libri symbolici Ecclesie orientalis* (Jena, 1843); GASS, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche* (Berlin, 1872); MESOLARAS, *Συμβολικὴ τῆς ὀρθόδοξου ἐκκλησίας* (Athens, 1883); KATTENBUSCH, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde* (Freiburg im Br., 1892), I; MICHALCESCU, *Die Bekenntnisse und die wichtigsten Glaubenszeugnisse der griechisch-orientalischen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1904); MEYER, *Die theol. Literatur der griechischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1899); LEGRAND, *Bibliogr. hellénique aux XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1885-1903); IDEM, *Bibliogr. hellénique au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (5 vols., Paris, 1894-1903); VRETOIS, *Νεοελληνικὴ φιλολογία* (2 vols., Athens, 1854-7); SATHAS, *Νεοελληνικὴ φιλολογία* (Athens, 1868); DEMETRAPOULOS, *Ὁρθόδοξος Ἑλλάς* (Leipzig, 1868); ZARVIAS, *Ἡ Ἑλλάς* (Athens, 1872); CHASSIOTIS, *L'Instruction publique chez les Grecs* (Paris, 1881); MONTMASON, *Les œuvres de bienfaisance grecques à Constantinople in Echos d'Orient* (January, 1909); BRANDI, *De l'union des Eglises* (Rome, 1896); BAUBER, *Argumenta contra orientalem ecclesiam ejusque synodicam encyclicam* (Innsbruck, 1897); MALATRAKIS, *Réponse à la lettre patriarcale et synodale de l'église de Constantinople sur les divergences qui existent, les deux églises* (Constantinople, 1896); MEESTER, *Leon XIII e la Chiesa Greca* (Rome, 1904).

S. VALLEÉ.

**Greek Empire.** See BYZANTINE EMPIRE.

**Greek Orthodox Church in America.**—The name *Orthodox Church* is generally used to distinguish those of the Greek Rite who are not in communion with the Holy See. It is a name common to the official designation of both Churches of the Greek Rite, but the schismatic or dissenting Churches lay great stress upon the word *Orthodox*, and its implied meaning of correctness of doctrine, while the Uniat Churches lay equal emphasis upon the word *Catholic*.

Hence these divisions of the Greek Church are respectively called the "Greek Orthodox" and the "Greek Catholic" for convenience in designation. The Greek Orthodox Church is now well established in America, and nearly every city of considerable size has one or more churches of the various nationalities belonging to that communion. There is no unity among them nor any obedience to a central authority; they conform to the general usages and discipline of the Byzantine Rite, but look to their respective Holy Synods in their home countries for governing authority and direction. Seven nationalities have their churches here, using the Old Slavonic, the Greek, the Arabic, and the Rumanian as their liturgical languages; and of these the Russian is the oldest and best established.

**I. RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.**—The Russian Church has been established upon American (formerly Russian) territory for over a century. In this connexion the word *Russian* refers to *rossiysky* (of the Empire of Russia), and not *russky*, which may be translated either Russian or Ruthenian. In 1793 a band of eight missionary monks was sent out from St. Petersburg to Alaska, and the first Russian church was built on Kodiak Island in 1794. In 1798 the first missionary bishop, Joasaph, was consecrated. In 1804 the fort and city of New Archangel (now Sitka) was founded on the island of Sitka. In 1812 the Russians made a settlement in California; Russian Hill, in San Francisco, is still a reminder of them. In Alaska they converted many of the Eskimo and Indians, and the success of their missions was such that in 1840 the monk Ivan Veniaminoff was made the first bishop of "Kamchatka, the Kuriles and Aleutians", and took up his see at Sitka. In 1867, just before Alaska was sold to the United States, he was made Metropolitan of Moscow, and in Russia his advice was of great assistance in the negotiations for the transfer of Alaska. After him the title of the see was changed to "Aleutia and Alaska". In 1872 the see was changed from Sitka to San Francisco, and a Russian cathedral built there. The Russian bishops in America have been Paul (1867-70), John (1870-79), Nestor (1879-82), Vladimir (1883-91), Nicholas (1891-97), and Tikhon (1897-1907). In 1900 the title of the see was changed to "Aleutia and North America", and an assistant bishop was appointed for Alaska. In 1905 Bishop Tikhon changed his see from San Francisco to New York City, and in the year 1906 the Russian Holy Synod raised him to the dignity of archbishop with the suffragan Bishop of Alaska and a new Bishop of Brooklyn. In 1907 he was succeeded by the present Archbishop Platon, a former member of the Russian Duma.

Until within the last twelve years the Russian Church was hardly known in the United States, being wholly confined to its Pacific shores. In New York between 1870 and 1880 there was a Russian Orthodox chapel on Second Avenue, established by the Rev. Nicholas Bjerring, but it failed for lack of a congregation and support by the Russian authorities. Father Bjerring became a Catholic before his death. The first great impulse to the establishment of the Russian Church in the United States on a large scale was given in 1891, when the late Rev. Alexis Toth, then a Ruthenian Greek Catholic priest in Minneapolis, disobeyed the instructions of Archbishop Ireland and, when threatened with a recall to his native country, left his parish, went to San Francisco, turned Orthodox, and submitted to Bishop Nicholas, and on returning to Minneapolis took over his whole parish to the Russian Orthodox Church. He afterwards tried, in 1892, to take over the entire congregation and church property of St. Mary's Greek Catholic church in Scranton, Pennsylvania. The transfer of the church property was prevented by the courts, but over half the congregation seceded. Toth became an able and energetic advocate of the Russian Orthodox

Church among the Ruthenians of America, succeeded in arousing the Holy Governing Synod of Russia to the opportunity to spread Orthodoxy and Panslavism among the Ruthenians in America, and became a most bitter opponent of Catholicism. He was made a mitred protopriest for his efforts and is said to have been the cause of nearly 10,000 secessions from the Greek Catholic to the Russian Orthodox Church. In 1900 the whole Orthodox movement was put under the direction of the "Orthodox Missionary Society of All-Russia", which, together with the Holy Synod, supplies extensive funds and numerous priests for its development here. In 1902 a fine Russian cathedral (St. Nicholas) was built in New York City, and Russian churches have begun to spring up everywhere in the Atlantic States, particularly in Pennsylvania. Numerous priests and lower clergy were brought from Russia, a theological seminary opened in Minneapolis, a monastery in South Canaan, Pennsylvania, the rites of the Greek Church were celebrated with a magnificence and splendour before unknown in America, and the Church itself put on a solid basis. In 1908 the whole United States and Canada were divided into five great *blagochinnia*, or deaneries: New York, Pennsylvania, Pittsburg, the Western States, and Canada, each one having from ten to twenty churches, and there was besides the Diocese of Alaska. In March, 1909, the Russian Church adopted an elaborate Constitution (*Normalny Ustav*) of sixty-four paragraphs, defining the rights of clergy, laity, and parishes, thus creating a local canon law for the United States, subject to the Holy Synod in Russia. This is the more remarkable when there are but few Russians (from Russia) in the United States. The latest figures (1909) for the Russian Orthodox Church in America are: Russians, 7974; Galician Ruthenians, 11,045; Hungarian Ruthenians, 5820; Bukovinians, 4180; making a total of 29,019. Besides these there are in Alaska: Indians, 1891; Aleutians, 2149; Eskimo, 3666. The Orthodox Russian clergy (1909) consist of one archbishop, one bishop, 2 archimandrites, 2 protopriests, 2 hegumens, 15 monastic priests, 70 secular priests, 2 deacons, and 40 cantors. Three of these are in Canada, and fifteen in Alaska. They have 60 churches in the United States, 10 in Canada, and 17 churches and chapels in Alaska. They have a large church society very much like the Ruthenian ones, the "Pravoslavnoe Obshchestvo Vzaimopomoshchi" (Orthodox Mutual Aid Society), with 133 brotherhoods and 3950 members. Two church journals are published, "Amerikansky Pravoslavny Vestnik" (American Orthodox Messenger), in Great Russian, and "Svit" (Light), in Ruthenian. Their tone is bitter towards Greek Catholics and in many Uniat parishes they excite dissension.

II. GREEK HELLENIC ORTHODOX CHURCH.—Greek immigration was confined to the hundreds until 1890; the immigration figures for 1905-08 are: Greece, 77,607; Turkey, 19,032. The first Greek church (Holy Trinity) was opened in New York City in 1891 by Rev. P. Ferentinos from Greece. Subsequently the new church on East 72nd Street was acquired, in which they have erected one of the finest Greek interiors—the altar, iconostasis and throne being of Pentelic marble. The Greeks have begun to build fine churches. There are (1909) about 130,000 Greeks in the United States, chiefly in the Eastern and Middle States, and they publish eighteen newspapers, including two dailies. They have 32 churches in the United States and 2 in Canada, some—like Holy Trinity of Lowell, Mass., and Holy Trinity of New York City—of considerable importance. Their clergy consist of 7 archimandrites, 3 monks, and 25 secular priests, but the churches are in the main governed by the lay trustees and particularly by the president of the board. Of these Greek clergy, 15 are subject to the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and 20

to the Holy Synod of Athens. This circumstance and the fact that a part of the Greeks come from the Turkish Empire and the other part from the Kingdom of Greece have given rise to many dissensions and prevented the nomination of a Greek bishop for the United States, neither the patriarch nor the Synod wishing to cede such an appointment to the other. On the other hand, they both decline to admit or recognize the authority of the Russian bishops here.

III. SYRO-ARABIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.—These are Syrians of the schismatic Greek Rite who use the Arabic language in their liturgy. They are nearly all from the Patriarchate of Antioch, which just now is quasi-schismatic towards Constantinople but closely affiliated with Russia. They of course began to immigrate to the United States at the time that the other Syrians, Melchites, and Maronites, came. The Russians have greatly assisted them in building churches and establishing missions here, and their bishop, Raphael of Brooklyn, is a Syrian educated in Russia. The first Syro-Arabian church (St. Nicholas) was built in Brooklyn in 1902, and has since become their cathedral church. Their clergy consist of the Syro-Arabian bishop and twelve priests, of whom three are monks. They have (1909) churches in the following localities: Brooklyn and Glens Falls, New York; Boston, Worcester, and Lawrence, Massachusetts; Pittsburg, Johnstown, and Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Kearney, Nebraska; Beaumont, Texas. There are said to be about 50,000 Orthodox Syrians in the United States, but they are quite scattered. They have frequent dissensions with their fellow-Syrians, the Melchites and Maronites, who are Uniats. They publish two Arabic newspapers in the interest of the Orthodox Church, and have a number of societies in New York and elsewhere.

IV. SERVIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.—This is composed of immigrants from Servia, Dalmatia, Hungary, and Montenegro. They all speak that southern Slavic language, the Servian, which is identical with the Croatian, except that it is written in the Russian alphabet to which are added two or three letters unknown to Russian, whilst the Croatian (used by the Roman Catholics) is written with Roman letters. The Russian, the Servian, and the Bulgarian Churches use the Old Slavonic language in the Mass and church offices. The Servians are mainly in Pennsylvania and the West, and the first church was built by the Archimandrite Sebastian Dabovitch in Jackson, Cal. (1894). The Servian Orthodox Church is closely affiliated to the Russian Church in this country, except that some of their churches do not recognize the jurisdiction or authority of the Russian archbishop. There are about 70,000 or 80,000 Servians in the United States, from Pennsylvania to California, Wyoming, and Washington. Their clergy consist of one archimandrite, five monks, and four secular priests, and they have churches in Chicago, Illinois; Pittsburg, McKeesport, Wilmerding, Steelton, and Johnstown, Pennsylvania; Kansas City, Kansas; Denver, Colorado; Jackson and Los Angeles, California; Butte, Montana; St. Louis, Missouri. They also publish three Servian papers, and have several church societies, the chief one "Srbo-brar".

V. RUMANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.—About half the Orthodox Rumanians in the United States come from Rumania and half from Transylvania in Hungary. Their immigration has been all within the past decade, both in the United States and in Canada. They are also under divided jurisdiction, those from Rumania being under the Holy Synod of Rumania and those from Transylvania under the Metropolitan of Hermannstadt. There are about 30,000 Orthodox Rumanians at the present time (1909) in America, including Canada. Their first church was St. Mary's, built in 1907 at Cleveland, Ohio. They have, besides several missionary stations, five churches situated at the

following places: Indiana Harbor, Illinois; Cleveland and Youngstown, Ohio; Sawyer, North Dakota; Regina, Canada. Of their clergy—one archimandrite and four secular priests—three are from Transylvania and two from Rumania. It is a noticeable fact that these two branches of the Greek Rite, Catholic and Orthodox, have harmonious relations and attend all Rumanian celebrations together, where matters of their race and language are concerned.

VI. BULGARIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.—Bulgarian immigration into the United States has only recently been in any considerable numbers. While the majority come from the Kingdom of Bulgaria, a great many are also from Macedonia, in Turkey. They dislike the Greeks very much, and while the Turkish contingent of them is nominally under the Patriarch of Constantinople, they recognize only the Exarch of Bulgaria. Neither will they affiliate with the Russian Church authorities here. While there are considerable numbers in New York City, yet they have settled chiefly in Illinois and Missouri, and are scattered also farther westward. The first Bulgarian Church (Sts. Cyril and Methodius) was built in 1908 by the Bulgarian monk Theophylact at Granite City, Illinois. There is also another one near St. Louis, Missouri, and one is being built at Madison, Illinois, while there are several mission stations. There are about 20,000 Bulgarians and three priests in this country. They publish two papers in their language and have several church societies, but have no national organization.

VII. ALBANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.—The Albanians use the Greek language in their liturgy, there having been no version into their very difficult tongue. They come from Albania in the southern Balkans and from Epirus and northern Greece. They are also known as Arnauts and call themselves in their own language *skipetar*, "mountaineers" (see ALBANIA). They are, of course, the same race which formerly emigrated into Italy, and whose descendants now form the majority of the Italian Greek Catholics. Albanian immigration to America has been quite recent, but there are now some 15,000 here, mostly settled in the vicinity of New York City and in New England. Although they use the Greek language in their liturgy and have attended the Hellenic Orthodox Church, they have no love for the Greeks. In February, 1908, the Russian Archbishop of Aleutia and North America ordained the Rev. F. S. Noli, a young Albanian, in New York City as an Orthodox priest and established him as missionary for his people in the United States. The Russian Holy Synod has taken steps on his initiative towards translating the Greek Liturgy into Albanian. They have a small chapel in Brooklyn and missions in New England, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. Endeavours have been made by them to attract the Italo-Greeks from their Uniat rite, on the ground of their being also of the Albanian race in America.

*Pravoslavny Kalendar* (New York, 1903-09); MATROSOFF, *Zaokanskaya Rus in Istoriichesky Vestnik*, LXVII (St. Petersburg, 1897); *Svil and Pravoslavny Vestnik* (New York, 1902-09); *Ελληνο-Αλβανικαίς Ομιλίαις* (New York, 1909); *Calendarul Zărilor Romanul* (Cleveland, 1909); *The Messenger*, XLII (New York, 1904), for December; *Echos d'Orient*, VII (Paris, 1904), for May and July.

ANDREW J. SHIPMAN.

**Greek Rites.**—(1) *Rite, Language, Religion.*—These are three things that must always be distinguished. A *rite* is a certain uniform arrangement of formulæ and ceremonies used for the Holy Eucharist, the Canonical Hours, the administration of other sacraments and sacramentals. These offices, as far as we know, have never been performed in the same way throughout Christendom. There are now, apparently there always have been, different rites, equally legitimate, used in different places both by Catholics and other Christians. Obviously each rite was originally composed in some language. But rite is not language; the vari-

ous rites cannot be classified according to their languages. There are many different rites in the same language; on the other hand the same rite, remaining the same in every detail, is constantly translated. Thus, in the West, the Roman and Gallican Uses are both written in Latin, but they are completely different rites. The Roman Rite is used in Dalmatia in an Old Slavonic version (written in Glagolitic letters), occasionally in Greek in Italy; but in any language it is always the Roman Rite. In the East this want of correspondence between rite and language is still more remarkable. Except those of the Armenians, Nestorians, and Abyssinians, all Eastern liturgies were originally written in Greek. Even the exceptions are only modified derivations from Greek originals. If, then, we take the language in which a rite was originally composed as our test, we must describe all Eastern liturgies as Greek. Indeed, the two great Western parent rites (of Rome and Gaul) represent, as a matter of fact, modified developments from Greek originals too. So we should come to the conclusion that every rite in the Church, every historic liturgy in Christendom is a Greek Rite. If, on the other hand, we make our test present use in the Greek language, we must separate the Byzantine Liturgy said in Greek at Constantinople from what is word for word the same service said in Old Slavonic at St. Petersburg. It is clear then that language is no clue as to rite. At the head of all Eastern liturgies, foundations of two great classes, are the Liturgies of Alexandria and Antioch. They are not only different rites, their difference underlies the fundamental distinction by which we divide all others into two main groups; and both are Greek. And the same Byzantine Liturgy is used unchanged in about fourteen different languages. A second false criterion that must be eliminated is that of *religion*. It would be convenient for classification if members of each Church used the same rite, different from that of any other Church. But this is by no means the case. The historic origin and legal position of the various rites is a much more complicated question. Catholics, joined of course entirely by the same faith, obeying the same laws (though in details there are different laws for different branches of the Church), united visibly to the same great hierarchy under the supreme rule of the pope at Rome, are divided according to rite, so that every Eastern liturgy is used by some of them. The same liturgies (but for a few modifications made by the Roman authorities in the interest of dogma) are shared by the various schismatical Churches. Indeed, Catholics and Schismatics often use the same books. The Orthodox Church, that has for many centuries aimed at an ideal of uniformity in the Byzantine Rite (in different languages), till the thirteenth century used those of Alexandria and Antioch too. Now she has restored the Antiochene Liturgy for certain rare occasions, and there are signs that the Alexandrine Rite may soon be restored too. Other schismatical bodies have, it is true, each its own rite, though this rite generally contains alternative liturgies. It will be seen then that these three points are three quite different questions that must not be confused. In the case of any Christian bishop or priest we may ask: what is his Church or sect, what rite does he use and in what language? And the answers may represent all kinds of combinations. A Catholic may use the Roman Rite in Old Slavonic, the Alexandrine Rite in Coptic, the Byzantine in Georgian. An Orthodox priest may use the Byzantine Rite in Arabic or Japanese.

(2) *The Essential Note of a Rite.*—We have seen then that neither its language nor the sect of people who use it can be taken as essential to a rite. The real note that defines it is the *place* where it was composed. All rites had their origin in some one place or city that was an ecclesiastical centre for the country round. After the service had been put together and used here,

by a natural process of imitation churches around began to copy the order observed in the great town. The greater the influence of the city where the rite arose, the more widely the rite spread. It was not a question of inherent advantages. No one thought of choosing the rite that seemed most edifying or beautiful or suitable. People simply copied their chief. The rites were formed at first in the patriarchal cities: Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople. Jerusalem had already given hers to Antioch. The bishops of each patriarchate naturally thought that they could not do better than celebrate the holy mysteries in the same way as their patriarch. We know in the West how, long before there were any laws on the subject, every one began to copy what was done at Rome. It seemed safest to follow Rome in the matter. The Frankish Church in the eighth century gave up the Gallican Rite, and adopted that of the patriarchal see. The "*Liber sacramentorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ*" spread throughout Western Europe till it had displaced all other uses, except in one or two remote districts. We see the same tendency at work still—uniformity in accordance with Roman customs, even in such details as the shape of vestments and the pronunciation of Latin. So it was in the East with regard to their patriarchal sees. Local customs are gradually suppressed in favour of the patriarch's way of doing things. Schisms and heresies accentuate this uniformity among Catholics. It was a sign of adherence to the Catholic centre—Alexandria, Constantinople, or whichever it might be—to agree entirely with it in rite. Lastly come laws determining this tendency; and so we have the principle that (with exceptions) obtains still throughout Christendom, namely: "Rite follows Patriarchate". The Roman Rite is used throughout the Roman patriarchate, by the clergy subject to the pope as their patriarch, and only by them; the Alexandrine Rite belongs to Egypt—where the patriarch of Alexandria has jurisdiction; that of Antioch to Syria; that of Constantinople to the Byzantine territory. The National Nestorian (East-Syrian) and Armenian patriarchates have their own rites. Such was the principle for many centuries everywhere. Except for the two remnants of other Western rites at Milan and Toledo, it may still be taken as a fairly safe one in the Catholic Church; and among all Eastern sects, except the Orthodox. Since the thirteenth century, however, the Orthodox, regardless of the older tradition, use the Byzantine Rite everywhere, even in their Alexandrine, Antiochene, and Jerusalem patriarchates. In their case, then, the principle cannot be applied. But the exception is rather apparent than real. This spread of the use of the Rite of Constantinople meant an assertion of that patriarch's jurisdiction throughout the Orthodox Church. In this case, too, rite really followed patriarchate; the disappearance of the Liturgies of Alexandria and Antioch among the Orthodox meant, as was intended, the practical disappearance of any real authority in those places save that of the prelate who nearly succeeded in justifying his pompous title of Ecumenical Patriarch. Now that his attempt has failed, and the other patriarchs are becoming more and more conscious of their independence of him, there are signs of a near restoration of their own liturgies, to be used, as before, where their jurisdiction extends.

But a rite in spreading out from the patriarchal city where it was composed does not itself change. Since the invention of printing, especially, and the later tendency to stereotype every detail of the sacred functions, each rite, wherever used, is made to conform rigidly with its standard form as used in the central church. The Liturgy of Jerusalem-Antioch contains, as the first member of its Great Intercession, a prayer for "the holy and glorious Sion, mother of all Churches", plainly a local touch intended originally for use in Jerusalem, where the rite was written

(Brightman, "*Eastern Liturgies*", 54, 90). The Alexandrine Rite, even if used in far countries, makes the priest pray that God may "draw up the waters of the river to their proper measure" (op. cit., 127, 167)—a local allusion to the flood of the Nile on which fertility in Egypt depends. And the Roman Rite, too, used in every continent, still contains unmistakable evidence that it was composed for use in that one city. The lists of saints ("*Communicantes*" and "*Nobis quoque*") contain the Apostles and then local Roman saints, or those, like St. Cyprian, specially honoured at Rome; the Calendar with its Rogation and ember-days supposes the Italian climate; the special heroes of Rome, as St. Laurence, are those that have the oldest great feasts. Of course Rome, like all Churches, honours the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, the Baptist, St. Stephen, the ecumenical saints of Christendom. After them she naturally honours first her own saints, whose relics hallow her basilicas. The stations at the Roman basilicas affect her year throughout; and on the feast of the Princes of the Apostles she remembers specially "happy Rome purple with their glorious blood". From all this, then, it is clear that the real distinction of rites is not by language nor by the religion of those who may use them, but according to the places where they were composed. The correct and scientific way of describing any rite, therefore, is always by the name of a place. Thus we have the Roman and Gallican Rites in the West; in the East the Rites of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, etc. This is the really essential note of any rite, that it keeps even when translated into other languages.

(3) *What is a Greek Rite?*—An obvious corollary of what has been said is that we had much better never speak of a "Greek Rite" at all. Like the cognate expression "Greek Church" it is a confused and unscientific term, the use of which argues that the speaker has a mistaken conception of the subject. What is called a Greek Rite will always be the rite of some city—Alexandria or Constantinople, and so on. If one wishes to emphasize the fact that the Greek language is used for it, that statement may be added. At Athens and Constantinople they use the Byzantine Liturgy; it may be worth while to add that they use it in Greek, since at St. Petersburg and Sofia they follow exactly the same rite in Old Slavonic. When people further distinguish "pure Greek" and "Græco-Arabic", "Græco-Slavonic" Rites, the confusion is greater than ever. By these last terms they mean rites translated into Arabic and Slavonic out of the Greek. Now, the evidence on the whole tends to show that every ancient rite in Christendom was first used in the Greek language; those of the Copts, Syrians, and Romans certainly were. So that if one calls the Russian service "Græco-Slavonic", one may just as well describe the pope's Mass as "Græco-Latin". It would then be enormously to the advantage of clear ideas if people would stop using this expression and would describe each rite by the name of its place of origin. The name *Greek Rites*, however, still too commonly used, applies to the three classical Eastern uses whose original forms in Greek are still extant. These are the parent rites of Alexandria and Antioch and the widely spread Byzantine Rite. The Alexandrine Liturgy, ascribed to St. Mark, is no longer said in Greek anywhere. It is the source of the Coptic and Abyssinian Rites. The Greek text, which was used by the Orthodox of Egypt down to the thirteenth century, will be found in Brightman's "*Eastern Liturgies*", 113-143; an English translation of the Coptic form follows, 144-188; the Abyssinian Liturgy, 194-244. For a further account see ALEXANDRINE LITURGY. The other parent rite of Antioch stands at the head of a very great family of liturgies. In the original Greek it is represented in two obviously cognate forms, that of the eighth book of the "*Apostolic Constitutions*" (Brightman, op. cit., 3-27; compare the fragments of the liturgy in the



second book, ib., 28-30), and the Liturgy of St. James (ib., 31-68). Its place of origin was not Antioch but Jerusalem. Till the thirteenth century, the Liturgy of St. James was used throughout both patriarchates. It still survives in Greek among the Orthodox for two occasions in the year, on St. James's feast (23 Oct.) at Zacynthus (Zante) and on 31 Dec. at Jerusalem. Translated into Syriac it is used by the Jacobites and Syrian Uniates (text in English in Brightman, 69-110); with further (Romanizing) modifications it forms the Maronite Rite (a Latin version has been edited by Prince Max of Saxony: "Missa Syro-Maronica", Ratisbon, 1907). The Chaldean Rite, used by Nestorians and Uniat Chaldees (Brightman, 247-305), appears also to be derived, if remotely, from St. James's Liturgy. The Byzantine Use is further derived from this, and the Armenian Liturgy from that of the Byzantines. So, except for the services of Egypt and her daughter-Church of Abyssinia, the Greek Liturgy of St. James stands at the head of all Eastern rites (see article ANTIOCHENE RITE).

People who speak of the Greek Rite generally mean that of Constantinople. The name is an unfortunate example of false analogy. We have all learnt in school of Greek and Roman history, Greek and Roman classics and architecture, and we know the Roman Rite. It is tempting to balance it with a Greek Rite, just as Homer balances Virgil. How different the real situation is this article shows. The Byzantine Rite, to which should always be given its own name, is the most wide-spread in Christendom after that of Rome. It was formed first in Cappadocia, then at Constantinople, by a gradual process of development from that of Antioch. The names of St. Basil (d. 379) and St. John Chrysostom (d. 407) are, not altogether wrongly, attached to the chief periods of this development. From Constantinople the rite then spread throughout by far the greater part of Eastern Christendom. As the power of the patriarchs of the imperial city grew, so did they gradually succeed in imposing their use on all bishops in communion with them. Now, except for the two insignificant exceptions noted above, the Byzantine Rite is used throughout the Orthodox Church. It seems that this abuse will not last much longer. Since the authority of the oecumenical patriarch outside of his own patriarchate has already come to an end, we may live to see the old rites restored in Egypt and Syria, according to the traditional principle that rite follows patriarchate. The Use of Constantinople is also followed by a great number of Catholic Uniates, Melchites in Syria and Egypt and others in the Balkans, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Italy, etc. These people represent the old Patriarchate of Constantinople in the Catholic Church; but that Church has never, like her Orthodox rival, set up a principle of uniformity in rite. There are, besides the Latins, Uniates of every rite. The text of the Byzantine Liturgy in Greek will be found in Brightman, 309-411. It is also used, translated into many languages. The older classical versions are Arabic and Old Slavonic (Syriac is no longer used, Georgian only by a handful of Uniates). Then come Rumanian and a number of modern languages used chiefly by Russian missionaries in Siberia, China, Japan, and America (list in Brightman, pp. lxxxi-lxxxii). Uniates recognize as liturgical languages for this rite only Greek, Arabic, Old Slavonic, and Georgian. It is these versions of the Byzantine Rite that people mean when they speak of "mixed Greek" rites. There are no changes of any importance in them. The Old Slavonic books contain some local feasts, and a few quite insignificant variants of the text; the same applies to the Arabic versions. Otherwise they are mere translations. The student of this rite (except in the case of very specialized study) should always turn to the Greek original. For further description see CONSTANTINOPLE, THE RITE OF.

For bibliography see ALEXANDRINE LITURGY; ANTIOCHENE LITURGY; CONSTANTINOPLE, THE RITE OF. See also CHARON, *Le Rite Byzantin dans les Patriarchats Melchites, extrait des Xpovotopuiká* (Rome, Propaganda, 1908); SOKOLOV, *Darstellung des Gottesdienstes der orth.-kath. Kirche des Morgenlandes* (Berlin, 1893); ENGDARL, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Byzantinischen Liturgie* (Berlin, 1908, the Greek text and a Latin version of the liturgy from a manuscript in the Grand-ducal Library at Baden, probably of the fifteenth century); PRINCE MAX OF SAXONY, *Ritus Missæ Ecclesiarum Orientalium S. Rom. Eccl. unitarum* (Ratisbon, 1907—), i. e. Latin versions of Uniat liturgies.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

**Green, Hugh**, martyr; b. about 1584; martyred 19 August, 1642. His parents, who were Protestants, sent him to Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he took his degree in 1605, but was afterwards converted and entered Douai College in 1610. He left again in 1612 to try his vocation among the Capuchins. From want of health or some other cause, he was unable to continue, and became a chaplain at Chideock Castle, Dorsetshire, the home of Lady Arundell of Lanherne. On 8 March, 1641, Charles I. to placate the Puritan Parliament, issued a proclamation banishing all priests from England, and Green resolved to obey this order. Unfortunately the news had been late in reaching him, and when he embarked the month of grace given for departure was just over. He was therefore arrested, tried, and condemned to death in August. In prison his constancy so affected his fellow-captives that two or three women sentenced to die with him sent him word that they would ask his absolution before death. They did so after confessing their sins to the people, and were absolved by the martyr. A providential reward for his zeal immediately followed. A Jesuit Father, despite the danger, rode up in disguise on horseback, and at a given sign absolved the martyr, who made a noble confession of faith before death. As the executioner was quite unskilled, he could not find the martyr's heart, and the butchery with appalling cruelty was prolonged for nearly half an hour. After this the Puritans played football with his head, a barbarity happily not repeated in the history of the English martyrs.

CHALLONER, *Missionary Priests* (1874), II, 113; DE MARSSY, *Persécution présente des Catholiques en Angleterre* (1846), II, 86-93.

J. H. POLLEN.

**Green, Thomas Louis**, priest and controversialist; b. at Stourbridge, Worcestershire, 1799; d. at Newport, Shropshire, 27 Feb., 1883. He was the son of Francis Green of Solihull Lodge, Warwickshire, and as a boy was entrusted to the care of Bishop Milner, by whom he was sent to Sedgley Park School, and afterwards in 1813 to Oscott. Having completed his theological studies there, he was ordained priest in Feb., 1825, and remained at the college as procurator. In 1828 he succeeded the Rev. J. McDonnell at Norwich, where he became known as a controversialist. Challenged to a public disputation, Green declined on the ground that no real good would be effected, but harm would arise owing to the excited and prejudiced feelings prevalent. He, however, undertook to meet all charges in a course of sermons, which he did successfully. After two years he went to Tixall, Staffordshire, as chaplain to Sir Clifford Constable, Baronet, and while there was engaged in a controversy with the Anglican clergyman, in which he strove, though fruitlessly, to have the Anglican burial service omitted in cases of the interment of Catholics in the parish churchyard. In 1846 he went back to Oscott as prefect of discipline, a post which he held for two years before becoming chaplain to St. Mary's Priory, Princethorpe, near Coventry. He was priest at Mawley, Shropshire, in 1858, and at Madeley, Shropshire, in 1859, while in 1860 he became chaplain to Lord Acton at Aldenham Park, near Bridgnorth, Shropshire, where he remained for the rest of his active life. In 1868 Pius IX granted him the honorary degree of

Doctor of Divinity in recognition of his services. He retired shortly before he died to Salter's Hall, Newport, Shropshire.

His works were: "A series of Discourses on the principal controverted points of Catholic Doctrine delivered at . . . Norwich" (Norwich, 1830), reprinted under the title "Argumentative Discourses" in 1837; "A Correspondence between the Protestant Rector of Tixall and the Catholic Chaplain of Sir Clifford Constable" (Stafford, 1834); "A Letter addressed to Rev. Clement Leigh" (London, 1836); "The Truth, the Whole Truth, and Nothing but the Truth" (London, 1838); "The Secular Clergy Fund of the late Midland District" (London, 1853, privately printed); "Rome, Purgatory, Indulgences, Idolatry, etc." (Bridgnorth, 1863); "Indulgences, Sacramental Absolutions and Tax Tables of the Roman Chancery and Penitentiary considered in reply to the charge of Venality" (London, 1872, 1880). He also contributed to the "Orthodox Journal", "Catholic Magazine" and "True Tablet".

*The Oscotian*, new series, III, 48; *GILLow, Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.

EDWIN BURTON.

**Green Bay, DIOCESE OF (SINUS VIRIDIS)**, established 3 March, 1868, from the territory of the Diocese of Milwaukee, comprises sixteen counties of the State of Wisconsin, U.S.A.: Brown, Calumet, Door, Florence, Forest, Kewaunee, Langlade, Manitowoc, Marinette, Oconto, Outagamie, Portage, Shawano, Waupaca, Waushara, and Winnebago; an area of 15,387 square miles.

At that time there were in this district thirty-one churches and forty-two stations, with thirty-one priests and fifty-five ecclesiastical students; eleven parish schools and seven convents of the Sisters of Notre Dame, the Ursulines, Sisters of St. Agnes, the Third Order of St. Dominic, and the Third Order of St. Francis, with a Catholic population of about 50,000. It was mixed Irish-American, German, Belgian, and Dutch, with a few Indians. Poles and Bohemians are now to be added to this classification.

**BISHOPS.**—(1) JOSEPH MELCHER was appointed the first bishop, and consecrated at St. Louis, Missouri, 12 July, 1868. In 1855 he had been appointed Bishop of the proposed See of Quincy, Illinois, but declined the appointment. The See of Quincy was soon after suppressed and the title transferred to Alton. Bishop Melcher was born 19 March, 1806, at Vienna, Austria, and ordained priest at Modena, Italy, 12 March, 1830. He died at Green Bay, 20 Dec., 1873.

(2) FRANCIS XAVIER KRAUTBAUER, second bishop, was consecrated 29 June, 1875, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A native of Bruck, Bavaria, where he was born 12 January, 1824, he was ordained priest 16 July, 1850, at Ratisbon. He died suddenly 17 December, 1885, at Green Bay.

(3) FREDERIC XAVIER KATZER, third bishop, had been vicar-general of the diocese. He was born 7 February, 1844, at Ebensee, Upper Austria, and in the last year of his collegiate course at Friedberg he volunteered for the American mission. Arriving in the United States in May, 1864, he entered the Salesianum at St. Francis, near Milwaukee, where he completed his theological course and was ordained priest, December, 1866. He taught in the Milwaukee Seminary until 1875, when Bishop Krautbauer made him his secretary, and three years later vicar-general of Green Bay. On 30 January, 1891, he was promoted archbishop and transferred to Milwaukee, where he died 20 July, 1903.

(4) SEBASTIAN GEBHARD MESSMER, fourth bishop, was consecrated at Newark, New Jersey, 27 March, 1892. He was born 29 August, 1847, at St. Gall, Switzerland, and ordained priest 23 July, 1871, at Innsbruck, Austria. He was professor of theology at Seton Hall College, New Jersey, from 1871 to 1889,

and was professor of canon law at the Catholic University, Washington, when chosen bishop. He was promoted to the Archbishopric of Milwaukee, 28 November, 1903.

(5) JOSEPH J. FOX, fifth bishop, was consecrated 25 July, 1904. He was born in Green Bay, 2 August, 1855, and made his theological studies at Louvain. He was ordained priest 7 June, 1870, and served as secretary to Bishop Krautbauer, vicar-general of the diocese, and pastor of Mariette, before he was appointed bishop, 27 May, 1904.

The religious communities located in the diocese are:—Men:—Capuchins, Franciscans, Premonstratensians, Fathers of the Society of the Divine Saviour, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and the Alexian Brothers. Women:—Sisters of St. Agnes, Sisters of St. Dominic, Felicians, Third Order of St. Dominic, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of Christian Charity, Hospital Sisters of St. Francis, Little Sisters of the Poor, Sisters of Mercy, Polish Sisters of St. Joseph, School Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of Our Lady of Christ, Sisters of Misericorde, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother, Sisters of the Society of the Divine Saviour, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis.

**STATISTICS.**—202 priests (47 regulars), 25 ecclesiastical students, 54 brothers, 45 churches, 65 missions, 3 stations, 3 chapels, 104 parish schools (16,482 pupils), 1 academy (95 pupils), 2 colleges (109 students), 1 Indian school (224 pupils), 1 orphan asylum (227 inmates), 1 industrial and reform school (66 inmates), 1 infant home and asylum (50 inmates), 17,418 young people under Catholic care, 8 hospitals, Catholic population 135,000.

*Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1909); *Catholic Home Almanac* (New York, 1892); *Reuss, Bgg. Encycl. Cath. Hierarchy U.S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Citizen* (Milwaukee), files.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Greenland.**—An island stretching from within the Arctic Circle south to about 59 degrees N. latitude, between 20 degrees and 75 degrees W. longitude. In shape it more or less resembles a triangle, its apex pointing south, its base facing north, in which direction its extent has not been precisely ascertained. It is bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean; on the west, by Smith Sound, Baffin's Bay, and Davis Strait; on the east by the Arctic and the Atlantic Oceans. Its area has been estimated at about 512,000 square miles. The interior of this huge island is a plateau rising gradually towards the east, above which a few mountain peaks tower to a height of more than 13,100 feet. Immense fields of ice, varying in thickness, are lodged on the island, and, on the coast here and there, form steep walls launching mighty glaciers towards the ocean, where, caught by the currents, they drift southwards. These ice-fields and the continually moving masses of ice, which are diminished only in the month of July, constitute the main difficulty in approaching the coast, which is indented with numerous fiords and lined with small islands. The mineralogical composition of Greenland is varied and comprises granite, sandstone, syenite, porphyry, and some brown coal, tin, and iron. Ivigtut is the only locality outside of Siberia which is known to produce the mineral kryolite (or kryolith) used in the manufacture of aluminium. The valleys in the south-west, traversed by rivers, and the hills facing towards the south-west, are the only sections of the country where vegetation finds a soil to nourish it, hence, as well as by reason of the severity of the long winters, the flora is comparatively insignificant. In the north the only vegetation consists of lichens and mosses, in the milder regions of the south berries and various dwarfed plants are met with, while the most sheltered localities produce willow, alder, and birch trees, which, however, seldom

attain the height of twelve to fifteen feet. Farming is not to be thought of; even the hardy potato yields only here and there a small return. On the other hand, some vegetables, especially lettuce and cabbage, thrive comparatively well. The dog is the only domesticated animal. Chickens, sheep, goats, and horned cattle are bred only occasionally. For game there are the reindeer, moose, and arctic hare, besides numberless bears and foxes which are constantly hunted for their valuable skins. Numerous species of birds furnish the inhabitants with food—the flesh of the ptarmigan and the eggs of the sea gull—while the eider duck yields its down. Whaling, seal-hunting, and fishing are of vital importance. Navigation on any considerable scale is possible only during the summer. Communication between the different settlements is maintained by means of the *umiak*, a boat made of sealskin, generally about thirty feet in length. For hunting and fishing the Greenlanders use the *knjak*, a boat propelled by means of paddles. The staple exports of Greenland are whale-oil, the skins of seals, bears, and foxes, eiderdown, and kryolith, all amounting to about 500,000 *kronen*. The value of the imports—coal, foodstuffs, and articles of common use—is about double that of the exports.

The original inhabitants of Greenland, the Eskimos, belong to the Mongolian race and are for the most part at least nominal Christians, under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Zealand. A number of the inhabitants residing on the east coast are still pagans. The creed of the latter shows pantheistic tendencies, and the exercise of their religion consists in certain forms of prayer and curious ceremonies. Without any clear conception of their responsibility to a supreme being they have, nevertheless, rude notions of heaven and hell. Their priests are at the same time teachers, judges, and doctors. Naturally amiable, though somewhat irascible and vindictive, and careless of cleanliness, the Christian Eskimos need constant guidance to prevent their relapsing into the general disregard for morality, which formerly obtained among them. The lords of the land are some 300 Danes. Politically, the country is divided into the North and South Inspectorates. The most notable settlements are: Godthaab, Neuherrenhut, Christianshaab, Jakobshavn, Fredrikshaab, Claushavn, Fiskerinas, Sukkertoppen, Ritenbenk, Sydby, Nosoak, Holstenborg, Egedeminde, Upernivik.

**HISTORY.**—Greenland can hardly be said to possess any political history as the small number of its inhabitants precluded its exerting any influence on the destiny of other countries. Although many historians claim that the Norse colony, which flourished there during the Middle Ages, was destroyed by the Skrælings (Eskimos), proof is wanting, and, considering the pacific character of the Eskimos, it is more probable that the colonists, relatively few in number, lost their identity by intermarriage with the aborigines. It is, however, an established fact that the Eskimos were in Greenland (at least transiently) at the time the Norseman Gunnbjörn set foot on the island and when Eric the Red of Iceland settled there (983). Eric gave the island its name. In the "Is-lendingabok", written about a century later by Are Fróthi, it is stated that there were found on the island numerous deserted huts, parts of boats, and various stone implements such as are in use even unto this day in the north-east and the west around Disko Bay and the Umanak Fiord. Erik named his first settlement (the site is unknown) Brattahlid. Kinsmen and friends soon joined him, and in a short time the Norse population grew considerably. With Christianity a higher civilization entered the island. When Norway took possession of Greenland there were more than three hundred farms, supporting a population of over three thousand, partly in Ostrabygd, partly in Westrabygd (both places on the western coast). The

means of subsistence were practically the same as those of to-day, except that cattle-raising was more general.

Greenland was considered a possession of the Norwegian Crown as late as the time of the Union of Kalmar (see Styffe, *Skandinavien under Unionstiden*, II, Stockholm, 1889, p. 355). The continued disturbances in the Scandinavian kingdoms caused these remote colonies to be forgotten. Eventually, all relations between the Norse settlers and their mother country ceased, and Greenland kept only a shadowy existence in the European geographies. Tradition had it that the island was rich in game (reindeer, polar bears, saibles, marten, fish, and certain "monsters"—perhaps walrus), and that it abounded in marble, crystals, and so on. Its inhabitants were, unhappily, lost to Christianity. The efforts of Archbishop Walkendorf of Trondhjem, to assist the lost Norse brethren, ended in failure. A general permission to settle there, granted by King Christian III, was also fruitless; the perils of the sea journey deterred his subjects. The honour of having practically rediscovered Greenland belongs to the English. Commissioned by Queen Elizabeth, Frobisher made several voyages northwards, between 1576 and 1578, and at last succeeded in reaching his goal. The work begun by him was continued by his countryman, Davis. The Danish Kings, who, as sovereigns of Norway, claimed Greenland, also sent expeditions there, the most successful of which was that of Dannels (1652-54). In the beginning of the eighteenth century the settlement and Christianization of Greenland recommenced. Factories were erected in Christianshaab (1734), Jacobshavn (1741) and Fredrikshaab (1742). Commerce was developed partly by individuals (e. g. the merchant Severin, 1734) and partly by commercial companies (*allmindeligt Handelskompagni*, 1774). Since then the Government itself has assumed control of the Greenland trade. In addition to the settlements established by the Government, the Moravian Brethren have founded several stations. The eastern coast of Greenland was not properly explored and described until the nineteenth century—by Scoresby (1822), Clavering (1823), Graah (1829), the German expedition (1869), and the Danish expedition (1883-85).

The church history of Greenland naturally divides itself into two periods: the Catholic period, from about 1000 to 1450, and the Protestant period, since 1721. Leif the Happy (Hepni), son of Erik the Red, visited Norway in 990, where he was won over to Christianity by King Olaf Trygvesson, who sent some missionaries to accompany him to his country. In a remarkably short time these missionaries succeeded in converting the Norse colonists, at least outwardly, and in establishing an organized Church. Sixteen parishes were founded successively, together with churches and even a few monasteries. As the distance to Europe made communication very difficult, Greenland, in spite of the small number of souls which it contained, was formed into the Diocese of Gardar, suffragan first to the Archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen, then to that of Lund, and ultimately to that of Trondhjem. The succession of its bishops is variously listed by Gams and by Eubel, and can hardly be ascertained with certainty at present. But this much seems certain that, before the colony perished, sixteen to eighteen bishops of various nationalities occupied the See of Gardar or at least were nominated to it. Their doings are unknown to history. Tradition has it that Bishop Erik Gnupton joined an expedition in 1121 for the purpose of locating again the eastern coast of North America which had been discovered 100 years previously. During the reign of Bishop Arnes (1314-43) Greenland contributed its quota in natural products (walrus teeth) toward the Peter's-pence and the expense of the Crusades. It appears that no bishop visited Greenland after the beginning of the fifteenth century. The succession of titular bishops closes with

Vincenz Kampe (1537). As mentioned above, the settlers received no reinforcements, and either perished or, by intermarriage, were assimilated by the pagan Eskimos. European manners and religion thus gave way to pagan barbarism. From the standpoint of the history of civilization it is remarkable that daring navigators had penetrated to the 73rd degree of north latitude as early as 1135, and that the first Arctic expedition was undertaken in 1266 under the guidance of Catholic priests. Numerous stone monuments and ruins recall this early Norse Christian period. Of special importance are the ruins of a Romanesque church at Kakortok which, although comparatively small, warrant us in making inferences as to the style and size of other places of worship. Tombstones with runic inscriptions have also been discovered. A few documents have been preserved to which are attached the seals of the Bishops of Gardar (see Cronau, "Amerika", I, 114).

Christianity having disappeared from Greenland for the space of two hundred years, and when Denmark had ceased to give the island any thought, Hans Egede, a Lutheran pastor at Vaagen, conceived the idea of visiting his forlorn countrymen who had lapsed into paganism, and of preaching the Gospel to them. After overcoming all difficulties, he handed in his resignation as pastor and, together with his wife and children, went first to Bergen to establish a Greenland trading company and then, failing in this, to Copenhagen. When presented to the king he managed to interest him in his cause and succeeded in launching the trading company. In his capacity of supreme bishop, the king appointed Egede missionary. After many hardships he reached Greenland, but soon perceived that no descendants of the ancient colonists remained, and that his whole duty would consist in converting the savage Eskimos. By diligent application he acquired their language and, supplementing the spoken word with pictures, induced these people to embrace Christianity. He remained fifteen years in Greenland and formed a small congregation. After Egede's departure, his son Paul continued his pastorate, completed his father's translation of the New Testament, and compiled a catechism in the Eskimo language. The elder Egede founded a Greenland seminary in Copenhagen and also wrote considerably. In 1740 he received the title of Superintendent of Greenland. He died, 5 November, 1758, at Stubbekjøping on the island of Falster. Since that time a number of preachers have endeavoured to Christianize the aborigines with more or less success. They were assisted in this work by German Moravian brethren, of whom Stack, David, Bohnisch, and Beck had already (1733-34) laboured in the field. Their first followers were a certain Kajarnak, his wife and children, who were baptized in 1739. After fourteen years' work a small congregation was established, and a mission house built. The Lichtenfels mission was established in 1766; that of Lichtenau, in 1774; that of Frederiksdal, in 1824. After a century of existence there were four mission stations (twenty-seven male and female missionaries) with 1799 wards (of whom 1715 were baptized, and 736 communicants), to which number were added in 1861 the Umanak mission, and in 1864 the Idlorpait. The largest membership was attained in 1857 (1905 members; about 900 adults). Since then decay has set in, ascribed variously to differences of opinion among the brethren, millenarian tendencies among the neophytes, and friction with the Lutheran ministers of the established Church. Without doubt the action of the Government in dispersing the Greenlanders over their extensive hunting territories was an obstacle to their conversion, as their concentration during the winter season would naturally make them more amenable to spiritual influences. It is apparent that, under these circumstances, their conversion to Christianity was in most cases rather

superficial—a fact also confirmed by reliable witnesses. The history of the Moravian brethren admits that the entire education of the Eskimos (Lutheran) is limited to reading, writing, and the singing of songs; that thrift and benevolence are almost unknown among them, and that their morality in general is, to say the least, questionable. The first volume of the work describing the second German Arctic expedition of 1869-70 contains (pp. 160 and 195) an account of the church at Lichtenau and the cemetery at Fredrikshaab, which throws much light on the religious conditions of that time and also corroborates the opinion that even the descendants of Danes and aborigines most commonly revert to barbarism—a poor result for the self-sacrifice of such men as Kleinschmidt and Cranz, the former a translator of the Bible and composer of various hymns, and the latter an historian of Greenland. In 1900 the Moravian mission resigned their parishes to the preachers and instructors of the Danish National Church, which had nominally about 8000 members, and left the scene of their thankless labours. Although Greenland, like the adjacent islands, is subject to the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of Copenhagen, all missionary activity has been suspended.

HAYES, *The Land of Desolation, being a personal narrative of adventure in Greenland* (London, 1871)—not very scientific, but instructive in its illustrations; PEARY, *Northward over the Great Ice* (2 vols., London, 1898); LOEFFLER, *The Vineland Excursions of the ancient Scandinavians* (Copenhagen, 1884); HORSFORD, *The Discovery of America by Northmen* (Cambridge, 1888); GRAAH, *Undersøgelse Reise til Østkysten af Grønland* (Copenhagen, 1832, with coloured copper plates and three views of the church ruins of Kakortok); RINK, *Grønland geogr. og statist. beskrevet* (with pictures, maps, and contributions of various scientists concerning its history and nature, 2 vols. with index, Copenhagen, 1855-57); *Middeldeler om Grønland, udvænet af Commis. for Ledelsen af de geol. og geogr. undersøgelser i Grønland*—with many maps and illustrations. The third section of the seventh part is of especial interest (Copenhagen, 1879); HELMS, *Sydgrønlands Skove, Naturen og Mennesket* (Copenhagen, 1895); ANDRUP, *Exped. til Østgrønland* (Copenhagen, 1902); CORNELIUS, *Kristna Kyrkana historia*, III (Stockholm, 1890); CORNELIUS, *Det nittonde århundradets kyrkohistoria* (2nd ed., Stockholm, 1891); STORM, *Hist. top. skrifter om Norge og Norske Landsdele forfattede i Norge i det 16de Aarhundrede* (Christiania, 1895); DAHLMAN and SCHAFER, *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten: Denmark* (5 vols., Gotha, 1840-1902); HERGENROTHER, *Handbuch d. allgem. Kirchengeschichte* (3rd ed., 3 vols., Freiburg, 1884-86); MAYER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. Egede; PERGER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. Grønland; *Realencyclop. (Protestant)* (Leipzig, 1896), s. v. Egede, GAMS, *Series ep. (Ratisbon, 1873)*; EUBEL, *Hierarchia catholica mediæ ævi* (Ratisbon, 1898); SCHULZE, *Abriß einer Geschichte der Brüdermission (Herrnhut, 1901)*; FENCER, *Bidrag til Hans Egedes og den grønlandske Missions Historie 1721-30* (Copenhagen, 1879); CRONAU, *America, I* (Leipzig, 1892); FÖRST, *Geschichte der Entdeckung Grönlands* (Worms, 1908), with bibliographical references in foot-notes; MAURER, *Die zweite deutsche Nordpolarfahrt in den Jahren 1869 u. 70* (Leipzig, 1874); DRYGALSKI, *Grönlanderexpedition der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin, 1891-93* (Berlin, 1897), excellent geographical and scientific bibliography on pp. 374-80; NORDENSKIÖLD, *Grønland und seine Eiswüsten im Innern u. seine Ostküste* (Leipzig, 1886); NANSEN, *Auf Schneeschuhen durch Grønland* (Hamburg, 1891); SOLBERG, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ostküste Grönlands* (Christiania, 1907); BEAUVOIS, *La chrétienté de Grønland au moyen âge in Rev. des Quest. Hist.*, I (Paris, 1902), 538-82.

PIUS WITTMAN.

Gregoras Nicephorus. See HESYCHASM.

**Gregorian Chant.**—The name is often taken as synonymous with plain chant (q. v.), comprising not only the Church music of the early Middle Ages, but also later compositions (elaborate melodies for the Ordinary of the Mass, sequences, etc.) written in a similar style down to the sixteenth century and even in modern times. In a stricter sense Gregorian chant means the Roman form of early plain chant as distinguished from the Ambrosian, Gallican, and Mozarabic chants, which were akin to it, but were gradually supplanted by it from the eighth to the eleventh century. Of the Gallican and Mozarabic chants only a few remains are extant, but they were probably closely related to the Ambrosian chant. Of the latter, which has maintained itself in Milan up to the present day, there are two complete manuscripts belonging to the thirteenth and fourteenth

centuries respectively, and a considerable number belonging to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. An incomplete manuscript belongs to the twelfth century. It is at present in the British Museum and has been published in the fifth volume of the "Paléographie musicale". All these manuscripts contain the chants both for the Office and for the Mass. The Office chants are antiphons and responses, as in the Roman books. The Mass chants are *Ingressa* (corresponding to the Introit, but without psalm), *Psalmellus* (Gradual), *Cantus* (Tract), Offertory, *Transitorium* (Communion), and, in addition, two antiphons having no counterpart in the Gregorian Mass, one *post Evangelium*, the other the *Confractorium*. There are, further, a few Alleluia verses and antiphons *ante Evangelium*. Musically it can easily be observed that the syllabic pieces are often simpler, the ornate pieces more extended in their *melismata* than in the Gregorian chant. The Gregorian melodies, however, have more individuality and characteristic expression. Though it is very doubtful whether these Ambrosian melodies date back to the time of St. Ambrose, it is not improbable that they represent fairly the character of the chant sung in Italy and Gaul at the time when the *cantilena romana* superseded the earlier forms. The frequent occurrence of cadences founded on the *cursus* at all events points to a time before the latter went out of use in literary composition, that is before the middle of the seventh century. (See Gâtard in "Diet. d'arch. chrét.", s. v. "Ambrosien (chant)" and Mocquereau, "Notes sur l'Influence de l'Accent et du Cursus toniques Latins dans le Chant Ambrosien" in "Ambrosiana", Milan, 1897.)

The name *Gregorian chant* points to Gregory the Great (590-604), to whom a pretty constant tradition ascribes a certain final arrangement of the Roman chant. It is first met in the writings of William of Hirschau, though Leo IV (847-855) already speaks of the *cantus Sti. Gregorii*. The tradition mentioned was questioned first by Pierre Gussanville, in 1675, and again, in 1729, by George, Baron d'Eckhart, neither of whom attracted much attention. In modern times Gevaert, president of the Brussels music school, has tried to show, with a great amount of learning, that the compilation of the Mass music belongs to the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. His arguments led to a close investigation of the question, and at present practically all authorities, including, besides the Benedictines, such men as Wagner, Gastoué, and Frere, hold that the large majority of plain-chant melodies were composed before the year 600.

The principal proofs for the Gregorian tradition may be summarized thus: (a) The testimony of John the Deacon, Gregory's biographer (c. 872), is quite trustworthy. Amongst other considerations the very modest claim he makes for the saint, "antiphonarum centonem . . . compilavit" (he compiled a patchwork antiphonary), shows that he was not carried away by a desire to eulogize his hero. There are several other testimonies in the ninth century. In the eighth century we have Egbert and Bede (see Gastoué, "Les Origines", etc., 87 sqq.). The latter, in particular, speaks of one Putta, who died as bishop in 688, "maxime modulandi in ecclesia more Romanorum peritus, quem a discipulis beati papæ Gregorii didicerat". In the seventh century we have the epitaph of Honorius, who died in 638 (Gastoué, op. cit., 93):—

... divino in carmine pollens  
Ad vitam pastor ducere novit ovis

Namque Gregorii tanti vestigia iusti  
Dum sequeris cupiens meritumque geris

—that is: "Gifted with divine harmony the shepherd leads his sheep to life . . . for while following the footsteps of holy Gregory you have won your reward."

According to this it was thought in Rome, less than forty years after the death of St. Gregory, that the greatest praise for a music-loving pope was to compare him to his predecessor Gregory. (b) The feasts known to have been introduced after St. Gregory use in the main melodies borrowed from older feasts. See the detailed proof for this in Frere's "Introduction". (c) The texts of the chants are taken from the "Itala" version, while as early as the first half of the seventh century St. Jerome's correction had been generally adopted. (d) The frequent occurrence in the plain-chant melodies of cadences moulded on the literary *cursus* shows that they were composed before the middle of the seventh century, when the *cursus* went out of use.

GEVAERT, *Les Origines du Chant Liturgique de l'Eglise Latine* (Ghent, 1890); IJEM, *La Mélodie Antique dans le Chant de l'Eglise Latine* (Ghent, 1895); MORIN, *Les Véritables Origines du Chant Grégorien* (Maredsous, 1890); CAGIN, *Un Mot sur l'Antiphonale Missarum* (Solesmes, 1890); BRAMMACH, *Gregorianisch* (Leipzig, 1893, 2nd ed., 1901); FRERE, *Introduction to the Graduale Sarisburiense* (London, 1894); *Paléographie musicale*, IV; WAGNER, *Introduction to the Gregorian Melodies*, pt. I, scale, IV; (1901, English ed. by the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society, London, chapter xii); GASTOUE, *Les origines du Chant Romain* (Paris, 1907), pt. II, i; WYATT, *St. Gregory and the Gregorian Music* (London, 1904).

H. BEWERUNGE.

**Gregory I (THE GREAT), SAINT, POPE, Doctor of the Church; b. at Rome about 540; d. 12 March, 604.** Gregory "is certainly one of the most notable figures in Ecclesiastical History. He has exercised in many respects a momentous influence on the doctrine, the organization, and the discipline of the Catholic Church. To him we must look for an explanation of the religious situation of the Middle Ages: indeed, if no account were taken of his work, the evolution of the form of medieval Christianity would be almost inexplicable. And further, in so far as the modern Catholic system is a legitimate development of medieval Catholicism, of this too Gregory may not unreasonably be termed the Father. Almost all the leading principles of the later Catholicism are found, at any rate in germ, in Gregory the Great" (F. H. Dudden, "Gregory the Great", I, p. v). This eulogy by a learned non-Catholic writer will justify the length and elaboration of the following article.

I. FROM BIRTH TO 574.—Gregory's father was Gordianus, a wealthy patrician, probably of the famous *gens Anicia*, who owned large estates in Sicily and a mansion on the Cælian Hill in Rome, the ruins of which, apparently in a wonderful state of preservation, still await excavation beneath the Church of St. Andrew and St. Gregory. His mother Silvia appears also to have been of good family, but very little is known of her life. She is honoured as a saint, her feast being kept on 3 November (see SILVIA, SAINT). Portraits of Gordianus and Silvia were painted, by Gregory's order, in the atrium of St. Andrew's monastery, and a pleasing description of these may be found in John the Deacon (*Vita*, IV, lxxxiii). Besides his mother, two of Gregory's aunts have been canonized, Gordianus's two sisters, Tarsilla and Emiliana, so that John the Deacon speaks of his education as being that of a saint among saints. Of his early years we know nothing beyond what the history of the period tells us. Between the years 546 and 552 Rome was first captured by the Goths under Totila, and then abandoned by them; next it was garrisoned by Belisarius, and besieged in vain by the Goths, who took it again, however, after the recall of Belisarius, only to lose it once more to Narses. Gregory's mind and memory were both exceptionally receptive, and it is to the effect produced on him by these disasters that we must attribute the tinge of sadness which pervades his writings and especially his clear expectation of a speedy end to the world. Of his education we have no details. Gregory of Tours tells us that in grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic he was so skilful as to be thought



second to none in all Rome, and it seems certain also that he must have gone through a course of legal studies. Not least among the educating influences was the religious atmosphere of his home. He loved to meditate on the Scriptures and to listen attentively to the conversation of his elders, so that he was "devoted to God from his youth up". His rank and prospects pointed him out naturally for a public career, and he doubtless held some of the subordinate offices wherein a young patrician embarked on public life. That he acquitted himself well in these appears certain, since we find him, about the year 573, when little more than thirty years old, filling the important office of prefect of the city of Rome. At that date the brilliant post was shorn of much of its old magnificence, and its responsibilities were reduced; still it remained the highest civil dignity in the city, and it was only after long prayer and inward struggle that Gregory decided to abandon everything and become a monk. This event took place most probably in 574. His decision once taken, he devoted himself to the work and austerities of his new life with all the natural energy of his character. His Sicilian estates were given up to found six monasteries there, and his home on the Cælian Hill was converted into another under the patronage of St. Andrew. Here he himself took the cowl, so that "he who had been wont to go about the city clad in the *trabea* and aglow with silk and jewels, now clad in a worthless garment served the altar of the Lord" (Greg. Tur., X, i).

II. AS MONK AND ABBOT, c. 574-590.—There has been much discussion as to whether Gregory and his fellow-monks at St. Andrew's followed the Rule of St. Benedict. Baronius and others on his authority have denied this, while it has been asserted as strongly by Mabillon and the Bollandists, who, in the preface to the life of St. Augustine (26 May), retract the opinion expressed earlier in the preface to St. Gregory's life (12 March). The controversy is important only in view of the question as to the form of monasticism introduced by St. Augustine into England, and it may be said that Baronius's view is now practically abandoned. For about three years Gregory lived in retirement in the monastery of St. Andrew, a period to which he often refers as the happiest portion of his life. His great austerities during this time are recorded by the biographers, and probably caused the weak health from which he constantly suffered in later life. However, he was soon drawn out of his seclusion, when, in 578, the pope ordained him, much against his will, as one of the seven deacons (*regionarii*) of Rome. The period was one of acute crisis. The Lombards were advancing rapidly towards the city, and the only chance of safety seemed to be in obtaining help from the Emperor Tiberius at Byzantium. Pope Pelagius II accordingly dispatched a special embassy to Tiberius, and sent Gregory along with it as his *apocrisiarius*, or permanent ambassador to the Court of Byzantium. The date of this new appointment seems to have been the spring of 579, and it lasted apparently for about six years. Nothing could have been more uncongenial to Gregory than the worldly atmosphere of the brilliant Byzantine Court, and to counteract its dangerous influence he followed the monastic life so far as circumstances permitted. This was made easier by the fact that several of his brethren from St. Andrew's accompanied him to Constantinople. With them he prayed and studied the Scriptures, one result of which remains in his "Morals", or series of lectures on the Book of Job, composed during this period at the request of St. Leander of Seville, whose acquaintance Gregory made during his stay in Constantinople. Much attention was attracted to Gregory by his controversy with Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople, concerning the Resurrection. Eutychius had published a treatise on this subject maintaining that the risen bodies of the elect would be "impalpable, more

light than air". To this view Gregory objected the palpability of Christ's risen body. The dispute became prolonged and bitter, till at length the emperor intervened, both combatants being summoned to a private audience, where they stated their views. The emperor decided that Gregory was in the right, and ordered Eutychius's book to be burned. The strain of the struggle had been so great that both fell ill. Gregory recovered, but the patriarch succumbed, recanting his error on his death-bed. Mention should be made of the curious fact that, although Gregory's sojourn at Constantinople lasted for six years, he seems never to have mastered even the rudiments of Greek. Possibly he found that the use of an interpreter has its advantages, but he often complains of the incapacity of those employed for this purpose. It must be owned that, so far as obtaining help for Rome was concerned, Gregory's stay at Constantinople was a failure. However, his period as ambassador taught him very plainly a lesson which was to bear great fruit later on when he ruled in Rome as pope. This was the important fact that no help was any longer to be looked for from Byzantium, with the corollary that, if Rome and Italy were to be saved at all, it could only be by vigorous independent action of the powers on the spot. Humanly speaking, it is to the fact that Gregory had acquired this conviction that his later line of action with all its momentous consequences is due.

In the year 586, or possibly 585, he was recalled to Rome, and with the greatest joy returned to St. Andrew's, of which he became abbot soon afterwards. The monastery grew famous under his energetic rule, producing many monks who won renown later, and many vivid pictures of this period may be found in the "Dialogues". Gregory gave much of his time to lecturing on the Holy Scriptures and is recorded to have expounded to his monks the Heptateuch, Books of Kings, the Prophets, the Book of Proverbs, and the Canticle of Canticles. Notes of these lectures were taken at the time by a young student named Claudius, but when transcribed were found by Gregory to contain so many errors that he insisted on their being given to him for correction and revision. Apparently this was never done, for the existing fragments of such works attributed to Gregory are almost certainly spurious. At this period, however, one important literary enterprise was certainly completed. This was the revision and publication of the "Magna Moralia", or lectures on the Book of Job, undertaken in Constantinople at the request of St. Leander. In one of his letters (Ep., V, liii) Gregory gives an interesting account of the origin of this work. To this period most probably should be assigned the famous incident of Gregory's meeting with the English youths in the Forum. The first mention of the event is in the Whitby life (c. ix), and the whole story seems to be an English tradition. It is worth notice, therefore, that in the St. Gall manuscript the Angles do not appear as slave boys exposed for sale, but as men visiting Rome of their own free will, whom Gregory expressed a desire to see. It is Venerable Bede (Hist. Eccl., II, i) who first makes them slaves. In consequence of this meeting Gregory was so fired with desire to convert the Angles that he obtained permission from Pelagius II to go in person to Britain with some of his fellow-monks as missionaries. The Romans, however, were greatly incensed at the pope's act. With angry words they demanded Gregory's recall, and messengers were at once dispatched to bring him back to Rome, if necessary by force. These men caught up with the little band of missionaries on the third day after their departure, and at once returned with them, Gregory offering no opposition, since he had received what appeared to him as a sign from heaven that his enterprise should be abandoned. The strong feeling of the Roman populace that Gregory must not be allowed to

leave Rome is a sufficient proof of the position he now held there. He was in fact the chief adviser and assistant of Pelagius II, towards whom he seems to have acted very much in the capacity of secretary (see the letter of the Bishop of Ravenna to Gregory, Epp., III, lxvi, "*Sedem apostolicam, quam antea moribus nunc etiam honore debito gubernatis*"). In this capacity, probably in 586, Gregory wrote his important letter to the schismatical bishops of Istria who had separated from communion with the Church on the question of the Three Chapters (Epp., Appendix, III, iii). This document, which is almost a treatise in length, is an admirable example of Gregory's skill, but it failed to produce any more effect than Pelagius's two previous letters had, and the schism continued.

The year 589 was one of widespread disaster throughout all the empire. In Italy there was an unprecedented inundation. Farms and houses were carried away by the floods. The Tiber overflowed its banks, destroying numerous buildings, among them the granaries of the Church with all the store of corn. Pestilence followed on the floods, and Rome became a very city of the dead. Business was at a standstill, and the streets were deserted save for the wagons which bore forth countless corpses for burial in common pits beyond the city walls. Then, in February, 590, as if to fill the cup of misery to the brim, Pelagius II died. The choice of a successor lay with the clergy and people of Rome, and without any hesitation they elected Gregory, Abbot of St. Andrew's. In spite of their unanimity Gregory shrank from the dignity thus offered him. He knew, no doubt, that its acceptance meant a final good-bye to the cloister life he loved, and so he not only refused to accede to the prayers of his fellow-citizens but also wrote personally to the Emperor Maurice, begging him with all earnestness not to confirm the election. Germanus, prefect of the city, suppressed this letter, however, and sent instead of it the formal schedule of the election. In the interval while awaiting the emperor's reply the business of the vacant see was transacted by Gregory, in commission with two or three other high officials. As the plague still continued unabated, Gregory called upon the people to join in a vast sevenfold procession which was to start from each of the seven regions of the city and meet at the basilica of the Blessed Virgin, all praying the while for pardon and the withdrawal of the pestilence. This was accordingly done, and the memory of the event is still preserved by the name "*Sant' Angelo*" given to the mausoleum of Hadrian from the legend that the Archangel St. Michael was seen upon its summit in the act of sheathing his sword as a sign that the plague was over. At length, after six months of waiting, came the emperor's confirmation of Gregory's election. The saint was terrified at the news and even meditated flight. He was seized, however, carried to the Basilica of St. Peter, and there consecrated pope on 3 September, 590. The story that Gregory actually fled the city and remained hidden in a forest for three days, when his whereabouts was revealed by a supernatural light, seems to be pure invention. It appears for the first time in the Whitby life (c. vii), and is directly contrary to the words of his contemporary, Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc., X, i). Still he never ceased to regret his elevation, and his later writings contain numberless expressions of strong feeling on this point.

III. As POPE, 590-604.—Fourteen years of life remained to Gregory, and into these he crowded work enough to have exhausted the energies of a lifetime. What makes his achievement more wonderful is his constant ill-health. He suffered almost continually from indigestion and, at intervals, from attacks of slow fever, while for the last half of his pontificate he was a martyr to gout. In spite of these infirmities, which increased steadily, his biographer, Paul the Deacon,

tells us "he never rested" (Vita, xv). His work as pope is of so varied a nature that it will be best to take it in sections, although this destroys any exact chronological sequence. At the very outset of his pontificate Gregory published his "*Liber pastoralis curæ*", or book on the office of a bishop, in which he lays down clearly the lines he considers it his duty to follow. The work, which regards the bishop pre-eminently as the physician of souls, is divided into four parts. He points out in the first that only one skilled already as a physician of the soul is fitted to undertake the "supreme rule" of the episcopate. In the second he describes how the bishop's life should be ordered from a spiritual point of view; in the third, how he ought to teach and admonish those under him, and in the fourth how, in spite of his good works, he ought to bear in mind his own weakness, since the better his work the greater the danger of falling through self-confidence. This little work is the key to Gregory's life as pope, for what he preached he practised. Moreover, it remained for centuries the textbook of the Catholic episcopate, so that by its influence the ideal of the great pope has moulded the character of the Church, and his spirit has spread into all lands.

(1) *Life and Work in Rome*.—As pope Gregory still lived with monastic simplicity. One of his first acts was to banish all the lay attendants, pages, etc., from the Lateran palace, and substitute clerics in their place. There was now no *magister militum* living in Rome, so the control even of military matters fell to the pope. The inroads of the Lombards had filled the city with a multitude of indigent refugees, for whose support Gregory made provision, using for this purpose the existing machinery of the ecclesiastical districts, each of which had its deaconry or "office of alms". The corn thus distributed came chiefly from Sicily and was supplied by the estates of the Church. The temporal needs of his people being thus provided for, Gregory did not neglect their spiritual wants, and a large number of his sermons have come down to us. It was he who instituted the "stations" still observed and noted in the Roman Missal (see STATIONS). He met the clergy and people at some church previously agreed upon, and all together went in procession to the church of the station, where Mass was celebrated and the pope preached. These sermons, which drew immense crowds, are mostly simple, popular expositions of Scripture. Chiefly remarkable is the preacher's mastery of the Bible, which he quotes unceasingly, and his regular use of anecdote to illustrate the point in hand, in which respect he paves the way for the popular preachers of the Middle Ages. In July, 595, Gregory held his first synod in St. Peter's, which consisted almost wholly of the bishops of the suburbicarian sees and the priests of the Roman titular churches. Six decrees dealing with ecclesiastical discipline were passed, some of them merely confirming changes already made by the pope on his own authority.

Much controversy still exists as to the exact extent of Gregory's reforms of the Roman Liturgy. All admit that he did make the following modifications in the pre-existing practice: (a) In the Canon of the Mass he inserted the words "*diesque nostros in tuâ pace disponas, atque ab æternâ damnatione nos eripi, et in electorum tuorum jubeas grege numerari*"; (b) he ordered the Pater Noster to be recited in the Canon before the breaking of the Host; (c) he provided that the Alleluia should be chanted after the Gradual out of paschal time, to which period, apparently, the Roman use had previously confined it; (d) he prohibited the use of the chasuble by subdeacons assisting at Mass; (e) he forbade deacons to perform any of the musical portions of the Mass other than singing the Gospel. Beyond these and some few minor points it seems impossible to conclude with certainty what changes Gregory did make. As to the much-disputed question of the Gregorian Sacramentary and the

almost more difficult point of his relation to the plain song or chant of the Church, for Gregory's connexion with which matters the earliest authority seems to be John the Deacon (Vita, II, vi, xvii), see GREGORIAN CHANT; SACRAMENTARY. There is no lack of evidence, however, to illustrate Gregory's activity as manager of the patrimony of St. Peter. By his day the estates of the Church had reached vast dimensions. Varying estimates place their total area at from 1300 to 1800 square miles, and there seems no reason for supposing this to be an exaggeration, while the income arising therefrom was probably not less than \$1,500,000 a year. The land lay in many places—Campania, Africa, Sicily, and elsewhere—and, as their landlord, Gregory displayed a skill in finance and estate management which excites our admiration no less than it did the surprise of his tenants and agents, who suddenly

found that they had a new master who was not to be deceived or cheated. The management of each patrimony was carried out by a number of agents of varying grades and duties under an official called the *rector* or *defensor* of the patrimony. Previously the rectors had usually been laymen, but Gregory established the custom of appointing ecclesiastics to the post. In doing this he probably had in view the many extra duties of an ecclesiastical nature which he called upon them to undertake. Thus examples may be found of such rectors being commissioned to undertake the filling up of vacant sees, holding of local synods, taking action against heretics, providing for the maintenance of churches and monasteries, rectifying abuses in the churches of their district, with the enforcing of ecclesiastical discipline and even the reproof and correction of local bishops. Still Gregory never allowed the rectors to interfere in such matters on their own responsibility. In the minutiae of estate management nothing was too small

for Gregory's personal notice, from the exact number of *sextarii* in a *modius* of corn, or how many *solidi* went to one golden pound, to the use of false weights by certain minor agents. He finds time to write instructions on every detail and leaves no complaint unattended to, even from the humblest of his multitude of tenants. Throughout the large number of letters which deal with the management of the patrimony, the pope's determination to secure a scrupulously righteous administration is evident. As bishop, he is the trustee of God and St. Peter, and his agents must show that they realize this by their conduct. Consequently, under his able management the estates of the Church increased steadily in value, the tenants were contented, and the revenues paid in with unprecedented regularity. The only fault ever laid at his door in this matter is that, by his boundless charities, he emptied his treasury. But this, if a fault at all, was a natural consequence of his view that he was the administrator of the property of the poor, for whom he could never do enough.

(2) *Relations with the Suburbicarian Churches.*—As patriarchs of the West the popes exercise a special

jurisdiction over and above their universal primacy as successors of St. Peter; and, among Western churches, this jurisdiction extends in a most intimate manner over the churches of Italy and the isles adjacent. On the mainland much of this territory was now in the hands of the Lombards, with whose Arian clergy Gregory was, of course, not in communion. Whenever opportunity offered, however, he was careful to provide for the needs of the faithful in these parts, frequently uniting them to some neighbouring diocese, when they were too few to occupy the energies of a bishop. On the islands, of which Sicily was by far the most important, the pre-existing church system was maintained. Gregory appointed a vicar, usually the metropolitan of the province, who exercised a general supervision over the whole church. He also insisted strongly on the holding of local synods

as ordered by the Council of Nicæa, and letters of his exist addressed to bishops in Sicily, Sardinia, and Gaul, reminding them of their duties in this respect. The supreme instance of Gregory's intervention in the affairs of these dioceses occurs in the case of Sardinia, where the behaviour of Januarius, the half-witted, aged Metropolitan of Cagliari, had reduced the church to a state of semi-chaos. A large number of letters relate to the reforms instituted by the pope (Epp., II, xlvii; III, xxxvi; IV, ix, xxiii-xxvii, xxix; V, ii; IX, i, xi, celi-cciv; XIV, ii). His care over the election of a new bishop whenever a vacancy occurs is shown in many cases, and if, after his examination of the elect, which is always a searching one, he finds him unfitted for the post, he has no hesitation in rejecting him and commanding another to be chosen (Epp., I, lv, lvi; VII, xxxviii; X, vii). With regard to discipline the pope was specially strict in enforcing the Church's laws as to the celibacy of the clergy (Epp., I, xlii, l;



POPE GREGORY THE GREAT SENDS MISSIONARIES TO ENGLAND  
From an Anglo-Saxon manuscript of the tenth century, preserved in the British Museum

IV, v, xxvi, xxxiv; VII, i; IX, cx, cexviii; X, xix; XI, lvi a; XIII, xxxviii, xxxix; the exemption of clerics from lay tribunals (Epp., I, xxxix a; VI, xi; IX, liii, lxxvi, lxxix; X, iv; XI, xxxii; XIII, l); and the deprivation of all ecclesiastics guilty of criminal or scandalous offences (Epp., I, xviii, xlii; III, xlix; IV, xxvi; V, v, xvii, xviii; VII, xxxix; VIII, xxiv; IX, xxv; XII, iii, x, xi; XIV, ii). He was also inflexible with regard to the proper application of church revenues, insisting that others should be as strict as he was in disposing of these funds for their proper ends (Epp., I, x, lxiv; II, xx-xxii; III, xxii; IV, xi; V, xii, xlviii; VIII, vii; XI, xxii, lvi a; XIII, xlv; XIV, ii).

(3) *Relations with Other Churches.*—With regard to the other Western Churches limits of space prohibit any detailed account of Gregory's dealings, but the following quotation, all the more valuable as coming from a Protestant authority, indicates very clearly the line he followed herein: "In his dealings with the Churches of the West, Gregory acted invariably on the assumption that all were subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman See. Of the rights claimed or exercised by his predecessors he would not abate

one title; on the contrary, he did everything in his power to maintain, strengthen, and extend what he regarded as the just prerogatives of the papacy. It is true that he respected the privileges of the Western metropolitans, and disapproved of unnecessary interference within the sphere of their jurisdiction canonically exercised. . . . But of his general principle there can be no doubt whatever" (Dudden, I, 475). In view of later developments Gregory's dealings with the Oriental Churches, and with Constantinople in particular, have a special importance. There cannot be the smallest doubt that Gregory claimed for the Apostolic See, and for himself as pope, a primacy not of honour, but of supreme authority over the Church Universal. In Epp., XIII, I, he speaks of "the Apostolic See, which is the head of all Churches", and in Epp., V, xlv, he says: "I, albeit unworthy, have been set up in command of the Church." As successor of St. Peter, the pope had received from God a primacy over all Churches (Epp., II, xlv; III, xxx; V, xxxvii; VII, xxxvii). His approval it was which gave force to the decrees of councils or synods (Epp., IX, clvi), and his authority could annul them (Epp., V, xxxix, xli, xlv). To him appeals might be made even against other patriarchs, and by him bishops were judged and corrected if need were (Epp., II, I; III, lii, lxiii; IX, xxvi, xxvii). This position naturally made it impossible for him to permit the use of the title Œcumenical Bishop assumed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, John the Faster, at a synod held in 588. Gregory protested, and a long controversy followed, the question being still at issue when the pope died. A discussion of this controversy is needless here, but it is important as showing how completely Gregory regarded the Eastern patriarchs as being subject to himself; "As regards the Church of Constantinople," he writes in Epp., IX, xxvi, "who can doubt that it is subject to the Apostolic See? Why, both our most religious lord the emperor, and our brother the Bishop of Constantinople continually acknowledge it." At the same time the pope was most careful not to interfere with the canonical rights of the other patriarchs and bishops. With the other Oriental patriarchs his relations were most cordial, as appears from his letters to the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria.

(4) *Relations with the Lombards and the Franks.*—Gregory's consecration as pope preceded by a few days only the death of Authari, King of the Lombards, whose queen, the famous Theodelinde, then married Agilulf, Duke of Turin, a warlike and energetic prince. With Agilulf and the Dukes Ariulf of Spoleto and Arichis of Benevento, Gregory soon had to deal, as, when difficulties arose, Romanus, the exarch, or representative, of the emperor, preferred to remain in sulky inactivity at Ravenna. It soon became clear that, if any successful resistance was to be made against the Lombards, it must be by the pope's own exertions. How keenly he felt the difficulty and danger of his position appears in some of the earliest letters (Epp., I, iii, viii, xxx); but no actual hostilities began till the summer of 592, when the pope received a threatening letter from Ariulf of Spoleto, which was followed almost immediately by the appearance of that chief before the walls of Rome. At the same time Arichis of Benevento advanced on Naples, which happened at the moment to have no bishop nor any officer of high rank in command of the garrison. Gregory at once took the surprising step of appointing a tribune on his own authority to take command of the city (Epp., II, xxxiv), and, when no notice of this strong action was taken by the imperial authorities, the pope conceived the idea of himself arranging a separate peace with the Lombards (Epp., II, xlv). No details of this peace have come down to us, but it seems certain that it was actually concluded (Epp., V, xxxvi). Dr. Hodgkin (Italy and her Invaders, v, 366) pronounces Gregory's action herein to have been wise and states-

manlike, but, at the same time, undoubtedly *ultra vires*, being quite beyond any legal competency then possessed by the pope, who thus "made a memorable stride towards complete independence". Gregory's independent action had the effect of rousing up Romanus the exarch. Wholly ignoring the papal peace, he gathered all his troops, attacked and regained Perugia, and then marched to Rome, where he was received with imperial honours. The next spring, however, he quitted the city and took away its garrison with him, so that both pope and citizens were now more exasperated against him than before. Moreover, the exarch's campaign had roused the Northern Lombards, and King Agilulf marched on Rome, arriving there probably some time in June, 593. The terror aroused by his advance is still mirrored for us in Gregory's homilies on the Prophet Ezekiel, which were delivered at this time. The siege of the city was soon abandoned, however, and Agilulf retired. The continuator of Prosper (Mon. Germ. SS. Antiq., IX, 339) relates that Agilulf met the pope in person on the steps of the Basilica of St. Peter, which was then outside the city walls, and "being melted by Gregory's prayers and greatly moved by the wisdom and religious gravity of this great man, he broke up the siege of the city"; but, in view of the silence both of Gregory himself and of Paul the Deacon on the point, the story seems scarcely probable. In Epp., V, xxxix, Gregory refers to himself as "the paymaster of the Lombards", and most likely a large payment from the papal treasury was the chief inducement to raise the siege. The pope's great desire now was to secure a lasting peace with the Lombards, which could only be achieved by a proper arrangement between the imperial authorities and the Lombard chiefs. On Queen Theodelinde, a Catholic and a personal friend, Gregory placed all his hopes. The exarch, however, looked at the whole affair in another light, and, when a whole year was passed in fruitless negotiations, Gregory began once again to meditate a private treaty. Accordingly, in May, 595, the pope wrote to a friend at Ravenna a letter (Epp., V, xxxiv) threatening to make peace with Agilulf even without the consent of the Exarch Romanus. This threat was speedily reported to Constantinople, where the exarch was in high favour, and the Emperor Maurice at once sent off to Gregory a violent letter, now lost, accusing him of being both a traitor and a fool. This letter Gregory received in June, 595. Luckily the pope's answer has been preserved to us (Epp., V, xxxvi). It must be read in its entirety to be appreciated fully; probably very few emperors, if any, have ever received such a letter from a subject. Still, in spite of his scathing reply, Gregory seems to have realized that independent action could not secure what he wished, and we hear no more about a separate peace. Gregory's relations with the Exarch Romanus became continually more and more strained until the latter's death in the year 596 or early in 597. The new exarch, Callinicus, was a man of far greater ability and well disposed towards the pope, whose hopes now revived. The official peace negotiations were pushed on, and, in spite of delays, the articles were at length signed in 599, to Gregory's great joy. This peace lasted two years, but in 601 the war broke out again through an aggressive act on the part of Callinicus, who was recalled two years later, when his successor, Smaragdus, again made a peace with the Lombards which endured until after Gregory's death. Two points stand out for special notice in Gregory's dealings with the Lombards: first, his determination that, in spite of the apathy of the imperial authorities, Rome should not pass into the hands of some half-civilized Lombard duke and so sink into insignificance and decay; second, his independent action in appointing governors to cities, providing munitions of war, giving instructions to generals, sending ambassadors to the Lombard king, and even negotiating a peace



without the exarch's aid. Whatever the theory may have been, there is no doubt about the fact that, besides his spiritual jurisdiction, Gregory actually exercised no small amount of temporal power.

Of Gregory's relations with the Franks there is no need to write at length, as the intercourse he established with the Frankish kings practically lapsed at his death, and was not renewed for about a hundred years. On the other hand he exercised a great influence on Frankish monasticism, which he did much to strengthen and reshape, so that the work done by the monasteries in civilizing the wild Franks may be attributed ultimately to the first monk-pope.

(5) *Relations with the Imperial Government.*—The

reign of Gregory the Great marks an epoch in papal history, and this is specially the case in respect of his attitude towards the imperial Government centred at Constantinople. Gregory seems to have looked upon Church and State as co-operating to form a united whole, which acted in two distinct spheres, ecclesiastical and secular. Over this commonwealth were the pope and the emperor, each supreme in his own department, care being taken to keep these as far as possible distinct and independent. This latter point was the difficulty. Gregory definitely held that it was a duty of the secular ruler to protect the Church and preserve the "peace of the faith" (Mor., XXXI, viii), and so he is often found to call in the aid of the secular arm, not merely to suppress schism, heresy, or idolatry, but even to enforce discipline among monks and clergy (Epp., I, lxxii; II, xxix; III, lix; IV, vii, xxxii; V, xxxii; VIII, iv; XI, xii, xxxvii; XIII, xxxvi). If the emperor interfered in church matters the pope's policy was to acquiesce if possible, unless obedience was sinful, according to the principle laid down in

Epp. XI, xxix; "Quod ipse [sc. imperator] fecerit, si canonicum est, sequimur; si vero canonicum non est, in quantum sine peccato nostro, portamus." In taking this line Gregory was undoubtedly influenced by his deep reverence for the emperor, whom he regarded as the representative of God in all things secular, and who must still be treated with all possible respect, even when he encroached on the borders of the papal authority. On his side, although he certainly regarded himself as "superior in place and rank" to the exarch (Epp., II, xlv), Gregory objected strongly to the interference of ecclesiastical authorities in matters secular. As supreme guardian of Christian justice, the pope was always ready to intercede for, or protect, anyone who suffered unjust treatment (Epp., I, xxxv, xxxvi, xlvii, lix; III, v; V, xxxviii; IX, iv, xlv, lv, cxiii, clxxxii; XI, iv), but at the same time he used the utmost tact in approaching the imperial officials. In Epp., I, xxxix a, he explains for the benefit of his Sicilian agent the precise attitude to be adopted in such matters. Still, in conjunction with all this deference, Gregory retained a spirit of independence which enabled him, when he considered it necessary, to address even the emperor in terms of startling directness. Space makes it impossible to do more than

VI.—50

refer to the famous letters to the Emperor Phocas on his usurpation, and the allusions in them to the murdered Emperor Maurice (Epp., XIII, xxxiv, xli, xlii). Every kind of judgment has been passed upon Gregory for writing these letters, but the question remains a difficult one. Probably the pope's conduct herein was due to two things: first, his ignorance of the way in which Phocas had reached the throne; and second, his view that the emperor was God's representative on earth, and therefore deserving of all possible respect in his official capacity, his personal character not coming into the question at all. It should be noted, also, that he avoids any direct flattery towards the new emperor, merely using the exaggerated

phrases of respect then customary, and expressing the high hopes he entertains of the new regime. Moreover, his allusions to Maurice refer to the sufferings of the people under his government, and do not reflect on the dead emperor himself. Had the empire been sound instead of in a hopelessly rotten state when Gregory became pope, it is hard to say how his views might have worked out in practice. As it was, his line of strong independence, his efficiency, and his courage carried all before them, and when he died there was no longer any question as to who was the first power in Italy.

(6) *Missionary Work.*—

Gregory's zeal for the conversion of the heathen, and in particular of the Angles, has been mentioned already, and there is no need to dwell at length on the latter subject, as it has been fully treated under AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY, SAINT. In justice to the great pope, however, it must be added that he lost no opportunity for the exercise of his missionary zeal, making every effort to root out paganism in Gaul, Donatism in Africa, and the Schism of

the Three Chapters in North Italy and Istria. In his treatment of heretics, schismatics, and pagans his method was to try every means—persuasions, exhortations, threats—before resorting to force; but, if gentler treatment failed, he had no hesitation, in accordance with the ideas of his age, in resorting to compulsion, and invoking the aid of the secular arm therein. It is curious, therefore, to find him acting as a champion and protector of the Jews. In Epp., I, xlv, he expressly deprecates the compulsory baptism of Jews, and many instances appear in which he insists on their right to liberty of action, so far as the law permitted, both in civil affairs and in the worship of the synagogue (Epp., I, xxxiv; II, vi; VIII, xxv; IX, xxxviii, cxv; XIII, xv). He was equally strong, however, in preventing the Jews from exceeding the rights granted to them by the imperial law, especially with regard to the ownership by them of Christian slaves (Epp., II, vi; III, xxxvii; IV, ix, xxi; VI, xxix; VII, xxi; VIII, xxi; IX, civ, cxxiii, cxxv). We shall probably be right, therefore, in attributing Gregory's protection of the Jews to his respect for law and justice, rather than to any ideas of toleration differing from those current at the time.

(7) *Gregory and Monasticism.*—Although the first



ST. GREGORY THE GREAT  
Jodocus of Ghent (?), Barberini Palace, Rome



monk to become pope, Gregory was in no sense an original contributor to monastic ideals or practice. He took monasticism as he found it established by St. Benedict, and his efforts and influence were given to strengthening and enforcing the prescriptions of that greatest of monastic legislators. His position did indeed tend to modify St. Benedict's work by drawing it into a closer connexion with the organization of the Church, and with the papacy in particular, but this was not deliberately aimed at by Gregory. Rather he was himself convinced that the monastic system had a very special value for the Church, and so he did everything in his power to diffuse and propagate it. His own property was consecrated to this end, he urged many wealthy people to establish or support monasteries, and he used the revenues of the patrimony for the same purpose. He was relentless in correcting abuses and enforcing discipline, the letters on such matters being far too numerous for mention here, and the points on which he insists most are precisely those, such as stability and poverty, on which St. Benedict's recent legislation had laid special stress. Twice only do we find anything like direct legislation by the pope. The first point is that of the age at which a nun might be made abbess, which he fixes at "not less than sixty years" (Epp., IV, xi). The second is his lengthening of the period of novitiate. St. Benedict had prescribed at least one year (Reg. Ben., lviii); Gregory (Epp., X, ix) orders two years, with special precautions in the case of slaves who wished to become monks. More important was his line of action in the difficult question of the relation between monks and their bishop. There is plenty of evidence to show that many bishops took advantage of their position to oppress and burden the monasteries in their diocese, with the result that the monks appealed to the pope for protection. Gregory, while always upholding the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop, was firm in support of the monks against any illegal aggression. All attempts on the part of a bishop to assume new powers over the monks in his diocese were condemned, while at times the pope issued documents, called *Privilegia*, in which he definitely set forth certain points on which the monks were exempt from episcopal control (Epp., V, xlix; VII, xii; VIII, xvii; XII, xi, xii, xiii). This action on Gregory's part undoubtedly began the long progress by which the monastic bodies have come to be under the direct control of the Holy See. It should be mentioned that in Gregory's day the current view was that ecclesiastical work, such as the cure of souls, preaching, administering the sacraments, etc., was not compatible with the monastic state, and in this view the pope concurred. On the other hand a passage in Epp., XII, iv, where he directs that a certain layman "should be tonsured either as a monk or a subdeacon", would suggest that the pope held the monastic state as in some way equivalent to the ecclesiastical; for his ultimate intention in this case was to promote the layman in question to the episcopate.

(8) *Death, Canonization, Relics, Emblem.*—The last years of Gregory's life were filled with every kind of suffering. His mind, naturally serious, was filled with despondent forebodings, and his continual bodily pains were increased and intensified. His "sole consolation was the hope that death would come quickly" (Epp., XIII, xxvi). The end came on 12 March, 604, and on the same day his body was laid to rest in front of the sacristy in the portico of St. Peter's Basilica. Since then the relics have been moved several times, the most recent translation being that by Paul V in 1606, when they were placed in the chapel of Clement V near the entrance of the modern sacristy. There is some evidence that the body was taken to Soissons in France in the year 826, but probably only some large relic is really meant. Venerable Bede (Hist. Eccl., II, i) gives the epitaph placed on his tomb, which contains

the famous phrase referring to Gregory as *consul Dei*. His canonization by popular acclamation followed at once on his death, and survived a reaction against his memory which seems to have occurred soon afterwards. In art the great pope is usually shown in full pontifical robes with the tiara and double cross. A dove is his special emblem, in allusion to the well-known story recorded by Peter the Deacon (Vita, xxviii), who tells that when the pope was dictating his homilies on Ezekiel a veil was drawn between his secretary and himself. As, however, the pope remained silent for long periods at a time, the servant made a hole in the curtain and, looking through, beheld a dove seated upon Gregory's head with its beak between his lips. When the dove withdrew its beak the holy pontiff spoke and the secretary took down his words; but when he became silent the servant again applied his eye to the hole and saw that the dove had replaced its beak between his lips. The miracles attributed to Gregory are very many, but space forbids even the barest catalogue of them.

(9) *Conclusion.*—It is beyond the scope of this notice to attempt any elaborate estimate of the work, influence, and character of Pope Gregory the Great, but some short focusing of the features given above is only just. First of all, perhaps, it will be best to clear the ground by admitting frankly what Gregory was not. He was not a man of profound learning, not a philosopher, not a controversialist, hardly even a theologian in the constructive sense of the term. He was a trained Roman lawyer and administrator, a monk, a missionary, a preacher, above all a physician of souls and a leader of men. His great claim to remembrance lies in the fact that he is the real father of the medieval papacy (Milman). With regard to things spiritual, he impressed upon men's minds to a degree unprecedented the fact that the See of Peter was the one supreme, decisive authority in the Catholic Church. During his pontificate he established close relations between the Church of Rome and those of Spain, Gaul, Africa, and Illyricum, while his influence in Britain was such that he is justly called the Apostle of the English. In the Eastern Churches, too, the papal authority was exercised with a frequency unusual before his time, and we find no less an authority than the Patriarch of Alexandria submitting himself humbly to the pope's "commands". The system of appeals to Rome was firmly established, and the pope is found to veto or confirm the decrees of synods, to annul the decisions of patriarchs, and inflict punishment on ecclesiastical dignitaries precisely as he thinks right. Nor is his work less noteworthy in its effect on the temporal position of the papacy. Seizing the opportunity which circumstances offered, he made himself in Italy a power stronger than emperor or exarch, and established a political influence which dominated the peninsula for centuries. From this time forth the varied populations of Italy looked to the pope for guidance, and Rome as the papal capital continued to be the centre of the Christian world. Gregory's work as a theologian and Doctor of the Church is less notable. In the history of dogmatic development he is important as summing up the teaching of the earlier Fathers and consolidating it into a harmonious whole, rather than as introducing new developments, new methods, new solutions of difficult questions. It was precisely because of this that his writings became to a great extent the *compendium theologicum* or textbook of the Middle Ages, a position for which his work in popularizing his greater predecessors fitted him well. Achievements so varied have won for Gregory the title of "the Great", but perhaps, among our English-speaking races, he is honoured most of all as the pope who loved the bright-faced Angles, and taught them first to sing the Angels' song.

HIS WRITINGS.—*Genuine, Doubtful, Spurious.*—

Of the writings commonly attributed to Gregory the following are now admitted as genuine on all hands: "Moralium Libri XXXV"; "Regula Pastoralis Liber"; "Dialogorum Libri IV"; "Homiliarum in Ezechielem Prophetam Libri II"; "Homiliarum in Evangelia Libri II"; "Epistolarum Libri XIV". The following are almost certainly spurious: "In Librum Primum Regum Variarum Expositionum Libri VI"; "Expositio super Cantica Canticorum"; "Expositio in VII Psalmos Pœnitentiales"; "Concordia Quorundam Testimoniorum S. Scripturæ". Besides the above there are attributed to Gregory certain liturgical hymns, the Gregorian Sacramentary, and the Antiphonary. (See ANTIPHONARY; SACRAMENTARY.)

*Works of Gregory; complete or partial editions; translations, recensions, etc.*—"Opera S. Gregorii Magni" (Editio princeps, Paris, 1518); ed. P. Tossianensis (6 vols., Rome, 1588-93); ed. P. Goussainville (3 vols., Paris, 1675); ed. Cong. S. Mauri (Sainte-Marthe) (4 vols., Paris, 1705); the last-named re-edited with additions by J. B. Gallicioli (17 vols., Venice, 1768-76) and reprinted in Migne, P. L., LXXV-LXXIX. "Epistolæ", ed. P. Ewald and L. M. Hartmann in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Epist.", I, II (Berlin, 1891-99); this is the authoritative edition of the text of the Epistles (all references given above are to this edition); Jaffé, "Regesta Pontif.", (2nd ed., Rome, 1885), I, 143-219; II, 738; Turchi, "S. Greg. M. Epp. Selectæ" (Rome, 1907); P. Ewald, "Studien zur Ausgabe des Registers Gregors I." in "Neues Archiv", III, 433-625; L. M. Hartmann in "Neues Archiv", XV, 411, 529; XVII, 193; Th. Mommsen in "Neues Archiv", XVII, 189; English translation: J. Barmby, "Selected Epistles" in "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers", 2nd Series, XII, XIII (Oxford and New York, 1895, 1898). "Regula Pastoralis Cursus", ed. E. W. Westhoff (Münster, 1860); ed. H. Hurter, S. J., in "SS. Patr. Opusc. Select.", XX; ed. A. M. Micheletti (Tournai, 1904); ed. B. Sauter (Freiburg, 1904); English translations: "King Alfred's West Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care", ed. H. Sweet (London, 1871); "The Book of Pastoral Care" (tr. J. Barmby) in "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers", 2nd Series, XII (Oxford and New York, 1895). "Dialogorum Libri IV": very many editions of the whole work have appeared, and also of Bk. II, "Of the Life and Miracles of St. Benedict", separately; an old English translation has been reprinted by H. Coleridge, S. J. (London, 1874); L. Wiese, "Die Sprache der Dialoge" (Halle, 1900); H. Delehaye, "S. Grégoire le Grand dans l'hagiographie Grecque" in "Analecta Bolland." (1904), 449-54; B. Sauter, "Der heilige Vater Benediktus nach St. Gregor dem Grossen" (Freiburg, 1904). "Hom. XL in Evangelia", ed. H. Hurter in "SS. Patrum Opusc. Select.", series II, Tom. VI (Innsbruck, 1892). G. Pfeilschifter, "Die authentische Ausgabe der Evangelienhomilien Gregors der Gr." (Munich, 1900). "Magna Moralia", Eng. tr. in "Library of the Fathers" (4 vols., Oxford, 1844); Prunner, "Gnade und Sünde nach Gregors expositio in Job" (Eichstätt, 1855).

**CHIEF SOURCES.**—First of all come the writings of Gregory himself, of which a full account is given above, the most important from a biographical point of view being the fourteen books of his *Letters* and the four books of *Dialogues*. The other early authorities are St. Gregory of Tours (d. 594 or 595), *Historia Francorum*, Bk. X, and the *Liber Pontificalis*, both practically contemporary. To the seventh century belong St. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *De Viris Illustribus*, XL, and St. ILDEPHONSUS OF TOLEDO, *De Viris Illustribus*, I. Next come the *Vita Antiquissima*, by an anonymous monk of Whitby, written probably about 713, and of special interest as representing an essentially English tradition in regard to the saint; the VEN. BEDE, *Hist. Eccles.*, II, whose work was finished in 731; PAUL THE DEACON, who compiled a short *Vita Gregorii Magni* between 770 and 780, which may be supplemented from the same writer's more famous work *Historia Longobardorum*; lastly JOHN THE DEACON, who, at the request of John VIII (872-882), produced his *Vita Gregorii* in answer to the complaint that no history of the saint had yet been produced in Rome. Besides these direct authorities considerable light on the period of St. Gregory's life may be gathered from the works of various contemporary chroniclers and historians.

**WORKS ON GREGORY.**—(1) General.—GREGORY OF TOURS, *Historia Francorum*, X, i, in P. L., LXXI; the best edition of this is by ARNDT and KRUSCH in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. Rerum Meroving.* I; *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE (Paris, 1884), I, 312; ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *De Vir. Illust.*, XL in P. L., LXXXIII; ILDEPHONSUS OF TOLEDO, *De Vir. Illust.*, I, *ibid.*, XCIV; *Vita B. Papæ Gregorii M.* (MS. Gallen, 567), written by a monk of Whitby, ed. GASQUET (Westminster, 1904); see also on same work EWALD, *Die älteste Biographie Gregors I.* in *Historische Aufsätze zum Andenken an G. Waziz gewidmet* (Hanover, 1886), 17-54; VEN. BEDE, *Hist. Eccles.*, I, xxiii-xxviii, II, i-iii; V, xxv; in P. L., XCV; PAUL THE DEACON, *Vita Gregorii M.*, in P. L., LXXV; IDEM, *De Gestis Longobard.*, III, 24; IV, 5; in P. L., XCV; JOHN THE DEACON, *Vita Gregorii M.*, *ibid.*, LXXV; Acta SS., 12 March; VAN DEN ZYPE, S. Gregorius Magnus (Ypres, 1610); SAINTE-MARTE, *Histoire de S. Grégoire* (Rouen, 1677); MAIMBOURG, *Histoire du pontificat de S. Grégoire* (Paris, 1687); BONUCCI, *Istoria del B. Gregorio* (Rome, 1711); WIETROWSKY, *Hist. de gestis præcipuis in pontificatu S. Gregorii M.* (Prague, 1726-30); POZZO, *Istoria della vita di S. Gregorio M.* (Rome, 1758); MARGARIT, *De Gregorii I. M. Vita* (Berlin, 1844); BIANCHI-GIOVINI, *Pontificato di S. Gregorio* (Milan, 1844); LAU, *Gregor I. der Grosse* (Leipzig, 1845); PFAHLER, *Gregor der Grosse* (Frankfurt, 1852); LUZARCHE, *Vie du Pape Grégoire le Grand* (Tours, 1857); ROMALTE, *Vie de S. Grégoire* (Limoges, 1862); PAGNON, *Grégoire le Grand et son époque* (Rouen, 1869); BELMONTÉ, *Gregorio M. e il suo tempo* (Florence, 1871); BOHRINGER, *Die Vater des Papsttums, Leo I und Gregor I* (Stuttgart, 1879); MAGGIO, *Prolegomeni alla storia di Gregorio I. il Grande* (Prato, 1879); BARMBY, *Gregory the Great* (London, 1879; reissue, 1892); CLAUSSIER, *S. Grégoire* (Paris, 1886); BOUSMANN, *Gregor I. der Grosse* (Paderborn, 1890); WOLFSGRUBER, *Gregor der Grosse* (Saulgau, 1890); SNOW, *St. Gregory, his Work and his Spirit* (London, 1892); GRISAR, *Roma alla fine del mondo antico* (Rome, 1899), Pt. III; IDEM, *San Gregorio Magno* (Rome, 1904); DUDDEN, *Gregory the Great, his Place in History and in Thought* (2 vols., London, 1905); CAPELLO, *Gregorio I. e il suo pontificato* (Saluzzo, 1904); CEILLIER, *Histoire générale des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, XI, 429-587; MILMAN, *History of Latin Christianity*, Bk. III, vii; MONTALEMBERT, *Monks of the West*, tr. Bk. v, GREGORIVUS, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, tr. I, 16-103; HODGKIN, *Italy and her Invaders*, V, vii-ix; GATTI, *Un parallelismo storico* (Marco Aurelio, Gregorio Magno) (Milan, 1901); MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1902), I, 1-250.

(2) Special.—(a) The Patrimony.—ORSI, *Della origine del dominio temporale e della sovranità del Rom. Pontif.* (2nd ed., Rome, 1754); BORGIA, *Istoria del dominio temporale della Sede Apostolica nelle due Sicilie* (Rome, 1789); MUZZARELLI, *Dominio temporale del Papa* (Rome, 1789); SUGENHEIM, *Gesch. der Entstehung und Ausbildung des Kirchenstaates* (Leipzig, 1854); SCHÄPFER, *Die Entstehung des Kirchenstaates* (Freiburg im Br., 1860); GRISAR, *Ein Rundgang durch die Patrimonien des hl. Stuhls i. J. 600*, in *Zeitschr. Kath. Theol.*, I, 321; SCHWARZLOSE, *Die Patrimonien d. rom. K.* (Berlin, 1887); MOMMSEN, *Die Bewirtschaftung der Kirchenpfründe unter Papst Gregor I.* in *Zeitschr. f. Social- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, I, 43; DOIZE, *Deux études sur l'administration temporelle du Pape Grégoire le Grand* (Paris, 1904). (b) Primacy and Relations with other Churches.—PFAFF, *Dissertatio de titulo Patriarchæ Eumenici* (Tübingen, 1735); ORTLIEB, *Essai sur le système ecclési. de Grégoire le Grand* (Strasbourg, 1872); PINGAUD, *La politique de S. Grégoire* (Paris, 1872); LORENZ, *Papstwahl und Kaiserthum* (Berlin, 1874), 23; CHIVELUCCI, *Istoria della relazione tra lo Stato e la Chiesa* (Bologna, 1885), II, 301; GORRES, *Papst Gregor der Grosse und Kaiser Phocas* in *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftliche Theol.*, XLIV, 592-602. (c) Relations with Lombards and Franks.—BERNARDI, *Longobardi e S. Gregorio M.* (Milan, 1843); TROYA, *Storia d'Italia del medio evo*, IV, *Codice diplomatico longobardo dal 568 al 774* (Naples, 1852); DIEHL, *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'Esarchat de Ravenne* (Paris, 1888); HARTMANN, *Unters. z. Gesch. d. byzant. Verwaltung in Italien* (Leipzig, 1889); LAMPE, *Quæ fuerint Gregorii M. p. temporibus in imperio byzantini parte occident. exarchis* (Berlin, 1892); PERRY, *The Franks* (London, 1857); KELLET, *Pope Gregory the Great and his Relations with Gaul* (Cambridge, 1889); GRISAR, *Rom. u. d. frankische Kirche vornehmlich im 6. Jahr. in Zeitschr. kath. Theol.*, 14. (d) Monasticism and Missionary Work.—MARILLON, *Dissertation de monastère vlti Gregorii Papæ* (Paris, 1676); BUTLER, *Was St. Augustine of Canterbury a Benedictine?* in *Downside Review*, III, 45-61, 223-240; GRUTZMACHER, *Die Bedeutung Benedikts von Nursia und seiner Regel in der Gesch. des Monachthums* (Berlin, 1892); CUTTS, *Augustine of Canterbury* (London, 1895); GRAY, *The Origin and Early History of Christianity in Britain* (London, 1897); BRIGHT, *Chapters on Early English Church History* (Oxford, 1897); BENEDETTI, *S. Gregorio Magno e la schiavitù* (Rome, 1904). (e) Writings.—ALZOG, *Lehrb. der Patrologie* (Freiburg im Br., 1876); HARNACK, *Lehrb. der Dogmengeschichte*, III (Freiburg im Br., 1890); LOOPS, *Leits. zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (Halle, 1893); SEEBERG, *Lehrb. der Dogmengeschichte*, II (Leipzig, 1898); BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br., 1908).

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

**Gregory II, SAINT, POPE (715-731)**, perhaps the greatest of the great popes who occupied the chair of Peter during the eighth century, a Roman, son of Marcellus and Honesta. To his contemporaries in the West he was known as Gregory Junior or the Younger;

to those in the East, who confounded him with Gregory I, author of the "Dialogues"; he was "Dialogus". The year of his birth is not known, but while very young he showed a desire for the Church and was placed by the pope in the "Schola cantorum". He was made a subdeacon and *secularius* (paymaster and almoner) of the Roman Church by Sergius I. Then the care of the papal library was entrusted to him, and he has the honour of being the first papal almoner or librarian known to us by name. By the time he had become a deacon, he had given such signs of character and superior intelligence that he was chosen by Pope Constantine to accompany him when he had to go to Constantinople to discuss the canons of the Quinisext Council with the truculent tyrant, Justinian II. The pope's trust was not misplaced. The deacon Gregory, "by his admirable answers", solved every difficulty raised by the emperor. One of the first things which Gregory took in hand when he became pope (19 May, 715) was to put in repair the walls of Rome. Not for the last time had the Lombards, those old enemies of the Romans, attacked their city, and now a new foe had shown itself. The Mediterranean was fast becoming a Saracen lake, and there was fear that the Moslems might make a descent upon the Eternal City itself. Gregory had made good progress with his work of repair, when various causes combined with a devastating flood of the Tiber to prevent him from completing it. But throughout all his pontificate, Gregory failed not to scan with anxiety the movements of the Saracens, and he is credited with having sent tokens of encouragement to the Frankish leaders who were stemming their advance in Gaul.

In the first year of his pontificate, he received a letter from John, Patriarch of Constantinople. Addressed "to the sacred head of the Church", it was really an apology for his having shown himself subservient to Philippius Bardanes in the matter of Monothelism. Gregory also received several distinguished pilgrims during his pontificate. Among the many Anglo-Saxon pilgrims who came to Rome during his reign, the most famous were Abbot Ceolfrid and King Ina, of whom the one took to the pope the famous Codex Amiatinus, and the other founded the "Schola Anglorum". Duke Theodo I of Bavaria also came to Rome to pray, and no doubt to obtain from the pope more preachers of the Gospel for his country. Among those whom Gregory despatched for the conversion of Bavaria was St. Corbinian, who became one of its apostles. But the great apostle of Bavaria, as of Germany generally, was St. Winfrid, or Boniface, as he was afterwards called. Anxious to preach to the heathens, he went to Rome, and God "moved the pontiff of the glorious See" to grant his wishes. He sent Boniface "to the wild nations of Germany", bidding him, by the irrefragable authority of Blessed Peter, "go forth and preach the truths of both Testaments". Gregory watched and encouraged the work of Boniface unremittingly. In 722 he consecrated him bishop and interested the famous Charles Martel in his labours. Gregory was a great supporter of the monastic order. On the death of his mother, he converted his parental mansion into a monastery, and founded or restored many others. Among those he helped to restore was the famous Abbey of Monte Cassino. During the early portion of his pontificate, Gregory was on good terms with the Lombards. Their king drew up his laws under his influence; but their dukes, with or without the consent of their king, embroiled the peninsula by seizing portions of the possessions of the Greek empire. The Greek exarch at Ravenna was quite unable to stem the advance of the Lombards, so that Gregory appealed for help to Charles Martel and the Franks. Charles could not or would not come, but greater commotion in Italy than could have been caused by his advent was aroused by the publication there of the decrees of the Greek em-

peror, Leo III, known as the Isaurian or the Iconoclast (727). The Italians had been previously enraged by his attempt to levy an extraordinary tax on them. Despite the attempts of Greek officials to take his life, Gregory opposed both the emperor's illegal taxes and his unwarrantable interference in the domain of ecclesiastical authority. Now was the opportunity of the Lombards. When the exarch attempted to compel the pope to obey the imperial decrees, they became his defenders. Nearly all the Byzantine districts of Italy also turned against the emperor, and but for the pope would have elected another emperor to oppose him. When all seemed lost to the Byzantine cause in Italy, Eutychius, the last of the exarchs, contrived to wean the Lombards from the pope and to make them turn against him. The exarch was to help Liutprand, the Lombard king, to bring the almost independent Lombard Dukes of Benevento and Spoleto into complete subjection to his authority, and Liutprand was to assist him in bringing the pope to his knees. But the personal influence of Gregory over Liutprand was able to dissolve this unnatural alliance, and he repaid the exarch's treatment of him by furnishing him with troops to put down a rebellion against the imperial authority.

In connexion with Gregory's struggle against the Iconoclast emperor and his Italian representatives, certain doubtful points have been hitherto passed over. For instance, it is certain that about the year 730 Ravenna fell for a brief space into the hands of the Lombards, and that by the exertions of the pope and the Venetians, it was recovered and continued to remain for a year or two longer a portion of the Byzantine empire. It is not, however, certain whether it was Gregory II or Gregory III who rendered this important service to Leo III. Probably, however, it was done by Gregory II about the year 727; though perhaps it is not quite equally probable that the two famous condemnatory letters which Gregory II is said to have sent to Leo III are genuine. If they are authentic, then it is certain not only that Ravenna was captured by the Lombards about 727, but that the independent temporal authority of the popes which in fact began with Gregory II was consciously felt by him. But when later Greek historians asserted that Gregory "separated Rome and Italy and the whole West from political and ecclesiastical subjection" to the Byzantine Empire, they are simply exaggerating his opposition to the emperor's illegal taxes, and Iconoclastic edicts. Despite all provocation, Gregory never for a moment swerved in his loyalty to the Iconoclast emperor; but, as in duty bound, he opposed his efforts to destroy an article of Catholic Faith. By his letters sent in all directions he warned the people against the teachings of the emperor, and in a council at Rome (727) proclaimed the true doctrine on the question of the worship of images. To the best of his power, also, he supported St. Germanus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, in the resistance he was making to the "gospel of Leo", and threatened to depose Anastasius, who had replaced the saint in the See of Constantinople, if he did not renounce his heresy. Gregory recognized both the Patriarch of Forum Julii (Civitate) and the Patriarch of Grado as joint heirs of the original metropolitan See of Aquileia, and for a time caused these rival prelates to live in peace.

Gregory died in February, and was buried in St. Peter's (11 Feb., 731). He is honoured as a saint in the Roman and other martyrologies.

*Liber Pontificalis* (Paris, 1886), I, 396 sqq., ed. DUCHESNE; PAUL THE DEACON, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Scriptores Longob.*; BEDE; THEOPHANES; JOHN THE DEACON OF VENICE, etc.; *Letters of St. Boniface in Mon. Germ. Hist.: Epp.*, III; HEFFELE, *History of the Councils* (Edinburgh, 1896), V, tr.; HODGKIN, *Italy and her Invaders* (Oxford, 1896), VI; BURY, *History of the Later Roman Empire*; HIRSCH, *Il ducato di Benevento*, Italian tr.; MALFATTI, *Imperatori e Papi*; BRUNENGO, *I primi Papi Re dell'ultimo dei Re Longobardi*; DUCHESNE, *The Beginnings of the*

*Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes*, tr.: PARGOIRE, *L'église Byzantine*, 527-847; MARIN, *Les Moines de Constantinople*; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1902), I, Pt. II.

HORACE K. MANN.

**Gregory III**, SAINT, POPE (731-741), was the son of a Syrian named John. The date of his birth is not known. His reputation for learning and virtue was so great that the Romans elected him pope by acclamation, when he was accompanying the funeral procession of his predecessor, 11 Feb., 731. As he was not consecrated for more than a month after his election, it is presumed that he waited for the confirmation of his election by the exarch at Ravenna. In the matter of Iconoclasm, he followed the policy of his predecessor. He sent legates and letters to remonstrate with the persecuting emperor, Leo III, and held two synods in Rome (731) in which the image-breaking heresy was condemned. By way of a practical protest against the emperor's action he made it a point of paying special honour to images and relics, giving particular attention to the subject in St. Peter's. Fragments of inscriptions, to be seen in the crypts of the Vatican basilica, bear witness to this day of an oratory he built therein, and of the special prayers he ordered to be there recited.

Leo, whose sole answer to the arguments and apologies for image worship which were addressed to him from both East and West, was force, seized the papal patrimonies in Calabria and Sicily, or wherever he had any power in Italy, and transferred to the patriarch of Constantinople the ecclesiastical jurisdiction which the popes had previously exercised both there, and throughout the ancient Prefecture of Illyricum. Gregory III confirmed the decision of his predecessors as to the respective rights of the Patriarchs of Aquileia and Grado, and sent the pallium to Antoninus of Grado. In granting it also to Egbert of York, he was only following out the arrangements of St. Gregory I who had laid it down that York was to have metropolitan rights in the North of England, as Canterbury had to have them in the South. Both Tatwine and Nothelm of Canterbury received the pallium in succession from Gregory III (731 and 736). At his request Gregory III extended to St. Boniface the same support and encouragement which had been afforded him by Gregory II. "Strengthened exceedingly by the help of the affection of the Apostolic See", the saint joyfully continued his glorious work for the conversion of Germany. About 737 Boniface came to Rome for the third time to give an account of his stewardship, and to enjoy the pope's "life-giving conversation". At Gregory's order the monk and great traveller, St. Willibald, went to assist his cousin St. Boniface in his labours.

The close of Gregory's reign was troubled by the Lombards. Realizing the ambition which animated Liutprand, Gregory completed the restoration of the walls of Rome which had been begun by his predecessors, and bought back Gallese, a stronghold on the Flaminian Way, from Transamund, Duke of Spoleto, which helped to keep open the communications between Rome and Ravenna. In 739, Liutprand was again in arms. His troops ravaged the exarchate, and he himself marched south to bring to subjection his vassals, the Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, and the Duchy of Rome. Transamund fled to Rome, and Gregory implored the aid of the great Frankish chief, Charles Martel. At length ambassadors from the viceroy (*subregulus*) of the Franks appeared in Rome (739). Their arrival, or the summer heats, brought a momentary peace. But in the following year, Liutprand again took the field. This time the Romans left their walls, and helped Transamund to recover Spoleto. When, however, he had recovered his duchy, he would not or could not comply with Gregory's request, and endeavour to recover for the pope "the four cities of the Roman duchy which had been lost

for his sake." In the midst of all these wars and rumours of war, Gregory died, and was buried in the oratory of our Lady which he had himself built in St. Peter's. He died in 741, but whether in November or December is not certain. It is, however, on 28 November that he is commemorated in the Roman martyrology.

*Codex Carolinus* in JAFFÉ, *Monumenta Carolina* (Berlin, 1867), or in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Epp.*, III (Berlin, 1892). See also bibliography of article GREGORY II.

HORACE K. MANN.

**Gregory IV**, POPE, elected near the end of 827; d. Jan., 844. When Gregory was born is not known, but he was a Roman and the son of John. Before his election to the papacy he was the Cardinal-Priest of the Basilica of St. Mark, which he adorned with mosaics yet visible. For his piety and learning he was ordained priest by Paschal I. This man, of distinguished appearance and high birth, was raised to the chair of Peter, despite his protestations of unfitness, mainly by the instrumentality of the secular nobility of Rome who were then securing a preponderating influence in papal elections. But the representatives in Rome of the Emperor Louis the Pious would not allow him to be consecrated until his election had been approved by their master. This interference caused such delay that it was not, seemingly, till about March, 828, that he began to govern the Church.

Throughout the greater part of his pontificate Gregory was involved in the quarrels between Louis and his sons which were to prove fatal to the domination of the Franks. Owing perhaps to a want of political insight or to an over-sympathetic or sanguine temperament, or, it may be, to a want of firmness of character, his efforts to promote domestic peace in the imperial family were not attended either with success or with glory. By a solemn deed, confirmed by Paschal I, Louis had made a division of the empire in favour of the three sons of his first wife, Lothair I, Pepin, and Louis the German (817). But on her death, he married the young and ambitious Judith, and was soon induced by her to devote himself wholly to furthering the interests of their son, afterwards known as Charles the Bald. Charles's half-brothers combined in arms against their father (830), seized and imprisoned him, and compelled him to confirm the Constitution of 817. The brothers, however, soon disagreed among themselves and Louis was restored to power by a diet at Nimwegen, and, by a decision of the pope, to his wife from whom he had been separated by force (Oct., 830). Untaught by experience, Louis continued his policy of favouring his youngest son. The brothers again flew to arms, and the eldest, Lothair (who was ruling Italy), by argument, by deception, and perhaps by gentle pressure, induced Gregory to accompany him across the Alps. The appearance of the pope in the camp of the rebels made it appear that he was in their favour. Hence the bishops who remained faithful to the emperor, suspicious of the pope's good faith, would not come to him when he summoned them to his presence. It was to no purpose that Gregory repelled their accusations. When at length he met Louis himself, he found that Louis also did not trust him. While these negotiations were in progress, Lothair, who was false to everyone, was suborning the allegiance of his father's soldiers. Betrayed in consequence, Louis once again fell into the hands of his sons. Lothair seized the empire, allowed Gregory to return to Rome a sadder and a wiser man, and degraded his father (833). But next year witnessed a second fraternal quarrel, and a second restoration of Louis, who was weak enough to allow Lothair to retain the Kingdom of Italy. The result of his mistaken acts of clemency was not only that he had to protect the pope against Lothair's aggressions but that he had to face another rebellion of one of his sons. In marching to put it down, he died (June, 840).

His death put Lothair in possession of the imperial name. To be emperor in fact, he resolved to crush his brothers by force of arms. Detaining the legate whom Gregory de-patched to try and make peace, Lothair crossed the Alps. The terrible battle of Fontenay (now Fontenoy-en-Puisaye) near Auxerre (841), resulted not only in the defeat of Lothair, but in the practical annihilation of the Frankish people, and in the end of their empire. While the empire was collapsing, the Saracens were pushing forward their conquests. During Gregory's pontificate they possessed themselves of Sicily, and had been invited into Italy to take part in the wars of the petty princes of South Italy. To do what he could for the safety of Rome, the pope fortified the ancient Ostia by the erection of a stronghold called after himself Gregoriopolis. Equally for the benefit of Rome and the "Patrimony of St. Peter", Gregory repaired aqueducts and churches and founded "farm colonies" in the Campagna. He seconded the heroic efforts which St. Anskar, the Apostle of the North, was making for the conversion of Sweden, authorizing his consecration as the first Archbishop of Hamburg, sending him the pallium, and "before the body and confession of Blessed Peter", giving him "full authority to preach the Gospel" and making him his legate "among the Swedes, Danes and Slavs."

Gregory gave the pallium to the Archbishops of Salzburg, Canterbury, and Grado, and favoured the latter against the encroachments of the Patriarch of Aquileia. He also supported Aldric, Bishop of Le Mans, who got into difficulties through his loyal support of Louis against his rebellious sons. To oblige Louis, Gregory caused some of his ecclesiastics to be trained in music in Rome, and he instructed him to proclaim the observance of the feast of All Saints throughout the empire. Gregory was buried in St. Peter's.


*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, II, 73 sqq.; the *Lives of Louis the Pious* by TREGANUS in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Scriptores*, II, and P. L., CVI, and by the ANTRONOMER in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Scriptores*, II, and P. L., CIV; the *Annals of Einhard*, etc.; the *Historia of Nithard* in P. L., CXV; the works of AGOBARD in P. L., CIV; and the *Life of Wala* by PASCHASIUS RABERT in P. L., CXX; see HILMLY, *Wala et Louis le Débonnaire*, CHEVALLARD, *St. Agobard*; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, II.

HORACE K. MANN.

**Gregory V**, POPE, b. c. 970; d. 4 Feb., 999. On the death of John XV the Romans sent a deputation to Otto III and asked him to name the one he would wish them to elect in the place of the deceased pontiff. He at once mentioned his chaplain and relation, Bruno, the son of Duke Otto of Carinthia and of Judith. He was already (996) distinguished for learning, especially for his knowledge of the dialects which were to develop into the languages of modern Europe. If possessed of a somewhat hasty disposition, he was nevertheless a worthy candidate for the papacy, and his election did honour to the Romans who elected him. This first German pope was consecrated 3 May, 996, and his accession was generally hailed with satisfaction. One of his first acts was to crown Otto emperor (21 May, 996). Throughout the whole of his pontificate he acted in full harmony with his imperial cousin. Together they held a synod a few days after Otto's coronation, in which Arnulf was ordered to be restored to the See of Reims, and Gerbert, the future Sylvester II, was condemned as an intruder. Unfortunately for himself and the peace of the Church, he prevailed upon the emperor not to banish from Rome the turbulent noble Crescentius Numentanus, "of the Marble Horse". No sooner did Otto leave Rome than Crescentius roused his adherents to arms and Gregory had to fly to the north. Crescentius did not stop here, but caused an antipope to be proclaimed in the person of the crafty Italo-Greek John Philagathus of Rosano, who had artfully made a position for himself at

the court of the Ottos and now took the title of John XVI (997).

At a synod which Gregory had ordered to meet at Pavia, not only were Crescentius and his antipope anathematized, but King Robert of France was threatened with excommunication if he did not put away Bertha whom he had married though she was related to him not only by spiritual relationship but by blood. After some opposition, Robert finally yielded, and, repenting of his misdeeds, repudiated Bertha and espoused Constance. Gerbert, too, after having been condemned by this synod also, abandoned the See of Reims, and was rewarded with the See of Ravenna. Furious that his authority had been so flouted, Otto marched upon Rome. Philagathus fled from the city and Crescentius shut himself up in the Castle of Sant' Angelo. The emperor's troops pursued the antipope, captured him, deprived him of his nose, ears, eyes, and



SARCOPHAGUS OF GREGORY V  
St. Peter's, Rome

tongue, and brought him back to Rome. There he was brought before Otto and the pope, and publicly degraded (998). Then, after being driven ignominiously through the streets of Rome on an ass, he was transported to Germany, where he seems to have died in the monastery of Fulda (1013). The castle of Sant' Angelo was next besieged, and, when it was taken, Crescentius was hanged upon its walls (998). About the year 997, Archbishop Ælfrie came to Rome in order to procure his pallium, and to consult the pope about replacing the secular canons, who then held the cathedral of Canterbury, by monks, in accordance with the commission he had received from King Ethelred and the Witan. As a mark of special honour, Gregory put his own pallium on Ælfrie, and bade him put into his monastery at Canterbury "men of that order which the Blessed Gregory commanded Augustine therein to place". At the request of Otto, Gregory granted exceptional privileges to many German monasteries, and in his company held various synods for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. He had to threaten with anathema Ardo, Marquess of Ivrea, if he did not make amends for his ill-treatment of the property of St. Mary's of Ivrea, its serfs, and its bishop. Gregory V was buried in St. Peter's "in front of the sacristy, i. e. on the Gospel side, near Pope Pelagius".

DUCHESNE, ed. *Liber Pontificalis*, II, 261 sq.; twenty-two of Gregory's Bulls in P. L., CXXXVII; the chronicles of THIETMAR, LEO OF OSTIA, etc.; the annals of Hildesheim, Quedlinburg, etc.; the lives of SAINTS ADALBERT, ABBO, NILUS, etc.; the *Historia* of RADULPHUS GLABER. Cf. LENORMANT, *La*



*Grande Grèce*, I, 341 sqq.; SCHLUMBERGER, *L'Épopée Byzantine*, II; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, IV.  
HORACE K. MANN.

**Gregory VI, POPE (JOHN GRATIAN)**, date of birth unknown; elected 1 May, 1045; abdicated at Sutri, 20 Dec., 1046; d. probably at Cologne, in the beginning of 1048. In 1045 the youthful libertine Benedict IX occupied the chair of Peter. Anxious, in order, so it is said, that he might marry, to vacate a position into which, though wholly unfit, he had been thrust by his family, he consulted his godfather, John Gratian, the Archpriest of St. John "ad portam Latinam", a man of great reputation for uprightness of character, as to whether he could resign the supreme pontificate. When he was convinced that he might do so, he offered to give up the papacy into the hands of his godfather for a large sum of money. Desirous of ridding the See of Rome of such an unworthy pontiff, John Gratian in all good faith and simplicity paid him the money and was recognized as pope in his stead. Unfortunately the accession of Gratian, who took the name of Gregory VI, though it was hailed with joy even by such a strict upholder of the right as St. Peter Damian, did not bring peace to the Church. When Benedict left the city after selling the papacy, there was already another aspirant to the See of Peter in the field. John, Bishop of Sabina, had been saluted as Pope Sylvester III by that faction of the nobility which had driven Benedict IX from Rome in 1044, and had then installed him in his stead. Though the expelled pontiff (Benedict IX) soon returned, and forced John to retire to his See of Sabina, that pretender never gave up his claims, and through his party contrived apparently to keep some hold on a portion of Rome. Benedict, also unable, it seems, to obtain the bride on whom he had set his heart, soon repented of his resignation, again claimed the papacy, and in his turn is thought to have succeeded in acquiring dominion over a part of the city.

With an empty exchequer and a clergy that had largely lost the savour of righteousness, Gregory was confronted by an almost hopeless task. Nevertheless, with the aid of his "capellanus" or chaplain, Hildebrand, destined to be the great Pope Gregory VII, he essayed to bring about civil and religious order. He strove to effect the latter by letters and by councils, and the former by force of arms. But the factions of the antipopes were too strong to be put down by him, and the confusion only increased. Convinced that nothing would meet the case but German intervention, a number of influential clergy and laity separated themselves from communion with Gregory or either of the two would-be popes and implored the warlike King Henry III to cross the Alps and restore order. Nothing loath, Henry descended into Italy in the autumn of 1046. Strong in the conviction of his innocence, Gregory went north to meet him. He was received by the king with all the honour due to a pope, and in accordance with the royal request, summoned a council to meet at Sutri. Of the antipopes, Sylvester alone presented himself at the synod, which was opened 20 Dec., 1046. Both his claim to the papacy and that of Benedict were soon disposed of. Deprived of all clerical rank and considered a usurper from the beginning, Sylvester was condemned to be confined in a monastery for the rest of his life. Benedict's case also presented no difficulty. He had now no claim to the papacy, as he had voluntarily resigned it. But it was different with Gregory. However, when the bishops of the synod had convinced him that the act by which he had become supreme pontiff was in itself simoniacal, and had called upon him to resign, Gregory, seeing that little choice was left him, of his own accord laid down his office. A German, Sudiger, Bishop of Bamberg (Clement II), was then elected to replace him. Accompanied by Hildebrand, Gregory

was taken by Henry to Germany (May, 1047), where he soon died.

*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, II, 270 sqq.; a few Bulls of Gregory in *P. L.*, CXLII; DESIDERIUS, *Dialogi* in *P. L.*, CXLIX; BONIZO, *Ad amicum*; GLABER, *Historia*; HERMANNUS CONTRACTUS and other chroniclers and annalists. See MITTLER, *De schismate in eccles. Rom. sub Bened. IX* (1835); JAFFÉ, *De Greg. VI abdicatione* in his *Bibliotheca rer. Germ.* (1865), II, 594-600; MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (London and St. Louis, 1909), V.

HORACE K. MANN.

**GREGORY VI, ANTIPOPE.**—On the death of Sergius IV in June, 1012, "a certain Gregory", opposed the election of Benedict VIII, and got himself made pope, seemingly by a small faction. Promptly expelled from Rome, he made his way to Germany, and craved the support of King Henry II (25 Dec., 1012). That monarch, however, after promising him that his case should be carefully examined in accordance with canon law and Roman custom, took away from him the papal insignia which he was wearing, and bade him cease to act as pope in the meanwhile. After this, history knows the "certain Gregory" no more.

*Chronicle of Thietmar*, IV, lxi, in *P. L.*, CXXXIX.

HORACE K. MANN.

**Gregory VII (HILDEBRAND), SAINT, POPE**, one of the greatest of the Roman pontiffs and one of the most remarkable men of all times; b. between the years 1020 and 1025, at Soana, or Ravacum, in Tuscany; d. 25 May, 1085, at Salerno. The early years of his life are involved in considerable obscurity. His name, Hildebrand (Hellebrand)—signifying to those of his contemporaries that loved him "a bright flame", to those that hated him "a brand of hell"—would indicate some Lombard connexion of his family, though at a later time, it probably also suggested the fabled descent from the noble family of the Aldobrandini. That he was of humble origin—*vir de plebe*, as he is styled in the letter of a contemporary abbot—can scarcely be doubted. His father Bonizo is said by some chroniclers to have been a carpenter, by others a peasant, the evidence in either case being very slender; the name of his mother is unrecorded. At a tender age he came to Rome to be educated in the monastery of Santa Maria on the Aventine Hill, over which his maternal uncle Laurentius presided as abbot. The austere spirit of Cluny pervaded this Roman cloister, and it is not unlikely that here the youthful Hildebrand first imbibed those lofty principles of Church reform of which he was afterwards to become the most fearless exponent. Early in life he made his religious profession as a Benedictine monk at Rome (not in Cluny); the house of his profession, however, and the year of his entrance into the order, both remain undetermined. As a cleric in minor orders he entered the service of John Gratian, Archpriest of San Giovanni by the Latin Gate, and on Gratian's elevation to the papacy as Gregory VI, became his chaplain. In 1046 he followed his papal patron across the Alps into exile, remaining with Gregory at Cologne until the death of the deposed pontiff in 1047, when he withdrew to Cluny. Here he resided for more than a year.

At Besançon, in January, 1049, he met Bruno, Bishop of Toul, the pontiff-elect recently chosen at Worms under the title of Leo IX, and returned with him to Rome, though not before Bruno, who had been nominated merely by the emperor, had expressed the intention of submitting to the formal choice of the Roman clergy and people. Created a cardinal-subdeacon, shortly after Leo's accession, and appointed administrator of the Patrimony of St. Peter, Hildebrand at once gave evidence of that extraordinary faculty for administration which later characterized his government of the Church Universal. Under his energetic and capable direction the property of the Church, which latterly had been diverted into the

hands of the Roman nobility and the Normans, was largely recovered, and the revenues of the Holy See, whose treasury had been depleted, speedily augmented. By Leo IX he was also appointed *propositus* or *provisior* (not abbot) of the monastery of St. Paul *extra Muros*. The unchecked violence of the lawless bands of the Campagna had brought great destitution upon this venerable establishment. Monastic discipline was so impaired that the monks were attended in their refectory by women; and the sacred edifices were so neglected that the sheep and cattle freely roamed in and out through the broken doors. By rigorous reforms and a wise administration Hildebrand succeeded in restoring the ancient rule of the abbey with the austere observance of earlier times; and he continued throughout life to manifest the deepest attachment for the famous house which his energy had reclaimed from ruin and decay. In 1034 he was sent to France as papal legate to examine the cause of Berengarius. While still in Tours he learned of the death of Leo IX, and on hastening back to Rome found that the clergy and people were eager to elect him, the most trusted friend and counsellor of Leo, as the successor. This proposal of the Romans was, however, resisted by Hildebrand, who set out for Germany at the head of an embassy to implore a nomination from the emperor. The negotiations, which lasted eleven months, ultimately resulted in the selection of Hildebrand's candidate, Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstätt, who was consecrated at Rome, 13 April, 1055, under the name of Victor II. During the reign of this pontiff, the cardinal-subdeacon steadily maintained, and even increased the ascendancy which by his commanding genius he had acquired during the pontificate of Leo IX. Near the close of the year 1057 he went once more to Germany to reconcile the Empress-regent Agnes and her court to the (merely) canonical election of Pope Stephen X (1057-1058). His mission was not yet accomplished when Stephen died at Florence, and although the dying pope had forbidden the people to appoint a successor before Hildebrand returned, the Tusculan faction seized the opportunity to set up a member of the Crescentian family, John Mincius, Bishop of Velletri, under the title of Benedict X. With masterly skill Hildebrand succeeded in defeating the schemes of the hostile party, and secured the election of Gerard, Bishop of Florence, a Burgundian by birth, who assumed the name of Nicholas II (1059-1061).

The two most important transactions of this pontificate—the celebrated decree of election, by which the power of choosing the pope was vested in the college of cardinals, and the alliance with the Normans, secured by the Treaty of Melfi, 1059—were in large measure the achievement of Hildebrand, whose power and influence had now become supreme in Rome. It was perhaps inevitable that the issues raised by the new decree of election should not be decided without a conflict, and with the passing away of Nicholas II in 1061, that conflict came. But when it was ended, after a schism enduring for some years, the imperial party with its Antipope Cadalous had been discomfited, and Anselm of Baggio, the candidate of Hildebrand and the reform party, successfully enthroned in the Lateran Palace as Alexander II. By Nicholas II, in 1059, Hildebrand had been raised to the dignity and office of Archdeacon of the Holy Roman Church, and Alexander II now made him Chancellor of the Apostolic See. On 21 April, 1073, Alexander II died. The time at length had come when Hildebrand, who for more than twenty years had been the most prominent figure in the Church, who had been chiefly instrumental in the selection of her rulers, who had inspired and given purpose to her policy, and who had been steadily developing and realizing, by successive acts, her sovereignty and purity, should assume in his own person the majesty and responsibility of that exalted power which his genius had so long directed.

On the day following the death of Alexander II, as the obsequies of the deceased pontiff were being performed in the Lateran basilica, there arose, of a sudden, a loud outcry from the whole multitude of clergy and people: "Let Hildebrand be pope!" "Blessed Peter has chosen Hildebrand the Archdeacon!" All remonstrances on the part of the archdeacon were vain, his protestations fruitless. Later, on the same day, Hildebrand was conducted to the church of San Pietro in Vincoli, and there elected in legal form by the assembled cardinals, with the due consent of the Roman clergy and amid the repeated acclamations of the people. That this extraordinary outburst on the part of the clergy and people in favour of Hildebrand could have been the result of some preconcerted arrangement, as is sometimes alleged, does not appear likely. Hildebrand was clearly the man of the hour, his austere virtue commanded respect, his genius admiration; and the promptitude and unanimity with which he was chosen would indicate, rather, a general recognition of his fitness for the high office. In the decree of election those who had chosen him as pontiff proclaimed him "a devout man, a man mighty in human and divine knowledge, a distinguished lover of equity and justice, a man firm in adversity and temperate in prosperity, a man, according to the saying of the Apostle, of good behaviour, blameless, modest, sober, chaste, given to hospitality, and one that ruleth well his own house; a man from his childhood generously brought up in the bosom of this Mother Church, and for the merit of his life already raised to the archidiaconal dignity". "We choose then", they said to the people, "our Archdeacon Hildebrand to be pope and successor to the Apostle, and to bear henceforward and forever the name of Gregory" (22 April, 1073), Mansi, "Conciliorum Collectio", XX, 60.

The decree of Nicholas II having expressly, if vaguely acknowledged the right of the emperor to have some voice in papal elections, Hildebrand deferred the ceremony of his consecration until he had received the royal sanction. In sending the formal announcement of his elevation to Henry IV of Germany, he took occasion to indicate frankly the attitude, which, as sovereign pontiff, he was prepared to assume in dealing with the Christian princes, and, with a note of grave personal warning besought the king not to bestow his approval. The German bishops, apprehensive of the severity with which such a man as Hildebrand would carry out the decrees of reform, endeavoured to prevent the king from assenting to the election; but upon the favourable report of Count Eberhard of Nellenburg, who had been despatched to Rome to assert the rights of the crown, Henry gave his approval (it proved to be the last instance in history of a papal election being ratified by an emperor), and the new pope, in the meanwhile ordained to the priesthood, was solemnly consecrated on the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, 29 June, 1073. In assuming the name of Gregory VII, Hildebrand not only honoured the memory and character of his earliest patron, Gregory VI, but also proclaimed to the world the legitimacy of that pontiff's title.

From the letters which Gregory addressed to his friends shortly after his election, imploring their intercession with heaven in his behalf, and begging their sympathy and support, it is abundantly evident that he assumed the burden of the pontificate, which had been thrust on him, only with the strongest reluctance, and not without a great struggle of mind. To Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino, he speaks of his elevation in terms of terror, giving utterance to the words of the Psalmist: "I am come into deep waters, so that the floods run over me"; "Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me, and darkness hath covered me."<sup>5</sup> And in view of the appalling nature of the task that lay before him (of its difficulties no one indeed had a

clearer perception than he), it cannot appear strange that even his intrepid spirit was for the moment overwhelmed. For at the time of Gregory's elevation to the papacy the Christian world was in a deplorable condition. During the desolating era of transition—that terrible period of warfare and rapine, violence, and corruption in high places, which followed immediately upon the dissolution of the Carolingian Empire, a period when society in Europe and all existing institutions seemed doomed to utter destruction and ruin—the Church had not been able to escape from the general debasement. The tenth century, the saddest perhaps, in Christian annals, is characterized by the vivid remark of Baronius that Christ was as if asleep in the vessel of the Church. At the time of Leo IX's election in 1049, according to the testimony of St. Bruno, Bishop of Segni, "the whole world lay in wickedness, holiness had disappeared, justice had perished and truth had been buried; Simon Magus lording it over the Church, whose bishops and priests were given to luxury and fornication" (*Vita S. Leonis PP. IX* in Watterich, *Pont. Roman. Vitæ*, I, 96). St. Peter Damian, the fiercest censor of his age, unrolls a frightful picture of the decay of clerical morality in the lurid pages of his "*Liber Gomorrhianus*" (*Book of Gomorrah*). Though allowance must no doubt be made for the writer's exaggerated and rhetorical style—a style common to all moral censors—yet the evidence derived from other sources justifies us in believing that the corruption was widespread. In writing to his venerated friend, Abbot Hugh of Cluny (Jan., 1075), Gregory himself laments the unhappy state of the Church in the following terms: "The Eastern Church has fallen away from the Faith and is now assailed on every side by infidels. Wherever I turn my eyes—to the west, to the north, or to the south—I find everywhere bishops who have obtained their office in an irregular way, whose lives and conversation are strangely at variance with their sacred calling; who go through their duties not for the love of Christ but from motives of worldly gain. There are no longer princes who set God's honour before their own selfish ends, or who allow justice to stand in the way of their ambition. . . . And those among whom I live—Romans, Lombards, and Normans—are, as I have often told them, worse than Jews or Pagans" (*Greg. VII, Registr.*, I, II, ep. xlix).

But whatever the personal feelings and anxieties of Gregory may have been in taking up the burden of the papacy at a time when scandals and abuses were everywhere pressing into view, the fearless pontiff felt not a moment's hesitation as to the performance of his duty in carrying out the work of reform already begun by his predecessors. Once securely established on the Apostolic throne, Gregory made every effort to stamp out of the Church the two consuming evils of the age, simony and clerical incontinency, and, with characteristic energy and vigour, laboured unceasingly for the assertion of those lofty principles with which he firmly believed the welfare of Christ's Church and the regeneration of society itself to be inseparably bound up. His first care, naturally, was to secure his

own position in Rome. For this purpose he made a journey into Southern Italy, a few months after his election, and concluded treaties with Landolfo of Benevento, Richard of Capua, and Gisolfo of Salerno, by which these princes engaged themselves to defend the person of the pope and the property of the Holy See, and never to invest anyone with a church benefice without the papal sanction. The Norman leader, Robert Guiscard, however, maintained a suspicious attitude towards the pope, and at the Lenten Synod (1075) Gregory solemnly excommunicated him for his sacrilegious invasion of the territory of the Holy See (Capua and Benevento). During the year 1074 the pope's mind was also greatly occupied by the project of an expedition to the East for the deliverance of the Oriental Christians from the oppression of the Seljuk Turks. To promote the cause of a crusade, and to

effect, if possible, a reunion between the Eastern and the Western Church—hopes of which had been held out by the Emperor Michael VIII in his letter to Gregory in 1073—the pontiff sent the Patriarch of Venice to Constantinople as his envoy. He wrote to the Christian princes, urging them to rally the hosts of Western Christendom for the defence of the Christian East; and in March, 1074, addressed a circular letter to all the faithful, exhorting them to come to the rescue of their Eastern brethren. But the project met with much indifference and even opposition; and as Gregory himself soon became involved in complications elsewhere, which demanded all his energies, he was prevented from giving effect to his intentions, and the expedition came to naught. With the youthful monarch of Germany Gregory's relations in the beginning of his pontificate were of a pacific nature. Henry, who was at the time hard pressed by the Saxons, had written to the pope (Sept., 1073) in a tone of humble

deference, acknowledging his past misconduct, and expressing regret for his numerous misdeeds—his invasion of the property of the Church, his simoniacal promotions of unworthy persons, his negligence in punishing offenders; he promised amendment for the future, professed submission to the Roman See in language more gentle and lowly than had ever been used by any of his predecessors to the pontiffs of Rome, and expressed the hope that the royal power and the sacerdotal, bound together by the necessity of mutual assistance, might henceforth remain indissolubly united. But the passionate and headstrong king did not long abide by these sentiments.

With admirable discernment, Gregory began his great work of purifying the Church by a reformation of the clergy. At his First Lenten Synod (March, 1074) he enacted the following decrees:

(1) That clerics who had obtained any grade or office of sacred orders by payment should cease to minister in the Church. (2) That no one who had purchased any church should retain it, and that no one for the future should be permitted to buy or sell ecclesiastical rights. (3) That all who were guilty of incontinence should cease to exercise their sacred ministry. (4) That the people should reject the ministrations of clerics who failed to obey these in-



EMPEROR HENRY IV KNEELING BEFORE COUNTESS MATILDA AT CANOSSA

"Rex rogat Abbatem! Mathildim supplicat atque"  
 a MS. "Life of Matilda" (1114) by Donizo,  
 a monk of Canossa, Vatican Library, Rome

junctions. Similar decrees had indeed been passed by previous popes and councils. Clement II, Leo IX, Nicholas II, and Alexander II had renewed the ancient laws of discipline, and made determined efforts to have them enforced. But they met with vigorous resistance, and were but partially successful. The promulgation of Gregory's measures now, however, called forth a most violent storm of opposition throughout Italy, Germany, and France. And the reason for this opposition on the part of the vast throng of immoral and simoniacal clerics is not far to seek. Much of the reform thus far accomplished had been brought about mainly through the efforts of Gregory; all countries had felt the force of his will, the power of his dominant personality. His character, therefore, was a sufficient guarantee that his legislation would not be suffered to remain a dead letter. In Germany, particularly, the enactments of Gregory aroused a feeling of intense indignation. The whole body of the married clergy offered the most resolute resistance, and declared that the canon enjoining celibacy was wholly unwarranted in Scripture. In support of their position they appealed to the words of the Apostle Paul, I Cor., vii, 2, and 9: "It is better to marry than to be burnt"; and I Tim., iii, 2: "It behoveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife." They cited the words of Christ, Matt., xix, 11: "All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given"; and resorted to the address of the Egyptian Bishop Paphnutius at the Council of Nice. At Nuremberg they informed the papal legate that they would rather renounce their priesthood than their wives, and that he for whom men were not good enough might go seek angels to preside over the Churches. Siegfried, Archbishop of Mainz and Primate of Germany, when forced to promulgate the decrees, attempted to temporize, and allowed his clergy six months of delay for consideration. The order, of course, remained ineffectual after the lapse of that period, and at a synod held at Erfurt in October, 1074, he could accomplish nothing. Altmann, the energetic Bishop of Passau, nearly lost his life in publishing the measures, but adhered firmly to the instructions of the pontiff. The greater number of bishops received their instructions with manifest indifference, and some openly defied the pope. Otto of Constance, who had before tolerated the marriage of his clergy, now formally sanctioned it. In France the excitement was scarcely less vehement than in Germany. A council at Paris, in 1074, condemned the Roman decrees, as implying that the validity of the sacraments depended on the sanctity of the minister, and declared them intolerable and irrational. John, Archbishop of Rouen, while endeavouring to enforce the canon of celibacy at a provincial synod, was stoned and had to flee for his life; Walter, Abbot of Pontoise, who attempted to defend the papal enactments, was imprisoned and threatened with death. At the Council of Burgos, in Spain, the papal legate was insulted and his dignity outraged. But the zeal of Gregory knew no abatement. He followed up his decrees by sending legates into all quarters, fully empowered to depose immoral and simoniacal ecclesiastics.

It was clear that the causes of the simony and of the incontinence amongst the clergy were closely allied, and that the spread of the latter could be effectually checked only by the eradication of the former. Henry IV had failed to translate into action the promises made in his penitent letter to the new pontiff. On the subjugation of the Saxons and Thuringians, he deposed the Saxon bishops, and replaced them by his own creatures. In 1075 a synod held at Rome excommunicated "any person, even if he were emperor or king, who should confer an investiture in connection with any ecclesiastical office", and Gregory, recognizing the futility of milder measures, deposed the simoniacal prelates appointed by Henry, anathe-

matized several of the imperial counsellors, and cited the emperor himself to appear at Rome in 1076 to answer for his conduct before a council. To this Henry retorted by convening a meeting of his supporters at Worms on 23 January, 1076. This diet naturally defended Henry against all the papal charges, accused the pontiff of most heinous crimes, and declared him deposed. These decisions were approved a few weeks later by two synods of Lombard bishops at Piacenza and Pavia respectively, and a messenger, bearing a most offensive personal letter from Henry, was dispatched with this reply to the pope. Gregory hesitated no longer: recognizing that the Christian Faith must be preserved and the flood of immorality stemmed at all costs, and seeing that the conflict was forced on him by the emperor's schism and the violation of his solemn promises, he excommunicated Henry and all his ecclesiastical supporters, and released his subjects from their oath of allegiance in accordance with the usual political procedure of the age.

Henry's position was now precarious. At first he was encouraged by his creatures to resist, but his friends, including his abettors among the episcopate, began to abandon him, and the Saxons revolted once more, demanding a new king. At a meeting of the German lords, spiritual and temporal, held at Tribur in October, 1076, the election of a new emperor was canvassed. On learning through the papal legate of Gregory's desire that the crown should be reserved for Henry if possible, the assembly contented itself with calling on the emperor to abstain for the time being from all administration of public affairs and avoid the company of those who had been excommunicated, but declared his crown forfeited if he were not reconciled with the pope within a year. It was further agreed to invite Gregory to a council at Augsburg in the following February, at which Henry was summoned to present himself. Abandoned by his own partisans and fearing for his throne, Henry fled secretly with his wife and child and a single servant to Gregory to tender his submission. He crossed the Alps in the depth of one of the severest winters on record. On reaching Italy, the Italians flocked around him promising aid and assistance in his quarrel with the pope, but Henry spurned their offers. Gregory was already on his way to Augsburg, and, fearing treachery, retired to the castle of Canossa. Thither Henry followed him, but the pontiff, mindful of his former faithlessness, treated him with extreme severity. Stript of his royal robes, and clad as a penitent, Henry had to come barefooted mid ice and snow, and crave for admission to the presence of the pope. All day he remained at the door of the citadel, fasting and exposed to the inclemency of the wintry weather, but was refused admission. A second and a third day he thus humiliated and disciplined himself, and finally on 28 January, 1077, he was received by the pontiff and absolved from censure, but only on condition that he would appear at the proposed council and submit himself to its decision.

Henry then returned to Germany, but his severe lesson failed to effect any radical improvement in his conduct. Disgusted by his inconsistencies and dishonesty, the German princes on 15 March, 1077, elected Rudolph of Swabia to succeed him. Gregory wished to remain neutral, and even strove to effect a compromise between the opposing parties. Both, however, were dissatisfied, and prevented the proposed council from being held. Henry's conduct towards the pope was meanwhile characterized by the greatest duplicity, and, when he went so far as to threaten to set up an antipope, Gregory renewed in 1080 the sentence of excommunication against him. At Brixen in June, 1080, the king and his feudatory bishops, supported by the Lombards, carried their threat into effect, and selected Guibert, the excommunicated simoniacal Archbishop of Ravenna, as pope under the title of Clement III. Rudolph of Swa-

bia having fallen mortally wounded at the battle of Merseburg in 1080, Henry could concentrate all his forces against Gregory. In 1081 he marched on Rome, but failed to force his way into the city, which he finally accomplished only in 1084. Gregory thereupon retired into the castle of Sant' Angelo, and refused to entertain Henry's overtures, although the latter promised to hand over Guibert as a prisoner, if the sovereign pontiff would only consent to crown him emperor. Gregory, however, insisted as a necessary preliminary that Henry should appear before a council and do penance. The emperor, while pretending to submit to these terms, tried hard to prevent the meeting of the bishops. A small number however assembled, and, in accordance with their wishes, Gregory again excommunicated Henry. The latter on receipt of this news again entered Rome on 21 March, 1084. Guibert was consecrated pope, and then crowned Henry emperor. However, Robert Guiscard, Duke of Normandy, with whom Gregory had formed an alliance, was already marching on the city, and Henry, learning of his advance, fled towards Città Castellana. The pontiff was liberated, but, the people becoming incensed by the excesses of his Norman allies, he was compelled to leave Rome. Disappointed and sorrowing he withdrew to Monte Cassino, and later to the castle of Salerno by the sea, where he died in the following year. Three days before his death he withdrew all the censures of excommunication that he had pronounced, except those against the two chief offenders—Henry and Guibert. His last words were: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." His body was interred in the church of Saint Matthew at Salerno. He was beatified by Gregory XIII in 1584, and canonized in 1728 by Benedict XIII. His writings treat mainly of the principles and practice of Church government. They may be found under the title "Gregorii VII registri sive epistolarum libri" in Mansi, "Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio" (Florence, 1759) and "S. Gregorii VII epistolæ et diplomata" by Horoy (Paris, 1877).

ALZOG, *Universal Church History*, tr., II (Dublin, 1900), 321, 343-67; HASS, *History of the Popes* (Tubingen, 1860), 279-423; GABB, *Apology of Gregory VII* (Tubingen, 1792); IDEM, *Vindication of Gregory VII* (Pressburg, 1786); BARRY, *The Papal Monarchy* (New York, 1902), 190-232; BOWDEN, *Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII* (London, 1840); VOIGT, *Hildebrand, als Papst Gregorius VII., und sein Zeitalter, aus den Quellen bearbeitet* (Weimar, 1846); French tr. (Paris, 1854); LILLY, *Work of Gregory VII, the turning-point of the Middle Ages in Contemporary Review* (1882), XLII, 46, 237; MONTALEMBERT, *St. Grégoire VII, moine et pape in Le Correspondant* (1874), B, LXIII, 641, 861, 1081, tr. in *The Month* (1875), C, V, 370, 502 sqq., VI, 104, 235, 379 sqq.; ROCQUAIN, *La puissance pontificale sous Grégoire VII in Cpte. rendu acad. scen. mor.-polit.* (1881), F, XV, 315-50; DE VIDAILLON, *Vie de Grégoire VII* (Paris, 1837); DAVIN, *St. Grégoire VII* (Tournai, 1861); DULARC, *Grégoire VII et la réforme de l'Eglise au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1889); GFRORER, *Papst Gregorius VII. und sein Zeitalter* (Schaffhausen, 1859-61); *Acta SS.*, May, VI, 102-13, VII, 850, MABILLON, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* (1701), VI, ii, 403-6; MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence, 1759-1798), XX, 60-391; BRISCHAR in *Kirchenlexicon*, s. v. *Gregor VII.*, CASOLI, *La vita di papa S. Gregorio VII* (Bologna, 1885); *Anal. Boll.* (1892), XI, 324-6; WATTERICH, *Pontificum Roman. vite ab exeunte seculo IX ad finem seculi XIII, ab æqualibus conscriptæ* (Braunsberg, 1864); HEFELÉ, *Gregor VII. und Heinrich IV. zu Cassano in Theolog. Quartalschr.* (Tubingen, 1861), XLIII, 3-36; IDEM, *Hist. concil.*, V, 1-166; JAFFÉ, *Bibl. rer. German.*, II (1865), 1-9, 520; IDEM, *Reg. pont. Roman.* (1851), 379, 384, 389, 402-43, 949; *Centenario di papa S. Gregorio VII in Civiltà cattolica* (1873), H, X, 428-45; *Centenary of Gregory VII at Canossa in Dublin Review*, LXXXIII (London, 1878), 107; GIRAUD, *Grégoire VII et son temps in Revue des deux mondes*, CIV, 437-57, 613-45; CV, 141-74; *Gregory VII and Sylvester II in Dublin Review*, II (London, 1839), 289. See also HERGENROTHER-KIRSCH, *Kirchengeschichte*; and GORINI, *Défense de l'Église contre les erreurs historiques de M. Guizot, Aug et Am. Thierry, Michelet, Ampère, etc.*, III (Lyons, 1872), 177-307.

THOMAS OESTREICH.

**Gregory VIII, POPE** (ALBERTO DI MORRA); b. about the beginning of the twelfth century, at Benevento; elected at Ferrara, 21 Oct., 1187; d. at Pisa, 17 Dec., 1187, after a pontificate of one month and

twenty-seven days. The year 1187 witnessed the almost complete obliteration of Christianity in Palestine. On 4 July, Saladin won the decisive victory of Hittin, near Lake Tiberias; on 3 October, the terrible sultan was master of Jerusalem. The news of the fall of the Holy City struck Europe like a thunderbolt. Urban III is said to have died of a broken heart (20 Oct.). The following day the cardinals elected the chancellor, Cardinal Alberto. He was a Beneventan of noble family; had received a good education; at an early age became a monk, some say a Cistercian, some a Benedictine of Monte Cassino. He was created cardinal-deacon in 1155, by Adrian IV, and in 1158 cardinal-priest with the title of San Lorenzo in Lucina. Alexander III, in 1172, made him his chancellor. It is interesting to notice that he was the last cardinal who used that title until it was revived in our own day by Pius X, succeeding chancellors of the Holy See, for some reason not satisfactorily explained, calling themselves vice-chancellors. Cardinal Alberto was one of the two legates despatched to England by Alexander III to investigate the murder of St. Thomas à Becket. He also, in the pope's name, placed the royal crown on Alfonso II of Portugal. He was universally beloved for the mildness and gentleness of his disposition; and was no sooner seated on the pontifical throne than he confirmed the popular estimate of his character by making overtures to Barbarossa for a reconciliation with the Church. Since the dominant policy of his pontificate must be a crusade for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre, he issued circular letters to all the faithful, enjoining prayers and fasts; and as peace between the rival seaports of Pisa and Genoa was an essential condition to the transportation of troops and supplies, he repaired to the former city, where he was overtaken by death. He was buried in the cathedral of Pisa with all possible honours, and was succeeded by Clement III.

*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, II, 451; WATTERICH, *Vite Pont. Rom.*, II, 683-92; *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes* (1881), XLII, 166; NADIG, *Gregors VIII 67 tagiges Pontifikat* (Basle, 1890).

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

**GREGORY VIII, ANTIPOPE**, was Mauritius Burdinus (Bordinho, Bourdin), who was placed upon the papal chair by Emperor Henry V, 8 March, 1118. Bourdin was a Frenchman, born probably at Limoges. He received a good education at Cluny, and followed his fellow-Benedictine, Bernard, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, beyond the Pyrenees. At a time when Cluny stood for learning and reform, his advancement was assured. In 1098, he was made Bishop of Coimbra (Gams); in 1111, he was raised to the Metropolitan See of Braga. Three years later, in consequence of a quarrel with the primate, he was suspended by Paschal II. Coming later to Rome, he so ingratiated himself with the pontiff, who was also a Clunian, that he was retained at court and employed on weighty affairs. In 1117, when Henry came to Rome to force his terms upon the pope, Paschal, safe in Benevento, sent Bourdin with some cardinals to negotiate with the emperor. This mission proved to be the downfall of Bourdin. Seduced from his Gregorian principles, he openly espoused the cause of Henry, and, to emphasize his apostasy, placed the crown upon the emperor on Easter Day. He was promptly excommunicated; but was marked out for the supreme dignity by his new associates. A few months later, when Henry, learning of Paschal's death, hastened to Rome, surrounded by jurists, only to find that he had been outwitted by the vigilance of the cardinals, failing to capture Gelasius, he declared the latter's election null, and, after a discourse by the learned Irenæus of Bologna on imperial rights, induced a bribed assembly of Romans to proclaim Bourdin pope, who with unconscious irony took the name of Gregory. The honours



of the papacy turned to ashes in his hands. Repeatedly excommunicated and finally delivered as a prisoner into the hands of Callistus II, he was detained in several monasteries until his death about 1137. Thus ended the career of a prelate "whom", says William of Malmesbury (*Gesta Regum Angl.* V, 434), "everyone would have been obliged to venerate and all but adore on account of his prodigious industry, had he not preferred to seek glory by so notorious a crime". One of the canons of the Ninth General Council, 1123, declares all ordinations made by him after his condemnation, or by any bishop by him consecrated, to be *irritæ*.

JAFFE, *Regesta RR. PP.* 2d ed., I, 821-22; II, 715.

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

**Gregory IX** (UGOLINO, Count of Segni), POPE; b. about 1145, at Anagni in the Campagna; d. 22 August, 1241, at Rome. He received his education at the Universities of Paris and Bologna. After the accession of Innocent III to the papal throne, Ugolino, who was a nephew of Innocent III, was successively appointed papal chaplain, Archpriest of St. Peter's, and Cardinal-Deacon of Sant' Eustachio in 1198. In May, 1206, he succeeded Octavian as Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia and Velletri. A year later he and Cardinal Brancalone were sent as papal legates to Germany to mediate between Philip of Swabia and Otto of Brunswick, both of whom laid claim to the German throne subsequent to the death of Henry VI. By order of the pope the legates freed Philip from the ban which he had incurred under Pope Celestine III on account of invading the Pontifical States. Though the legates were unable to induce Otto of Brunswick to give up his claims to the throne, they succeeded in effecting a truce between the two claimants and returned to Rome in 1208 to treat with the pope concerning their future procedure. On their way back to Germany early in June, 1208, they were apprised at Verona that Philip had been murdered, and again returned to Rome. Early in January, 1209, they again proceeded to Germany with instructions to induce the princes to acknowledge Otto of Brunswick as king. They were successful in their mission and returned to Rome in June of the same year. After the death of Pope Innocent III, 16 July, 1216, Ugolino was instrumental in the election of Pope Honorius III on 18 July. In order to hasten the choice the College of Cardinals had agreed to an election by compromise and empowered Cardinals Ugolino and Guido of Pre-neste to appoint the new pope.

In January, 1217, Honorius III made Ugolino plenipotentiary legate for Lombardy and Tuscia, and entrusted him with preaching the crusade in those territories. In this capacity he became a successful mediator between Pisa and Genoa, in 1217, between Milan and Cremona in 1218, and between Bologna and Pistoia in 1219. At the coronation of Frederick II in Rome, 22 November, 1220, the emperor took the cross from Ugolino and made the vow to embark for the Holy Land in August, 1221. On 14 March, 1221, Pope Honorius commissioned Ugolino to preach the crusade also in Central and Upper Italy. After the death of Pope Honorius III (18 March, 1227), the cardinals again agreed upon an election by compromise and empowered three of their number, among whom were Ugolino and Conrad of Urach, to elect the new pope. At first Conrad of Urach was elected, but he refused the tiara lest it might appear that he had elected himself. Hereupon the cardinals unanimously elected Ugolino on 19 March, 1227, and he reluctantly accepted the high honour, taking the name of Gregory IX. Though he was already far advanced in age (being more than eighty years old), he was still full of energy.

The important diplomatic positions which Gregory

IX had held before he became pope had acquainted him thoroughly with the political situation of Europe, and especially with the guileful and dishonest tactics of Emperor Frederick II. Three days after his installation he sternly ordered the emperor at last to fulfil his long delayed vow to embark for the Holy Land. Apparently obedient to the papal mandate, Frederick II set sail from Brindisi on 8 September, 1227, but returned three days later under the plea that the Landgrave of Thuringia, who was accompanying him, was on the point of death, and that he himself was seriously ill. Gregory IX, knowing that Frederick II had on eight or nine previous occasions postponed his departure for the East, distrusted the emperor's sincerity, and on 29 September, 1227, placed him under the ban of the Church. He tried to justify his severe measures towards the emperor in a Brief to the Christian princes, while, on the other hand, the emperor addressed a manifesto to the princes in which he condemns the action of the pope in very bitter terms. The imperial manifesto was read publicly on the steps of the Capitol in Rome, whereupon the imperial party in Rome, under the leadership of the Frangipani, stirred up an insurrection, so that when the pope published the emperor's excommunication in the basilica of St. Peter, 23 March, 1228, he was openly insulted and threatened by a Ghibelline mob, and fled first to Viterbo, and then to Perugia.

In order to prove to the Christian world that the pope was too hasty in placing him under the ban, the emperor resolved to proceed to the Holy Land and embarked from Brindisi with a small army on 28 June, 1228, having previously asked the blessing of Gregory IX upon his enterprise. The pope, however, denying that an excommunicated emperor had a right to undertake a holy war, not only refused his blessing, but put him under the ban a second time and released the crusaders from their oath of allegiance to him. While in the Holy Land the emperor, seeing that he could accomplish nothing as long as he was under the ban, changed his tactics towards the pope. He now acknowledged the justice of his excommunication and began to take steps towards a reconciliation. Gregory IX distrusted the advances of the emperor, especially since Rainald, the imperial Governor of Spoleto, had invaded the Pontifical States during the emperor's absence. But the papal anathema did not have the effect which Gregory IX had hoped for. In Germany only one bishop, Berthold of Strasburg, published the Bull of excommunication, and nearly all the princes and bishops remained faithful to the emperor. Cardinal Otto of San Nicolò, whom Gregory IX had sent to Germany to publish the emperor's excommunication, was entirely unsuccessful, because Frederick's son Henry, his representative in Germany, forbade the bishops and abbots to appear at the synods which the cardinal attempted to convene. Equally futile were Gregory's efforts to put Duke Otto of Brunswick on the German throne. In June, 1229, Frederick II returned from the Holy Land, routed the papal army which Gregory IX had sent to invade Sicily, and made new overtures of peace to the pope. Gregory IX, who had been a fugitive at Perugia since 1228, returned to Rome in February, 1230, upon the urgent request of the Romans, who connected an overwhelming flood of the Tiber with their harsh treatment of the pontiff. He now opened negotiations with Hermann of Salza (q. v.), the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, whom the emperor had sent as his representative. On 20 July, 1230, a treaty was concluded at San Germano between the pope and the emperor, by force of which that part of the Pontifical States which was occupied by imperial troops and the papal possessions in Sicily were restored to the pope. After the ban was removed from the emperor by Cardinals John of Sabina and Thomas of Capua in the imperial camp near Ceperano on 28 August, 1230, pope and

emperor met at Anagni and completed their reconciliation during the first three days of September.

The peace concluded between the pope and the emperor was, however, to be only temporary. The papacy as conceived by Gregory IX and the empire as conceived by Frederick II could not exist together in peace. The emperor aimed at supreme temporal power with which the pope should have no right to interfere. At least in Italy he attempted to establish a rule of absolutism by suppressing all municipal liberty and holding the cities in subjection by a revived sort of feudalism. The pope, on the other hand, citing the example of Constantine, who exchanged Rome for Constantinople in deference to the pope, thought that the pope should be the supreme ruler in Italy and by force of his spiritual authority over the whole Christian world the papacy should in all things hold the supremacy over the empire. For a time the emperor assisted the pope in suppressing a few minor revolts in the Pontifical States, as was stipulated in the conditions of peace. Soon, however, he began again to disturb the peace by impeding the liberty of the Church in Sicily and by making war upon Lombardy. The freedom of the Lombard cities was a strong and necessary bulwark for the safety of the Pontifical States and it was only natural that the pope should use all his influence to protect these cities against the imperial designs. As arbiter between the emperor and the Lombard cities the pope had a few times decided in favour of the latter. The emperor, therefore, no longer desired the services of the pope as mediator and began open hostilities against the Lombard League. He gained a signal victory at Cortenuova, on 27 November, 1237. To save Lombardy from the despotic rule of the emperor and to protect the Pontifical States, the pope entered into an alliance with the Tuscans, Umbrians, and Lombards to impede the imperial progress. The continuous victories of the emperor spurred his pride to further action. He declared his intention to unite with the empire not only Lombardy and Tuscany, but also the Patrimony of St. Peter and practically the whole of Italy. On 20 March, 1239, the pope again excommunicated the emperor and another disastrous struggle between the papacy and the empire ensued. Henceforth the pope was convinced that as long as Frederick was emperor there was no possibility of peace between the papacy and the empire, and he left nothing undone to bring about his deposition. He ordered a crusade to be preached against him in Germany, instructed his German legate Albert of Behaim, the Archdeacon of Passau, to urge the election of a new king upon the princes, and to place under the ban all those that continued to side with the excommunicated emperor. Despite papal anathemas many bishops and princes remained loyal to the emperor who, encouraged by his large following, decided to humiliate the pope by making himself master of the Pontifical States. In this great distress the pope ordered all bishops to assemble in Rome for a general council at Easter (31 March), 1241. But the emperor prevented the meeting of the council by forbidding the bishops to travel to Rome and by capturing all those that undertook the journey despite his prohibition. He himself marched towards Rome with an army and lay encamped near the city, when Gregory IX suddenly died at the age of almost one hundred years.

The mendicant orders which began to shed great lustre over the Christian Church in the first half of the thirteenth century found a devoted friend and liberal patron in Gregory IX. In them he saw an excellent means for counteracting by voluntary poverty the love of luxury and splendour which was possessing many ecclesiastics; a powerful weapon for suppressing heresy within the Church; and an army of brave soldiers of Christ who were ready to preach His Gospel to the pagans even at the risk of their life. When still

Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, Gregory IX would often don the dress of St. Francis, walk about barefoot with the saint and his disciples, and talk of holy things. Saint Francis loved him as his father and in a prophetic spirit addressed him at times as "the bishop of the whole world and the father of all nations". Upon the special request of Saint Francis, Pope Honorius III appointed him protector of the order in 1220. He was also a devoted friend of St. Dominic and promoted the interests of his order in many ways. At the death of St. Dominic he held the funeral services and buried the saint at Bologna in 1221. St. Clare and her order stood likewise under the protection of Gregory IX, as is attested by the convents he founded for the order in Rome, Lombardy, and Tuscany. However, despite his great liberality towards the rising mendicant orders he did not neglect the older ones. On 28 June, 1227, he approved the old privileges of the Camaldolese, in the same year he introduced the Premonstratensians into Livonia and Courland, and on 6 April, 1229, he gave new statutes to the Carmelites. He financially and otherwise assisted the Cistercians and the Teutonic Order in the Christianization of Prussia and the neighbouring countries of the North. On 17 January, 1235, he approved the Order of Our Lady of Mercy for the redemption of captives. With the help of the religious orders he planned the conversion of Asia and Africa and sent missionaries out of their ranks to Tunis, Morocco, and other places, where not a few suffered martyrdom. He also did much to alleviate the hard lot of the Christians in the Holy Land, and would have done still more, if his plans to recover the Holy Land for the Christians had not been frustrated by the indifference of Frederick II. The calendar of saints was enriched with some of the most popular names by Gregory IX. On 16 July, 1228, he canonized St. Francis at Assisi, and on the next day he laid the cornerstone of the church and monastery which were erected in honour of the saint. He took part in the composition of the Office of St. Francis and also wrote some hymns in his honour. It was also at his command that Thomas of Celano wrote a biography of the saint (latest and best edition by d'Alençon, Rome, 1906). On 30 May, 1232, he canonized St. Anthony of Padua, at Spoleto; on 10 June, 1233, St. Virgil, Bishop of Salzburg and Apostle of Carinthia; on 8 July, 1234, St. Dominic, at Rieti; and on 27 May, 1235, St. Elizabeth of Thuringia, at Perugia.

Gregory IX was very severe towards heretics, who in those times were universally looked upon as traitors and punished accordingly. Upon the request of King Louis IX of France he sent Cardinal Romanus as legate to assist the king in his crusade against the Albigenses. At the synod which the papal legate convened at Toulouse in November, 1229, it was decreed that all heretics and their abettors should be delivered to the nobles and magistrates for their due punishment, which, in case of obstinacy, was usually death. When in 1224 Frederick II ordered that heretics in Lombardy should be burnt at the stake, Gregory IX, who was then papal legate for Lombardy, approved and published the imperial law. During his enforced absence from Rome (1228-1231) the heretics remained unmolested and became very numerous in the city. In February, 1231, therefore, the pope enacted a law for Rome that heretics condemned by an ecclesiastical court should be delivered to the secular power to receive their "due punishment". This "due punishment" was death by fire for the obstinate and imprisonment for life for the penitent. In pursuance of this law a number of Patarini were arrested in Rome in 1231, the obstinate were burnt at the stake, the others were imprisoned in the Benedictine monasteries of Monte Cassino and Cava (Ryccardus de S. Germano, ad annum 1231, in Mon. Germ. SS., XIX, 363). It must not be thought, however, that Gregory IX

dealt more severely with heretics than other rulers did. Death by fire was the common punishment for heretics and traitors in those times. Up to the time of Gregory IX the duty of searching out heretics belonged to the bishops in their respective dioceses. The so-called Monastic Inquisition was established by Gregory IX, who in his Bulls of 13, 20, and 22 April, 1233, appointed the Dominicans as the official inquisitors for all dioceses of France (Ripoll and Bremond, "Bullarium Ordinis Fratrum Predicatorum", Rome, 1729, I, 47).

For a time Gregory IX lived in hope that he might effect a reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches. Germanos, Patriarch of Constantinople, after a conversation on the religious differences between the Greeks and the Latins, which he had with some Franciscans at Nice, in 1232, addressed a letter to Gregory IX, in which he acknowledged the papal primacy, but complained of the persecution of the Greeks by the Latins. Gregory IX sent him a cordial answer and commissioned four learned monks (two Franciscans and two Dominicans) to treat with the patriarch concerning the reunion. The papal messengers were kindly received both by the Emperor Vatatzes and by Germanos, but the patriarch said that he could make no concessions on matters of faith without the consent of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. A synod of the patriarchs was held at Nympha in Bithynia, to which the papal messengers were invited. But the Greeks stubbornly adhered to their doctrine concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost and asserted that the Latins could not validly consecrate unleavened bread. Thus Gregory IX failed, like many other popes before and after him, in his efforts to reunite the two Churches. In 1237 the Patriarch of the Syrian Monophysites and many of his bishops and monks renounced their heresy and submitted to the pope (Raynaldus ad annum 1237, n. 87 sq.), but their conversion was only temporary.

During the thirteen years and four months of his pontificate he created about fourteen cardinals, many of whom were members of religious orders. The best known among them are Sinibald of Fiesco, a learned canonist, who afterwards ascended the papal throne as Innocent IV; Raynald of Segni, a nephew of Gregory IX, who succeeded Innocent IV as Alexander IV; Otto of Monterrat, who spent over three years (1237-1240) as papal legate in England; Jacob of Vitry, an author, confessor of Bl. Mary of Oignies, whose life he wrote (Acta SS., June, IV, 636-66); St. Francis Nonnatus; and the learned and pious Englishman, Robert of Somercote, who, it is said, would have succeeded Gregory IX on the papal throne had he not died during the conclave (26 Sept., 1241). Gregory IX was also a man of learning, which he encouraged in various ways. He bestowed many privileges upon the University of Paris, his Alma Mater, but also watched carefully over its professors, whom he warned repeatedly against the growing tendency of subjecting theology to philosophy by making the truth of the mysteries of faith dependent on philosophical proofs. He also possesses the great merit of having again made Aristotelianism the basis of scholastic philosophy, after the Physics of Aristotle had been prohibited in 1210, and his Metaphysics in 1215. The prohibition of Aristotle was meant only for the perverted Latin translation of his works and their Averroistic commentaries. Gregory IX commissioned William of Auvergne and other learned men to purge the works of Aristotle of their errors and thus made them again accessible to students. Among the greatest achievements of Gregory IX must be counted the collection of papal decretals, a work with which he entrusted Raymond of Pennaforte and which was completed in 1234 (see DECRETALS). The numerous letters of Gregory IX were first collected and published by Pamelius (Antwerp, 1572). Rodenburg edited 485 letters of

Gregory IX, selected by Pertz from the papal registers of the thirteenth century, and published them in "Mon. Germ. Epist. Rom. Pontif." (Berlin, 1883), I, 261-728. Lucian Aubray began (Paris, 1890) to edit "Les Registres de Gregoire IX, recueil des bulles de ce pape, publiées ou analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican", of which the eleventh fascicle appeared in 1908.

A Life of Gregory IX, *Vita Gregorii IX*, was written by a contemporary of Gregory IX, perhaps JOANNES DE FERENTINO. It was published by MURATORI in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* (Milan, 1728), III, 1, 577-588. Concerning it see MARX, *Die Vita Gregorii IX quellenkritisch untersucht* (Berlin, 1889). The two best modern references are: BALAN, *Storia di Gregorio IX e dei suoi tempi*, 3 vols. (Modena, 1872-3); FELTEN, *Papst Gregor IX*, (Freiburg, 1886); see also KOEHLER, *Verhältniss Friedrichs II zu den Papsten seiner Zeit* (Breslau, 1888); HUIJLARD-BESCHOUËS, *Historia diplomatica Frederici II*, 12 vols. (Paris, 1852-61); BOEHMER-FICKER, *Regesten des Kaiserreichs* (Innsbruck, 1879-81); WINKELMANN, *Acta imperii inedita sac. XIII et XIV*, 2 vols. (Innsbruck, 1880-85); PAGI, *Braviarium Gestorum Pont. Rom.* (Venice, 1730), III, 214-243.

MICHAEL OTT.

**Gregory X, POPE:** b. 1210; d. 10 January, 1276. The death of Pope Clement IV (29 November, 1268) left the Holy See vacant for almost three years. The cardinals assembled at Viterbo were divided into two camps, the one French and the other Italian. Neither of these parties could poll the two-thirds majority vote, nor was either willing to give way to the other for the election of a candidate to the papacy. In the summer of 1270 the head and burgesses of the town of Viterbo, hoping to force a vote, resorted to the expedient of confining the cardinals within the episcopal palace, where even their daily allowance of food was later on curtailed. A compromise was finally arrived at through the combined efforts of the French and Sicilian kings. The Sacred College, which then consisted of fifteen cardinals, designated six of their body to agree upon and to cast a final vote in the matter. These six delegates met, and on 1 September, 1271, united their ballots in choice of Teobaldo Visconti, archdeacon of Liège, who, however, was not a cardinal himself, nor even a priest. The new pontiff was a native of Piacenza and had been at one time in the service of Cardinal Jacopo of Palestrina, had become archdeacon of Liège, and accompanied Cardinal Ottoboni on his mission to England, and at the time of his election happened to be in Ptolemais (Acre), with Prince Edward of England, on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Receiving a summons from the cardinals to return immediately, he began his homeward journey on 19 November, 1271, and arrived at Viterbo on 12 February, 1272. He declared his acceptance of the dignity and took the name of Gregory X. On 13 March he made his entry into Rome, where on the nineteenth of the same month he was ordained to the priesthood. His consecration as pope took place on 27 March. He plunged at once with all his energies into the task of solving the weighty problems which then required his attention: the restoration of peace between Christian nations and princes, the settlement of affairs in the German empire, the amendment of the mode of life among clergy and people, the union of the Greek Church with Rome, the deliverance of Jerusalem and of the Holy Land. As early as the fourth day after his coronation he summoned a general council, which was to open at Lyons on 1 May, 1274 (see LYONS, COUNCILS OF). In Italy the pope sought to make peace between the Guelphs and Ghibellines, whose factional war raged chiefly in Tuscany and Lombardy. Against the city of Florence, the burgesses of which resisted these efforts to bring about a reconciliation, he issued a decree of excommunication. After the death of Richard of Cornwall (1272) Gregory advised the German princes to select a new sovereign and refused the demand of Alfonso of Castile, rival of Richard, for recognition as emperor. Rudolf of Hapsburg having been elected on 29 Sep-


tember, 1273, Gregory X immediately recognized him and invited him to Rome to receive the imperial crown. The pope and the emperor met at Lausanne in October of 1273. Gregory was then returning from the Council of Lyons. Rudolf took here the customary oaths for the defence of the Roman Church, took the cross, and postponed until the following year his journey to Rome. The pope obtained from Alfonso of Castile the renunciation of his claims to the German crown.

From the very beginning of his pontificate Gregory sought to promote the interests of the Holy Land. Large sums were collected in France and England for this crusade. A resolution adopted at the Council of Lyons, which opened on 7 May, 1274, provided that one-tenth of all benefices accruing to all churches in the course of six years should be set aside for the benefit of the Holy Land, the object being to secure the means of carrying on the holy war. This tithe was successfully raised, and preparations were at once

*Rudolf von Habsburg in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen (Freiburg im Br., 1891); WALTER, Die Politik der Kurie unter Gregor X. (Berlin, 1894); OTTO, Die Beziehungen Rudolfs von Habsburg zu Papst Gregor X. (Innsbruck, 1895); VON HIRSCH-GEREUTH, Studien zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, I: Die Kreuzzugspolitik Gregors X. (Munich, 1896); PICHLER, Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident, I (Munich, 1864), 342 sq.; DRASEKE, Der Kirchenversuch des Kaisers Michael VIII Paläologus in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1891), XXXIV, 325 sq.; HEFELE, Konziliengeschichte, VI, 119 sq.*

J. P. KIRSCH.

**Gregory XI** (PIERRE ROGER DE BEAUFORT), POPE; b. in 1331, at the castle of Maumont in the Diocese of Limoges; d. 27 March, 1378, at Rome. He was a nephew of Pope Clement VI, who heaped numerous benefices upon him and finally created him cardinal deacon in 1348, when he was only eighteen years of age. As cardinal he attended the University of Perugia, became a skilled canonist and theologian, and gained the esteem of all by his humility and purity of heart. After the death of Urban V, the cardinals unanimously elected him pope at Avignon, on 30 De-



RETURN OF GREGORY XI FROM AVIGNON TO ROME  
Benvenuto di Giovanni, Siena

made in France and England for the expedition, which unfortunately was not carried out. The ambassadors of the Grecian emperor, having arrived in Lyons on 24 June, swore, at the fourth sitting of the council (July 6) that the emperor had renounced the schism, and had returned to the allegiance due the Holy See. But this union, entered into by Michael Palæologus for purely political reasons, was in no sense destined to endure. At the close of this council, over which Gregory had presided in person, he travelled by way of Lausanne, Milan, and Florence as far as Arezzo, where he died on 10 January, 1276. Though his pontificate proved so short, the results which he achieved were of far-reaching consequence, and he succeeded in maintaining unimpaired peace and harmony. On account of his unusual virtues he is revered as a saint in Rome and in a number of dioceses (Arezzo, Piacenza, Lausanne), his feast being 16 February.

GUIRAUD, *Les Registres de Grégoire X. Recueil des bulles de ce Pape in Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises de Rome et d'Athènes* (Paris, 1892—); POTTHAST, *Regesta Romanorum Pontificum*, II (Berlin, 1875), 1651 sq.; *Vita Gregorii X.*, ed. MURATORI in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, III, i, 597 sq., 599 sq.; III, ii, 424 sq.; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, I (Brussels, 1898-99), 545 sq.; BONUCCI, *Istoria del pontefice Gregorio X* (Rome, 1711); PIACENZA, *Compendio della storia del b. Gregorio X papa* (Piacenza, 1876); LOSERTH, *Akten über die Wahl Gregors X.* in *Neues Archiv* (1895), XXI, 309 sq.; ZISTERER, *Gregor X. und*

cember, 1370. He chose the name of Gregory XI, had himself ordained priest on 4 January, 1371, and was crowned pope on the following day. Immediately upon his accession he attempted to reconcile the Kings of France and England, but failed. He succeeded, however, in pacifying Castile, Aragon, Navarre, Sicily, and Naples. He also made efforts towards the re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches, the undertaking of a crusade, and the reform of the clergy. Soon, however, he had to give his entire attention to the turbulent affairs of Italy. Duke Bernabò Visconti of Milan, an inveterate enemy of the papacy, had in 1371 made himself master of Reggio and other places that were feudatory to the Holy See. When all other means to bring him to terms had failed, Gregory XI placed him under the ban. Bernabò compelled the legates that brought him the Bull of excommunication to eat the parchment on which his excommunication was written, and heaped many other insults upon them. Hereupon Gregory XI declared war upon him in 1372. Success was at first on the side of Bernabò, but when Gregory XI obtained the support of the emperor, the Queen of Naples, the King of Hungary, and bought into his service the English *condottiere* John Hawkwood, Bernabò sued for peace. By bribing some of the papal councillors he obtained a favourable truce on 6 June, 1374.

Like the preceding popes of Avignon, Gregory XI made the fatal mistake of appointing Frenchmen, who did not understand the Italians and whom the Italians hated, as legates and governors of the ecclesiastical provinces in Italy. The Florentines, moreover, feared that a strengthening of the papal power in Italy would impair their own prestige in Central Italy and allied themselves with Bernabò in July, 1375. Both Bernabò and the Florentines did their utmost to stir up an insurrection in the pontifical territory among all those that were dissatisfied with the papal legates in Italy. They were so successful that within a short time the entire Patrimony of St. Peter was up in arms against the pope. Highly incensed at the seditious proceedings of the Florentines, Gregory XI imposed an extremely severe punishment upon them. He put Florence under interdict, excommunicated its inhabitants, and outlawed them and their possessions. The financial loss which the Florentines sustained thereby was inestimable. They sent St. Catherine of Siena to intercede for them with Gregory XI, but frustrated her efforts by continuing their hostilities against the pope. In the midst of these disturbances Gregory XI, yielding to the urgent prayers of St. Catherine, decided to remove the papal see to Rome, despite the protests of the French King and the majority of the cardinals. He left Avignon on 13 September, 1376, boarded the ship at Marseilles on 2 October, and came by way of Genoa to Corneto on 6 December. Here he remained until arrangements were made in Rome concerning its future government. On 13 January, 1377, he left

Corneto, landed at Ostia on the following day, and sailed up the Tiber to the monastery of San Paolo, from where he solemnly made his entrance into Rome on 17 January. But his return to Rome did not put an end to the hostilities. The notorious massacre of Cesena, which was ordered by Cardinal Robert of Geneva (afterwards Antipope Clement VII), embittered the Italians still more against the pope. The continuous riots in Rome induced Gregory XI to remove to Anagni towards the end of May, 1377. He gradually quelled the commotion and returned to Rome on 7 Nov., 1377, where he died while a congress of peace was in process at Sarzano. Gregory XI was the last pope of French nationality. He was learned and pious, though not free from nepotism. In 1374 he approved the Order of the Spanish Hermits of St. Jerome, and on 22 May, 1377, he issued five Bulls in which the errors of Wyclif were condemned. He was so disgusted with the conditions at Rome that only death prevented him from returning to Avignon. The Great Schism began after his death.

BALUZE, *Vitæ Paparum Avinion.* (Paris, 1693), 452-486, 1059-1234; GHERARDI, *La guerra dei Fiorentini con Papa Gregorio XI, detta la guerra degli Otto Santi* (Florence, 1868); SCHOLZ, *Die Rückkehr Gregors XI. von Avignon nach Rom* (Hirschberg, 1884); KIRSCH, *Die Rückkehr der Papste Urban V. und Gregor XI.* (Paderborn, 1898); PASOR, *Gesch. der Papste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, 4th ed. (Freiburg, 1901), 101-114, tr., ANTROBUS (London, 1891), I, 100-116; TOMASETH, *Die Register und Secretare Urbans V. und Gregors XI.* in *Mittheilungen des Instituts oesterr. Geschichtsforsch.* (1898), XIX, 417-470; DRANE, *The History of St. Catherine of Siena*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1899), passim.

MICHAEL OTT.

I































UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



130 535

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY